

KIRKBY MALZEARD, LAVERTON AND DALLOWGILL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

APPENDIX G

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS RECEIVED TO THE FINAL PRE-SUBMISSION PLAN OCTOBER – DECEMBER 2025

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM:

1. HISTORIC ENGLAND	23. COMMUNITY RESPONDENT 5
2. ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	24. COMMUNITY RESPONDENT 6
3. NATURAL ENGLAND	25. COMMUNITY RESPONDENT 7
4. NIDDERDALE NATIONAL LANDSCAPE	26. COMMUNITY RESPONDENT 8
5. DALLOWGILL OUTDOOR CENTRE	27. COMMUNITY RESPONDENT 9 (KIRKBY MALZEARD WOMEN'S INSTITUTE)
6. YORKSHIRE WATER	28. COMMUNITY RESPONDENT 10
7. KIRKBY MALZEARD CHARITY TRUST	29. COMMUNITY RESPONDENT 11
8. COAL AUTHORITY/MINING REMEDIATION	
9. NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNCIL PLANNING	
10. NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNCIL CLIMATE	
11. NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNCIL ECOLOGY	
12. NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNCIL EDUCATION	
13. NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNCIL HIGHWAYS	

14. NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNCIL PARISH LIAISON, DEVOLUTION AND COMMUNITY RIGHTS	
15. DALLOWGILL METHODIST CHAPEL	
16. FEARBY AND HEALEY PARISH COUNCIL	
17. D AND M DESIGN AND FABRICATION	
18. IVY BANK CAMPSITE, KIRKBY MALZEARD	
19. COMMUNITY RESPONDENT 1	
20. COMMUNITY RESPONDENT 2	
21. COMMUNITY RESPONDENT 3	
22. COMMUNITY RESPONDENT 4	

CONTACTED FOR COMMENTS BUT NONE RECEIVED (REMINDERS ALSO SENT):

1. NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNCIL – ALL DEPARTMENTS WERE ASKED TO COMMENT BUT RESPONSES ONLY RECEIVED FROM THOSE REFERRED TO ABOVE	22. CPRE
2. AZERLEY PARISH COUNCIL	23. HARROGATE AND DISTRICT COMMUNITY ACTION
3. GREWELTHORPE PARISH COUNCIL	24. BRITISH HORSE SOCIETY
4. HIGH AND LOW BISHOPDALE PARISH COUNCIL	25. RAMBLERS ASSOCIATION
5. GRANTLEY AND SAWLEY PARISH COUNCIL	26. LAVERTON ESTATE
6. FOUNTAINS EARTH PARISH COUNCIL	27. DALLOWGILL ESTATE
7. HOMES ENGLAND	28. R AND J YORKSHIRE FINEST
8. NATIONAL POWERGRID	29. KIRKBY MALZEARD AND MASHAM SURGERIES
9. MONO CONSULTANTS LTD	30. KIRKBY MALZEARD C OF E PRIMARY SCHOOL
10. BRITISH GAS	31. SAPUTO (WENSLEYDALE DAIRY)
11. NATIONAL GRID	32. KIRKBY MALZEARD MECHANICS INSTITUTE VILLAGE HALL
12. NETWORK RAIL	33. ST ANDREW'S CHURCH, KIRKBY MALZEARD
13. MOBILE UK	34. METHODIST CHURCH, KIRKBY MALZEARD
14. VODAFONE AND O2	35. HIGHSIDE PLAYING FIELDS ASSOCIATION, KIRKBY MALZEARD
15. EE	36. KIRKBY MALZEARD PRE-SCHOOL
16. THREE	37. KIRKBY IN BLOOM
17. HUMBER AND NORTH YORKSHIRE INTEGRATED CARE BOARD	38. DALLOWGILL WOMEN'S INSTITUTE
18. HARROGATE AND DISTRICT FOUNDATION TRUST	39. KIRKBY MALZEARD HIGHSIDE SINGERS

19. NATIONAL TRUST	40. KIRKBY MALZEARD YOUTH CLUB
20. HOUSE BUILDERS' FEDERATION	41. KIRKBY MALZEARD LIONS JUNIOR FOOTBALL
21. COUNTRY LAND OWNERS' ASSOCIATION	

As the above, together with other members of the community, did not use this opportunity to make any comments, we have assumed that, in the absence of any indication to the contrary, they are in general agreement with the Draft Plan.

No	Respondent	Summary of comments	Response of Steering Group	Amendment made to Plan?
GENERAL COMMENTS RECEIVED (including those of a general nature provided in Q34 of public consultation questionnaire)				
1	Historic England	We have considered the pre-submission Draft and Historic England supports the overall approach to heritage in the Neighbourhood Plan and commends the Parish Council for its thorough and evidence-based work. Subject to the following points (<i>outlined individually under relevant headings within this document</i>), the Plan provides a sound basis for conserving and enhancing the historic environment in line with national policy.	That you consider the Plan provides a sound basis for conserving and enhancing the historic environment in line with national policy is noted and welcomed.	N/a
2	Environment Agency	Thank you for consulting us on the Kirkby Malzeard, Laverton and Dallowgill Neighbourhood Plan, which we received on 16 October 2025. The Environment Agency does not have any concerns over the contents of this	That you do not have any concerns over the contents of the Plan and generally welcome the aspirations to protect and enhance the environment is noted and welcomed.	N/a

		Neighbourhood Plan and generally welcome the plans aspirations to protect and enhance the environment.		
3	Natural England	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 16 October 2025. Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and to the following information - Annex 1: Neighbourhood planning and the natural environment: information, issues and opportunities.</p>	<p>That you have no specific comments on the Plan is noted. We have previously considered the information within Annex 1 which you provided in response to the Regulation 14 Consultation.</p>	N/a
4	Nidderdale National Landscape	<p>Thank you for consulting Nidderdale National Landscape. Please see attached for the Joint Advisory Committee's detailed response, which is set out in tabular form (<i>responses to individual section incorporated under relevant headings</i>).</p> <p>We would like to make the general point that, as indicated previously, the JAC strongly supports the Neighbourhood Plan and we consider that it aligns well with the National Landscape Management Plan aims and objectives for the designated landscape.</p>	<p>We have provided responses below to individual points. That you strongly support the Plan and consider that it aligns well with the NL Management Plan is noted and welcomed.</p>	N/a
5	Yorkshire Water	<p>Thank you for consulting Yorkshire Water. We will respond to your planning enquiry within 21 days. If you do not receive a reply within 21 days of receipt, then please assume that Yorkshire</p>	<p>We note that you have no further observations to make at this point.</p>	N/a

		Water has no observation comments to make on the planning consultation. <i>(No further reply received)</i>		
6	Kirkby Malzeard Charity Trust	Thank you. We have nothing to add beyond our original submission.	That you have no further comments to make at this point is noted.	N/a
7	Mr Mark Roberts Designing Out Crime Officer North Yorkshire Police	I have now had opportunity to review the latest version of the Neighbourhood Plan and acknowledge the inclusion of the suggested amendments made on behalf of North Yorkshire Police.	That you have acknowledged the amendments made to the Plan in the light of your suggestions is noted.	N/a
8	Coal Authority/Mining Remediation Authority	Thank you for your notification of the 16th October 2025 seeking the views of the Coal Authority on the above. We commented on the draft Neighbourhood Plan on the 27th August 2024 and note that you indicate that changes have been made in light of comments received. Having reviewed these I can confirm that the Planning team at the Coal Authority have no additional comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.	That you have no additional comments to make at this point is noted.	N/a
9	Fearby and Healey Parish Council	No comments to make.	That you have no comments to make at this point is noted.	N/a
10	Dallowgill Methodist Chapel	No further comments.	That you have no further comments to make at this point is noted.	N/a
11	Dallowgill Outdoor Centre	Thanks for checking. We have no concerns relating to the plan.	That you have no concerns about the Plan at this point is noted and welcomed.	N/a

12	D and M Design and Fabrication	I wondered whether there will be a meeting arranged to discuss the Steering Group's draft Neighbourhood Plan before it is submitted?	We responded to this question when it was received and advised that a walk-in session had been arranged in the village hall during the period of the Consultation and invited the Respondent to attend.	N/a
13	D and M Design and Fabrication	I appreciate the huge amount of work that has been put into the document so far, and I can see that most of the content is genuinely aimed at being for the good of the village. However, I do have a few concerns. From reading the summary and analysis of comments, it appears that the consultation process hasn't yet engaged a wide enough range of residents to give confidence that the Plan represents the community as a whole.	It is unclear how this conclusion has been arrived at as, to the contrary, the responses received at every stage show clearly that the community is supportive of the contents of the Plan generally, and where concerns have been raised, for example in respect of the original approach to the issue of allotments, appropriate amendments have been made. Every opportunity has been given to anyone wishing to be involved with the community engagement process to do so, with this alone being the fourth public consultation held during the creation of the Plan, in addition to numerous Steering Group meetings and Parish Council meetings which the public could attend and raise any concerns. Given the time the process has taken it could certainly not be said	No

			that it has been rushed. We believe that the community as a whole is satisfied that a thorough consultation has been carried out and that the Plan represents their views.	
14	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We note that unlike the previous draft plan this version does not include page numbers. It would be helpful for future users of the plan if page numbers were added to the submission draft. Ideally the numbering would align with the numbering used when viewing a PDF version i.e. with the front cover as page 1.	We note this comment and will incorporate page numbering prior to submission.	Amended
15	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	Please ensure that the submission version of the neighbourhood plan includes (either within the plan or as an appropriately titled separate document) a single composite Policies Map. Further advice is set out in our previous comments. In the absence of specific advice on neighbourhood plan policy maps in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), it is recommended that guidance on local plan policy maps is followed where relevant. We're happy to provide further advice on content and layout of the policies map on request.	This has now been provided. As this service is regrettably no longer provided by North Yorkshire Council it has been necessary to identify a private firm to undertake this. Also, as no support funding is available through Locality, we have delayed this until every relevant aspect has been finalised, to keep costs as low as possible.	Amended
16	North Yorkshire Council Climate	We note that our comments on the earlier draft Kirkby Malzeard, Laverton and Dallowgill Neighbourhood Plan (Reg 14 June 2024) have	That you have noted that your suggestions have been incorporated into the latest version	N/a

		<p>been acknowledged and, where considered appropriate, have been incorporated into the new document.</p> <p>We have no further comments at this stage.</p>	<p>of the Plan and that you have no further comments at this stage is welcomed.</p>	
17	North Yorkshire Council Education	<p>In response to the earlier draft, we highlighted that we do not have any concerns regarding the school accommodating the forecasted level of pupils following committed and planned development, and this remains the case. We have reviewed the current document and have no additional comments to make.</p>	<p>That you have no concerns regarding evidence and no additional comments to make, is noted and welcomed.</p>	N/a
18	Community Respondent 3	<p>Brilliant, well done!</p>	<p>We are pleased that you are happy with the Plan. Thank you.</p>	N/a
19	Community Respondent 4	<p>Unfortunately, the amount of time that it has taken to get to this stage will have detrimental effect on the constructive responses received.</p>	<p>Whilst in an ideal world the process would have been completed more quickly, we feel that the reduced number of public responses received is due to contentious matters (such as the allotments) being resolved due to the consultation process, rather than solely as a result of interest fatigue.</p>	N/a
20	Community Respondent 11	<p>The state of the Henry Jenkins seems to be missing - this to me would make the single greatest impact to how KM looks and feels. Also would have liked to have seen a discussion about moving us away from oil</p>	<p>The fate of the Henry Jenkins is a very divisive matter within the village and is one which ultimately needs to be resolved by the various interested parties. We have considered the issue and feel</p>	N/a

			<p>there is little that this Plan can usefully do to help.</p> <p>Renewable energy has been referred to in various sections where relevant, but the move away from traditional fuels is a national if not global issue, which we also feel is not an issue which can be usefully addressed through this Plan.</p>	
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND				
21	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>The section includes important and useful information for readers and users of the plan. However, we note that the sub-section headings that previously split the content have been removed. Most users of the plan are unlikely to be reading the document cover to cover and, as such, the subheadings were helpful in directing to particular information.</p> <p>We recommend that the nature of the content is reviewed, re-ordered if necessary and appropriate sub-sections re-introduced.</p>	<p>It was necessary to update some of the information within this introductory section and it has been rewritten in a manner which is believed to be clearer. The advice has been noted but it is not felt that subheadings within this section are necessary within the amended version.</p>	No
22	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>Para 1.6 - We welcome that this para has been amended and now more accurately reflects terminology used in planning legislation.</p>	<p>We welcome that you now approve of the amended version.</p>	N/a
23	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>Parish Actions – We highlight that the description of Parish Actions as ‘not directly of a planning nature’ may not be fully accurate in all cases. The</p>	<p>We accept that the distinction between Policies and Parish Actions should be made clearer</p>	Amended.

		<p>key difference between the planning policies and the parish actions is that the policies are requirements that will have to be considered when preparing and determining planning applications while parish actions are not relevant to applications and are essentially pledges that the parish council will undertake specified activities at some point in the future. We recommend the description in para 1.8 is amended considering the above information. As the parish council is unable to pledge future action by other agencies, the description should be clear that these are actions for the parish council to progress. We recommend individual actions are checked/amended to ensure they do not place requirements on other organisations.</p>	<p>and we will amend the wording accordingly in line with your advice.</p>	
24	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>Para 1.10 - We welcome the amended reference to the Harrogate District CIL Charging Schedule, highlighting that information on qualifying development and use of the neighbourhood fund is set out.</p>	<p>We note that you now approve of the amended version.</p>	N/a
SECTION 2: LEGISLATIVE AND PLANNING CONTEXT				
25	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>We note that para 2.4 identifies that the neighbourhood plan has been prepared to align with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024) but highlight that a number of NPPF references in the plan appear to direct to incorrect/ unrelated content – possibly relevant content in earlier versions of NPPF. We also</p>	<p>We will ensure that when the Plan is submitted it will refer to the version of the NPPF valid at the time, and that all references are up to date.</p>	Amended

		<p>highlight that an update to NPPF is expected from December 2025.</p> <p>Please review and amend where necessary references to the NPPF. If an updated NPPF is published prior to submitting the plan to North Yorkshire Council, it should be reviewed. Unless transitional arrangements set out in the new NPPF indicate otherwise, the content of the plan should be amended, where necessary, to reflect updated national policy and NPPF references within the plan should be updated, if required.</p>		
26	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We consider it would be helpful to introduce sub-heading to this section and use these as a basis for the re-ordering of the information.	The advice has been noted but given the brief nature of the section it is felt that sub headings are not needed.	No
SECTION 3: A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO THE PARISH				
27	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We note that paragraph numbering appears to have gone awry from para 3.3	Thank you for pointing this out. It will be rectified in the submission version.	Amended
SECTION 4: VISION FOR THE PARISH AND KEY OBJECTIVES				
PUBLIC CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE (PCQ) Q1: Do you have any comments about the Vision Statement and Objectives set out in Section 4?				

28	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>We highlight that the colours used for text and the background on which text sits within documents can affect whether people with certain disabilities can access the material. We note that the vision now uses red text on a green background.</p> <p>We understand that an inability to distinguish between red and green is one of the most common forms of colour blindness. Therefore, to help ensure the plan is accessible to all, it is recommended that these colours are altered.</p>	<p>Thank you for pointing this out. The matter will be rectified.</p>	Amended
SECTION 5 HOUSING				
SUPPORTING SUSTAINABLE AND APPROPRIATE HOUSING GROWTH				
POLICY KMLD1 (AND INTRODUCTORY TEXT 5.1 TO 5.13)				
<p>PCQ Q2. Do you agree with Policy KMLD1 which seeks to ensure that if ‘major’ developments will have an adverse impact on highway and pedestrian safety in Kirkby Malzeard, then appropriate upgrading work must be undertaken to the infrastructure to alleviate impacts prior to the development being completed.</p>				
29	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>We note that much of this text, alongside further information, was previously used to introduce content on development limits. The text specific to development limits has now been moved to a</p>	<p>It is not the intention of Policy KMLD1 to limit growth but simply to try and ensure that it takes place in parts of the village</p>	<p>No - for the reasons stated the Policy is retained in its</p>

		<p>separate section and replaced with information that discusses the local plan growth strategy and community views on the appropriate scale of development, followed by discussion of community views on infrastructure and policies on highway safety and sewerage infrastructure. However, the plan also includes a separate section specifically focussed on infrastructure, which includes a sub-section on highway safety (which repeats some paragraphs from section 5). We consider this approach unnecessarily confusing and, notwithstanding comments on the separate policies, recommend that these policies and the introductory text relevant to them are moved to section 9: Infrastructure. We also consider that, if included, these policies ought to relate to all development types (not solely housing) to increase their effectiveness, underscoring their unsuitability for inclusion in a section focussed on housing development. Discussion of appropriate levels of growth, the growth strategy etc. are not relevant to infrastructure issues so should be presented separately. We note that the plan does not include policies or actions relating to this content and, as such suggest it may be more appropriate to present alongside discussion of the local plan in the “planning context” sub-section of section 2.</p>	<p>adequately served by existing infrastructure or, alternatively elsewhere in the village, that the infrastructure is upgraded by the time the development is completed.</p> <p>The main concern is the highway network within Kirkby Malzeard but similar problems also apply in respect of the sewerage system which is dealt with in Policy KMLD2.</p> <p>The conclusion is that both matters are sufficiently important to justify the inclusion of Policies although Parish Action 8 is also included in the Plan in respect of Highway Safety as there may be additional improvements which can be brought about by the Parish Council either within Kirkby Malzeard or elsewhere in the Plan Area. As there are clear distinctions between the scope of Policies and Parish Actions, we do not consider that any duplication will be confusing.</p> <p>The suggestion that the Policy be extended to include any non-</p>	<p>unamended form.</p>
--	--	---	---	------------------------

			residential development other than of a small scale nature is noted and an amendment has been incorporated into KMLD17 a) accordingly.	
30	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>We note the addition of this new policy which requires proposals for major development to be refused unless they can demonstrate that additional traffic would not have an adverse impact on highway, pedestrian or equestrian safety unless appropriate upgrades are undertaken to alleviate all impacts.</p> <p>We highlight that this requirement is contrary to NPPF para 116, which requires that (emphasis added): <i>development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.</i> In addition, we highlight NPPF para 115d, which require the assessment of planning applications to ensure that: <i>any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree</i></p> <p>We consider that this policy is contrary to NPPF and should be removed from the plan.</p>	<p>With regard to NPPF para 116, it is very much the view of the community and the Parish Council that anything other than small scale development would indeed have a 'unacceptable' impact on highway safety, and the impacts would be 'severe' locally.</p> <p>With regard to NPPF para 115d, it is considered that the cost of mitigation should be taken into account within the feasibility study prior to any application for development being submitted. If mitigation work makes the development unfeasible then it should be undertaken in a different location within the village where it would be feasible.</p>	No - for the reasons stated the Policy is retained in its unamended form.

31	Community Respondent 4	As on street parking is already a problem. This issue must be resolved before further development takes place	It is agreed that on street parking on Main Street is one of the factors which combine to create the existing issue around Highway Safety within Kirkby Malzeard village and it is important that this matter is not made worse by inappropriately placed development in the village in the future.	N/a
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 8 RESPONSES – YES 8 (100%)			UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
<p>POLICY KMLD2 (AND INTRODUCTORY TEXT 5.15 TO 5.17)</p> <p>PCQ Q3. Do you agree with Policy KMLD2 which seeks to ensure that in similar circumstances to those referred to for KMLD1, any upgrading work necessary to the sewerage network in Kirkby Malzeard is also undertaken prior to development being completed.</p>				
32	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We note that this text discusses two perceived issues, the condition of the sewerage system (highlighting its Edwardian origins and three instances of collapse in recent years) and its capacity. Paragraph 5.17 then suggests that development in certain parts of the village could exacerbate these issues and, therefore the location of development should be carefully considered.	We welcome the advice provided and amendments have been made accordingly.	Amended

		<p>The local plan growth strategy provides in principal support for development within the village subject to site-specific proposals meeting detailed policies (currently local plan policies but ultimately also neighbourhood plan policies), including policies requiring development is served by adequate infrastructure. The approach ensures development is not permitted unless its needs can be accommodated, or capacity will be increased to meet the development's needs. However, the existing condition of infrastructure, for example due to its age, is the responsibility of the infrastructure provider rather than applicants and is therefore not relevant.</p>		
33	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>Para 1- It is unclear what this paragraph requires from applicants or decision makers. Given that meeting the requirements of para 2 would also require consideration of wastewater generated by a development, we consider that para 1 is unnecessary and should be deleted.</p> <p>Para 2- As currently worded, it is unclear whether para 2 is intended to apply to both major and minor development or should be read as a continuation of para 1, which relates only to major development. We consider that para 2 would be most effective if its scope is not limited to only major development.</p> <p>To improve clarity and aid the operation of the requirement, we suggest para 2 is amended as follows:</p>	We note your advice and will make appropriate amendments to reflect this.	Amended

		“Development will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that the capacity of the sewerage network can accommodate the additional demand for sewage disposal needs generated by the development, or that any necessary upgrading is to be carried out in conjunction with Yorkshire Water and other relevant Agencies capacity improvements will be in place, prior to the occupation of development being completed.”		
34	Community Respondent 4	Already problems. Further development would just further exacerbate them.	We note your support for the Policy	N/a
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION			UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
9 RESPONSES – YES 9 (100%)				
DEVELOPMENT LIMITS				
PARISH ACTION 1 (AND INTRODUCTORY TEXT 5.19 TO 5.22)				
Q4. Do you support Parish Action 1 which requires that the Parish Council lobby North Yorkshire Council to include all existing housing in Kirkby Malzeard within the Development Limits when drawing up their next Local Plan.				
35	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We welcome that the intention to seek specific changes to the Kirkby Malzeard development limit when responding to consultations on the emerging North Yorkshire Local Plan is now set	The Parish Council has already stressed the need for a logical approach to the development limit within its response to initial Local Plan consultation in 2025 and will	N/a

		out as a parish action rather than a planning policy.	continue to lobby on this point in the future.	
36	Nidderdale National Landscape JAC	The existing Harrogate Local Plan defines development limits for KM within which it is acceptable in principle to develop. The NP has set out additional areas which should be included in a review of the limits -which are not additional areas to develop but reflect existing permissions and appeal decisions. There is therefore not an intention to enable further development but to rationalise to take account of existing. This is noted and is a reasonable approach – changes to the limits and/or any potential land allocations for housing will be responded to in due course as part of the NY Local Plan process. It is also noted that any potential future affordable housing development is not compromised by development limits as it can take place adjacent to development limits where appropriate and acceptable.	We are pleased to note that you support the approach to this issue taken by the Plan and consider it reasonable.	N/a
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION			UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
8 RESPONSES – YES 8 (100%)				
WINDFALL SITES 5.24 TO 5.28				
		No comments received	As no comments have been received no amendments are considered necessary to this sub-section	No

HOUSING MIX

POLICY KMLD3 (AND INTRODUCTORY TEXT 5.29 TO 5.37)

PCQ Q5. Do you agree with Policy KMLD3 which is intended to ensure that there is a housing mix on all new developments which better reflects the needs of the community by providing more homes with 2 or 3 bedrooms, rather than 4 or more

37	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We welcome identification of the updated HEDNA. As this is now our most up-to-date evidence it replaces the 2018 document. As such it is no longer necessary to discuss the 2018 evidence. This section could be updated focus solely on the current evidence as this is what is now used to justify the approach.	Whilst the 2018 HEDNA information has now been superseded by the 2025 HEDNA, as the current Local Plan has been formulated on the basis of the 2018 data we consider it useful to continue to refer to it as background, within the justification provided for Policy KMLD3.	Amended
38	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We continue to support inclusion of policy on housing mix subject to the requirements being in-line with the HEDNA or supported by other comparable evidence. It is considered that this policy is in-line with findings outlined in the North Yorkshire HEDNA (2025), which continues to identify a need to focus delivery on homes with fewer than four bedrooms. As such, the policy is supported.	Your support for this Policy is noted and welcomed.	N/a

39	Community Respondent 3	What about some bungalows too	The wording in 5.36 has been strengthened to reflect this point.	Amended
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION			UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
8 RESPONSES – YES 8 (100%)				
AFFORDABLE HOUSING				
PARISH ACTION 2 (AND INTRODUCTORY TEXT 5.39 TO 5.48)				
PCQ Q6. Parish Action 2 concerns the use of a rural exception site if necessary to provide affordable housing. Do you agree with this approach?				
40	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We welcome the amendment made at para 5.46 in response to previous comments, which clarifies that the parish council supports development of a rural exceptions site, rather than suggesting the plan supports such development given that no explicit policy support is included.	We note that you welcome the amended wording of the Parish Action.	N/a
41	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	No comments on Parish Action 2.		N/a
42	Nidderdale National Landscape JAC	In line with current Management Plan objectives relating to housing to meet community needs in the NL, the Rural Exception site approach can be supported, provided such sites are acceptable in terms of landscape impact and therefore do not conflict with Policy GS6 or its replacement.	The comment concerning landscape impact is noted. Any development would be carried out in accordance with any relevant Policies within the Local Plan including GS6.	Amended

ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION			Majority support noted.	
8 RESPONSES – YES 5 (62%) NO 3 (38%)				
ESSENTIAL HOUSING FOR RURAL WORKERS				
POLICY KMLD4 (AND INTRODUCTORY TEXT 5.49 TO 5.52)				
PCQ Q7. Do you agree with Policy KMLD 4 which indicates that planning applications to lift agricultural occupancy restrictions will not be considered within the first ten years of the original consent being granted?				
43	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We note that this section uses both 'rural worker' and 'agricultural worker' in relation to dwelling proposals and occupancy conditions/restrictions and appears to use the phrases interchangeably. While the provisions being discussed were applied to agricultural workers in the past, national policy has required inclusion of a wider range of occupations captured by the phrase 'rural worker' for some time- see NPPF para 84a. To accord with NPPF 'agricultural worker' should be replaced with 'rural worker' throughout this section.	This advice is noted and wording will be amended accordingly	Amended
44	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We welcome the change to para 5.51, which previously discussed a need to refuse all applications seeking to remove rural worker occupancy conditions but now discusses refusing applications not supported by valid reasons.	We welcome your support for the amendment made to the wording	N/a

45	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We highlight reference to an Agricultural Workers Dwellings guidance document produced by the former Harrogate Borough Council. Please amend the reference to include the correct title of the document, the Rural Workers Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2021).	The text will be amended.	Amended
46	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>We note that the previous requirement to refuse all applications to seeking to remove rural workers dwelling occupancy conditions has been replaced with a requirement to refuse all applications where the condition has been in place for less than 10 years.</p> <p>We consider that the policy as amended fails to contribute to sustainable development as it will prevent the occupation of dwellings where a condition has been in place for less than 10 years even where valid reasons to remove the condition can be demonstrated. The approach also risks rural housing remaining unoccupied, potentially for a significant period of time.</p> <p>Section 6 of the Rural Workers Dwellings SPD (2021) provides guidance on acceptable reasons for removal of such conditions and the evidence required to demonstrate these reasons exist. We highlight that the approach currently used by NYC could be strengthened by transposing relevant elements of section 6, where appropriate, into KMLD4, thereby giving these considerations the status of statutory policy – such as, the need for proposals to be supported by evidence that the</p>	<p>It is the view of the Parish Council and the community that if the dwelling in question is no longer needed by the applicants or their family then it should be occupied by any other qualifying rural worker until at least ten years from the granting of the consent. Such properties could be readily let for permanent occupation subject to confirmation that the occupiers meet the qualifying requirements to be confirmed by the Local Planning Authority as set out in Parish Action 3.</p> <p>The suggestion that some elements of Section 6 of the Rural Workers Dwellings SPD (2021) are incorporated into the Policy has been noted and amendments made accordingly.</p>	Amended

		dwelling is no longer required to meet a long term functional need of the rural enterprise or meet a wider local need of rural enterprises, including the need for appropriate marketing. It would also be useful to signpost the SPD, explaining that it provides guidance on the operation of the policy.		
47	Nidderdale National Landscape JAC	It is understood why the plan wishes to put additional restrictions in place as the current system is perceived as being open to manipulation by applicants who receive consent and then in a relatively short time seek to remove the condition which is “invariably approved”. However, national policy still requires a stock of rural workers dwellings to meet a wider agricultural need in the locality even if the specific local need that required the dwelling has ceased – for example to provide housing for people retiring from or last employed in the farming industry. This is really a matter of compliance which the LPA will address in its response or prior to the plan being adopted (It had previously said the policy should be removed).	That you recognise that the problem exists is noted and welcomed.	N/a
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 8 RESPONSES – YES 8 (100%)			UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
PARISH ACTION 3				

PCQ Q8. Parish Action 3 also deals with verifying that properties built with agricultural occupancy restrictions are only used by such workers rather than anyone else. Do you agree with this?

48	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	No comments		N/a
----	---	-------------	--	-----

ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION
8 RESPONSES – YES 8 (100%)

UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED

CONVERSION OF RURAL BUILDINGS TO DWELLINGS

POLICY KMLD5 (AND INTRODUCTORY TEXT 5.55 TO 5.58)

PCQ Q9. Do you agree with Policy KMLD 5 which supports conversions of rural buildings to dwellings providing they will not adversely affect landscape values?

49	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>We welcome that content relating to the conversion of rural buildings to business premises has been removed from this section and placed elsewhere in the plan. We also welcome the amended focus of the section from agricultural buildings to rural buildings.</p> <p>To ensure the circumstances in which the policy applies are understood, we recommend adding text to clarify that rural buildings are buildings in the countryside outside development limits- in the case of this parish, buildings outside the Kirkby Malzeard development limit. Application of</p>	<p>We welcome your approval of the previous amendments.</p> <p>We will provide the clarification on this aspect as suggested.</p>	Amended
----	---	--	---	---------

		the policy to buildings within Kirkby Malzeard would be contrary to Local Plan policy GS3 which already provides in-principal support for the conversion of buildings in all defined settlements.		
50	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>We welcome amendments to the policy so it engages the tests within local plan policy HS6. We recognise the concern that the 2nd sentence seeks to address but consider that to achieve its aims whilst not preventing otherwise sustainable development from taking place, it should focus on the development impacts that the policy seeks to prevent rather than focussing on a blanket prevention of a type of development assumed to have such impacts. In addition, we consider that the two aspects of the policy could be presented with greater clarity. To overcome these concerns, we suggest the following:</p> <p>Proposals for the conversion of rural buildings to form residential units, will be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development does not relate to isolated buildings in prominent positions in the landscape unless landscape impacts, for example from new or improved access tracks, will be satisfactorily mitigated and • Criteria within Local Plan Policy HS6: Conversion of Rural Buildings for Housing (or successive Local Plan policies) are met 	The suggestion in respect of alternative wording has been noted and amended accordingly.	Amended
51	Nidderdale National Landscape JAC	This policy refers to the criteria in the Harrogate Local Plan HS6 which includes the details the previous policy version lacked. It also however	Your strong support for the Policy is noted and welcomed.	N/a

		introduces a “spatial” element which seeks to resist conversions of isolated and prominent rural buildings. This is strongly supported, and it would be helpful if this or similar criteria relating to isolated rural buildings such as field barns was incorporated in such a policy in the new NYC Local Plan as this is considered to be a significant omission currently.		
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 8 RESPONSES – YES 7 (87%) NO 1 (13%)			STRONG SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
SECOND HOMES AND HOLIDAY LETS (AND INTRODUCTORY TEXT 5.60 TO 5.65)				
PCQ Q10. No Policies or Parish Actions have been included in respect of Holiday Lets or Second Homes as there have been actions taken recently at county level, and further actions currently under consideration at national level, the effect of which is awaited. Do you agree with this approach, or do you feel further action is needed here now?				
52	Community Respondent 3	I feel we ought to have something of our own	Your comment is noted but until the effectiveness of recently introduced approaches such as that referred to in 5.64 of this Plan are known it remains unclear as to what type of Policy could be usefully included within this Plan. As indicated in the text that matter will be considered again when the Plan is reviewed in the future.	No

ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 8 RESPONSES – YES 5 (62%) NO 3 (38%)			Majority support noted.	
SECTION 6: HERITAGE AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT				
BUILT HERITAGE (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 6.1 TO 6.4)				
BUILDINGS OF NATIONAL HERITAGE IMPORTANCE (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 6.5 TO 6.10)				
NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 6.11 TO 6.17)				
KMLD6/APPENDIX A				
Q11. Do you agree with the principle behind Policy KMLD6 which deals with the classification of Non-Designated Heritage Assets and do you have any comments about those buildings or structures which have been suggested?				
53	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We welcome amendments at paragraph 6.11 (previously para 116) and para 6.16 (previously para 122), which respectively better reflect NPPF and more accurately describe the scope of the policy. We also welcome the amended reference to the SPD providing guidance on the identification of NDHAs through the addition of the document title at para 6.14 (previously para 119).	We note that you welcome the amendments made to the previous version of the Plan.	N/a
54	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We welcome the amendment to this paragraph highlighting that the non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs) identified during preparation of	We note that you welcome the amendment made to the previous version of the Plan. Whilst we note	N/a

		<p>the neighbourhood plan is not exhaustive and further assets could be identified through the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>We understand that the parish council has sought to consult directly with owners of proposed NDHAs. Although we consider this will be helpful for owners, we highlight that identification does not require an owner's agreement and should be based on whether an asset has sufficient heritage significance worthy of consideration within planning decisions.</p>	<p>that identification does not require an owner's agreement, we would advise that we have received no objections or concerns from owners of any of the proposed NDHAs following the notification which we carried out.</p>	
55	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>We appreciate that the evidence supporting the identification of NDAs, set out at Appendix A, has been updated following previous comments but note that the request to follow the process set out in chapter five of the Heritage Guidance SPD has not been fully met - although we recognise that this may be because our previous comments and/or the guidance is not clear. As such, we consider that a small amount of further work is required to adequately evidence the identification of assets.</p> <p>Although Appendix A now identifies the type of heritage significance each asset is considered to have (in every case, both architectural significance and historic significance), it should justify these conclusions by setting out (for each asset) the attributes considered to give each type of significance identified.</p>	<p>Thank you for clarifying the requirements which were not immediately clear from the wording of the SPD. We have also amended the Policy to ensure that the implications of a NDHA designation are clear.</p>	Amended

		<p>We ask the parish council to meet with us so requirements can be clarified and any questions the parish council may have about this process can be answered.</p> <p>However, in summary... para 5.11 of the SPD guidance identifies four types of significance (architectural, historic, artistic, archaeological) – to be a NDHA an asset needs to have sufficient attributes so it can be concluded that it has at least one of these types of significance (although it is recognised that some assets may have sufficient attributes to conclude it has more than one type of significance).</p> <p>The guidance then discusses the first three types of significance and for each it sets out criteria or attributes that constitute the relevant type of significance. As set out at para 5.17, to conclude that an asset has a particular type of significance it needs to meet at least two of the relevant attributes or criteria.</p> <p>For example, for an asset to have historic significance it would need to be demonstrated that it meets at least two of criteria A to H at para 5.13. Each criterion met should be highlighted alongside a brief explanation to justify how the criterion is met. The criteria for architectural significance are A to K at para 5.12 and the criteria for artistic significance are A to d at para 5.15.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

56	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We welcome the amendment to para 2 but note that this varies from that suggested in previous comments by limiting the scope of the requirement from 'proposals that would affect' to 'proposals that would adversely affect'. We recommend the policy is amended to include the former wording to ensure that national policy requirements to enhance the significance of heritage assets (even where no harm or adverse impact is proposed) can be applied via the policy.	We note your comment and will make the appropriate amendment.	Amended
57	Nidderdale National Landscape JAC	This is a useful policy setting out a list of the identified NDHAs within the plan area and referencing national policy where these are affected by development proposals. Knowing whether buildings are NDHA in advance is extremely helpful in shaping and determining planning applications and adds strength to being able to resist such proposals where they are harmful.	We note and welcome that you consider the Policy useful.	N/a
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 8 RESPONSES – YES 7 (87%) NO 1 (13%)			STRONG SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
<p>AREA OF LOCAL CHARACTER AND HERITAGE</p> <p>POLICY KMLD7/APPENDIX B (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 6.19 TO 6.23)</p>				

Q12. Do you agree with designation of an Area of Local Character and Heritage in the area in and around Church Street, Kirkby Malzeard as set out in Policy KMLD7?

58	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>We welcome the addition of text at para 6.22, which discusses the Heritage SPD and specifically identifies relevant general guidance relating to non-designated heritage assets from within the SPD.</p> <p>We support the identification of the area as a non-designated heritage asset in its own right, recognising that sufficient justification ought to be possible. We welcome additions to the evidence in Appendix B, however, note that although types of significance are claimed, justification is not provided.</p> <p>We highlight there remains a discrepancy between the stated aims of the policy and those of policies applying to heritage assets- see previous comments and comments (below) on KMLD7.</p>	<p>Thank you for clarifying the requirements which were not immediately clear from the wording of the SPD. We have also amended the Policy to ensure that the implications of this designation are clear.</p>	Amended
59	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>We understand that a designation underpinned by heritage evidence (Appendix B) is being proposed but remain concerned that the policy requirements of para 1 do not explicitly relate to the significance of the proposed asset. We note that para 1 includes a specific requirement but are unsure how/whether this relates to the significance identified within Appendix B or whether the evidence includes sufficient information to help assess proposals against the requirement.</p>	<p>Thank you for clarifying this point. The Policy has been amended to ensure that the implications of the designation are clear.</p>	Amended

		<p>We welcome reference to national planning policy regarding NDHAs in para 2. However, as with policy KMLD7, we note use of ‘proposals that would adversely affect’ rather than ‘proposals that would affect’ and recommend this is altered for the same reasons as set out for para 2 of KMLD7.</p> <p>We ask the parish council to meet with us to discuss these issues further and explore approaches that will achieve the parish council’s intentions, whilst according with NPPF.</p>		
60	D and M Design and Fabrication	<p>Likewise, while residents naturally value the character of Church Street, many if not all Church Street residents would probably take a different view if additional planning restrictions were introduced on what they can alter or repair to their own homes.</p>	<p>We are satisfied that the information included within the Appendix does clarify this aspect and welcome the continued 100% support for the Policy from the community including those who live in the Church Street area. Permitted Development Rights will be unaffected (unlike in Conservation Areas) but when consent for alterations is sought it is expected that these will not ‘remove, demonstrably harm or undermine the significance’ of the area.</p>	No
61	Community Respondent 11	<p>Don’t live in the proposed area. The biggest visual concern in the entire village is the derelict state of the Henry Jenkins. I think we’ve all</p>	<p>The Henry Jenkins is not situated within the proposed Area of Local Character and Heritage. It is however proposed that it be</p>	N/a

		become “nose blind” to the absolute eye sore it has become - can we sort this first?	designated as a NDHA as referred to in KMLD6 above.	
62	Nidderdale National Landscape JAC	Support amended version	The support of the>NNL JAC is noted and welcomed.	N/a
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 8 RESPONSES – YES 8 (100%)			UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
ENSURING GOOD DESIGN				
POLICY KMLD8 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 6.25 TO 6.30)				
PCQ Q13. Policy KMLD8 sets out design criteria for new buildings and extensions. Do you agree with these?				
63	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We refer to our previous comments, which are largely still relevant. In particular we highlight that the policy includes bullets that address issues not considered design issues in an aesthetic sense, which should therefore be set out separately to this policy. In addition, some of these bullets repeat existing local plan policy, which is unnecessary, and/or address issues for which the neighbourhood plan includes separate specific policies, which we consider will lead to confusion. Bullet f: Deals with amenity considerations - repeats requirements of Local Plan (LP) policy	These comments are noted and the following action agreed: Bullet f amended as suggested. Bullet g – removed (with subsequent re-lettering of remaining bullet points undertaken). Elements of the content have been incorporated into KMLD15 with any duplicated wording removed.	Amended

		<p>HP4 and therefore this should be deleted. We note new content relating to crime added to this bullet. As this does not relate to amenity this should be set out as a separate bullet. Unsure what “plan positively to reduce crime and the fear of crime” is intended to mean- suggest along the lines of, demonstrate a design that will reduce the potential for crime and the fear of crime. Bullet g: Deals with road safety and parking. However, the plan includes separate specific policies on these matters- remove from this policy and add any necessary content to the specific policies.</p>		
64	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>(bullet e) We note that a requirement to provide on-site public open space on all major developments has been added to this bullet and that, as worded the requirement is not restricted to housing development. The provision of open space constitutes a ‘developer contribution’. NPPF para 35 requires that developer contributions should not undermine delivery i.e. make development unviable. In addition, the use of developer contributions is limited in law by Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations (2010), which requires particular tests to be met. We do not consider that the requirement meets the Reg 122 tests and its impact on development viability is unknown- as such should be removed from the policy.</p>	<p>Bullet e – last line removed as already covered by Local Plan Policy LP7. Whilst this now only covers housing developments, given the current limitations on other types of development in the Plan Area, given the National Landscape designation, this is acceptable.</p>	Amended

		Local Plan policy HP7 and the accompanying Open Space and Village Halls SPD already sets out a detailed and prescriptive approach to securing developer contributions for 7 specific types of open space from housing developments, which meets Regulations and NPPF requirements. The approach applies from 5 homes within the plan area and therefore captures more schemes than the approach proposed in this policy. It also ensures that where a contribution is required but open space cannot be delivered on-site, a financial contribution to enhance existing open space is secured.		
65	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>(bullet i) As set out previously, we consider that this is not a design issue in an aesthetic sense and therefore should be set out as a separate policy, which would also give greater prominence to the requirements</p> <p>Part iii – We note that the plan includes KMLD16, a specific policy on EV charging, albeit with different (perhaps contradictory) wording. Relevant requirements should be set out all together in a single place- we recommend this is in a stand-alone policy. See also comments on KMLD16.</p>	<p>Note Bullet h) re-lettered to become g) following removal of previous g).</p> <p>Previous bullet point i) now h).</p> <p>It is felt that there is merit in retaining parts i) and ii) within this policy as they refer to issues which are relevant when the design of buildings is being considered, even if not of an aesthetic nature.</p> <p>Bullet point iii) removed and incorporated into KMLD16.</p>	Amended

66	D and M Design and Fabrication	There also seems to be limited evidence on the practical realities of affordable housing in Kirkby. The existing affordable homes around The Green would not meet the building standards now proposed, and it is difficult to see how new homes could remain genuinely affordable if such strict design requirements are imposed. This could risk making the delivery of smaller, lower-cost homes unviable and deter development in general, which from my reading of the summary and analysis is not what people want.	It is not the intention of this Plan to raise design standards (and as a consequence) development cost to such an extent that it would affect the viability new homes (whether market or 'affordable') but it is important that design does reflect the distinctive character of the local area, which we hope will be achieved by this Policy.	No
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 8 RESPONSES – YES 8 (100%)			UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
<p>SECTION 7: NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE LANDSCAPE</p> <p>POLICY KMLD9 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 7.1 TO 7.9)</p> <p>Q14. Do you agree with Policy KMLD9 which seeks to ensure that future development should conserve and enhance the natural beauty of this National Landscape area?</p>				
67	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	Paras 7.6 to 7.8 discuss the Harrogate District Landscape Character Assessment (HBC, 2004). We welcome the amended approach of identifying	We note the advice and will amend the wording on the Plan to reflect this.	Amended

		<p>relevant character areas and signposting information in the LCA.</p> <p>NYC is currently preparing a new LCA that will replace existing landscape evidence at some point during the life of the neighbourhood plan. We recommend that these paragraphs identify that this work is taking place to help future proof the plan as much as possible. If the new LCA is published prior of submission of the NP, this section should be updated to reflect the up-to-date evidence</p>		
68	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>We note the addition of this new policy aimed at preserving and enhancing landscape character and recommend the following amendments:</p> <p>Para 1 – Replace “...enhance the natural beauty of...” with “...enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of...” to align with terminology used in para 189 of NPPF.</p> <p>Para 2- To clarify and future proof requirements, amend the end of the para as follows: “...within the relevant landscape character area, as set out in the Harrogate District Landscape Character Assessment (or successor documents).”</p>	We note the advice and will amend the wording on the Plan to reflect this.	Amended
69	Community Respondent 10	Why have the parish council not properly lobbied NYC planning on the illegal development at the top end of Cemetery Lane? By failing to do so I cannot see that your Policy KMLD9 is very valid.	This is a matter for Planning Enforcement and is outside the scope of this Plan.	No
70	Nidderdale National Landscape JAC	The inclusion of a generic Landscape Policy is supported, particularly the reference to the statutory purpose of the NNL and also ensuring	The support for this Policy is noted and welcomed.	N/a

		<p>development proposals have regard to the key characteristics of the relevant LCA in which it is proposed.</p> <p>The requirement that development should conserve (and where possible enhance) is consistent with case law on the LURA Act which requires relevant authorities to seek to conserve natural beauty of NLs</p>		
<p>ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 9 RESPONSES – YES 9 (100%)</p>			<p>UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED</p>	
<p>PROTECTING IMPORTANT LOCAL GREEN SPACES</p> <p>POLICY KMLD10/APPENDIX C (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 7.11 TO 7.18)</p> <p>PCQ Q15. Seven areas in and around Kirkby Malzeard have been identified as Local Green Spaces in Policy KMLD10. Do you agree with the idea behind this and the inclusion of these specific sites?</p>				
71	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>We welcome amendments to this text following previous comments but highlight a further change required to accurately reflect NPPF.</p> <p>Para 7.15 – This quotes NPPF para 106 but appears to include text not found within para 106 (the sentence re how development is managed in LGSs which includes ‘very special circumstances’). This should be replaced with text describing requirements as set out in NPPF para 108.</p>	We note your advice and will make amendments accordingly	Amended

72	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>Appendix C</p> <p>Para 1. We welcome updates to the approach to assessing candidate LGSs, as set out in Appendix C, including identifying that engagement with landowners has taken place.</p> <p>We continue to support designation of the sites identified in the current policy as sites 1, 2, 4 and 6.</p> <p>Site 3: West End Green – We welcome updates to the assessment, which now indicates the NPPF criteria are met, and therefore support designation</p> <p>Site 5: St Andrew’s Churchyard - We continue to support designation and note that consultation with the landowner has taken place.</p> <p>Site 7: Lamberts Quarry – We note this is a new proposal. We are satisfied that the assessment demonstrates that LGS requirements are met and, therefore, support designation.</p>	That you support the updated assessments is noted and welcomed	N/a
73	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	<p>Para 2. We welcome the addition of the 1st sentence, which outlines appropriate controls in-line with NPPF, following previous comments but consider this should have replaced the previous requirement (2nd sentence) rather than being required alongside. As set out previously, we consider that sentence 2 introduces an additional test contrary to NPPF requirements and should be removed.</p>	We note your advice and will appropriate amendments to the Policy wording.	Amended

74	Nidderdale National Landscape JAC	The identification and protection of important local green spaces is supported in principle consistent with national policy on this issue. The policy now identifies seven such green spaces including the playing fields, churchyard and High Walk Verges. Development in these areas will not generally be permitted unless there are special circumstances of strong public benefit. These spaces are generally important for public use within the village of Kirkby Malzeard, though the appropriateness of the inclusion of Lamberts Quarry outside the settlement is queried	That you support in principle this Policy which identifies Local Green Spaces within the Plan Area is noted and welcomed. We consider that Lamberts Quarry is within easy walking distance of the village and meets the requirements of the NPPF as confirmed by the LPA in item 72 above.	N/a
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 8 RESPONSES – YES 8 (100%)			UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
<p>ALLOTMENTS AND COMMUNITY GARDEN</p> <p>PARISH ACTION 4 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 7.20 TO 7.24)</p> <p>PCQ Q16. Parish Action 4 deals with the provision of an allotment/community garden. Do you agree that this should continue to be pursued by the Parish Council?</p>				
75	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We note that the plan no longer indicates that the parish council has a preferred site. We continue to consider that preparation of the plan provides an opportunity to include an appropriate	The suggestion to incorporate a Policy has been considered but we are satisfied that a Parish Action is appropriate at the present time.	N/a

		<p>planning policy in support of new allotment provision that may help any future proposal gain planning consent, should this be necessary. Perhaps a policy indicating a general support along the line of: "Proposals for new allotment provision are encouraged and will be supported where other neighbourhood plan and local plan policies are met"</p>	<p>Further consideration will be given when the Plan is reviewed in the future if the provision of an allotment has not been resolved at that time.</p>	
76	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	Parish Action 4 – no comments.	Noted.	N/a
77	Community Respondent 6	<p>Not unless they are on the edge of the village away from residential housing and where traffic is not a problem.</p> <p>Although the reference to the preferred site has been removed from the Plan it is still the " go too "site of the PC regardless of all the reasons given in the results of the last questionnaire. It is noticed that there are no positive responses for that site.</p> <p>Since the last questionnaire a house sale fell through because of the mention there were possibly going to be allotments at the bottom of the garden which reiterates the fact that property prices/sales will be affected for all houses adjacent to that site.</p> <p>The flood risk is low on the flood risk map however after a medium amount of rain there is a lot of ground water and pooling near the</p>	<p>These comments are noted and will be taken into consideration by the Parish Council when the Parish Action is implemented.</p>	N/a

		entrance/exit of the field. I have a photograph of this.		
78	Community Respondent 10	But there should be strict controls on the use of the land and any buildings erected. It should not be allowed to look like the allotments in Ripon which look ramshackle	It is expected that the Committee responsible for managing the site would ensure that strict controls were imposed.	N/a
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 9 RESPONSES – YES 7 (78%) NO 2 (22%)			MAJORITY SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
<p>CONSERVING DARK SKIES</p> <p>POLICY KMLD11 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 7.26 TO 7.32)</p> <p>PCQ Q17. Do you agree with the zoning proposals to conserve ‘Dark Skies’ included in Policy KMLD11?</p>				
79	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We welcome amendments to this section. We welcome that para 7.32 discusses the Dark Skies SPD and seeks to justify the proposed policy with reference to the evidence underpinning the approach in the SPD, in particular the identification of darkness zones and application of the guidance relevant to these zones. However, we note that the paragraph also seeks to justify a policy approach contrary to this evidence. This text should be amended in light of our comments on para 2 of KMLD11.	That you welcome the amendments made previously is noted. The remainder of the text in 7.32 has been amended to reflect the revision to the Policy.	Amended

80	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	1a We welcome the addition of examples of potentially essential lighting (safety and security) within this paragraph. However, we consider that 'and' should be replaced with 'or' since either may constitute an essential need (rather than needing to demonstrate both needs).	The advice provided is noted and the Policy will be amended accordingly.	Amended
81	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	Para 2 We object to applying zone E0 requirements to areas of the parish in zone E1 (and not in zone E0) as this is contrary to the evidence underpinning the identification of zones set out in the SPD. Section 3 of the SPD identifies that the zones are based on dark sky mapping which has been used to differentiate areas of differing levels of darkness. The SPD guidelines for each zone, which the policy intends to apply as requirements, are detailed, prescriptive and increasingly restrictive for darker zones. We do not consider it appropriate to apply the additional E0 guidance as requirements to E1 areas as these go beyond what the evidence indicates is necessary for these areas. We welcome linking policy requirements to the guidance in the SPD, however, consider the current wording may not achieve this. While the policy expects SPD 'requirements' to be met, the SPD content is set out as guidance. To be clearly interpreted as policy requirements, we recommend the relevant guidance in section 4 of the SPD is transposed into the policy.	<p>With regret it is accepted that without additional technical evidence, which it is beyond our resources to commission, we are obliged to remove the section of this Policy which would have extended E0 zoning to all parts of the Plan Area. Based on our local knowledge there are no discernible differences to any aspects within the current E0 and E1 zones and the differentiation simply complicates enforcement.</p> <p>We will follow your advice and incorporate requirements from the SPD into the Policy itself in order to give extra weight to these.</p>	Amended

82	Nidderdale National Landscape JAC	Continued support for this policy	That you continue to support the Policy is noted and welcomed	N/a
83	D and M Design and Fabrication	The survey questions themselves may also have led to results that don't fully reflect how people would respond once specific planning implications are understood. For example, almost everyone supports keeping our dark skies, but that support might be more nuanced if it meant that extensions with larger glazed areas or necessary external lighting could no longer be approved.	There is no reason to believe that the community has misunderstood the Policy. If external lighting is 'necessary' we consider that it would by definition be deemed essential as referred to, and therefore covered by section a).	N/a
84	Community Respondent 11	As long as it's not too dark to walk safely along Main Street at night - a real concern at the moment with the damaged light by the doctors	Street lighting required for safety would be covered until section a) of the Policy. Your concerns are understandable – thank you for enabling clarification to be provided.	N/a
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 7 RESPONSES – YES 7 (100%)			UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
<p>PROTECTING AND ENHANCING BIODIVERSITY</p> <p>POLICY KMLD12 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 7.34 TO 7.45)</p>				

PCQ Q18. Policy KMLD12 is included within the Plan to help towards the protection and enhancement of biodiversity in our local area. Do you agree with the proposed measures?

85	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	Please see comments provided by a council ecologist, set out separately.		N/a
86	North Yorkshire Council Ecology	Section 7.43 The national policy relates to 'Biodiversity Net Gain' rather than 'Net Biodiversity Gain'.	Noted – the wording will be corrected.	Amended
87	North Yorkshire Council Ecology	Section 7.44 It should be noted that the statutory BNG metric only accounts for losses and gains in habitat, it does not directly relate to species specific measures (such as bat boxes). It may be clearer if the species-specific design measures were separated from those relating to habitats. Consideration could be given to additional measures for specific species that could be included in designs of new or renovated structures. For example, swift boxes may be appropriate given the records for this species in Kirkby Malzeard village.	The suggestion has been noted and amendments made to the wording of paragraphs 7.44 and 7.45	Amended
88	North Yorkshire Council Ecology	Section 7.46 It is noted that Policy KMLD12 mentions the designation of Habitat Banks. It may be worth clarifying whether these are different to Habitat Banks which are the result of a landowner entering into a legal agreement with a competent authority. The intention of which is to create biodiversity units which can then be sold to developers seeking offsite BNG units.	The Habitat Banks referred to are those described. It is important that such areas can be established locally rather than elsewhere.	N/a

89	D and M Design and Fabrication	I would also like to raise a specific point regarding the proposed candidate Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) shown on the draft plan. Parts of my family's woodland appear to have been included, but we have not been contacted or consulted about any ecological survey or proposal to designate these areas. I would therefore ask that this land is not put forward for SINC status unless and until an evidence-based assessment is carried out in consultation with us as landowners.	We have advised the respondent separately that this matter is being dealt with by NEYEDC (and that reference is simply being made to this process within the Plan) and that if further clarification is required it would be best to contact them directly.	N/a
90	Community Respondent 10	But I totally disagree with so called "rewilding" of moorland.	Your view is noted. The re-wilding of moorland is not specifically referred to within the Policy unless it were to come under the heading of 'enhancement'. It is anticipated that if Planning Consent were needed for any such measures that close attention would be paid by the LPA as to whether 'rewilding' did indeed constitute enhancement in that specific case.	No
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 9 RESPONSES – YES 9 (100%)			UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
<p>PROTECTING AND IMPROVING TREES, HEDGEROWS AND WOODLANDS</p> <p>PARISH ACTION 5 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 7.47 TO 7.55)</p>				

PCQ Q19. Tree Preservation Orders are seen as a useful tool to protect trees or groups of trees. Do you agree that this method set out in Parish Action 5, should be used, where appropriate, by the Parish Council to extend the number currently protected?

91	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	No comments	Noted	N/a
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 8 RESPONSES – YES 8 (100%)			UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	

TREE PLANTING

PARISH ACTION 6 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 7.57)

PCQ Q20. Parish Action 6 seeks to support native tree planting schemes in the area. Do you agree with this?

92	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	No comments	Noted	N/a
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 8 RESPONSES – YES 8 (100%)			UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	

Section 8: COMMUNITY FACILITIES

PROTECTING AND ENHANCING COMMUNITY FACILITIES

POLICY KMLD 13 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 8.1 TO 8.11)

PCQ Q21. Eight facilities which are particularly important to the community have been identified in Policy KMLD13 in order to provide additional protection against any future development which may adversely affect them. Do you agree with those selected and the purpose behind doing so?

93	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We note that this section discusses issues around community facilities, identifying specific facilities. However, we note other than identifying an open space the section does not discuss open spaces. In a planning policy sense, community facilities and open spaces are different things. We recommend that some introductory text on open space is added to this section.	The Policy has been amended to avoid confusion between community facilities and open spaces and it is not therefore felt that introductory text on open spaces is now required,	No
94	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	For many years the approach to public open space in the Harrogate area of North Yorkshire has been based on the differentiation of open space into 7 typologies (set out in section 2.3 of the Provision for Open Space and Village Halls SPD) according to their primary purpose. To ensure there is no confusion that any neighbourhood plan policy is intended to apply to all types of open space, we recommend the term 'recreational open space' is replaced with 'public open space' within the policy and accompanying text. We highlight that the policy relates to proposals that may threaten the continued use of existing	This advice on the terminology is noted and the existing wording 'recreational open space' will be amended accordingly. As there appears to be adequate protection under Local Plan Policies for open spaces such as the Highside Playing Fields, specific reference to this has been removed from the Policy. KMLD 10 also applies to that specific open space area providing further protection. We have also clarified the position regarding	Amended

		<p>facilities (protection), other proposals affecting existing facilities (enhancement) and proposals for new facilities. It also relates to these three types of proposals in relation to public open space. We consider that the presentation of requirements relating to such a wide range of development in a single policy is confusing and risks the policy requirements being misunderstood and mis-applied. We recommend separate policies for facilities and open space, each with separate requirements for each type of development identified.</p> <p>We understand that the policy seeks to apply local plan policy HP9 protections to specific community facilities included in the policy and LP policy HP7 protections to specific open spaces, following our previous comments. However, there is concern that as written the policy does not engage any protections. A similar concern relates to proposals that may threaten open space. It is recommended that changes are made to the policy to ensure it has the effect intended by the parish council.</p> <p>We are unclear on the exact nature of controls on proposals for enhancement or new provision and whether appropriate controls are being applied to facilities and open space in-light of the type of proposals that many come forward.</p> <p>We ask the parish council to meet with us to discuss these issues further and explore</p>	<p>enhancement of existing facilities and the creation of new facilities within the text.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

		approaches that will achieve the parish council's intentions.		
95	Community Respondent 3	We need a cafe	This view is noted. We would point out that reference is made to the café which now exists at the Ivy Bank campsite in para 8.3.	N/a
96	Community Respondent 4	I don't accept the Henry Jenkins PH as an Asset worthy of protection	The Henry Jenkins has not been included within Policy KMLD 13 as it is currently a disused building rather than an existing community facility. If it were ever to reopen as a public house it is probable that it would constitute a community facility at that point.	N/a
97	Community Respondent 10	And please resolve the issues with the HJ - this should be converted to housing.	We refer to the comment under item 20 above	N/a
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 9 RESPONSES – YES 8 (89%) NO 1 (11%)			UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
<p>PROVISION OF FACILITIES FOR YOUNGER PEOPLE</p> <p>PARISH ACTION 7 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 8.13)</p> <p>PCQ Q22. Parish Action 7 seeks to encourage the expansion of facilities for younger people in the community. Do you agree that this is necessary?</p>				

98	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	No comments	Noted	N/a
99	Community Respondent 7	In more disadvantaged areas of Ripon, perhaps yes, but our local children appear well provided for. More youth and sports club volunteers would be desirable, but these are not really a question of facilities and money, in my opinion.	The lack of volunteers does seriously affect the provision of some facilities and activities, and the wording of this Parish Action will be amended to reflect the need for the Parish Council to also encourage people to volunteer.	Amended
100	D and M Design and Fabrication	It's also notable that suggestions for youth facilities such as a pump track were considered outside the Plan's scope, yet the proposal for allotments continues to receive detailed attention. Both involve the use of community land, so it's not clear why one is excluded while the other remains a focus.	It is understood that the Playing Fields Association are now investigating the practicality of providing facilities such as a pump track.	N/a
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 9 RESPONSES – YES 7 (78%) NO 2 (22%)			MAJORITY SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
<p>ASSETS OF COMMUNITY VALUE</p> <p>PARISH ACTION 8 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 8.15 TO 8.18)</p> <p>PCQ Q23. Do you agree that there is a benefit in the eight facilities referred to in Policy KMLD13 being considered by the Parish Council for Listing as Assets of Community Value (ACVs) as referred to in Parish Action 8?</p>				

101	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We welcome updates to this text following previous comments. Following discussion with the council's Parish Liaison, Devolution and Community Rights team (responsible for Assets of Community Value, including their designation), we recommended that further minor changes are made to this text and Parish Action 8 in-line with their comments, as set out above. This will ensure that these sections reflect current legislation and are future proofed in expectation of further ACV legislation.	That you welcome the amendments made to the previous version is noted.	N/a
102	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	Please see comments on supporting text 8.15 to 8.20. No further comments.	Noted	N/a
103	North Yorkshire Council Parish Liaison Devolution and Community Rights	To ensure that content concerning ACVs accurately reflects current legislation and is future proofed, as much as can be, in expectation of further ACV legislation, we propose the following changes to this section: 8.15 The designation of a community facility as an Asset of Community Value ('ACV') provides the opportunity to give it added protection – replace 'from inappropriate development' with 'to enable facilities to remain in use by the community'.	Thank you for this suggestion – the section will be amended accordingly.	Amended
104	North Yorkshire Council Parish Liaison Devolution and Community Rights	8.16 Add 'The English Devolution and Community Empowerment Bill 2025 includes proposals to expand this definition and also to automatically list a range of sporting sites together with supporting facilities' at the end of this section.	Thank you for this suggestion– the section will be amended accordingly.	Amended

105	North Yorkshire Council Parish Liaison Devolution and Community Rights	8.17 Change to: Where an asset is 'Listed' as an ACV the Parish Council or other community interest groups will be given the opportunity to buy the asset on behalf of the local community if it comes up for sale on the open market or subject to a long-term lease over 25 years.	Thank you for this suggestion– the section will be amended accordingly.	Amended
106	North Yorkshire Council Parish Liaison Devolution and Community Rights	8.18 Change to: Through the consultation, some properties have been identified as important to the social well-being of the community, for example those referred to in Policy KMLD13. The Parish Council will therefore consider the mechanism of nominating them and any others that may be identified in the future as ACVs, to further ensure that their social value is protected.	Thank you for this suggestion– the section will be amended accordingly.	Amended
107	North Yorkshire Council Parish Liaison Devolution and Community Rights	Change wording of Parish Action to: PARISH ACTION 8: NOMINATING IMPORTANT COMMUNITY FACILITIES AS ASSETS OF COMMUNITY VALUE The Parish Council will give consideration to nominating the community facilities referred to in Policy KMLD 13, and any other facilities as identified in the future, or arising from the English Devolution and Community Empowerment Bill 2025, as Assets of Community Value.	Thank you for this suggestion– the section will be amended accordingly.	Amended
108	Community Respondent 4	I don't accept the Henry Jenkins PH as an Asset worthy of protection	The Henry Jenkins is not included in KMLD 13 and it is not therefore currently covered by Parish Action 8.	N/a
109	Community Respondent 7	But not the Henry Jenkins. I would like to see a row of affordable housing in its place.	See response to 108 above.	N/a

110	Community Respondent 10	Please do not then add HJ to the list at a later date.	The Henry Jenkins would only be considered as an ACV in the future if it were to be reopened as a public house or as another form of Community Facility.	N/a
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION			MAJORITY SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
8 RESPONSES – YES 7 (87%) NO 1 (13%)				
<p>POLICY KMLD14 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 8.20)</p> <p>PCQ Q24. Do you also agree that if they are Listed as ACVs then the proposals set out in Policy KMLD14 are important and that their ACV Listing should be relevant when any future planning application is being considered?</p>				
111	North Yorkshire Council Parish Liaison Devolution and Community Rights	Change wording of Policy to: Development proposals that support the ability of an Asset of Community Value (ACV) to benefit the local community will be supported and encouraged. Where proposals could threaten the continued registration of an ACV, for example through a change of use, the clear benefits to the local community of maintaining the asset's ability to retain its listing will be fully considered.	Thank you for this suggestion– the section will be amended accordingly.	Amended
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION			MAJORITY SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
8 RESPONSES – YES 7 (87%) NO 1 (13%)				
SECTION 9 INFRASTRUCTURE				

HIGHWAY SAFETY

PARISH ACTION 9 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 9.1 TO 9.6)

PCQ Q25. Highway Safety, particularly on Main Street in Kirkby Malzeard, is seen as an area of concern by the community. Do you agree that the Parish Council needs to work with partners such as NYC Highways to improve safety wherever possible as set out in Parish Action 9?

112	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	Please see comments of the local highway authority.	Noted.	N/a
113	North Yorkshire Highways	The narrative and resulting parish action need to make clearer how the issues described have been identified as safety concerns, particularly if it is the community's perception identified through consultation rather than based on empirical data. Para 9.3 - This includes para 9.3 where it states that speeding is seen as an issue throughout the parish, particularly along Main Street in Kirkby Malzeard. It also states that many drivers fail to drive safely within speed limits. What data are these statements based upon? If the answer is speed surveys, it should say so but if speed surveys have not been carried out the text should be amended to clarify it's the community's perception based on anecdotal information.	Regrettably, as there is a delay in obtaining traffic data, an amendment will be made to indicate that it is the view of the community that such problems exist.	Amended

114	North Yorkshire Council Highways	Para 9.5 – I suggest ‘pavements’ is replaced with ‘footpaths’ to be more technically accurate for what is being described.	Thank you for this suggestion– the section will be amended accordingly.	Amended
115	North Yorkshire Council Highways	Parish Action 9 Highway Safety The parish action should be amended in-light of the above. It is recommended that “particularly where safety has been identified locally as an issue” is replaced with “particularly where safety has been identified by the local community as a concern”.	Thank you for this suggestion– the section will be amended accordingly.	Amended
116	Community Respondent 3	Absolutely, and we need action fast.	Your support for this Parish Action is noted and welcomed	N/a
117	Community Respondent 7	I would support a 20 mile an hour speed limit	This suggestion will be referred to the Parish Council when it considers how to best implement this Parish Action on behalf of the community.	N/a
118	Community Respondent 11	And maybe look at the numerous blind corners on the roads - the bend in the road in Grewelthorpe, the almost blind junction by the butchers - all could be sorted with some thought.	This suggestion will be referred to the Parish Council when it considers how to best implement this Parish Action on behalf of the community.	N/a
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 8 RESPONSES – YES 8 (100%)			UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
CAR PARKING				
POLICY KMLD15 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 9.8 TO 9.10)				

PCQ Q26. Policy KMLD15 seeks to strengthen rules around the provision of off-street parking where development is being carried out. Do you agree that this is important?

119	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We welcome amendments to this policy following previous comments. These widen the application of the policy to the whole plan area, reference highway authority standards and make other minor changes that will improve the effectiveness of the policy.	That you welcome the amendments to the previous version is noted.	N/a
120	North Yorkshire Council Highways	Para 9.9 – Similar to comments above, this paragraph states there is a serious issue with on-street parking with detrimental impacts on pedestrian and road safety. How has it been determined that this issue is serious? It is recommended that the word ‘serious’ is removed.	We shall amend the wording as suggested but do so reluctantly as the issue is considered to be serious by the community and has been for a long time.	Amended
121	Community Respondent 11	Encouraging people with parking spaces on back lane to use them instead of parking on Main Street	This suggestion will be referred to the Parish Council when it considers how to best implement Parish Action 9 above on behalf of the community.	N/a

ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION

9 RESPONSES – YES 9 (100%)

UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED

PROVISION OF PUBLIC CAR PARK IN KIRKBY MALZEARD

PARISH ACTION 10 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 9.12)

PCQ Q27. Parish Action 10 outlines the idea of creating a public parking area on a section of The Green, including if practical the provision of ULEV charging points. Do you agree that this approach should be explored further by the Parish Council?

122	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	Please see our previous comments, which we consider are still applicable. In particular, we re-iterate that there may be planning policy hurdles that would prevent planning consent being granted for a car park on the Green. Preparation of the neighbourhood plan provides an opportunity to investigate these and potentially include a supportive policy to help overcome them. In addition, it should be recognised that even were planning permission granted, no development would be able to take place on the Green without landowner consent. It is recommended that this is also investigated.	These comments are noted. Having consulted with the community it is felt that there is insufficient support to justify including a Policy within this Plan. It is however considered appropriate to incorporate a Parish Action as this requests the Parish Council 'to explore the feasibility' of the proposed scheme. The issue of landowner consent will be investigated as part of this process.	No
123	Ivy Bank Campsite	The campsite cafe is open to the public and has had an amazing amount of support from local residents / businesses. We already help with parking for village events including the yearly football tournament, village big weekend / village festival and offer parking for weekly football events. This is great when the weather / ground conditions are favourable. The suggested idea of increasing our car park area and upgrading the footpath down to the village / green would have the following benefits	This information is noted and will be drawn to the attention of the Parish Council when a public car park on a section of the Green is considered further under this Parish Action. The campsite car park could be complementary to, or an alternative to, a car park on the Green.	N/a

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - encourage people to walk all year about + support the cafe (see the campsite and book a stay - reduce pressure on village resident parking and aid relations for events / safety for vehicle access. - from our perspective it will increase winter bookings, better revenue and exposure for the local area. <p>We are planning on doing this work to extend the car park area for winter 2027 (of course doing all relevant planning permissions / advice required) and if this could be covered or coincide with improvements to the footpath then it's a benefit to everyone. I'm on site 247 if you ever want to drop in always welcome</p>		
124	Kirkby Malzeard Women's Institute	As a WI which meets in the MIVH we feel that public parking is becoming more and more inadequate. We feel that creating parking on The Green will do very little to improve parking at the Mechanics and further down the village.	These comments are noted. It is hoped that if a car park were created on part of The Green it could serve those using the nearby Playing Fields and Doctors Surgery (as well as providing additional parking for residents in and around The Green). It is agreed that it is unlikely to be of any obvious use to those using the Mechanics Institute or other facilities at the East end of the village.	N/a
125	Community Respondent 1	I think that most people charge at home.	The comment is noted but it is recognised that whilst those who are able to charge at home will do	N/a

			so, a significant percentage of residents are unable to because their properties do not have on-site parking to enable this, including many of the traditional cottages in the village and indeed many of those living in and around The Green.	
126	Community Respondent 2	Yes I live on the Green. Any parking should be for residents. EV owners can use home charging	The comment is noted. It is felt that if a car park were created on a section of The Green this would be used by both the public and by residents. The question of home charging is referred to in item 125 above.	N/a
127	Community Respondent 8	The parking provision on the green is under utilised more than 50 percent of the weekday. There is always spaces available. The green is an important amenity and greenspace for children, dog walkers etc. Removing more green space for occasional parking on less than 10 days a year is not in line with environmental duty or respectful of the current amenity value. More parking will also increase safety issues for locals who use the green daily. There is alternative provision for occasional use such as larger sporting events available as field parking or local businesses with ample space to accommodate.	The various comments here are noted. a) The current parking provision on The Green has always been seen as serving the residents of The Green only, instead of being for public use, so those going to the playing fields or the Doctors' do not use them for that reason. b) It is known that there have been occasions in the past when residents have had to resort to parking on the grass as there were not enough spaces available, which the provision of an	N/a

			<p>additional car park would help to resolve.</p> <p>c) It is unclear how providing more parking would increase safety issues.</p> <p>d) As only part of The Green would be utilised for parking it is not anticipated that the overall amenity value would be significantly affected.</p> <p>e) Whilst field parking or similar is appropriate for one-off events it is intended that the additional car parking provision would help to alleviate problems on a day-to-day basis.</p>	
128	Community Respondent 10	The Green should remain a green and any parking created should be offset by tree planting / screening.	The comment is noted. The car park design may well involve measures such as tree-planting and screening. In the usual way residents in and around The Green would be consulted when plans are being drawn up.	N/a
129	Community Respondent 11	With new much longer ranger electric cars now - the need for chargers everywhere is much reduced.	The comment is noted. It is anticipated that chargers in this location would be used by residents charging regularly rather than those visiting from a distance.	N/a

<p>ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION</p> <p>9 RESPONSES – YES 5 (56%) NO 4 (44%)</p>	<p>There are mixed views on this Parish Action within the community, which appears in part to be opposition to a car park in general and also specific objections to the provision of EV chargers within the car park. It is however felt appropriate to retain the Parish Action as the Parish Council are asked only to explore the feasibility of the project rather than to undertake it. The wording also states that the Parish Council are to work in partnership with other parties including residents and it is hoped that their concerns will be addressed during that process.</p>
--	--

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

PARISH ACTION 11 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 9.14 TO 9.19)

PCQ Q28. Parish Action 11 hopes to result in improvements to local bus services. Do you agree that this is important to our rural community?

130	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	No comments	Noted	N/a
131	Community Respondent 11	Apparently not looking at the responses.	The comment is noted although the meaning is unclear as previous responses, for example within the Regulation 14 Consultation, did not raise any significant points and in general, as in this instance, there is	N/a

			strong support for this Parish Action.	
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 7 RESPONSES – YES 7 (100%)			UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
<p>ULTRA LOW EMISSIONS VEHICLE INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>POLICY KMLD 16 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 9.21 TO 9.26)</p> <p>PCQ Q29. Steps to encourage the provision of an Ultra Low Emissions Vehicle charging network are covered in Policy KMLD16. Do you agree with this Policy?</p>				
132	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	Sentence 1: We object to the inclusion of this requirement as it is unclear what is intended by “relevant development proposals”. Electric vehicle (EV) charging points are already required through existing local plan policy on most housing, employment and leisure developments. More importantly, as highlighted previously, EV charging is a legal requirement on many developments through Building Regulations Approved Document S. It is not necessary for neighbourhood plan policy to re-state existing local plan requirements or legal requirements and, therefore we consider sentence 1 should be removed. The policy could then focus on	It is agreed that the first sentence will be deleted. Amend wording of remaining sentence and add reference to Parish Action 10. The comment that requirements already exist within Local Plan Policy and Building Regulations covering the provision of EV charging points is noted and removes the need for specific reference to new development within this Policy.	Amended

		expressing support for public charging points subject to the criteria described.		
133	Community Respondent 1	I think that those scheme doesn't contribute to stop global warming	The comment is noted but it is not felt that any amendment to the text or Policy is required.	No
134	Community Respondent 2	EV's are not the way forward	The generally accepted position is that EVs will replace other types of vehicles in the foreseeable future.	No
135	Community Respondent 3	Ulev's are all very well if you have more than 1 car.	Please see response in 134	No
136	Community Respondent 10	Disagree with your statement at 9.23: As many transport users are likely to make the transition to Ultra-Low Emissions Vehicles (ULEVs) over the next few years I will not be and I do not see that many people can afford to	Please see response in 134	No
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 8 RESPONSES – YES 4 (50%) NO 4 (50%)			Although this consultation did not show clear support for or against this Policy, it is felt that it should be retained given that at present it is national policy to gradually phase out petrol/diesel fuelled vehicles in the future.	
PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY				
PARISH ACTION 12 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 9.28 TO 9.32)				

PCQ Q30. That the Parish Council should take measures to promote the use of the Public Rights of Way network and ensure that necessary maintenance is carried out is referred to in Parish Action 12, with expansion of the network also to be investigated. Do you agree with this?

137	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	No comments	Noted.	N/a
138	Community Respondent 8	Yes, should include support for landowners with permissive paths etc. A paid for service	The comment is noted. The idea will be considered by the Parish Council in conjunction with this Parish Action.	N/a
139	Community Respondent 10	Please ensure that footpaths are not blocked, signs have not been removed and that stiles are maintained	The comment is noted. It is anticipated that these points would be covered under the wording of 'necessary maintenance'.	N/a

ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION

9 RESPONSES – YES 9 (100%)

UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED

UTILITIES

PARISH ACTION 13 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 9.34 TO 9.38)

PCQ Q31. As surface water flooding is now seen as an increasing risk due to the climate change do you agree that it is important that the Parish Council should do all it can to ensure that issues do not arise wherever possible, as covered in Parish Action 13?

140	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	No comments	Noted	N/a
141	Community Respondent 10	Disagree that this is due to climate change though - it is due to poorly maintained drainage in part and by building on land that has always flooded (Laverton Oaks)	The comment is noted. Poorly maintained drainage is an issue which the Parish Council can monitor under this Parish Action. It is expected that measures will be taken during construction to prevent any flooding arising in the future where land is being developed which has flooded in the past.	N/a
142	Community Respondent 11	No mention of how we move off Oil as a community.	The comment is noted being one which refers to Utilities generally rather than to the issue of surface water flooding. Please refer to the response under item 20.	N/a
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 7 RESPONSES – YES 7 (100%)			UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
SECTION 10: SUPPORTING THE LOCAL ECONOMY				
POLICY KMLD 17 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 10.1 TO 11)				
Q32 Policy KMLD17 is intended to support specific types of development to aid the local economy. Do you feel that the measures incorporated are correct?				

143	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We welcome that the policy has been amended so that provisions differentiate between development in a defined settlement and development in open countryside, as required by the local plan growth strategy. We support para 1 part a.	<p>That you welcome the amendments made to the previous version of this Plan is noted.</p> <p>Sub-section a) An additional amendment is to be made as referred to under KMLD1 and KMLD2, relating to requirements for mitigation where upgrading of infrastructure is necessary in conjunction with anything other than small scale development whether this be of a residential or non-residential nature.</p>	Amended
144	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We are concerned that this would allow any kind of development that would be income generating with the only safeguards being that proposals are “compatible in scale and nature with a farm based location”, which we consider to be too imprecise. We recommend that the bullet is re-worded to support ‘farm diversification and other land based enterprises’ and include a requirement to meet local Plan policy EC7.	Sub-section b) - We note this advice and will amend the wording accordingly.	Amended
145	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	We note that this new element of the policy closely aligns with KMLD5, albeit referencing local plan policy EC3 (relating to employment development in countryside) rather than LP policy HS6 (relevant to housing). Similarly, our comments mirror those for KMLD5. In summary,	Sub-section c) -This advice is noted and amendments will be made.	Amended

		<p>we recognise the concern that the 2nd part of the requirement seeks to address but consider that it should focus on the development impacts to be avoided rather than focussing on a blanket prevention of a type of development assumed to have such impacts. In addition, we consider that the two aspects of the policy could be presented with greater clarity. To overcome these concerns, we suggest the following:</p> <p>3. Proposals for the conversion of rural buildings to form commercial/business units, where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development does not relate to isolated buildings in prominent positions in the landscape unless landscape impacts, for example from new or improved access tracks, will be satisfactorily mitigated; and o Relevant criteria within Local Plan Policy EC3: New Employment Development in the Countryside (or successor Local Plan policies) are met. 		
146	Nidderdale National Landscape JAC	As now worded the policy is strongly supported as it relates the scale of commercial development to the appropriateness of its location. Reference to isolated rural buildings is welcomed and reflects the approach in the main conversions policy.	That you strongly support the Policy is noted and welcomed.	N/a
147	Community Respondent 10	10.2 - you might want to amend to remove Saputo.	The comment is noted. As Saputo (Wensleydale Dairy) has recently	Amended

			closed we will amend the text accordingly	
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 8 RESPONSES – YES 7 (87%) NO 1 (13%)			MAJORITY SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	
MEASURES TO PROMOTE LOCAL BUSINESSES				
PARISH ACTION 14 (INTRODUCTORY TEXT 10.13 TO 10.16)				
PCQ Q33. The Parish Council will take an active role in promoting local business in ways which are described in Parish Action 14. Do you agree with these?				
148	North Yorkshire Council Planning Policy	No comments	Noted.	N/a
149	Community Respondent 10	You make no mention of the Uredale Community Partnership - Felicity Cunliffe Lister sits on the steering committee and should be able to feed this into the Parish Council	The comment is noted. Cllr Cunliffe-Lister provides reports to the Parish Council at each of its meetings and passes on any relevant information from the UCP.	N/a
ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES IN PUBLIC CONSULTATION 8 RESPONSES – YES 8 (100%)			UNANIMOUS SUPPORT NOTED AND WELCOMED	