

Comments on Draft Plan and how the Plan has been Changed

Part of Document	ID	Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
	35	Mr and Mrs R and D Sunderland	Comment	Given the development is adjacent to residential bungalows all of which are occupied by elderly residents we would hope that any development on the site would be sympathetic to the existing residents' needs.	The impact on residential amenity will be considered when determining the detailed design of the scheme.
All	2	Marine Management Organisation		No comments	N/A
All	241	RSPB	Support	Do not have any concerns to raise	Noted
All	17	Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council		No Comments	N/A
All	14	The Coal Authority		No Comments	N/A
Development Limits	70	English Heritage	Comment	Criterion (g) states that "important open spaces have been identified on the Proposals Map". However the plan on page 25 does not identify any such areas.	Reference to the identification of important open spaces has been changed to important open views on the policies map.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Development Limits	68 English Heritage	Support	We endorse the basis upon which the Development Limits have been defined. We particularly support criterion (e) (the exclusion of burgage plots) and criterion (g) (the exclusion of important open spaces on the edge of the town). This will help to ensure that there is less pressure for the development of elements which contribute to the historic character of the town.	Noted.
Development Limits	69 English Heritage	Comment	In order to avoid any confusion, it would be better to also include mention of the landscape setting of the town (which is a key element to its character).	Reference to the landscape setting has been added to criteria (g) of the Development Limit section in paragraph 5.18.
General	4 Mr C Christie	Comment	Page 5 says that the National Park has the highest status of protection to conserve and enhance the natural beauty. I trust this principle will underlie all discussions on siting, design etc of development. I hope that any development will be as unintrusive as possible and full consideration given to existing inhabitants.	The Draft Helmsley Plan refers to the need to make reference to the adopted Design Guides of the North York Moors National Park and these consider in detail the requirement to conserve and enhance the special qualities of the National Park . Policy H9 'Design' has been added to the Publication version of the Plan , which seeks to maintain the landscape of the National Park.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
General	94 England and Lyle	Support	We consider the approach adopted by the Plan to fully accord with existing and emerging development plan policy and the NPPF.	Support noted.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
General	77 The Home Builders Federation		<p>The document is heavily reliant upon the Ryedale Core Strategy and North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies. The Ryedale Core Strategy is currently undergoing examination and therefore the policies within this document will need to have due regard to the outcome of the examination, particularly with regard to housing requirements. The North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies document was adopted under a different national planning context prior to the publication of the National Planning Framework. The HBF cannot identify whether a thorough assessment of the North York Moors Core Strategy and its policies has been undertaken against the requirements of the NPPF. The National Park will be aware that NPPF paragraph 213 requires plans to be revised where they do not adequately take into account national policies. It is imperative that the Helmsley Plan is based within the context of the NPPF.</p>	<p>The National Park Authority has carried out an assessment of compliance of policies against the NPPF policies, which is available on the Authority's website. The housing requirements for the Helmsley Plan are based on the figure for the whole of Helmsley identified in the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy and this approach was recently found sound by the Planning Inspector. The Ryedale Local Plan Strategy has been adopted and has full weight as part of the development plan for Ryedale. This figure meets some of the needs of the National Park given the close interrelationship. The North York Moors National Park commitment to the allocation of sites in Helmsley has been set out in the Core Strategy and Development Policies document, which was adopted in 2008. The approach for housing development set out in the Core Strategy and Development Policies Document is supported by the English National Parks and the Broads UK Government Vision and Circular 2010, which states that the Government recognises that the Parks are not suitable for unrestricted housing and does not therefore provide general housing targets for them. In the case of Helmsley the town is split by the</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
				National Park boundary and therefore both authorities consider that a co-ordinated approach provided the most appropriate planning solution. The text in section 5 has been amended to reflect that It is within this context that the housing provision figure in the plan has been set.
General	41 Mrs V A Moorby	Comment	It is somewhat ironic that the Conservation Area is to be increased - which is commendable - at the same time as nearby infringement, not to say desecration of other areas is proposed. There should be no greenfield development around Helmsley, while there are still undeveloped sites within the town and while there are many buildings, both residential and commercial which are currently unoccupied or underoccupied, with the retail sector in its present state a number of properties could with imagination be returned to residential use. This could be achieved with little difficulty and lead to much benefit, thereby increasing the housing stock.	The level of development which needs to be allocated through the Helmsley Plan cannot be accommodated within existing brownfield sites and therefore needs to be located on greenfield land. The Helmsley Plan has also identified the opportunity for "windfall" development, however the NPPF requires that unless a robust case can be made this should not be included in the overall supply and will be in addition to the provision figure.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
General	100 England and Lyle	Comment	<p>Ryedale District Council, through the emerging Ryedale Local Plan, currently envisages that there is a need to deliver about 150 additional dwellings in and around Helmsley over the next 15 years. This figure has not yet been confirmed and is not yet adopted but is likely to represent a minimum housing requirement figure for the Town for the plan period. The supply of land within the existing settlement limits of Helmsley, that is available for housing is very limited. Policy H1 identifies just one site 'commitment'. As a result it will be necessary to identify greenfield sites on the edge of the town to fully meet the town's objectively assessed needs over the plan period. The Council and the National Park Authority have undertaken a thorough review of all available options around the edge of Helmsley and have identified a range of sites that will be capable of meeting the identified housing requirement, as well as providing an element of choice and competition, in a sound and sustainable manner. This includes our client's site - NYMH3 Land North of Elmslac Road.</p>	Noted.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
General	240 Stone and Bean Associates obo Thomas the Baker	Comment	In order to ensure that Thomas the Baker remains in Helmsley they will need to be able to sustainably expand and this requires either upgrading and adoption of Sawmill Lane or access through Riccal Drive to Station Road/Sawmill Lane. A more direct route out onto the A170 would reduce the number of properties subject to potential disturbance.	The Helmsley Plan is concerned with ensuring that new development can be accommodated on the highway network. The proposed allocations do not seek to use Sawmill Lane for access and therefore it is not a requirement of the Plan to seek its upgrading. However the Planning Authorities acknowledge the business needs of Thomas the Bakers and will work with them and the developers of Sites EMP1 and EMP2 to facilitate future expansion. The current proposed access to sites EMP1 and EMP2 are via Riccal Drive.

General	198 Environment Agency	Support	We are pleased to see that our previous comments dated 2 March 2012 are included in the development briefs for sites where flood risk varies around the site. The briefs stipulate that water compatible uses such as public open space/ habitat areas are steered towards the highest flood risk areas. This applies to sites 174, 183 and NYMH8 where there are some areas of flood zones 2 and 3 (medium and high risk).	Noted.
---------	------------------------	---------	---	--------

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
General	197 Environment Agency	Comment	We are pleased to see that the proposed residential allocations have taken the sequential approach and the sites coming forward are all within flood zone 1, low flood risk. This complies with development policy 2 (flood risk) of the North York Moors National Park's Core Strategy and Development Policies, as well as policy SP17 (managing air quality, land and water resources) of Ryedale's Local Plan Strategy.	Noted.
General	24 NYCC	Comment	The Local Highways Authority (LHA) has previously provided feedback on the early Helmsley Plan discussion papers. As well as considering the accessibility and impact of the existing network in the Helmsley area the LHA highlighted the need to consider the priority and strategic nature of the A170.	Noted.
General	120 Mr Peter Holmes Johnson	Comment	Currently there are many homes and shops for sale in Helmsley, some of which have been on the market for some time. These could be developed, without damaging the countryside.	There is a requirement to build at least a 150 new homes in Helmsley over the plan period, there is insufficient existing empty stock to meet this level of need.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
General	118 Mr Peter Holmes Johnson	Comment	All of the proposed sites in Helmsley will be significantly detrimental to the preservation of the Yorkshire countryside and the North York Moors National Park. The Ryedale Council and the North York Moors National Park Authority need to explain more fully the justification for spoiling several beautiful areas in Helmsley. If development is required and this is not certain, the Council should examine again other sites in Helmsley and nearby towns. Ideally no building should be contemplated on greenfield sites or be allowed within the National Park unless it is within existing boundaries and does	Government guidance requires Local Planning Authorities to meet their full objectively assessed housing needs and where there are restrictions to this they must be robustly justified. Ryedale District Council have a provision figure to deliver at least 150 new homes in Helmsley over the plan period. As the town is split by the National Park boundary both authorities are working jointly to assess the most suitable sites for development to meet the housing needs of the town. The sites that have been identified for allocation are considered the most appropriate for a range of reasons including their impact on the National Park's special qualities. There is clearly insufficient land available within the town to provide the required new homes.
General	65 English Heritage	Comment	The Plan is setting out a strategy not just for the development "in" the town, but also around the existing built-up area.	Noted. This has been clarified in the introduction.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
General	51 Helmsley Town Council	Support	Helmsley Town Council has been a party to the drafting of the Plan and I can confirm its support in principle for the Plan's overall vision for the development of the town, the selection of sites for new housing and the allocation of site EMP1 and EMP2 for employment land.	Support noted.
General	52 Helmsley Town Council	Comment	We recognise that the town has to grow during the 15 year period, both to contribute to wider housing needs and in order to remain sustainable as a market town economy and as a lively community. We place great importance, however, on the conservation of the town's distinctive character, which includes its compactness as well as its traditional architectural styles and materials. We are particularly concerned not to see 'suburban sprawl' in the north east quadrant of the town - and therefore wish it to be clearly established that sites NYMH1 and NYMH8 represent the maximum extent of development in that quadrant for the foreseeable future, rather than a starting point for further negotiation as the Plan period advances.	The allocations in the Helmsley Plan set out where development will be supported over the plan period. The Plan is clear that apart from windfall sites located within the Development Boundary only development on these sites will be supported. The allocated sites therefore define the extent for new development over the plan period.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
General	62 English Heritage	Comment	The section sets out a good overview of the town's historic development and the many heritage assets in and around the settlement that contribute to its distinct identity, its tourism economy and the quality of life of its communities.	Noted.
General	61 English Heritage	Comment	There needs to be a statement setting out the precise extent of the area which is covered by this Local Plan. Presumably it is the area depicted on page 25.	Noted. This has been added to the introduction at paragraph 3.4.
General	60 English Heritage	Comment	It would greatly assist those commenting on the plan if the paragraphs were numbered	Noted. The Publication version is numbered.
General	134 Beth and Jonathan Davies	Comment	We feel that the Authority has put its desire to help Ryedale with its housing allocation before its first purpose which is deeply regrettable. Helmsley is a thriving place and we acknowledge the need for measured additional housing but the addition of over 200 new units in such a short space of time will change the character of the town and will have an adverse impact on the special qualities of the National Park.	The NPPF requires that Local Planning Authorities meet their full objectively assessed housing needs. The figure for Helmsley of 150 has been based on a range of evidence including household population projections and has been found sound by the Planning Inspector following examination of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy. Commitment to a joint allocation plan with Ryedale District Council is long established in the Core Strategy and Development Policies Document.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
General	119 Mr Peter Holmes Johnson	Comment	<p>Currently it is understood that no conversions of existing buildings or new buildings are allowed in the North York Moors National Park. The NYMH3 plan shows approximately 95 new units/houses within the National Park. The Council is making it too easy for developers to build on greenfield sites. There are plenty of other areas in Helmsley and other local towns which could be developed.</p>	<p>There is a requirement to build at least a 150 new homes in Helmsley over the plan period as a result of increases in the population and changes to the demographics of the town and this figure has been found sound by the Inspector following the examination of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy. There is insufficient brownfield land within the town to accommodate this level of development. The National Park policies support the conversion of existing buildings where they do not conflict with National Park Purposes.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
General	19 Sport England	Comment	<p>While the National Planning Policy Framework has radically simplified the Planning system in England, a central tenet of Plan-making remains that the plan must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. The NPPF explains that Local Planning Authorities should set out the strategic priorities for the area, including strategic policies to deliver ... the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities. Paragraph 171 falls within the section of the NPPF that sets out advice on the evidence base that Plans need, and deals with Health and Well-Being. It advises;“Local planning authorities should work with public health leads and health organisations to understand and take account of the health status and needs of the local population (such as for sports, recreation, and places of worship), including expected future changes and any information about relevant barriers to improving health and well-being.” This advice is amplified in the section of the</p>	<p>An Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study was carried out by Ryedale District Council in 2007. The Strategy included the whole of Helmsley and is considered to be up to date.</p>

NPPF that deals with promoting healthy communities. Paragraph 73 states; "Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up to date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required." In light of the above, it is Sport England's policy to challenge the soundness of Local Plan and Local Development Framework documents which are not justified by; an up to date playing pitch strategy (carried out in accordance with a methodology approved by Sport England) and an up to date built sports facilities strategy (carried out in accordance with a methodology approved by Sport

Part of Document

ID Respondent

Support/Object/Comment

Comment

Authorities Response

England). For a playing pitch strategy to be considered “up to date”, it should have been undertaken within the last three years. For a built facilities strategy to be considered “up to date” it should have been carried out within the last five years. The situation for Helmsley is complicated by the fact that for planning purposes it falls partly within Ryedale and partly within the National Park, but our understanding is that neither authority has up-to-date strategies dealing with playing pitches or built sports facilities.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
General	13 Mono Consultants Limited	Comment	<p>We would take this opportunity to comment that we consider it important that there is a telecommunications policy within the emerging Helmsley Plan. It is recognised that telecommunications plays a vital role in both the economic and social fabric of communities. National guidance recognises this through Section 5: "supporting high quality communications infrastructure" of NPPF which provides clear guidance as to the main issues surrounding telecommunications development. The NPPF at paragraph 42 confirms that; "advanced, high quality communications infrastructure is essential for sustainable economic growth and play a vital role in enhancing the provision of local community facilities and services". Paragraph 42 of NPPF confirms that "in preparing local plans, local planning authorities should support the expansion of telecommunications networks". But should also "aim to keep the numbers of radio telecommunications masts and sites for such installations to a minimum consistent with the efficient operation of the</p>	<p>Noted. Policy 13 'Telecommunications Installations' has been added to the Publication version, which sets out criteria against which new development of this nature will be assessed.</p>

network. Existing masts, buildings and other structures should be used unless the need for a new site has been justified". Further advice on the siting and design of telecommunications and good practice procedural guidance is contained within the Code of Best Practice for Mobile Network Development (2002). This builds on the Ten Commitments to ensure that the industry is alive to the concerns of local communities and consultation is built into the development process. On this basis we would suggest that a concise and flexible communications policy should be included within the Helmsley Plan. Such a policy should give all stakeholders a clear indication of the issues that telecommunications development will be assessed against. The proposed wording of policy is set out in response.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
General	11 Dr Paul Harris	Comment	These two consultation events have not been publicised in the Gazette and Herald; why not? I don't think sufficient local residents have been made adequately aware of the proposals. Only six weeks consultation period: many people are on holiday and have not been able to attend either of the two sessions.	Flyers were put up around the town advertising the 2 consultation events and a press release was issued to the local press, which received great interest. The consultation events were deliberately arranged 3 weeks apart in order to try and allow for holidays etc. At the initial consultation stage a paper was sent to every resident in the town. A database has been compiled of all those who responded and a letter about the consultation was sent out to all these people. Officers also attended a meeting of the Town Council to discuss the consultation.
General	232 NYCC	Comment	In landscape terms there is general support for the joint-authority approach, with allocations needing to be developed with sympathetic design criteria in mind.	Support noted.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
General	231 NYCC	Comment	<p>With respect to library facilities there is an issue in the town, particularly with regard to lack of available / affordable community venues. The library's current location at Helmsley Town Hall requires a commercial rent which has been deemed unaffordable by other natural community partners such as Ryedale DC, the Police, and Helmsley Town Council. This means that at present there is no single, coherent community centre or hub in the centre of town. Some clarity on this going forward will be useful.</p>	<p>The Authorities are looking into CIL and RDC have published a PDCS for consultation. Developer contributions are taken to ensure that the infrastructure requirements (on site and off-site) needed to support development over the plan period are put in place. They are not to be used to remedy existing problems (unless the new development places has an effect on these which requires attention) or to entirely replace existing revenue funded services/ facilities. Clearly commercial issues with existing private landlords are outside the scope of the Helmsley Plan or CIL. Ryedale District Council prepared an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is informing the emerging infrastructure list for CIL, and this issue has not been previously highlighted by NYCC as being required. Therefore it has not been highlighted in the Helmsley Plan. The Authorities will have an ongoing discussion with NYCC regarding infrastructure requirements in the progression of the Helmsley Plan and CIL.</p>
General	9 Dr Paul Harris	Support	I am fully in agreement with your underlying policies.	Noted.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
General	18 Mr and Mrs E Kirby	Comment	More people work in tourism than in agriculture. Planners should make it easier for property owners to convert/replace buildings on brownfield sites, not just restrict planning conversion to traditional buildings only. This could be done sympathetically to improve and enhance the National Park.	This is out of the scope of the Helmsley Plan.
General Comments	136 Beth and Jonathan Davies	Comment	We would also like to know how the NPA will be able to control the release of land for development to ensure that all development does not take place at the same time.	All sites will require detailed planning permission. A flexible approach to phasing of development has been adopted to ensure there is an ongoing mix of new housing being delivered. Further text on phasing has been added to the Publication version on page 16.
General Comments	135 Beth and Jonathan Davies	Comment	It seems illogical that the housing units to be provided by the care facility are not being incorporated within the overall figures and we would urge the NPA to address this	The approach not to deduct the Extra Care provisions from the planned levels of housing provision which has been adopted in the Helmsley Plan complies with the overall approach of Ryedale District Council's Local Plan Strategy which has been found sound by an independent Planning Inspector.

Part of Document	ID	Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Highways Access to S	234	Stone and Bean Associates obo Thomas the Baker	Comment	Sawmill Lane and Station Road have their difficulties and Highway Access from Riccal Drive to to these roads should be sought.	The access issues will need to be negotiated with the developers of sites EMP1 and EMP2 to try and resolve this issue. The purpose of the Helmsley Plan is to ensure that new employment land can be accessed appropriately rather than provide a solution to existing problems. However where there are opportunities to resolve existing issues Officers will work with stakeholders to achieve the most suitable outcome.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
NYMH8	48 Stan Houston	Object	<p>At the Wharfedale presentation on July 9 we were assured that the mature trees lining Linkfoot Lane would be retained. This must in our view, be insisted upon to preserve the existing appearance of this main route into Helmsley. The proposed supermarket is unattractive and unnecessary. There is already the BATA shop at this end of town and putting another shop here could adversely effect businesses in the centre of Helmsley. Helmsley's existing character must be protected and anything that threatens the balance of this small market town is unacceptable. Road access is also a concern for this site. Would the existing bus stops have to be moved? Would this be safe or sensible? Additional traffic from a residential development at this site might be managable - that from a supermarket would not.</p>	<p>The Helmsey Plan will allocate sites for housing and employment development only. Any proposal for retail use will need to be assessed against Policy H5.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
NYMH8	g Ms Jen Harris	Object	<p>Page 18 of the Draft Development Plan quite rightly emphasises the importance of Helmsley as a retail centre. Page 19 states that there should be no harm to the vitality and viability of the town as demonstrated through a robust impact assessment. The proposal by Wharfedale Homes to build a retail unit on this site is contrary to the above statement and will jeopardise the future of Helmsley Town's economic success. The proposed unit will have approximately double the floor area of the existing Co-op store in Helmsley Market Square. This new store will be anticipating a doubling of customer sales and this will result in a significant reduction of business for the Town Centre retail outlets. Shoppers will be drawn from the town centre leading to closure of some outlets as they cease to be economically viable. This will impact on both residents and visitors since the range of high quality independent retailers in Helmsley Town Centre will be reduced and Helmsley will cease to be the vibrant economic centre we currently enjoy.</p>	<p>Noted. Any application for out of town retail use will be assessed against Policy H5 contained in the Helmsley Plan.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Objectives	63 English Heritage	Support	We support the proposed objectives for the Plan especially the final two bullet points relating to the conservation and enhancement of the special qualities of the town and the retention of its historic character.	Noted.
Objectives	137 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Support	Supports the 4 main objectives of the Plan.	Support noted.
Phasing	144 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	The wording on page 13 relating to the phasing of 'over 15 years' is ambiguous and this should be changed to reflect the wording in the policy	The plan period will be up to 2027 in order to align with the time period of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy. Further text on the phasing of development has been added to the Publication version of the Plan, which explains that a flexible approach has been adopted.
Plan Period	138 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	Objects to the plan period up to 2027 as this should be at least 15 years as set out in the NPPF. A clearly established plan period is essential for the purpose of calculating the housing requirement, the housing trajectory, the five year land supply and consideration of whether it is necessary to address any backlog in delivery.	The plan period has to be 2027 to be in line with the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy the basedate of which is 2012. The NPPF states that Local Plans should be drawn over "an appropriate timescale". Officers consider this to be appropriate.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Plan Period	78 The Home Builders Federation	Object	<p>The plan period identifies that it will set the spatial approach to development for the next 15 years, yet the plan period only extends until 2027. This will effectively provide, at best, 13 years post adoption and not the preferred 15 years as indicated by NPPF paragraph 157. Whilst it is recognised the plan period of 2012 to 2027 will align with the Ryedale Core Strategy, presuming it is found to be sound. However, the plan period appears confused throughout the document. For example Table H1 indicates the phasing of development within the plan but this extends to 2028. It is recommended that the plan provides a clear and consistent period throughout the document. For example Table H1 indicates the phasing of the development within the plan but extends this to 2028. It is recommended that the plan provides a clear and consistent period throughout. If the period is less than 15 adequate justification should be provided. Establishing the plan period is essential for the purposes of calculating the housing requirement, the housing trajectory, the five year land supply and consideration of</p>	<p>The timescale of the Plan must reflect the timeframe of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy of 2012 - 2027. The NPPF talks about "preferably a 15 year time horizon" and the basedate of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy reflected this.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
			whether it is necessary to address any backlog in delivery.	
Poicy H10	195 Environment Agency	Comment	The current text portrays green infrastructure merely as amenity green space and neglects to mention its importance for biodiversity and flood risk. This should be addressed in the next draft of the plan.	Policy H11 'Green Infrastructure' has been amended to refer to biodiversity and environment systems as well as amenity green space.
Policy H1	79 The Home Builders Federation	Comment	As noted above Table H1 which is part of policy H1 identifies a confused phasing of sites with the plan indicating a period from 2012 to 2027 yet the timescale runs from 2013 until 2028. Whilst it is accepted that some sites may not be fully developed until after the plan period this needs to be clearly stated. The non-completion of sites until after the plan period will inevitably impact upon the plan requirement of 150 housing units by 2027. Whilst it is noted the plan provides allocations for more than 150 dwellings, it is not clear how this late phasing will impact upon the overall delivery.	Noted. Further information on the approach to the phasing of development has been added to the Publication version of the Plan on page 16.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H1	143 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	<p>Object to the housing requirements as the 150 is not adequately justified in the plan and has not been assessed fully in accordance with up to date evidence for the cumulative needs of both authorities. In short, the plan is specific to Helmsley and as such the housing delivery needs to be specific to Helmsley. The background text to the policy is heavily focused on discussing the needs of Ryedale. It begins on page 12 by discussing the affordable housing needs of Helmsley before then going on to discuss in great detail the needs of Ryedale and the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy and its approach to supply. Wharfedale Homes consider this is muddled and unclear. There is a need to provide additional evidence within the background text that clearly identifies the needs of the National Park for which Helmsley is the Service Centre. The North Yorkshire SHMA identified a an annual need for 18 affordable units in Helmsley. This level of provision would indicate a need for c 270 affordable housing units in Helmsley over the plan period. Wharfedale Homes is concerned that the allocated sites will</p>	<p>The National Park Authority has carried out an assessment of compliance of policies against the NPPF policies, which is available on the Authority's website. The housing requirements for the Helmsley Plan are based on the figure for the whole of Helmsley identified in the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy and this approach was recently found sound by the Planning Inspector. As argued at the Examination, this figure also assists in addressing some of the needs in the National Park. The Ryedale Local Plan Strategy has been adopted by Ryedale District Council and has full weight as part of the development plan for Ryedale. The North York Moors National Park commitment to the allocation of sites in Helmsley has been set out in the Core Strategy and Development Policies document, which was adopted in 2008. The approach for housing development set out in the Core Strategy and Development Policies Document is supported by the English National Parks and the Broads UK Government Vision and Circular 2010, which states that the Government recognises that the Parks are not suitable for unrestricted housing and does not therefore provide general housing targets for them. In the case of</p>

deliver very few affordable homes from developers contribution. If need cannot be met the plan will need to allow for an increased total number of houses to make up this deficit. The Ryedale Local Plan Strategy housing figures are based on out of date figures from from the RSS and Wharfedale Homes considers there is a requirement for RDC and the NYMPA to produce an up to date evidence base, specifically for Helmsley which takes into account recent household projection figures of both authorities. This is because a district wide approach is not relevant here and is the reason why the Helmsley Plan is needed. The Helmsley Plan will need to have due regard to the outcome of the Ryedale LPS examination, particularly in regards to housing requirements.

Helmsley the town is split by the National Park boundary and therefore both authorities consider that a co-ordinated approach provided the most appropriate planning solution. It is within this context that the housing provision figure set out in the adopted Ryedale Local Plan Strategy has been adopted by the National Park Authority. The text of the Plan has been amended to clarify this context.

Policy H1

142 Barton Willmore obo
Wharfedale Homes

Object

There is no supportive evidence to justify the phasing of housing sites. This restrictive policy is contrary to the provisions of NPPF paragraph 47 which seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing.

It is entirely appropriate that phasing of the site is included to ensure that requirements are met over the plan period. Further clarification on the approach to phasing has been added to the Publication version of the Plan on page 16.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H1	158 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	Wharfedale Homes considers that the phasing of housing sites is not adequately justified in the plan or the supporting evidence. If a site is deemed to be suitable for development and allocated to deliver the housing needs of the area it should be made available for development now and not artificially constrained by policy. Page 17 makes reference to monitoring housing closely in conjunction with the delivery of housing across Ryedale. The district wide approach is not relevant here which is why the plan was needed in the first place.	The phasing of development is explained on page 16 of the Publication version of the Plan.

Policy H1	26 Ms Christine Wright	Comment	All the homes must be for local working people. None must be sold for holiday letting, as there are too many homes already in Helmsley which are empty for most of the year.	The Helmsley Plan requires that 40% of all new housing is affordable to meet the needs of local people. The Planning Authorities are unable to control open market housing and therefore cannot prevent them being used as second homes.
-----------	------------------------	---------	--	--

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H1	80 The Home Builders Federation	Comment	The phasing of housing sites is not adequately justified in the plan or in the supporting evidence. If a site is deemed to be appropriate for development and required to deliver the housing needs of an area it should be made available for development now and not artificially constrained by policy. Such an approach is contrary to the provisions of NPPF paragraph 47 which seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing.	Further information on the approach to the phasing of development has been added to the Publication version of the Plan on page 16.
Policy H1	146 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	Wharfedale Homes support the inclusion of current housing commitments within Policy H1 as this directly affects future housing requirements. However reference to future housing commitments in paragraph 4 should be clearer and include the number of units and name of the site.	Noted. The number of units and name of sites with existing consents has been added to Policy H1. The allocated sites and current commitments will allow for at least 150 units to be delivered.
Policy H1	5 Mr C Christie	Comment	On page 9 it says "housing to meet local needs only". This may not be 100% deliverable but developers should not be allowed free reign to expand. It is important that housing development be released gradually as per note on page 9.	Noted. Sites allocated in the Plan will be supported for new development. Further details on how development will be phased has been set out in the Publication version of the Plan.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H1	145 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	<p>It should read 'at least 150 dwellings'. Wharfedale Homes considers that the NYMPA has not undertaken a thorough assessment of the housing requirements within the National Park against the requirements of the NPPF. Section 62 of the 1995 Environment Act states that National Park Authorities should seek to foster the economic and social well-being of the local community, therefore an assessment of local needs within the National Park is vital. At present the NP does not have a housing target but anticipates that future completions will be of a similar average annual figure of 26 units which is based in the period 1991-2007. Using this figure as a baseline NYMPA could potentially accumulate an additional 390 dwellings over a 15 year period for which the majority of growth is directed towards Helmsley. At present using this figure the potential growth has not been accounted for within the plan. Wharfedale Homes contests that there is no up to date evidence base that reflects the local needs of the National Park. It is not clear how the 26 dwellings per annum stated in the NYMNP Core</p>	<p>The North Yorkshire SHMA identifies a need for 20 affordable units per year over the next 5 years to meet the existing backlog (5 of these arise from within the National Park). However this is set within the context of a National Park, where the 2010 circular states that Government recognises that Parks are not suitable locations for unrestricted housing. The sites which have been identified are considered suitable for development and are not considered to harm the special qualities of the Park, whereas further development will. The Authorities will seek to achieve the highest possible affordable housing contribution viable. The levels of growth for the town have already been established through the examination of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy and the purpose of the Helmsley Plan is to allocate the sites to deliver this level of growth.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
			Strategy and 150 dwellings per annum from the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy have been reconciled against the provisions of the NPPF.	
Policy H1	7 Ms Jen Harris	Object	The intention to build approximately 150 residential units is not being supported with adequate employment opportunities. The new houses risk attracting more retired people to Helmsley or becoming second homes.	The Helmsley Plan allocates 1.9ha of employment land in the town in order to support the expansion of existing businesses in the town and attract new employment opportunities. There is a requirement for up to 40% of all new units to be affordable to meet identified housing needs in the local area. These units will remain affordable to local people through the implementation of a legal agreement. The Authorities are unable to restrict the use of the open market properties and there is a risk that these will be occupied by retired people or as second homes in the same way as all open market housing stock.
Policy H1	159 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	The housing requirements must jointly take into account the need of both Ryedale District Council and the National Park.	The further information on the housing provision figure has been added to the supporting text of Policy H1.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H1	148 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Support	Wharfedale Homes supports the provision of an extra care facility and it is agreed that this should not be included in the overall requirements for 150 new homes as this aligns with DCLG guidance on cumulative housing requirements. However Wharfedale Homes suggests that the provision should not be limited to the NYCC scheme to ensure there is no conflict of interest.	NYCC have been referred to in the Plan as they are working with developers on bringing this site forward. The need is also supported through evidence. The Plan does not preclude other extra care facilities coming forward if the need can be justified.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H1	81 The Home Builders Federation	Comment	<p>The policy also requires 5% of all new dwellings to be bungalows on sites above 50 units or more. Whilst this requirement would only potentially apply to one site in Helmsley there appears little justification for its requirement. Whilst it is noted that the 2010 Ryedale SHMA indicates a district wide deficit in such properties, this does appear to be followed into the more recent 2011 North Yorkshire SHMA, including the Ryedale annex. However even if this requirement can be justified by the evidence it should only be used as a guideline. It should also be noted that the needs of the elderly can be met in several ways including extra care housing, for which there is an allocation in Helmsley. A specific requirement may have the effect of stalling development and could jeopardise the delivery of this site.</p>	Noted. Text on the justification for the requirement for 5% of all new dwellings on proposals greater than 50 units has been added to paragraph 5.11 of the Publication version.

Policy H1	22 NYCC	Support	<p>In strategic planning terms the Plan's proposed measures for housing numbers (including affordable homes provision) appears to be appropriate as regards both national policy and the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy.</p>	Noted.
-----------	---------	---------	---	--------

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H1	82 The Home Builders Federation	Comment	Putting aside issues relating to the appropriateness of the housing requirement for Helmsley as set out within the Ryedale Core Strategy, the principle of identifying more sites than the plan requires in Helmsley is generally supported as this will ensure flexibility within the plan to enable it to meet its targets. If, however development exceeds the 25% local tolerance levels this should not, as inferred in the plan, be used as a brake upon development. Such a stance would be contrary to the NPPF which seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing. Additional housing over and above the targets set for Helmsley will assist Ryedale in meeting its overall housing need and assist in alleviating the affordable housing issues within the town.	Noted. Further text has been added to the plan to clarify phasing. The phasing has been flexibly applied with indicative end times rather than start times as some sites may require longer lead in times.

Policy H1	157 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Support	Wharfedale homes generally support the suggestion that 30 dph is an appropriate housing density and welcomes the plans flexibility in suggesting dependence on individual site assessments.	Support noted.
-----------	--	---------	---	----------------

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H1	147 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Support	Wharfedale Homes supports the requirement of Policy H1 that at least 5% of all new dwellings on developments of more than 50 units must be bungalows.	Support noted.
Policy H10	201 Environment Agency	Comment	The existing draft falls short of the overarching policy SP14 of the Ryedale Local Plan, and provides little direction as to requirements for developers. In order to be compliant with the Ryedale Local Plan and NPPF, the policy should be rewritten as: All development proposals within the Plan area must demonstrate a net gain in green infrastructure and biodiversity, commensurate with the scale of the development. This should include expansion and enhancement of green infrastructure assets. This more aspirational policy would deliver more for local residents and the environment, whilst giving developers a better steer as to what is required when proposing new developments within the plan area.	Noted. Policy H11 'Green Infrastructure' has been amended to reflect these concerns and now addresses biodiversity and green infrastructure assets.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H11	167 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	The introduction of CIL needs to be based upon an identified infrastructure deficit within an associated infrastructure delivery plan. The plan should highlight some broad infrastructure schemes which are considered necessary by both Local Authorities. The Councils will also need to consider how any other infrastructure will be funded and delivered. Our client is concerned at the range of contributions identified and the cumulative impact on the ability to provide meaningful amounts of affordable housing.	Further information on the infrastructure requirements for Helmsley have been added to the Publication version of the Plan.
Policy H11	168 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	It should also be highlighted that design requirements with each development brief will also have significant cost implications. This is something which needs to be carefully thought through when setting affordable housing provision requirements.	As set out in Policy H3 an affordable housing requirement of up to 40% affordable housing will be sought subject to independent viability assessment as this recognises that viability will be dependent on the detailed design requirements of schemes.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H11	169 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	Wharfedale Homes accepts that the background text does specifically set out that any Section 106 agreements will be used to fund infrastructure improvements directly related to the development of a site. However, the policy itself is not explicit as to the difference between S106 and CIL contributions. Wharfedale Homes advise that this needs to be made explicitly clear to avoid any confusion as to where the contributions go.	Further clarification on the use of CIL and S106 agreements has been added to the Publication version of the Plan to address these concerns.
Policy H11	170 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	Wharfedale Homes notes that the Plan does not have any policies for sport and recreation provision for the town but wants contributions for this within each development brief. It is recommended that there is a need for policy H11 to set out guidance on contributions expected from developers.	Noted. Sections 12 and 13 of the Publication version of the Plan sets out in detail what contributions will be sought for and through which mechanisms.
Policy H11	171 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	Wharfedale Homes recommends that there should be a clear policy provision for the enhancement of open spaces and pathways. These details can then be provided within the development briefs.	Noted. This has been included in the revised text and is also set out in the Development Briefs.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H11	89 The Home Builders Federation	Comment	It is noted that Ryedale District Council and the National Park Authority are considering the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy. It is important that the Council undertake a thorough viability assessment of all plan policies both within the National Park, Ryedale and Helmsley Plans prior to its introduction. The levy should not be set at the margins of viability as this is likely to jeopardise plan delivery.	If CIL is introduced it will be supported by robust evidence and will be subject to independent examination. Ryedale District Council have now published the Draft Charging Schedule for consultation, which sets out likely tariffs having regard to drawing back from the margins of viability and having considered the policy requirements of the Local Plan Strategy and the emerging Helmsley Plan policies. The National Park Authority are currently awaiting a report on possible tariffs and if this is progressed it will be consulted on.
Policy H11	92 The Home Builders Federation	Comment	While the HBF does not wish to comment upon individual sites it is important that the viability of the sites proposed is adequately assessed with developers within the area. The cumulative impact of contributions required upon each site must also be considered and the Council should not seek to unduly burden development in line with NPPF paragraph 137.	Ryedale District Council are currently consulting on the Draft CIL charging schedule which is based on a robust assessment of viability and with reference to the NPPF.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H11	20 Sport England	Comment	Sport England notes the Plan's identification of quantitative deficiencies in outdoor and indoor sports and qualitative deficiencies in outdoor sports, but given our concerns about the Plan's evidence base we would query how this has been established.	The deficiencies have been identified through the Ryedale Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study 2007, which is considered up to date.
Policy H11	90 The Home Builders Federation	Comment	If CIL is adopted this should be the only tool for collecting funds to address the cumulative impacts of development on types of infrastructure. It is noted that the proposed allocations indicate site specific and wider (generally highway) infrastructure improvements required in Helmsley. The policy, therefore, needs to explicitly explain any funds received through section 106 will relate solely to the requirements necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; be directly related to the development and be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. They should not seek to rectify existing deficits or wider strategic infrastructure issues as this is the role of CIL.	Noted. The Publication version of the Helmsley Plan clarifies the distinction between S106 requirements and CIL.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H11	166 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	Prior to the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy it is vital that the Councils undertake a thorough viability assessment of all plan policies, of both the National Park Core Strategy, Ryedale Local Plan Strategy and also the Helmsley Plan.	Noted. If CIL is adopted by the authority it will be supported by evidence and be subject to independent examination. Ryedale are currently consulting on a draft charging schedule which has considered viability issues in detail.
Policy H11	91 The Home Builders Federation	Comment	The introduction of CIL also needs to be based upon an identified infrastructure deficit within an associated delivery plan. It is noted that the plan does indicate some broad infrastructure schemes which are considered necessary by the Council. It is, however, important that the Council consider how this and any other infrastructure will be funded and delivered. If the infrastructure identified cannot be delivered the Council will need to prioritise the infrastructure and ensure its delivery would promote development.	Noted. The Publication version of the Helmsley Plan provides more details about the infrastructure requirements and the role of CIL. The Authorities will be required to meet the CIL regulations if CIL is to be introduced which includes a regulation 123 infrastructure list setting out the details of required infrastructure improvements.
Policy H2	149 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	Generally supportive of the approach to windfall developments, however this policy should make it clear that windfalls will not count towards overall supply targets in Helmsley.	Further clarification on this has been added to paragraph 5.16.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H2	150 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	Wharfedale Homes accepts the general principle of defining development limits as part of the policy , however we would argue that the limits should be more widely drawn to include the whole of site NYMH1 and Site NYMH2.	The reasons why these sites are not allocated is set out in the Plan. The inclusion of these sites within the development boundary would mean that they are considered appropriate for development which is contrary to the outcome of the Site Selection Methodology assessment.
Policy H2	67 English Heritage	Comment	The Conservation Area Appraisal notes the importance of the various open spaces throughout the town of which the burgage plots are only one element. It would be preferable to amend this bullet-point in order to ensure that these other spaces are also appropriately protected. It would also be preferable to use the terminology of the NPPF.	Noted. Reference to open spaces within the town has been added to Policy H2.
Policy H2	83 The Home Builders Federation	Comment	The background to this policy identifies that no windfall allowance has been made in the land supply forecasts. Whilst such an approach is generally supported it is important that the development of windfall sites are not used as a reason to invoke a brake upon development if the 25% local tolerance is surpassed. The policy should make clear that windfalls will not count towards overall supply targets for the settlement.	Noted. Text has been added at paragraph 5.16, which clarifies that windfalls will form 'committed' housing supply.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H2	84 The Home Builders Federation	Comment	<p>The policy identifies that windfalls outside of the defined development limits will be restricted to those of an essential or exceptional nature. It is considered that such a stance is overly restricted and an unnecessary requirement. Applications should be considered on their merits against the provisions of the NPPF which already provides protection for National Parks and rural areas from inappropriate development. An overly restrictive policy may prevent beneficial development taking place.</p>	<p>The approach of the Helmsley Plan complies with the North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies and the adopted Ryedale Core Strategy, which do not allow for development in open countryside, sites outside of the Development Boundary would be considered as open countryside.</p>
Policy H2	66 English Heritage	Support	<p>Subject to the change below, we support the policy which will assist in ensuring that any windfall developments which come forward do not harm the historic environment of the town or those elements which contribute to its distinctive character.</p>	<p>The policy has been amended to include reference to conservation of elements which contribute to the historic character of the town.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H3	85 The Home Builders Federation	Comment	<p>The need for affordable housing is identified within the North Yorkshire SHMA which identifies a requirement for 20 units per year in Helmsley. Over the 15 year life of the plan this would equate to 300 units, double the planned housing requirement. If the overall housing requirement for Helmsley were increased this would greatly assist in reducing the affordable housing need in the town.</p>	<p>The reference to the requirement for 20 units per year in the North Yorkshire SHMA is for a five year period in order to address the existing backlog. The delivery of affordable housing must comply with the NPPF but must consider National Park Purposes and the English National Parks Circular 2010. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF specifies that Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs unless specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted and a footnote says that such an example are National Parks. The housing figures for the whole of Helmsley were discussed at length during the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy examination. As argued at the Examination, this figure also assists in addressing some of the needs in the National Park. The Local Plan Strategy has now been adopted and has full weight as part of the development plan for Ryedale.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H3	86 The Home Builders Federation	Comment	<p>The plan states that the requirement for up to 40% affordable housing on sites of 5 or more within Helmsley. Whilst the Entec and Stoughair reports on affordable housing viability identify potential viability in Helmsley no account is taken of abnormal costs or the full cumulative costs of planning obligations. A nominal £5,000 figure is identified for obligations, however the full cost of plan requirements in line with NPPF paragraphs 173 and 174 are not explored. It is essential that the Council undertakes such work prior to adopting the affordable housing requirements, it is also noted that the Entec study was undertaken in 2010 and the Stroughair study does not specifically look at sites in Helmsley, therefore the Council may wish to update this to take account of current economic circumstances.</p>	<p>Policy H3 requires an affordable housing provision of up to 40% subject to independent viability assessment this will take account of any abnormal costs. This level of affordable housing provision is supported by the viability assessments carried out by both Authorities, which assessed the general viability of housing development, taking account of planning obligations and therefore considered robust. The basis for the 40% affordable housing requirement is supported by viability assessments carried out by both Authorities but is subject to negotiation if the developer believes it cannot be made. This will be carried out on an open book viability basis.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H3	87 The Home Builders Federation	Comment	<p>Whilst the provision for negotiation upon the affordable housing requirement is welcomed this should not be used as a standard remedy to an unsustainable policy. It is essential that the Council provides clear evidence that the cumulative impact of all developer contributions will not unduly burden development in the majority of cases. The requirement for the prescriptive 10% intermediate/90% social rented tenure mix, should be amended to allow flexibility of tenure mix on a site by site basis based upon development viability and local needs at the time of development. Such inflexibility may inhibit the development of sites which will only lead to exacerbation of current affordability issues in Helmsley.</p>	<p>The Authorities are considering the introduction of CIL in Helmsley, which will need to be based on robust evidence and will be subject to independent examination. The tenure split reflects the problems of mortgage availability for shared ownership schemes and the high house prices in the town. Although this requirement has been removed from the policy, paragraph 5.24 specifies that the starting point for discussions will be 90% social and affordable rent and 10% intermediate. The basis for the 40% affordable housing requirement is supported by viability assessments carried out by both Authorities but is subject to negotiation if the developer believes it cannot be made. This will be carried out on an open book viability basis.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H3	151 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	<p>Wharfedale homes is very concerned that the housing need identified within the North Yorkshire SHMA is not achievable through developer contributions alone. While viability implications have been identified within the financial viability assessment carried out by both authorities in 2011, no account is taken of any abnormal costs or the full cumulative costs of planning obligations for each site. Furthermore the full cost of plan requirements in line with NPPF paragraphs 173 and 174 are not explored. If the Councils are not able to provide a sufficient level of affordable housing from their permissions then it is suggested that the Plan will need to allow for an increased total number of houses to make up this deficit.</p>	<p>The housing requirement for Helmsley was debated and supported through the examination of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy, which has now been adopted. The North Yorkshire SHMA identifies a need for 20 affordable units per year over the next 5 years to meet the existing backlog (5 of these arise from within the National Park). However this is set within the context of a National Park, where the 2010 circular states that Government recognises that Parks are not suitable locations for unrestricted housing. The sites which have been identified are considered suitable for development and are not considered to harm the special qualities of the Park, whereas further development will. The Authorities will seek to achieve the highest possible affordable housing contribution viable.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H3	152 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	<p>Wharfedale Homes is broadly supportive of the policy requirement for up to 40% affordable housing on sites of 5 or more dwellings within Helmsley. However an alternative is that the plan could require affordable housing provision to be in the range of 25% to 40% for all sites. Wharfedale Homes would be supportive of such an approach so other developers do not create unrealistic land value expectations and then argue against affordable housing provision on the grounds of viability.</p>	<p>The policy is currently worded to say a requirement of up to 40% will be sought, which is supported by evidence collated by both Authorities. The target is subject to negotiation where a developer believes this level cannot be met and will be carried out on an open book basis.</p>
Policy H3	153 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	<p>Where developers argue that 40% affordable housing is not viable on particular scheme the plan outlines that an assessment will be carried out by Ryedale District Council's in house valuer. Wharfedale Homes consider this is too restrictive and should be removed from the plan.</p>	<p>Independent viability assessment on an open book basis is standard practice where a developer argues that the requirement is not viable.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H3	154 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	Our client objects to the inclusion of prescriptive requirements for the affordable housing tenure mix at 90% social and affordable rent tenures and 10% intermediate. A prescriptive approach of this nature may hinder the development of sites. Wharfedale Homes considers the requirement should be amended to allow flexibility of tenure mix on a site by site basis. That way the affordable housing provision will be based upon development viability and local needs at the time of development.	This requirement has been removed from the policy itself, however paragraph 5.24 of the supporting text specifies that the starting point for discussions will be 90% social and affordable rent and 10% intermediate.
Policy H3	156 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	Wharfedale Homes considers that the references to the North Yorkshire Strategic Housing Assessment are confusing and inconsistent and need to be amended accordingly. The background text to Policy H3 on page 16 of the plan identifies a gross annual housing need for 20 affordable units per year. However on page 12 this figure is 18 per year. This is a significant difference of 30 homes over the 15 year plan period.	The supporting text referring to an affordable need of 18 units has been amended to 20 to reflect the need identified in the SHMA.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H3	53 Helmsley Town Council	Support	The Council particularly welcomes the aspiration throughout the plan to achieve a 40 per cent level of new affordable housing, if a satisfactory balance is to be maintained between working and retired residents and across the age spectrum.	Support noted.
Policy H3	155 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	The background text to the policy on page 16 indicates that all affordable housing provision will be restricted to occupancy to people from the local area. Wharfedale Homes considers that the explanation of describing people from the local area is vague and needs further explanation within the text. This paragraph explains that allocations for properties will be made via North Yorkshire Home Choice Based Letting schemes. Wharfedale Homes is concerned that there is no mention of landlords or other Registered Providers. For example, Helmsley Estates is a significant landlord in the town and may wish to provide some affordable housing. Therefore it is considered that this approach should be amended accordingly in consistency with the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy.	The Authorities acknowledge that the Duncombe Park Estate are a major landlord in the town, however the allocation of affordable units needs to be done in an open and transparent way and therefore this should be through Choice Based Lettings, which RPs and private landlords can sign up to.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H3 and Site NY	54 Helmsley Town Comment	Comment	We also welcome the proposed extra care facility, but wish to highlight the fact that by creating a significant number of low waged jobs which would otherwise have to be filled by commuters from other towns and villages, which facility in itself will increase the need for affordable units.	The extra care facility will provide a number of employment opportunities which will be available to suitably qualified local people. The development of new employment opportunities alongside affordable housing development will help to retain the sustainability of the town.
Policy H4	23 NYCC	Support	In strategic planning terms the Plan's proposed supply of land for business appears to be appropriate as regards both national policy and the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy.	Noted.
Policy H5	71 English Heritage	Comment	It is not clear what "town centre uses as defined in national policy" refers. There is no definition of "town centre uses" in the NPPF.	Noted. The policy has been amended to clearly define town centre uses.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H5	161 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	<p>Wharfedale Homes is broadly supportive of the provision of a local floor space threshold for retail impact assessments in accordance with paragraph 26 of the NPPF. At present the policy background states that the floorspace limits have been set at a scale appropriate for Helmsley without further explanation. Therefore the policy lacks any justification as to how the Councils have reached these thresholds and on that basis the policy is unsound. Wharfedale Homes would advise justification be added to the background text to substantiate this requirement and for the purposes of soundness.</p>	<p>The threshold is based upon the evidence contained in the Ryedale District Council Retail Capacity Study carried out by Roger Tym and Partners.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H5	160 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	Wharfedale Homes is supportive of the inclusion of the first two requirements in relation to sequential tests and impact assessments because they are consistent with paragraph 24 and 26 of the NPPF. However the requirement, that the development must provide considerable demonstrable benefits to the community, cannot be considered sound because it is not consistent with national policy and is not justified within the policy background. Wharfedale Homes would advise that this requirement is completely removed from the policy in order to bring policy H5 in line with National Policy.	Noted. This requirement has been removed from the policy.
Policy H8	73 English Heritage	Comment	The Helmsley Conservation Area Appraisal identified not simply important views but many other aspects which contribute to the distinct character of the town (and which should, as a result, be conserved). The conclusions of this appraisal should be used as the basis of a Policy which will safeguard all the elements which contribute to the character of Helmsley.	Noted. Policy H8 has been expanded and a new policy H9 'Design' has been added to the Plan to reflect the other distinctive patterns of the town.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H8	162 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	Wharfedale Homes objects to this policy as it is too general, lacks any evidence to substantiate its requirement and is inconsistent with national policy.	Policy H8 has been included as it refers to the important views, vistas and skylines which are influenced by the town's historic core and the setting of the National Park. Further text on these characteristics have been added to the supporting text.
Policy H8	74 English Heritage	Comment	Whilst the Design Guide and Conservation Area Appraisal are extremely helpful in terms of providing further guidance to users of the plan (and potentially are capable of being material considerations in planning decisions), they do not form part of the development plan and therefore do not carry the same weight as the policies in an adopted local plan. Consequently such guidance is not an appropriate substitute for those circumstances (like the case in this Local Plan) where there is a clear need for a detailed policy.	Noted. The policy and supporting text has been amended to reflect these comments.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H8	72 English Heritage	Comment	Whilst we support this policy to protect open views, this is only one element which contributes to the distinctive character of Helmsley. Given the fact that the attractiveness of the town is a key component of its economic well being and the quality of life of its community, this policy should be expanded to provide a framework for conserving all the features which contribute to its character.	Noted. Policy H8 8 has been expanded and a new policy H9 'Design' has been added to the Plan to reflect the other distinctive patterns of the town.
Policy H8	133 Beth and Jonathan Davies	Comment	Policy H8 states that windfall sites should respect views out of the settlement into open countryside. We contend that this consideration should be made in all development sites within the NPA especially given the NPA's first purpose. For those of us who live in the area and either work in Helmsley or who no longer drive/don't leave Helmsley that often the views of open countryside that can be enjoyed from Carlton Road and Elmslac add enormously to our quality of life.	Policy H8 will apply to all proposals not just windfall sites.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H8	163 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	It is noted that the proposals map on page 25 of the plan does identify 4 important open views within Helmsley. This includes views through the non allocated site: site NYMH2, which is currently within our client's control. Notwithstanding this, the policy does not set out any justified conclusions or assess whether some development on site NYMH2 could be successfully accommodated. Wharfedale Homes considers that if no sound evidence can be provided to justify the importance of the proposed views, then this policy should be deleted and replaced by a design related policy.	The policy and supporting text to policy H8 has been amended to include the important views which play an important role in the setting of the Conservation Area and the National Park
Policy H8	164 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	This policy should consider how the design of new developments should respond positively to its surroundings in terms of massing, fenestrations, detailing and scale.	Noted, a new policy H9 on 'design' has been added to the Publication version of the plan.
Policy H8	165 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	The policy could also include a requirement that development must preserve or enhance the setting of the Conservation Area and affected Listed Buildings. These are merely suggestions at this point.	Noted. The policy and supporting text to policy H8 has been amended to include the important views which play an important role in the setting of the Conservation Area and key historic buildings.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H9	6 Mr C Christie	Comment	On page 21 it says that new buildings should incorporate renewable energy technologies. Not I hope unsightly roof top wind machines.	There are a wide range of renewable energy options available and the nature of those proposed will need to consider the impact on the character of a particular location. However policy H10 'Renewable Energy' has been amended to reflect the requirement to consider the special qualities of the National Park.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H9	88 The Home Builders Federation	Comment	<p>The policy requires all new residential development to comply with Building Regulations and meet the highest 'Code for Sustainable Homes' (or its successor) that is feasible and viable on the site. Building regulations are the Government's national standards for construction and therefore compliance with the regulations do not need to be stated within a planning policy. The need for development to meet the highest standards of 'Code for Sustainable Homes' should be deleted. The Code for Sustainable Homes is a voluntary set of national standards devised by the house building industry. Since it is voluntary the Council should not attempt to make such standards mandatory. Whilst the policy would provide opportunities for negotiation the reliance upon site specific (or open book) assessments of viability as a remedy to unsustainable policies is not an acceptable approach as it will simply slow down the development process and introduce further costs for the developer. It is therefore recommended that the requirement be deleted and developers encouraged to build</p>	<p>The reference to meeting the highest 'Code for Sustainable Homes' standard (or its successor) that is feasible and viable on the site has been supported by the Inspector in the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy. The terms feasible and viable are considered flexible and unlikely to slow down the speed of decision making or a cost burden on the developer.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Policy H9	196 Environment Agency	Support	We support policy H9 to ensure that development that comes forward is of the highest design quality so that less water resource is used.	Support noted.
Site 174	191 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	Page 43 of Plan notes a restrictive covenant on this site, which prevents the development of the site for residential use. Wharfedale Homes objects to the allocation of this site within Policy H1 as it is not available because the respective landowners for this site and site 174 are not cooperating. The site should, therefore, be discounted as it is not available or deliverable.	The Authorities are working with the owners of the site to overcome the issues relating to the restrictive covenant.
Site 174	112 Ryedale Walking Group/Ryedale Rambers	Comment	We note the presence of PROW 25.45/6/2 and 25.45/7/1 to the south and east of the development site on the land south of Riccal Drive. Our group will consider the final plans for these sites when they are published and comment further then. At present we take the view that existing PROWs should be maintained and that Council's have a duty to protect these for the benefit and enjoyment of residents.	Noted.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site 174	192 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	Wharfedale Homes objects to the allocation of this site within Policy H1 of the Plan. It is our Clients understanding that access constraints exist on the site. Therefore, the availability and deliverability of the site is questionable and the site should be discounted on that basis.	The Authorities are working with the owners of this site to overcome the access issues to this site.
Site 174	75 English heritage	Comment	As the development brief for this site notes, the land at Riccal Drive lies close to three round barrows. Consequently we welcome the requirement that proposals for this area will need to demonstrate that they will not harm any elements which contribute to the significance of these assets.	Noted.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site 174	105 Mr Christopher Rose	Comment	The site lies to the south of the A170 and is accessed via Riccal Drive. It is flat and is just north of the River Rye. The Spittle Beck bounds the site to the east. The site includes area noted as Flood Zone (3) on the EA flood zone map of 2009. A buffer zone is essential to the west to mitigate against flood risk, and a full site specific flood risk assessment must be undertaken, as the site is larger than one hectare. This assesment must be updated to include the flooding which occurred in 2012, when on occasions there was what amounted to a lake all the way to Harome.	The detailed planning application for these sites will need to be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment.
Site 174	236 Stone and Baker Associates obo Thomas the Baker	Comment	Concerns about the proposed use of the site as residential and it might be sensible to consider a considerable buffer zone between the two uses as it is likely that the employment zone will create many nuisance items to the enjoyment of the dwelling house.	Noted. Following discussions with the developer reference to buffer zones between residential and employment land has been added to the development briefs for sites EMP1 and EMP2.
Site 174	237 Stone and Bean Associates obo Thomas the Baker	Comment	it is noted that this site floods - would a sequential flood test indicate that this site, or the lower portion of it, might be better allocated for an alternative use to residential?	A flood risk assessment will be required if the site is over 1ha.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site 183	109 Mr Christopher Rose	Comment	Enhancement of tree cover is essential to margins and within the site, to retain moisture in an area with a high water table. Housing may be detrimental in these conditions.	Text has been added to the development brief which requires the retention of existing trees on the boundary of the site.
Site 183	113 Ryedale Walking Group/Ryedale Ramblers	Comment	We note the presence of PROWs running on the east side of the proposed site (25.45/7/1) and the short section of footpath on the former railway line in the north west corner of the proposed site (25.45/9/1 and 25.45/9/2) on the land east of Riccal Drive. Our group will consider the final plans for these sites when they are published and comment further then. At present we take the view that existing PROWs should be maintained and that Council's have a duty to protect these for the benefit and enjoyment of residents.	Noted.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site 183	111 Mr Christopher Rose	Comment	Well prior to the flooding of 2012, insurers have refused flood protection cover and consider properties in Storey Close to be "at grave risk of flooding". The buffer zone on site 183 might have to be on such a scale as to preclude the proposed development, unless the residents and industrial users in other settled areas of Helmsley to the west are to be put at an unreasonable increased risk.	The Environment Agency require a Flood Risk Assessment at detailed planning application stage.
Site 183	108 Mr Christopher Rose	Comment	Green linkage in the area of Spittle Beck is essential for species such as bats, badgers, otters and white clawed crayfish. Having development which includes domestic pets will have a detrimental effect on the wildlife diversity in the area.	An appropriate assessment has been carried out, however an ecological survey will be required at detailed application stage.
Site 183	107 Mr Christopher Rose	Comment	Historical concerns, such as the three round barrows, as scheduled ancient monuments, require setting that do not detract from the quality of the heritage environment. This should have a significant impact on the western area of site 174.	Reference to protection of the round barrows has been included within the development brief for the site.
Site 183	104 Mr Christopher Rose	Comment	Development may have a detrimental effect on local wildlife.	An appropriate assessment has been carried out, however an ecological survey will be required at detailed application stage.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site 183	103 Mr Christopher Rose	Object	The contours of the existing land from Spittle Beck eastwards, across the site to the road, and further towards the settled land of Storey Close should be analysed, to establish if flood water run-off from the north and from the beck will aggravate flood damage to residents if further development takes place.	A Flood Risk Assessment will be required at detailed application stage.
Site 183	102 Mr Christopher Rose	Object	In view of the 2012 flood events and the position of insurers to the flood risk within Storey Close we ask that a full site specific flood risk assessment be undertaken on site 183 before any future development is contemplated on this open land.	A flood risk assessment will be required at detailed application stage.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site 183	101 Mr Christopher Rose	Object	<p>The site lies to the east of Storey Close , a group of settled residential properties, within the built form of Helmsley and Spittle Beck. The modern housing estate of Storey Close appears within, in part, Flood Zone (2) as indicated in the Environment Agency Flood Zone Map at 1:10000 scale dated 2009. Although the site is shown as clear of flood investigation in 2009, flooding across the site in 2012 did occur. Even prior to 2009, it proved impossible to secure insurance in Storey Close, which was deemed to be at serious risk. The site is noted as occurring, in the majority, within Flood Zone (2) along the roadway, as shown on the EA map. Flood Zone (3) is noted as being located along the margins of Spittle Beck. The draft consultation plans suggest that a buffer zone should be located along the margins of Spittle Beck so that when the beck floods, there will be some land for it to overflow on to , rather than flooding properties. Should the land be developed for up to 45 dwellings and in the light of the flood water in 2012 we maintain that the development of the land would gravely exacerbate the potential for over flooding</p>	<p>The Environment Agency require a Flood Risk Assessment at detailed planning application stage.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site 183	76 English Heritage	Comment	<p>westwards, on to the settled areas of the Storey Close estate in future flood events. We also maintain that notwithstanding the inclusions of a sustainable drainage system as part of a developers specification, the installation of the footprint of 45 dwellings within site 183 will significantly impede the behaviour of flood water in future events, to the detriment of residents in Storey Close. The site is clearly a potential flood plain area.</p>	<p>Noted. This has been added to the Development Brief.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site 183	238 Stone and Bean Assoiates obo Thomas the Baker	Comment	<p>This site is better shielded from the potential neighbouring uses if it is to be developed as general housing. If the land to the south is to be developed as employment use, then the increased traffic using Riccal Drive would need to be considered. Not least the possibility of residential car parking on the street on both sides which could be dangerous and a potential negative issue with regard to attracting employers. Therefore we suggest any housing should not front onto Riccal Drive. It might be worth considering a green buffer set back in the building line which is characteristic of parts of Helmsley.</p>	<p>Points noted. These are considerations which will need to be addressed as a materplan for the site is taken forward. Detailed issues of amenity will be considered through the detailed planning application process.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site 183	106 Mr Christopher Rose	Comment	It is noted that up to 50 residential units are contemplated for the period 2023 to 2028. Sited on two sides, east and south, by river courses that are a potential for flooding, care should be taken to include 1:100 flood event. Construction on a potential flood plain has the potential to constrict stormwater run off, and to increase the chance of flooding the developed properties to the west. The use of sustainable drainage systems may not be sufficient to accommodate storm water management in severe weather conditions, should the site be developed as proposed.	The Environment Agency have confirmed that a Flood Risk Assessment will be required at detailed planning application stage.
Site 183	199 Environment Agency	Comment	We note that for this site, there is no mention in the brief of submitting a Flood Risk Assessment which is required for a site over one hectare in size in Flood Zone 1. The following sentence must be included in the flood risk paragraph; 'As the site is larger than 1 hectare, a Flood Risk Assessment will be required.'	Noted. The development brief has been amended accordingly.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site 183	56 Helmsley Town Council	Support	This is a very suitable site for housing which has been neglected as wasteland for many years. The Town Council would hope to see the 'restrictive covenant' issue resolved by the parties concerned so that development might take place earlier than 2023-28.	Noted. Further details on the phasing of development has been added to paragraphs 5.6 to 5.8 of the Plan with the intention of enabling sites which support the delivery of employment land to come forward.
Site 183	110 Mr Christopher Rose	Comment	The contours of the land should be carefully considered as the land is largely flat and the site specific flood risk assessment should consider that a slight rise in flood water would extend to a larger area than now considered, if a 1:100 year event is taken into account.	The Environment Agency require a Flood Risk Assessment at detailed planning application stage.
Site EMP1	193 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Support	Wharfedale Homes agrees that this site represents a good opportunity for future employment opportunities as the site already adjoins an existing employment area.	Support noted.
Site EMP1 and EMP2	57 Helmsley Town Council	Comment	We would like to see these sites available for development earlier than 2023-28.	Noted. Further details of the phasing of development has been added to the Publication version of the Plan on page 16.
Site EMP2	194 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Support	Wharfedale Homes agrees that this site represents a good opportunity for future employment opportunities as the site already adjoins an existing employment area.	Support noted.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH1	178 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	Wharfedale Homes would like to express its concern over the benefits of retaining the remnant orchard, as this will result in inefficient use of the site and therefore additional land will be required.	The Authorities consider that the remnant orchard does have value which is worth considering in the development brief for the site. However the text has been amended in light of the comments.
Site NYMH1	174 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	Wharfedale Homes objects to the Plan's attempts to control the housing mix without justification for both affordable and market housing. The Brief needs to either clearly identify the local demand for these types of properties or remove the requirement.	Paragraphs 5.10 and 5.11 set out the requirements in terms of mix of housing, this reflects the shortfalls identified in the Ryedale 2010 SHMA.
Site NYMH1	175 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	Wharfedale Homes objects to the requirement that all units should meet Lifetime Homes and Secured by Design Standards. Lifetime Homes is now outdated and Secured by Design is unnecessarily restrictive and unnecessary in such a rural landscape.	The supporting text of Policy H1 at paragraph 5.10 makes reference to the fact that building properities to Lifetime Homes Standards ensures that new dwellings are flexible and adaptable to create accommodation which is suitable for a range of households. Specific reference to meeting Lifetime Homes Standards and Secured By Design has been removed from the Development Briefs, however text has been included which refers to consideration of the implications for crime.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH1	226 Dr Neil Mayfield and Mrs Louise Mayfield	Comment	There are few jobs around here and due to its distance from larger towns I am very concerned that any houses will become second homes or we will become a commuter town.	The Helmsley Plan will also allocate new employment land, however there are already many jobs currently within the town.
Site NYMH1	176 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	The Brief requires that the design of the development should reflect the density and character and patterns of the Elmslac Estate. Paragraph 60 of the NPPF states that planning policies should not set out unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. Wharfedale Homes therefore objects to these requirements and asks that it is removed from the Development Brief because it does not conform to the requirements of the NPPF.	Noted. Reference to the adjacent area has been amended to say "the character of the development should replicate and reinforce the existing street patterns being no greater than 2 storeys in height".

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH1	37 Dr Neil Mayfield and Mrs Louise Mayfield	Object	<p>The site is a beautiful area with far reaching views over the countryside. Many people, local residents and visitors alike enjoy walking here as it gives instant easy access to the countryside but is still in the town. Green spaces are vital for all of our wellbeing. As well as an agricultural field used for livestock the field has a wealth of wildlife - owls, curlews, bees - is it right to take this away? Our countryside is slowly being built on all over England surely the National Park should be safeguarding our landscape for wildlife, farming and future generations.</p>	<p>The Helmsley Plan aims to balance the requirements of meeting objectively assessed housing needs with protecting the special qualities of the National Park. The Local Planning Authorities must make provision for building new housing in their areas to provide homes to meet the changing demography of Helmsley and its environs. There are no brownfield sites in the Town which can accommodate new development and therefore the loss of some countryside is inevitable. A Habitats Regulation Assessment has been carried out as part of the plan process and there is no evidence of protected species utilising the site and Natural England have been consulted throughout the process.</p>
Site NYMH1	177 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	<p>Our Client objects to the requirement to replicate open space found at Ryedale Close as this is considered to impose a particular taste and stifle innovation and originality. This requirement should be removed from the Development Brief as it does not conform to the requirements of Paragraph 60 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>Noted. This has been removed from the development brief.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH1	172 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Support	Wharfedale Homes control this site and very much welcomes its proposed allocation for housing within the Plan. Our Client agrees that the site has no significant constraints which would preclude its development.	Support noted.
Site NYMH1	173 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	The proposed yield of 60 units, outlined within Policy H1 and the Development Brief, is considered deliverable. However, the wording within Policy H1 must confirm this.	Noted.
Site NYMH1	180 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	Wharfedale Homes objects to the inclusion of developer contributions for waste recycling vehicles and broadband. This is a separate matter for CIL ; however, we would like to confirm from the outset that our Client is not in support of this.	Objection noted. This will need to be addressed through the examination of CIL.
Site NYMH1	130 Beth and Jonathan Davies	Comment	We would like to know why the development limited to the east of this site tapers out beyond the existing building line.	The development brief seeks an area of landscaping/open space along this eastern boundary to soften the impact of the built development, this has also been identified on the Policies Map.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH1	129 Beth and Jonathan Davies	Object	<p>During the last round of consultation we objected to the development of the field adjacent Carlton Road because of the impact on the views of the mature trees afforded from the road and their parkland-type setting which combine to create a breathtaking vista. We, along with many other local residents who enjoy this view, and deliberately walk out of our way to enjoy the view, signed a petition requesting that this view be taken into consideration. We are therefore very disappointed to see these that these comments have been ignored and are not even acknowledged in the Plan. The result is that the proposed development line extends to the north side of Feversham Road this blocking this view into open countryside. During the last round of consultation there was a suggestion made by the NPA that, as a compromise, a more angled, tapered site might be suggested which would address this issue and we wonder why this has not materialised.</p>	<p>Following lengthy discussions with developers the site has been significantly reduced to the area identified as a preferred site. All of the sites submitted have been assessed through the Site Selection Methodology criteria, this concluded that the proposed allocation of site NYMH1 will not have an adverse impact on the Special Qualities of the National Park. A larger area which has been submitted by the developers to the north of this site has not been allocated due to the impact on the National Park landscape.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH1	179 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	Our Client considers that there is no justification for a phasing approach as discussed within paragraphs 3.3 and 5.11 of these representations. The inclusion of timescales within the Development Brief should be deleted.	The Plan has been amended to provide further details of phasing and the timescale set out in the development briefs and are indicative of when development is likely to take place.
Site NYMH1	38 Dr Neil Mayfield and Mrs Louise Mayfield	Object	There will be an impact on the amount of vehicles here which impacts on safety, air quality and accessibility to the main road.	The development of the site will undoubtedly lead to an increase in the amount of vehicles using Carlton Lane, however the Highways Authority consider this can be accommodated by the existing infrastructure.
Site NYMH1, Site 18	49 Stan Houston	Comment	It is essential in our view that Ryedale District Council insist on the utmost care being taken, both in planning and site development to ensure that building near Spittle Beck does nothing to reduce the viability of existing flood meadows. New homes should not be built where there is a risk of flood and should not be permitted if their addition to the landscape increases or extends the risk of flood to existing residential areas.	All the sites proposed for allocation in the Helmsley Plan are within FloodZone 1 with some parts in Flood Zone 2 in order to minimise flood risk. The development briefs seek the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems in order to mitigate threats of surface water run off. Where development is greater than 1ha in size a Flood Risk Assessment will be required at full planning application stage. The Environment Agency have been consulted throughout the Helmsley Plan process.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	25 Helmsley Bowling Club	Comment	<p>In 1995 Helmsley Bowling Club sought to extend the bowling green eastwards to create a larger bowling surface by extending into part of the old hockey field and the adjacent agricultural land. The Helmsley Estate confirmed on 18 April 1995 that in principle it was agreeable to sell land for the proposed extension and support the club's planning application. Helmsley Parish Council in a letter dated 26 April had no objections to forfeiting the land the club required. The North York Moors National Park Committee before being the Planning Authority granted permission for the proposed development, subject to conditions, on 26 June 1995. However at that time lack of finance prohibited the matter being taken further. Helmsley Bowling Green is one of the best in Ryedale. It is maintained by our members to a very high standard and has been approved for play at County level for a number of years. This year it has been used for Yorkshire Bowling Association matches throughout the summer season. However these matches can only take place north to south as the east to west rinks are not long</p>	<p>The aspirations of the Bowling Club are noted, however the owner of the land has subsequently agreed to sell it to the developers of Site NYMH3.</p>

Part of Document

ID Respondent

Support/Object/Comment

Comment

Authorities Response

enough for competition play. The committee is confident that if the green can be extended eastwards to allow competition play both ways and enable additional seating to be erected on the east side we would attract more matches and therefore more revenue as on such occasions visitors use the Sports and Social Club bar facilities as well as bringing revenue into the town. With consideration presently being given to the Draft Helmsley Plan which in its present form affects the area into which we seek to develop, the Bowling Club Committee wishes to reiterate their wish to pursue this matter and is seeking support from the Trustee, Helmsley Recreation Charity and Town Council.

Site NYMH3

58 Helmsley Town Council

Comment

The Town Council has concerns about vehicle access to the site, which we understand is intended to be via Ashwood Close only. Have all other possible access points been considered, and if such why have they been eliminated?

Further negotiations are taking place between the developers and the owners of the land at the top of Elmslac Road to try and resolve the issue of access.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	59 Helmsley Town Council	Comment	We note the requirement for replacement of the overflow sports field - but point out that there is a long-term plan on the part of the Bowling Club to enlarge its existing bowling green, which adjoins the north-west corner of the site. The proposal should be looked at closely to see whether it can be achieved to the north of the development site. A S106 or CIL contribution towards this and other improvements to the sports complex would clearly be a welcome gesture from the developer of this site.	This point is noted, however the owner of the site has agreed to the allocation of this site.

Site NYMH3	43 Mrs V A Moorby	Object	Traffic flow through Ashwood Close would increase greatly turning a tranquil, safe cul-de-sac into a busy through road	Officers from the Highways Authority have visited the site and consider the use of Ashwood Close is appropriate for the use proposed. The impact of the development will need to be assessed through a robust traffic impact assessment at detailed planning stage.
------------	-------------------	--------	--	---

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	3 Simon Read and Frances Toynbee	Object	<p>The site is referred to in the Plan as an "overflow sports field": the use of the word "overflow" appears intended to indicate its superfluity or lack of regular use in some way. It is not an overflow sports field - it is the second cricket pitch for the club, which runs more teams than its main pitch can otherwise accommodate. It forms part of a superb community facility that the whole town and those living nearby can use: the cost is minimal. The views from the land in question are superb and the atmosphere at the Club is inclusive and nurturing for the young players. The nearby Ampleforth College has marvellous cricket facilities and potential for football pitches but despite its charitable status these are of course sadly not available to us or the wider public. Ryedale School has limited sports facilities. Neither school is in Helmsley, even if they could and did offer alternative provision. Therefore the loss of this land in Helmsley for cricket and football would have a seriously detrimental effect on the availability of truly local recreational facilities for the community - especially the younger members, who</p>	<p>The Authorities recognise the importance of retaining important community facilities. The proposed development of site NYMH3 will not proceed unless a replacement site in an appropriate location as been agreed with the owners.</p>

(typically and understandably for a small market town) are not best served as it is. It is our understanding that Policy H7 concerns loss of Community Facilities. Proposals which will result in the loss of Community Facilities should, we understand, be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the site is no longer suitable or viable for the current use. We understand that DPCC is interested in alternative provision of adjacent land by the same landowner that owns the land proposed for development, but without binding undertakings to this effect, the Authority should not authorise the loss of such a wonderful amenity.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	44 Mrs V A Moorby	Object	<p>The proposed housing development should be turned down on the grounds of general comments already listed. The extra care housing whilst an admirable idea in principle did not appear at the consultation event to have been fully thought through. The proposed houses should not be three storey on this or probably any other site. In this location it is particularly intrusive coming between an area of mainly bungalows and the beautiful countryside beyond.</p>	<p>The proposed site is abutted by a range of single storey bungalows and two storey houses and it is within this context that the development will be seen. The design brief contained in the plan aims to reduce the impact of the extra care facility by limiting it's size to 2.5 storeys.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	46 Helmsley Tennis Club	Object	<p>Whilst not being averse to development it is my view that should the field be taken for development it is imperative a replacement field of similar quality and close to the present amenities is not only promised but is actually in black and white on the planned development drawings. Not only is this because of historic and present use but also with the planned expansion of the village population there will be a need for at least the present sports facilities if not more. The tennis club have some 30 odd members and whilst some of my colleagues may well also write I am sure they all feel the same, namely that on the application there must be a substitute for the loss of this field.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. The development brief requires the identification of an appropriate alternative site to replace the playing field.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	47 Robin Wray	Object	<p>As a member of Helmsley Tennis Club and the Sports and Social Club for over 40 years I would like to express my concern and objection to the proposed development of site NYMH3. As several generations of Helmsley have been using the site I would have thought that morally and legally the inhabitants of Helmsley should continue to enjoy the use of it in perpetuity. Should there be a concrete and binding offer of another field of similar size for recreation and sport adjacent to the main Sports Field I would withdraw my objection.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. The development brief requires the identification of an appropriate alternative site to replace the playing field.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	15 Ms Helen Teasdale	Object	Having lived in the area all my life and seem to have spent a large number of years trying to raise money to improve the sports facilities in the town I feel that to lose a recreation ground for sake of building houses is a false economy. Surely with more people in the town the need will arise for more recreation facilities? The recreation ground is used almost daily by various different clubs and people. The junior cricket matches and weekly practice sessions are held here, as is the weekly junior football practice. There are numerous groups of people who regularly play football here, ranging from the school pupils through to the staff of the nearby hotels in the town.	The Authorities recognise the importance of retaining important community facilities. The proposed development of site NYMH3 will not proceed unless a replacement site in an appropriate location as been agreed with the owners.
Site NYMH3	21 Sport England	Comment	Note the site's identified constraint and agree with the identification that "Part of the site is currently utilised as an overflow sports field, an appropriate replacement for this provision will need to be secured prior to any planning permission being granted. Any proposal which results in the loss of a playing field will need to be referred to Sport England for their consideration".	Noted.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	27 Ms Christine Wright	Comment	I notice that Keepmoat are the agents for the site NYMH3 and I have heard two reports that their workers do not care about doing a good, careful job. Who will be checking their standard of work? Why can't the work be done by good local firms?	The building work of all development will be required to meet Building Regulation standards.
Site NYMH3	29 Ms Christine Wright	Object	This site has been mentioned for many years as a site for an extra care facility, but the entrance needs to be from Elmslac Road. The land has been left wide enough for this purpose, in between the two houses at the top, nos 28 and 30 and was never intended to be accessed from Ashwood Close. The people who live there bought their bungalows as it is a quiet residential close.	The developers have indicated that the access to the site will be via Ashwood Close. The Highways Authority have been consulted on this at an early stage and consider it acceptable.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	30 Duncombe Park Cricket Club	Object	<p>Duncombe Park Cricket Club is a long established sporting club that has been based in Helmsley since the beginning of the last century providing recreational activity to the community. Our membership numbers around 30 senior playing members, fielding 2 senior Saturday teams and 2 Evening League teams. Our junior section is thriving and we currently run 2 under 11, an Under 13 and Under 15 teams. Our junior section numbers around 50 players with parents being associated members. We also have a mini cricket section for ages 5 to 8/9 years of age. This provides a starting point for cricket in our area and we have up to 30 children in each weekly session during the summer school terms. The club also boasts somewhere in the region of 15 non playing patrons. We are therefore a sizable club in the context of the town. Part of the proposed development site NYMH3 has been used as a playing field by the clubs that operate from Baxtons Lane, as well as the wider community for at least 40 years. The clubs and wider community have had uninterrupted use of this playing field and without going into legal aspects in detail probably</p>	<p>The Helmsley Plan requires that an alternative, appropriate site is identified to replace the lost playing fields.</p>

have implied tenancy rights over this land. The playing field is in constant use during the summer with junior cricket training (Wednesdays) and matches (Fridays, Sundays and Mondays). It is a regular occurrence to see junior and senior cricket matches being played on adjacent pitches and some junior matches are also played on the senior pitch when junior training is ongoing. We would be unable to host fixtures as required by the cricket leagues if we lost the playing field in question. Duncombe Park Football Club also use this field for training purposes, so as to minimise the adverse impact of our main pitch outfield (in front of the pavilion) from its use as the main football pitch. We already struggle to gain the necessary improvement to the outfield required for senior cricket after the end of the football season, even with football training taking place on their 'second pitch'. Kirkbymoorside Juniors FC used the playing field for training last year and there are negotiations ongoing for more formalised use during the 2013/14 season for both training and matches. This benefits many local children

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
			who live in Helmsley and the surrounds and play for Kirkbymoorside Juniors. Not having the use of a second playing field would also inhibit the formation of any future winter sports clubs (hockey, rugby etc).	
Site NYMH3	42 Mrs V A Moorby	Object	The proposed scheme would drastically alter the character and amenity of the immediate quiet residential area, close to the extended Conservation Area and spoil an area of Natural Beauty on the edge of town.	The site has been assessed through the Site Selection Methodology and it is considered that the development will have limited impact on the wider character of the town as it is seen from wider views in the context of the built form.
Site NYMH3	16 B A and M I Laxton	Object	Following the recent meeting we found that many answers to our concerns were not forthcoming due to the plans not yet submitted. We find this absurd. How can a contractor submit a plan for development without outlining the contract itself re the position of the buildings, roads and drainage.	The Development Plan Process seeks to allocate appropriate sites for further development, which provides certainty to local people and developers of where growth will take place. However the details on proposals will be required as part of the planning application process.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	213 B A and M I Laxton	Object	We now come to the traffic situation it appears that again this cannot be confirmed until the plans are considered "what rubbish". One of the main factors is that Ashwood Close is a narrow road serving detached bungalows leading to a dead end at the field gate. At present the only traffic is private plus delivery vans. It is totally unsuitable for any heavy traffic and consists of asphalt over soil, no foundation.	As a result of the concerns raised in response to the consultation Officers have now met with representatives from the Highways Authority on site and they have no concerns about the use of the existing access for the proposed allocation of the site for the Extra Care Facility and residential properties.
Site NYMH3	182 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	Wharfedale Homes considers that the development of this site could have a potential adverse impact on the highway network during and after construction. Therefore, it is recommended that this site should contribute pro -rata to any improvements required at that junction. This needs to be specified within the Development Brief.	The requirements for infrastructure improvements are set out in the development briefs.
Site NYMH3	183 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	The phasing of this site is expected between 2013 to 2018. Taking into account the current use of the site as a sports field and the potential access issues Wharfedale Homes consider that this is an unachievable timescale due to the current constraints.	Comment is noted.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	221 Duncombe Park Cricket Club	Object	<p>Lastly there are detailed plans to improve the overall facilities at Baxtons Lane and to encourage further uses of this facility for the community. Losing this second playing area will severely limit the uses of the site in the future. With nothing specifically tabled as a replacement for this amenity land , Duncombe Park Cricket Club strongly oppose any development of NYMH3.</p>	Noted.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	220 Duncombe Park Cricket Club	Comment	<p>With the draft proposals to increase the population of Helmsley through further development, it is even more important to protect the amenities that we currently enjoy. If anything they need to be further improved. It is clear that a significant proportion of amenity monies available from these developments should be channelled into the Baxtons Lane site to improve our wider offering to the benefit of the community. We are not opposed to development of NYMH3 providing a suitable replacement site and the funds to bring it up to a required standard can be made available and if this alternative playing fields use can be assured in perpetuity. Any replacement site would need to be adjacent to existing land and directly accessible as we would not want to see junior sports players having to cross roads from the existing site to play.</p>	<p>The Publication version of the Plan sets out the necessary improvements to the existing sports facilities in the town. The NYMNPA are considering the adoption of a CIL charge, which will seek contributions from developers for funding to meet these requirements and 15% of this will automatically be passed onto Helmsley Town Council. If CIL is not adopted contributions will be sought from developers for this through S106.</p>
Site NYMH3	219 Suncombe Park Cricket Club	Comment	<p>The ability of Duncombe Park Cricket Club and Duncombe Park Football Club to develop additional junior teams or create additional senior sides would also be compromised.</p>	<p>The development of the site is subject to the provision of a replacement sports field in an appropriate location.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	218 Duncombe Park Cricket Club	Comment	The Baxtons Lane site also relies upon funding raised by the Bonfire Committee and the 10km Committees. Both of these bodies use the playing field, the Bonfire Committee use an area at the far side of the playing field for the actual bonfire and the 10km group use this land for junior races. These groups currently raise in excess of £5,000 per annum towards the cost of operations at the site and these funds are critical to solvency.	The development of this site is subject to the relocation of the existing sports field, these uses could therefore continue on the new field.

Site NYMH3	217 B A and M I Laxton	Comment	Finally we conclude that the development should be sited on the existing sports complex where this open site is serviced by Baxtons Lane and would not effect any properties. The sports complex would be rebuilt on Carlton Lane a very level site at the same time as the houses possible to the rear. The site roads would service the new properties and the sports complex and parking catered for at the same time of development. The contract for the houses should stipulate the building of the sports complex at the same time.	This has not been put forward by the developers of the site, however the scale of the extra care facility in this location is considered to have greater impact on the National Park's special qualities.
------------	------------------------	---------	--	---

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	216 B A and M I Laxton	Comment	As you are no doubt aware properties in Helmsley are at a premium and cost far more than surrounding areas. A local estate agents informs me that property in Helmsley with a very good view of the countryside is worth £50,000 to £100,000 in excess of similar properties. If plans and development of this site went ahead with Ashwood Close overlooking it and the traffic problems a considerable amount of value of these private properties would be lost. I take it that the owners would be compensated for the loss of value?	The loss in value to individual properties is not a material planning consideration. There is no provision in planning legislation for the payment of compensation to individual property owners for the loss in value resulting from development.

Site NYMH3	181 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	Wharfedale Homes objects to the proposed residential yield stated within Policy. H1 and the Development Brief. 35 dwellings plus a 60 unit extra care home constitutes a particularly high density given the small site size and the existing low density levels within the town. The proposed yield would need to be reduced to be considered acceptable.	The high yield reflects the nature of the extra care facility, which essentially comprises a block of flats with communal areas.
------------	--	--------	--	--

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	214 B A and M I Laxton	Object	When explaining this aspect we now turn to the entrance of the site. At present a 12 foot steel farm gate. This would have to be made considerably wider to take large vehicles etc. As private front gardens of the bungalows especially number 7 our own and number 6 opposite are the last properties before the gate where will the land come from to enable entrance widening - our front garden?	As a result of the concerns raised in response to the consultation Officers have now met with representatives from the Highways Authority on site and they have no concerns about the use of the existing access for the proposed allocation of the site for the Extra Care Facility and residential properties.

Site NYMH3	227 Mrs V A Moorby	Object	The siting of such a facility on the far edge of town would negate many of the intended benefits. Residents would find the shops and town centre too far to walk to. The community would be unlikely to be able to make use of any on site facilities, unless by car; thus generating additional traffic flow. A survey addressing this scenario would be beneficial.	This site is considered appropriate for an extra care facility as it located in close proximity to the existing community facilities and is the closest site to the town centre. Information on traffic impacts will be assessed at detailed application stage.
------------	--------------------	--------	---	---

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	202 Peter Wragg	Object	Finally although it may not be relevant in planning laws, I think it would be a shame to lose this beautiful green space which is admired by all visitors to the playing fields and by the regular groups of walkers using the footpath between the playing field and the proposed development site. This area is part of what makes Helmsley so special; open spaces mixed in with existing housing and formal playing fields. Permitting further development of this sort would risk losing that unique mixture of modern with tradition which is so admired by both residents and visitors alike.	The Development Brief requires the provision of a footpath link to the community facilities and to the wider public right of way network.
Site NYMH3	212 B A and M I Laxton	Comment	Along with this are a considerable number of smaller dwellings. Where are all the properties to be sited?	The exact location of the properties will be considered at detailed planning application stage. The Helmsley Plan is considering the principle of allocation for this purpose only.
Site NYMH3	211 B A and M I Laxton	Object	The only items we were advised about was the care home on the above site and how good it would be for Helmsley etc not a word about the properties overlooking it. We now find that the main building on site will be 2.5 storeys high and the size of a large hotel. This would be completely unsuitable on the site in question.	The extra care facility is large in scale, however the restriction in height is considered appropriate as it will be seen in the context of the existing built form, much of which is two storeys in height.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	121 Mr Peter Holmes Johnson	Object	This proposal will completely destroy a beautiful area of Helmsley wrecking wonderful views of fields, woods and the moors as well as seriously damaging the environment for properties located in Ashwood Close, Feversham Road and Elmslac Road.	The sites which have been identified in the Helmsley Plan have been robustly assessed through the Site Selection Methodology and are considered to be acceptable in landscape terms.
Site NYMH3	210 Ms Helen Teasdale	Comment	Would it not be more sensible to build a care home on the site alongside the A170 where there is rumour of a new co-op store and also it would be on the bus route to take the pensioners into the market for any shopping they may require. This road would also be more accessible for staff and delivery of provisions.	This has not been put forward by the developers. However the scale and massing of the extra care facility will have much greater impact on the special qualities of the National Park if it were in this location. The proposed site is considered appropriate as it is adjacent to the existing community facilities.
Site NYMH3	209 Ms Helen Teasdale	Comment	My other concern is that we will need to be given an access road through to the rear of our properties.	There is no formal provision for access to the back gardens of these properties at present and therefore this will not be a requirement for the developers.
Site NYMH3	206 Ms Helen Teasdale	Object	I am also concerned where the road access would go to access the site and what the proposed increase in traffic movements will be and how this traffic and associated parking will effect the nearby primary school.	The Highways Authority have visited the site and have not raised any concerns about the impact of the proposed allocation on the existing road network.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	208 Ms Helen Teasdale	Object	My understanding from the consultation at the National Parks office that the plan for this area is a care home with 60 appartments. My concerns with this are as above regarding the increase in traffic and pedestrian movements but I am also concerned with light pollution and increase in the noise at all hours to accommodate the staff.	The issues of light pollution and noise will need to be addressed at the detailed planning application stage.
Site NYMH3	207 Ms Helen Teasdale	Object	There will also be a great increase in the use of the narrow footpath between the gardens and the cemetry and all the pedestrians heading for the town would automatically take the shortest route which is down Black Swan Lane which is a single width road, already often congested with delivery vehicles and doesn't lend itself to be widened to accommodate a footpath.	The development brief for the site requires the provision of a new footpath access to the community facilities.
Site NYMH3	215 B A and M I Laxton	Object	The site would have to have a considerable amount of parking space for each property and a large one for the care home to cater for visitors, service and staff vehicles. If not this would overflow into Ashwood Close causing severe problems and a disaster for the private road.	A traffic impact assessment will be required to support the development proposal and this will need to meet the car parking requirements set by North Yorkshire County Council Highways Authority.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	124 Mr Peter Holmes Johnson	Object	In any event, the care home proposed for this site is in the wrong place. It is "out of town". A care home must be "in town". The site is too far from a main road, bus route and shops. It was stated that people would walk to/from the care home. This is almost certainly incorrect as almost all visitors, staff and cares will arrive and leave by car.	There is no suitable location for this kind of facility within the existing built form of the town. The site is considered suitable for this purpose due to its relative proximity to the town and existing community facilities.
Site NYMH3	95 England and Lyle	Support	Our clients would fully support the allocation of Site NYMH3 - land North of Elmslac Road, Helmsley for residential development comprising a mix of approximately 35 dwellings and a 60 bed extra care facility. They also support the Plan's suggested timescale for the delivery of this development i.e. 2013-2018 and the inclusion of this site within the Town's new Development Boundary.	Support noted.
Site NYMH3	96 England and Lyle	Support	The draft plan explains clearly the reasoning behind the allocation of this site for this mix of development in terms of the overall housing requirement in Helmsley over the plan period, the specific justification for the extra care facility and the reason why Site NYMH3 has been identified as being the site best suited to accommodate these needs.	Support noted.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	97 England and Lyle	Comment	Our clients site has an estimated capacity of 35 dwellings - although this may vary slightly subject to detailed design, layout and house types. It constitutes just 23% of the overall supply proposed in Helmsley and is of a scale that is proportionate to the size of the town. The site is suitable for a mix of dwellings. The exact mix to be provided on this site will be negotiated through the application for planning permission.	Noted.
Site NYMH3	98 England and Lyle	Support	The SA of site NYMH3 that accompanies the Helmsley Plan assesses the performance of the site against a range of sustainability objectives. The site performs well on all counts and subject to the submission of further detailed evidence on Flood Risk, drainage, energy efficiency as part of a detailed planning application, the proposed use of this site for residential development dwellings etc can be categorised as being a highly sustainable development option in the context of Helmsley and the National Park.	Noted.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	99 England and Lyle	Support	Our clients would support the site assessment and development principles outlined in the development brief.	Support noted.
Site NYMH3	114 Julie Cavanagh	Object	I am concerned that the design at present "is not Helmsley" as the building could have been plucked from any big city and plonked on the site.	Comment noted. The detailed design of the scheme will be considered at planning application stage, as the Helmsley Plan sets out the broad principles only.
Site NYMH3	115 Julie Cavanagh	Comment	Helmsley may be a growing town, but it is still a long way from a city centre or even large town and any new development should consider Helmsley's design and layout.	Noted. The nature of the extra care facility requires a different approach to the traditional layout of the town.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	116 Julie Cavanagh	Comment	<p>The site itself is to the rear of a mixture of existing development of both two storey and single storey dwellings. The land levels are somewhat higher than surrounding land and dwellings and as such I feel that the two and a half storey design proposed is far too large for the site. Further consideration and changes to the design should be given to include that development should be no higher than 2 storeys (ideally 1.5 storeys due to the land levels). I also feel that the U shaped building is very prison like and not similar to the majority of developments in Helmsley. There may be an economic consideration to be made in terms of cost of building, however the u shaped design could be better. I think three buildings with glazed links between would enhance the development. Elmslac Close is a good example of the U shaped development which is attractive in appearance mostly due to its scale. No dormer windows, there are presently no dormer windows to neighbouring properties. A variation to the roofline. To help conserve the perspective of distance and retain some view into the</p>	<p>The Helmsley Plan will set out a development brief for the site, however the details of the scheme will be considered at planning application stage. The limitation of the extra care facility to 2.5 storeys is considered to be in keeping with the 2 storey dwellings which are adjacent to the site. The very nature of an extra care facility is a large scale building and it would not be feasible to replicate this in the form of domestic dwellings which are single storey. The site has been chosen for the facility as it is considered to fit in with the existing built form.</p>

countryside beyond, the mid section should be lower than the side buildings. As the mid section building will be the most visible from Elmslac Road. There should also be variation to the roofline of the side buildings. Whilst I appreciate the plans at the consultation event were more "indicative" than actual, I would urge the developer to pay close attention to detail. On such a large building(s), the detail of the windows, doors, chimneys and porches etc will make a huge difference

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	117 Julie Cavanagh	Comment	<p>Appreciate some design suggestions may reduce the number of units, however 60 units of this type of accommodation does seem quite large considering Helmsley already has a mixture of units for the elderly/infirm/over 55s at Rye Court, Cannons Garth Mews, Castle Court, Elmslac Close and Elm Green. I know this new facility will enable people to remain in their homes until the end of their lives (if they so wish), however with no on site nursing facilities or accommodation I fail to see how this differs from other elderly accommodation in Helmsley for example Cannons Garth Mews.</p>	<p>The provision of the Extra Care Facility is supported by evidence of need collected on behalf of North Yorkshire County Council which requires 30 new facilities across North Yorkshire by 2020. Extra care provision is very sheltered housing or assisted living, which is not currently available in the town.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	1 Peter Wragg	Object	<p>The site is currently used by Duncombe Park Cricket Club as the main area for development of junior teams at the Club. The cricket club plays an important role in providing recreation for young people in Helmsley and surrounding villages. I am impressed by the accessibility to training and play that it offers young people in Helmsley. Youngsters can borrow kit to play matches, so they don't need to buy equipment to start playing cricket. The coaching and support is second to none and opens up real opportunities to youngsters in Helmsley. The proposed development area NYMH3 is particularly important because it allows these junior cricketers to continue when the main pitch is used by the senior teams for matches. It also allows juniors to play football when the main playing field is occupied by senior football teams. So it is more than just an 'overspill' it's an integral part of the club's planned continuation of play when multiple age groups are playing simultaneously.</p>	<p>The Authorities recognise the importance of retaining important community facilities. The proposed development of site NYMH3 will not proceed unless a replacement site in an appropriate location has been agreed with the owners.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	123 Mr Peter Holmes Johnson	Object	The proposal is for a 3 storey care home. The comment by the developers that it is only 2.5 storeys is misleading. As it is proposed to be built on an area that rises to the north of the town it will be highly visible and out of character with the neighbouring properties.	The extra care facility has been put forward on this site by the developers. However it is considered that this site will have limited impact on the setting and character of the National Park and it is located within close proximity to the existing community facilities.

Site NYMH3	228 Mrs V A Moorby	Comment	The extra care housing by the very nature of its title would require the support of extra carers. Again a survey should be undertaken to establish from where these additional carers will come. From personal experience over a number of years, I am aware that carers who live in Helmsley are few and far between. Any who can be found would therefore need to come by car, again adding to the traffic. The idea of enabling elderly people to remain in their homes is good but it is always only as good as the personal care available.	These issues will be considered at the detailed application stage. However the provision of affordable housing alongside the development of the extra care facility will provide opportunities for staff to access the housing stock.
------------	--------------------	---------	--	---

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	125 Mr Peter Holmes Johnson	Object	The care home and houses will generate considerable traffic movement. It was stated that 50 car parking spaces at the Home would be provided. In addition, the other houses will all have car parking spaces and the residents may well have more than 2 or more cars. The care some will receive visitors, carers and service vehicles all of which generate an enormous amount of traffic, noise and pollution.	As a result of the concerns raised in response to the consultation Officers have now met with representatives from the Highways Authority on site and they have no concerns about the use of the existing access for the proposed allocation of the site for the Extra Care Facility and residential properties.
Site NYMH3	126 Mr Peter Holmes Johnson	Object	Ashwood Close is shown as the only access to this site. It will destroy this quiet residential close. The road will have to be widened resulting in compulsory purchase of land, which would, of course, be resisted strongly. Ashwood Close is likely to see more than 100 (minimum) traffic movements a day. At present there are probably only 15 per day. The proposal will turn Ashwood Close and also Feversham Road into very busy main road	As a result of the concerns raised in response to the consultation Officers have now met with representatives from the Highways Authority on site and they have no concerns about the use of the existing access for the proposed allocation of the site for the Extra Care Facility and residential properties.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	233 Ms Christine Wright	Comment	The extra care facility intended is too high, what is 2.5 storeys? Surely the sensible thing would be to have it all on one level, much better for elderly care. I know from friends in Knaresborough that no one who finds it difficult to get around wants to be "stuck upstairs" (their words) at the end of corridors - they don't see anybody. Please consider having it all on one level with gardens to sit in.	The extra care facility will include lifts and will be designed specifically with those with care needs in mind and will include communal areas.
Site NYMH3	127 Mr Peter Holmes Johnson	Object	The value of properties in Ashwood Close will be reduced significantly. Almost all of the residents have bought their properties in recent years for their retirement. Their quality of life will be reduced by the noise, pollution and additional population in the area.	The issues of residential amenity will be considered in detail at planning application stage.
Site NYMH3	230 Ms Helen Teasdale	Comment	The view of the town for the large number of people who enter Helmsley via the footpath through Ashdale woods would be totally spoilt. Nowhere else available to the community offers this beautiful view of Helmsley and the surrounding areas. The playing fields offer this unique view because they are in a raised position surrounded by open fields.	The wider footpath route would not be impacted by the proposed development and therefore these views will still be available.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH3	131 Beth and Jonathan Davies	Object	<p>We did not object in principle to the development of the field beyond Elmslac as we assumed that this would be developed with bungalows to reflect the height and character of the adjacent housing. We did however comment that we would expect any proposed development to respect the lovely view up Elmslac towards the wooded hills which again creates a very special feeling of connectivity and is enjoyed by a wide range of local residents on a daily basis. We understand, however that the proposed location for the care facility will block this view as the ground rises from Elmslac into this site and the proposed height of the facility is 2.5 storeys. We strongly object to the NPA producing a document that states in a design brief that the height of new development should exceed that of surrounding development, especially when valued views of the National Park beyond will be destroyed. Who is leading the design brief; the Authority or the developer? Whilst we have not seen proposed plans for the care facility it sounds as if it will resemble a block of flats which is totally out of keeping with the</p>	<p>The design brief specifying a restriction in height to 2.5 storeys reflects the nature of Extra Care Facilities and is considered to be appropriate for the site, as it will be seen in the context of the existing built up area.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
			character and density of local development. Surely a low level, low density development would be more appropriate.	
Site NYMH3	132 Beth and Jonathan Davies	Comment	We are also quite shocked that the 60 units to be provided by the care facility will not be factored in the overall total of units that the NPA has committed itself to providing for Ryedale. If these were to be taken into consideration, as they should be, this would reduce pressure on both this and the other proposed sites in the National Park which would enable NYMH1 to be reduced in size and would enable a green corridor through NYMH3 to be secured which would protect the view of the hills.	The approach not to deduct the Extra Care provisions from the planned levels of housing provision which has been adopted in the Helmsley Plan complies with the overall approach of Ryedale District Council's Local Plan Strategy which has been found sound by an independent Planning Inspector.
Site NYMH3	122 Mr Peter Holmes Johnson	Object	The proposal to develop a care/sheltered home for 65 units and 30 houses is out of all proportion for Helmsley and the proposed site. The traffic flows generated by the development will be horrendous.	As a result of the concerns raised in response to the consultation Officers have now met with representatives from the Highways Authority on site and they have no concerns about the use of the existing access for the proposed allocation of the site for the Extra Care Facility and residential properties.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH8	10 Dr Paul Harris	Object	<p>The proposal for a "convenience store" on site NYMH8 is unsuitable and undesirable. Out of town shopping is not required for Helmsley. Provision of a "convenience store" of 4000sqft (comprising grocery, greengrocery, hardware, butchery, newspapers) will have an adverse impact on existing town-centre retail outlets. We must not allow an out of town facility (with a car park) to filter trade and traffic away from the market place; a reduced number of people would then stop and shop in the town. Shops will then close (leading to more tea/coffee shops).</p>	<p>Noted. Any application for out of town retail use will be assessed against Policy H5 contained in the Helmsley Plan.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH8	12 Mrs Viola Stokes	Object	<p>There is no mention of a convenience store on this site in the Helmsley Plan. The site is a ten minute walk from the town centre making the provision by Wharfedale Homes of a convenience store totally unnecessary , especially as the plan states "the design and layout should encourage people to walk or cycle". Wharfedale Homes also intend to build a service area for deliveries by heavy goods vehicles. This must surely be totally unacceptable in what will be a small residential area.</p>	<p>The Helmsley Plan is allocating sites for housing and employment land only. Any application for a retail use will be assessed against Policy H5.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH8	28 Ms Christine Wright	Object	<p>It is imperative that the Co-op stays in the Town Centre before any other supermarket takes over (there are rumours to this effect). Local people, many elderly, come to the centre for shopping, banking, post office, coffee etc and do it all in one visit and do not wish to walk further away for their shopping. The Co-op's reps said on Tuesday 9th July that the proposed new store would give them double their present space - well when Thomas' no longer require their half - here is their doubled space as previously - this would suit everyone. Helmsley people do not want edge of town supermarkets, this would be the beginning of the end. Look at other town centres - ruined by out of town shops. Can we not learn from their mistakes? There are several empty retail outlets already in the town. There is no need for the co-op to sell newspapers and magazines (there are two newsagents in the town, one of these only a few steps away) this would free up a good deal of shelf space for more choices of food. I wish to vote against this.</p>	<p>The Draft Plan contains a policy which seeks to ensure that new retail developments are located in the town centre. The sequential test will be applied to any proposal for retail development which seeks to ensure that town centre uses are accommodated within the town centre first and if no suitable sites are available then edge of centre first.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH8	31 W B Tait	Support	I support the development proposed at Linkfoot Lane, particularly a supermarket. Parking in Helmsley , particularly during the tourist season is very difficult. It will be handy and delivery lorries will find it easier. It is desirable but must be in keeping.	Noted.

Site NYMH8	229 Mrs V A Moorby	Comment	Many people will not follow up a visit to an out of town store with a further foray into the centre. This result has been and sadly still being seen throughout the country with devastating effect on the viability and vibrancy of the towns. So far Helmsley has avoided the fate of many other places. Hopefully the 'planners' will appreciate this and have the courage and imagination to reverse the trend and not follow it.	Noted.
------------	--------------------	---------	---	--------

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH8	203 Ms Jen Harris	Comment	<p>Page 19 also states that there should be 'considerable demonstrable benefits to the local community of Helmsley'. This proposed retail outlet will benefit those who wish to drive there directly by-passing the Town Centre and all it has to offer. Walking from the centre will add approximately 10 minutes (both ways) to a shopping journey. The distance may well be too far for the elderly residents of Rye Court and Castle Court. Those living near to the new outlet may have less incentive to go to the Town Centre.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The proposal for a convenience store was being considered by an individual developer and was not being considered through the Helmsley Plan. Since the consultation an application has been received for this site without the convenience store element.</p>
Site NYMH8	186 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	<p>It is important that the policies and Development Briefs within the Plan are linked to the overall vision.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The vision has been amended to include reference to the distinctive historic landscape setting of the town within the National Park.</p>
Site NYMH8	128 Mr Peter Holmes Johnson	Object	<p>The site is understood to have a new supermarket in the area that was shown on the original plan as a residential area only. Helmsley does not need an "out of town" store. What it requires is "in town" stores. The town is suffering already from shops closing down and the proposed supermarket will accelerate this trend. The new store will not bring people into Helmsley for shopping.</p>	<p>The purpose of the Helmsley Plan is to allocate sites for housing and employment land. Any proposal for a retail will be assessed against policy H5.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH8	55 Helmsley Town Council	Comment	The draft plan makes no mention of a retail facility on this site, but the developer has already proposed one and secured the Co-op as tenant. This controversial proposals cuts across the Plan process and is strongly opposed by traders in the town centre. If the plan allocates a site for housing, surely it should not be allowed immediately to mutate into a mixed development site?	The Helmsley Plan will allocate sites for new housing and employment land only. Policy H5 will be used to assess any proposals for retail development.
Site NYMH8	184 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Support	Wharfedale Homes control this site and very much welcomes its proposed allocation for housing within Plan. Our Client agrees that the site has no significant constraints which would preclude its development.	Support noted.
Site NYMH8	50 Stan Houston	Comment	Road access (from and onto Linkfoot Lane) is also a concern regarding this site. Would the existing bus stops have to be moved? Would this be safe or sensible? Additional traffic from a residential development at this site must be manageable, that from a supermarket would not.	The existing bus stops would have to be moved to a safer location to facilitate the use of Linkfoot Lane as an access. The Highways Authority have been consulted on this issue and have not raised any concerns.

Part of Document	ID	Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH8	187	Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	Wharfedale Homes considers that the site has the potential to accommodate a convenience store as a secondary use on the site. This should be reflected within the Plan.	The purpose of the plan is to allocate housing and employment land not retail. Any proposals for retail use will be assessed against policy H5 of the Helmsley Plan.
Site NYMH8	188	Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	Similarly to Site NYMH1, Wharfedale Homes objects to the Plan seeking to control the housing mix without justification for both affordable and market housing. The Brief needs to clearly identify the local demand for these types of properties or remove the requirement.	Noted further information on the justification for the housing mix is set out on page 17 of the Publication version of the Plan.
Site NYMH8	189	Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	Our client considers that there is no justification for a phasing approach as discussed within paragraph 3.3 and 5.11 of these representations. The inclusion of timescales for development within the Development Brief should be deleted.	The approach to phasing has been clarified through the text on page 16 of the Publication version of the Plan.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH8	45 Mrs V A Moorby	Object	<p>The original development was for a housing development only, for which the above comments are applicable. However as a supermarket has now been added further comment is necessary. Out of town or edge of town retail developments always have a detrimental effect on the high street. This has been proven time and time again and Helmsley would be no exception. One of the assets of Helmsley for both residents and visitors alike is that there is still - at present - a good mix of shops in and around the market place - each one has a beneficial knock on effect on others. If one of the main food and household suppliers is removed to a more distant site, this will have immediate repercussions on other businesses.</p>	<p>The Helmsley Plan is only seeking to allocate sites for housing and employment use. Any proposal for a convenience store will need to be considered against the criteria set out in Policy H5.</p>
Site NYMH8	36 Mr and Mrs R and D Sunderland	Comment	<p>As we are adjacent to this development we would wish that our privacy is maintained through appropriate positioning of windows and the construction of a permanent border in keeping with Helmsley.</p>	<p>The impact on residential amenity will be considered when determining the detailed design of the scheme.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH8	33 Mr and Mrs R and D Sunderland	Comment	There is a footpath and access to farmers field to the north of our property and we are concerned that the proposed access from the new development could result in unauthorised parking on aforementioned footpath. Therefore we would like a means of preventing this happening but allowing access for farmer.	These issues will need to be dealt with during the discussions on the detailed design of the scheme.
Site NYMH8	185 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Comment	Our Client is confident that they are able to deliver residential development on this site. However, in discussions with NYMNPA Wharfedale Homes have received supportive comments for a retail unit on the site in addition to the proposed dwellings. There is no retail allocation within the Plan and this site offers one of only a few opportunities for a potential convenience store development. The key focus for the Plan is to build a strong and competitive economy.	Any proposal for retail on this site will need to be addressed through Policy H5.
Site NYMH8	34 Mr and Mrs R and D Sunderland	Comment	This is a prominent access onto east Helmsley and is part of the National Park. We would therefore expect that any development would be in keeping with Helmsley and the National Park.	An additional policy H9 'Design' has been added to the Publication version of the Plan, which refers to the need to maintain the local distinctiveness of the built environment and the landscape of the National Park.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH8	190 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	Wharfedale Homes objects to the inclusion of developer contributions for waste recycling vehicles and broadband. This is a separate matter for CIL; however, we would like to confirm from the outset that our Client is not in support of this.	Objection noted. This will need to be addressed through the examination of CIL.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH8	205 Dr Paul Harris	Object	<p>Helmsley Parish Plan refers to NYM1 to NYM7 this is the first occurrence of NYMH8 which does not appear on the Helmsley Plan. I recognise that housing is inevitable but the proposed "convenience store" of Wharfedale Homes was a revelation, even to the Town Council - some of whom apparently knew just one day before the Town Council presentation to others it was news. How have co-op staff become aware of this for several weeks. It appears that Wharfedale Homes been working behind the scenes with them? According to their website "Wharfedale Homes...specialise in developing design-led, high quality homes for purchasers seeking a blend of individuality and craftsmanship supported by dedicated customer service. We create unique developments which are carefully designed to blend sympathetically into their local environment and contribute positively to the local area - they have no experience outside of their housing remit.</p>	<p>NYMH8 is part of the site, which was originally submitted as part of a larger proposal for site NYMH1.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH8	204 Dr Paul Harris	Comemnt	<p>The reason that Helmsley is such a successful, vibrant town is that it has adequate parking and a range of quality shops - all within walking range; do not spoil this by reducing footfall. It is not true that people will walk from the Market Place to NYMH8. I have encountered Market Place visitors who have asked me if there is a pharmacy and have said "I won't bother" on being told it's on Carlton Lane. What about market day visitors? They will be less-well provided for (there will only be one "central" supermarket) and may go elsewhere. Allowing an out of town store is setting a precedent and is the thin end of the wedge; irrespective of what Wharfedale Homes may say, this would be a precursor to further retail on NYMH1 on A170 boundary.</p>	Comment noted.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Site NYMH8	40 R A and L E Ashbridge	Comment	There is a field access track running past the side of our bungalow, of which there is an access on to the land (Site NYMH8). Currently there is a footpath along this track, although there is a proposal to upgrade this to a bridleway. We would ask that the access onto site NYMH8 be closed off to avoid the possible disruption of the track being used frequently by people and vehicles to the housing. A suggestion would be (to stop people taking vehicles down the track) to put in foldable bollards to gates at the Carlton Road end giving a key to the farmer for his access to his fields.	Noted. This will need to be addressed through the detailed design of the scheme.
Sites 174, 183, EMP1	225 W B Tait	Comment	The footpath (public) on left of culvert (Spital Beck) needs upgrading to a bridleway and the footbridge enlarging to take horses. Therefore horse riders can use this to access the 2 old railway lines. It would give access to fish farm bridge at Rye House. Therefore a new horse bridge and upgrading the whole route to Sawmill Lane to a bridleway is essential. It would mean horse riders not having to use the Harome Road which is much safer.	This is outside the scope of the Helmsley Plan.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Sites 174, 183, EMP1	222 W B Tait	Comment	Use of stone rather than brick - if brick is to be used it should be old brick.	Noted.
Sites 174, 183, EMP1	223 W B Tait	Object	I see no need for industrial development as the present is more than adequate. If industrial development is agreed then there should be a new access road built or Sawmill Lane extended.	The requirement for additional employment land is supported by the Ryedale Employment Land Review. The use of Sawmill Lane is not considered appropriate to access new employment land as it not possible to raise it to adoptable standard and therefore Riccal Drive will be used as access to the preferred employment areas.
Sites 174, 183, EMP1	239 Stone and Bean Associates obo Thomas the Baker	Comment	Due to the fall of the land toward the river mains sewerage must need some consideration for all of these sites.	Yorkshire Water have not identified the requirements for any new infrastructure, however this will need to be considered further at full planning application stage.
Sites 174, 183, EMP1	32 W B Tait	Comment	I would like to see a reduction in the number of homes built - too many.	The level of housing contained in the Helmsley Plan is supported by a range of evidence, which has been endorsed by the Inspector who has recently found the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy to be sound. The housing provision figure has already been established through the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy and the Helmsley Plan will stipulate where this level of development will take place.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Sites 174, 183, EMP1	224 W B Tait	Comment	Increased traffic on Riccal Drive - as children play near the road, cross etc traffic calming would be needed as well as a 20 mph speed limit.	Noted. The Highways Authority will advise on any requirements on traffic calming at detailed planning application stage.
Sites EMP1 and EMP	39 Stone & Bean Associates obo Thomas the Baker	Comment	Links should be provided from Station Road through to the new areas proposed for employment development in order to accommodate the future expansion of Thomas the Bakers and ensure it remains in Helmsley.	The provision of links to the existing business on Sawmill Lane/Station Road will be considered in the detailed design of the site.
Sites EMP1 and EMP	235 Stone and Bean Associates obo Thomas the Baker	Support	The increase of employment land is welcomed. However unless the existing employment land is linked to the new allocation sites they will become isolated sites.	Noted. The LPA will work with the developers to address the issue of access links with the existing employment uses.
SUDs	200 Environment Agency	Comment	We believe the flood benefits of the SuDS are not clearly highlighted in all the development briefs and would suggest the following wording to the sentence; 'Where feasible, developers should consider the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems in order to mitigate the effects of floods to people, property and species in the River Derwent catchment.	The development briefs have been amended to reflect this proposed wording.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Unallocated Site NY	139 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	<p>Larger area of Site NYMH1 - Wharfedale Homes also control the site directly to the north of the allocated area of NYMH1. This site has not been considered appropriate for allocation. Our Client accepts that the site may comprise former medieval strip patterns however; as a reason for not allocating the site, it lacks weight and justification in planning policy terms. The site is not designated as an area of high landscape value or as a specially protected area of interest on any of the proposals maps for North York Moors Core Strategy, Ryedale Local Plan 2002 and the Helmsley Plan. As such there is no substantiated policy or statutory weighting that protects this site from any future development. As an evidence base Wharfedale Homes commissioned CGMS Consulting to undertake a Heritage Appraisal of the site. The report reviews available historic landscape character information and historic ordnance survey mapping to provide baseline information and a preliminary appraisal of the heritage sensitivity of the site. The findings of the Heritage Appraisal confirms that the site</p>	<p>The Site Selection Methodology Assessment table shows the outcome of the site assessment process and this reduced area is considered an appropriate balance between meeting housing requirements and the impact on the designated landscape. The SSM assessment and the independent landscape assessment of this part of the proposed allocation is considered to have greater impact on the landscape of the National Park and has therefore not been taken forward as a preferred allocation. Further details have been added to the Publication version of the Plan. Additional land is not required on this site as the levels of housing set out in the proposed allocations already meets housing requirements for Helmsley.</p>

forms part of a 25.39ha block of enclosed land lying east of Carlton Road which is characterised by Medieval Strip Patterns. The site occupies part of two fields within this block and represents 8% of the identified area of enclosed Strip Fields. A review of the historic landscape character data for this area has established that this block is not especially well preserved in a county context and is not the only area of such survival in North Yorkshire, or even in a 5km radius of Helmsley. However, it does concede that it is the only surviving evidence within Helmsley itself. Accordingly, there is a perfectly good, visible and understandable area of Strip Fields surviving to the east of the Spittle Brook and to the north of the nonallocated site. These areas will retain the historic interest and local landscape character. It is concluded that the allocation of the site and its future residential development will not have an unacceptable adverse heritage impact as the appraisal has not identified any heritage issues or site sensitivity. Further details regarding these findings can be found within the attached

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Unallocated Site NY	140 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes		<p data-bbox="1234 113 1458 142">Heritage Appraisal.</p> <p data-bbox="1234 172 1615 777">Wharfedale Homes also objects to the contention that this site will have a negative impact on the long distance views of the town. There is no justified visual impact assessment to support this claim and there is no evidence the site does not encroach further north than the existing settlement pattern. Wharfedale Homes recommends that the allocation of this larger area of the site is reconsidered and the allocation of Site NYMH1 within Policy H1 reflects this to also include this larger area.</p>	<p data-bbox="1641 172 2056 817">The Site Selection Methodology Assessment table shows the outcome of the site assessment process which raises concern about the impact of development of this part of the site on the landscape of the National Park as it rises northwards and on the existing medieval field patterns. The reduced area put forward for allocation by the LPAs is considered an appropriate balance between meeting the housing requirements of Helmsley and the impact on the designated landscape. It should also be noted that this area is not required to meet the housing provision figure.</p>

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Unallocated Site NY	141 Barton Willmore obo Wharfedale Homes	Object	Site NYMH2 – Land North of Beckdale Road Wharfedale Homes control this site and objects to its exclusion from allocation for housing within the Plan. It is agreed that there are no pronounced landforms, trees or landscape features within the site. However, this should be regarded as a reason why the site is developable, not undevelopable, as it is free from physical constraints. It is considered that there is a lack of evidence to justify how the development of the site would completely change the existing open landscape character of this part of the town when no visual impact assessment has been carried out by the Local Authorities.	A landscape assessment of this site has been carried out, which raises concern about the impact of development of this site on views into the historic core of Helmsley and from the town into the National Park landscape. This site is located within the National Park and assessment must be made in terms of harm to the designated area and the need for housing.
Vision	64 English Heritage	Comment	Whilst we broadly support the general thrust of the Vision, it does not adequately reflect the third and fourth bullet points of the main objectives insofar as they relate to the historic character of the town itself (as opposed to its landscape setting).	Noted. The Publication version has been amended accordingly.

Part of Document	ID Respondent	Support/Object/Comment	Comment	Authorities Response
Vision and Objective	93 England and Lyle	Support	<p>Our clients would fully support the vision and objectives for Helmsley as expressed in the Helmsley Plan. It is essential that the National Park and Ryedale Council work together to ensure that there is adequate provision in the town to meet future housing and employment requirements if the vitality and viability of the town is to be maintained and enhanced. Helmsley plays a critical role in the settlement hierarchy of the Park and Ryedale District and supports a variety of high order shops, services and community facilities on which a large number of lower order settlements rely. It is also a significant tourist and leisure destination. Clearly any development required to meet the vision and objectives will need to take account of the town's special landscape setting on the edge of the National Park and the particular environmental and historic qualities of the Town.</p>	Support is welcomed.