National Park HQ

Additional observations summarised

- Ask that a more balanced view of the NYMNPA application be given
- Residents expect to get a less disinterested voice from officers
- Other National Park HQs in England are beautiful old buildings (with style) or nicely constructed cabin like structures in keeping with their surroundings.
- The proposed development is a monstrosity in a historic town.
- Surely they could have come up with a better design than the factory/warehouse they propose.
- This development cannot be seen in isolation . The field development proposed nearby and the headquarters will engender a huge traffic problem in this quiet residential area.
- The field development needs if it goes ahead to have a separate access road from the Harome road and Riccal drive needs to become a Cul de sac.
- The question of biodiversity has not been addressed and it is no good saying it will be offset by work in another area.
- What is needed is not employment land but affordable houses for young couples to buy.
- Scrap the headquarters and build some nicely appointed houses to match what is there.

Applicant - reference to the number of persons attending external meetings.

The convenor for the Archaeological Society is currently on holiday and as such this information is not available.

The WI attract attendances of around 20 people and 5 or 6 of these arrive by car.
Helmsley Town Council attendance vary depending on the public interest in any item being discussed – there are 7 town councillors plus the clerk at each meeting.
It is of course not known whether any of these groups will use our premises when we move.

We can say with absolute certainty though that the number of likely vehicle movements in the evening will be very low (on the approx. 20 evenings per annum when these activities would take place) and our car parking would be more than adequate.

Officer

The matter of the delivery of the land to the north and the footpath is within land in the control of the applicant and as such can be delivered via condition as set out in the recommendation. There is no necessity for this to sit within the S106 agreement. Bio-diversity Net Gain is to be delivered entirely on a separate parcel of land in the control of the applicant and as such the land to the north does not contribute to the Bio-diversity Net Gain calculation and therefore does not need to be covered in the S106 agreement.