

Annexe 3: Summary of general submissions received on survey sites
(December 2007 and February 2008)

Ref	Name	Site Ref	General or other Comments	Response
001	WBC Surveyors	Various		Dealt with in Comments Annex
002	Natural England		<p>unable to respond on detailed sites. over and above existing published information on designated sites in and around the Craven area and the information provided previously on the consultations on Craven District Council Local Development Framework Allocations Development Plan Documents</p> <p>We would hope that the site selection process will have regard to the emerging SHELAA methodology and the site specific information provided previously</p>	Comments Noted. Further consultation will take place at SA DPD stage for appropriate sites
003	Lancashire County Council		No comment	Noted
004	Yorkshire and Humber Regional Assembly		We do not have the capacity or specific local knowledge at the Assembly to consider individual sites. Assembly consultants have met with Craven DC to discuss the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment methodology.	Noted
008	Cononley Parish Council	Various	Members noted that current and approved development in Cononley [approximately 45 dwellings] went a long way towards meeting any foreseeable demand. There are general concerns about the ability of the existing infrastructure to cope with further development. Sites CN001-4 are in the present conservation area.	The study will address the suitability of land within and adjoining all key settlements included in the draft Core Strategy. The allocation of sites to meet the agreed settlement strategy (including appropriate housing and employment land) will be undertaken by the separate Site Allocations DPD.
010	English Heritage		<p>Various site specific comments</p> <p>EH also make the following comments in relation to several areas:</p> <p>Strongly recommend that the Council undertake a Conservation Area Assessment of the [eg]Sutton-in-Craven Conservation Area in order to help it determine the likely impact which the development of this site might have upon its special character and appearance and, therefore, its suitability as an allocation.</p>	<p>Site specific comments dealt with in Comments Annex.</p> <p>With regard to the comments relating to the need for CAA of various conservation areas (and potential for CA designation in High and Low Bentham) this will be considered during preparation of the SA SPD</p>
011	Richard Ellis	Various	The following sites constitute existing supply and should not be included in this assessment:	Site specific comments dealt with in Comments Annex.

Ref	Name	Site Ref	General or other Comments	Response
			<p>SG005 – Rose Cottage, Giggleswick</p> <p>SG018 – NYCC Depot, north of Kings Mill, Settle</p> <p>SG028 – Land south of Ingfield Lane, Settle</p> <p>SG047 – Ingfield Garage, Skipton Road, Settle</p> <p>SG046 – Land east of Castleberg Hospital, Maintenance Yard, Raines Road, Giggleswick</p>	<p>The methodology for preparing the SHELAA provides for re-examination of sites which have planning permission but not yet started. We have reviewed these sites to determine whether additional capacity would be feasible. Sites with planning permission that have been completed will be counted as contributing to supply accordingly but will not be shown as SHELAA sites.</p>
			<p>In addition to carrying out detailed assessments of the Settle and Giggleswick sites I have reviewed the remaining sites across Craven. In particular I would like you to note the following points.</p> <p>The sites identified across South Craven, incorporating Sutton-in-Craven and Cross Hills, are largely undeliverable for physical reasons. The majority of the sites fall within a flood plain e.g. SC014, SC037, SC039, SC041, SC042, SC043, SC044, SC050, SC052, SC053. In addition many of the other sites appear to be occupied, land-locked or without a suitable means of access. Furthermore some of the allocations would result in the amalgamation of Sutton and Cross Hills which has historically been resisted to maintain the separate identity and character of both settlements. Consequently I consider that aspirations to allocate development in South Craven as set out in the Preferred Options Core Strategy are highly questionable and as such further consideration should be given to allocating development in settlements, such as Settle and Giggleswick, where capacity is identified.</p>	<p>The study will address the suitability of land within and adjoining all key settlements included in the draft Core Strategy. The allocation of sites to meet the agreed settlement strategy (including appropriate housing and employment land) will be undertaken by the separate Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Flood risk and accessibility are some of the issues that will be considered has potential constraints when considering potential sites across the study area.</p>
012	Ingleton Parish Council	Various	<p>In addition to responses to questionnaires the PC submitted a letter expressing concern regarding the level of potential development in the village which is not in keeping with emerging settlement strategy of the Craven LDF.</p> <p>The council supports creation of employment opportunities for local people. Concern about potential impact of major retail development on employment site on village centre.</p>	<p>Site specific comments dealt with in Comments Annex.</p> <p>The covering letter explained that sites identified in the SHELAA will have no planning status. The level of housing and employment development in Ingleton will be set out in the emerging Craven Core Strategy. Specific sites to meet this requirement will then be identified through</p>

Ref	Name	Site Ref	General or other Comments	Response
				the Site Allocations DPD. The purpose of the SHELAA is merely to identify potential availability of land.
013	Brown & Whittaker Ltd	Various	<p>Ingleton As a centre Ingleton is quite unique, it is the nearest community in Craven to a Motorway connection. Is located on a major trunk road, with good road links to Lancaster and the North through Hawes.</p> <p>Ingleton should be considered for development as a Business & Commercial Centre. With all these facilities currently here it seems common sense.</p>	The study will address the suitability of land within and adjoining all key settlements included in the draft Core Strategy. The allocation of sites to meet the agreed settlement strategy (including appropriate housing and employment land) will be undertaken by the separate Site Allocations DPD.
			<p>Bentham is currently marked down for more Industrial development than Ingleton which seems ridiculous. We are encouraging more people to travel on second class roads into an area that does not have a good road link, or any area to develop in with a proper access that complies with current highway requirements.</p> <p>All which are already available at Ingleton with the entire infrastructure in place. Easy and inexpensive to develop with good road connections.</p>	The study will address the suitability of land within and adjoining all key settlements included in the draft Core Strategy. The allocation of sites to meet the agreed settlement strategy (including appropriate housing and employment land) will be undertaken by the separate Site Allocations DPD.
			There are some areas included in this community which are not suitable for development as they would fail at the first hurdle on access grounds. Have marked up a separate plan showing our suggestions, any further advice or information required please contact us.	Our study will assess known constraints such as access issues.
			<p>Settle & Giggleswick Our main proposal here is to look for more land for Industry Suggest the areas down towards the bypass are included</p> <p>SG03 & possibly SG04 allowing the area to become more of an employment centre. The housing proposals seem for both Settle & Giggleswick seem ok.</p>	The study will address the suitability of land within and adjoining all key settlements included in the draft Core Strategy. The allocation of sites to meet the agreed settlement strategy (including appropriate housing and employment land) will be undertaken by the separate Site Allocations DPD.
014	Embsay Parish Council	Various	The Council met on 8th January 2008 and discussed the matter.	

Ref	Name	Site Ref	General or other Comments	Response
			There were two issues from that meeting which I would wish to highlight, as follows;	
			1. Members expressed concerns about the impact on the character of the village if any further development were to be permitted in Embsay. They feel that there has already been sufficient development in Embsay and that any further development would completely change the character of the village.	The study will seek to identify land suitable for housing and employment development within and adjoining all key settlements in accordance with the settlement strategy of the emerging Core Strategy. The allocation of sites to meet the particular requirements of Embsay as part of this settlement strategy will be undertaken by the Council's separate Site Allocations DPD. This DPD will address environmental and other sustainability issues when allocating sites.
			There is currently a large development being undertaken at the site of the former Tannery of approximately 54 properties. The Council feel that time should be allowed to assess the impact of the development of this site before any new sites are considered.	See comments above
			We understood that the last (or current) Local Plan stated that Embsay had sufficient development already and that the Local Planning Authority would only permit small infill development.	See comments above
			2. Concerns were expressed about village infrastructure, including access to the sites. Sewerage infrastructure, traffic, loss of open/amenity space, flooding and the capacity of the local school were also issues referred to. Please see the individual questionnaires for details.	See comments above
			Members did query whether any of these sites had been visited.	All sites were visited-during dry weather.
015	United Utilities		I have made general comments on the sites which you have previously not consulted us on. BURTON-IN-LONSDALE The whole village is in the River Lune water catchment area. HIGH BENTHAM The whole village is in the River Lune water catchment area. Further development would lead to a need to invest in the capacity of the	Site specific comments dealt with in Comments Annex. The issue relating to potential WWTW capacity cannot be addressed by this study, but will be considered as part of the Council's Site Allocations DPD process.

Ref	Name	Site Ref	General or other Comments	Response
			Wastewater Treatment Works in the AMP5 (Asset Management Plan 5 – 2005-2010) period. It cannot be assumed that OFWAT our regulator will support our bid for funding investment.	
			<p>INGLETON The whole village is in the River Lune water catchment area.</p> <p>LOW BENTHAM The whole village is in the River Lune water catchment area. Further development would lead to a need to invest in the capacity of the Wastewater Treatment Works in the AMP5 (Asset Management Plan 5 – 2005-2010) period</p> <p>SETTLE and GIGGLESWICK The capacity of the sewer network in Giggleswick is limited. It is important that new developments are served by separate sewers and SUDS type techniques. Clean surface water should not be discharged to foul/combined sewers. We look to the support of the Council's Development Control Department in encouraging SUDS type techniques, insisting on separate sewerage systems and attenuation of surface water discharges.</p>	
020	Windle Beech Winthrop Surveyors	Various	Note that the site put forward on behalf of George Marshall (Properties) Limited shown edged in black on the plan attached has not been included within the potential sites for Bradley village. Requested information way why this site has been excluded given its central location within the village envelope and, especially given the fact that part of the land is surrounded by residential development on three sides.	<p>Site specific comments dealt with in Comments Annex.</p> <p>Site referred to has been consulted on during second stage consultation – February 2008</p>
			<p>Plan submitted outlining three further sites owned by our clients[in Hellifield], Craven Cattle Marts Ltd, for consideration for residential development in the LDF review.</p> <p>I confirm that the sites are presently used for agricultural purposes but vacant possession could be obtained should the sites be considered suitable for development.</p> <p>All sites have good road frontage.</p>	<p>The Southern Site forms part of amended site HE007- which has been subject to 2nd Stage Consultation – Feb 2008</p> <p>The majority of the Gisburn Road site has been included in HE007 which was subject to consultation in February 2008. Of the three other sites submitted only one site (land west of Formview Road is considered suitable for inclusion in the SHELAA. It should be noted that its potential inclusion</p>

Ref	Name	Site Ref	General or other Comments	Response
				as with all other SHELAA sites infers no special planning status.
021	Bentham Parish Council		<p>It is important to remember that Bentham is poorly served by public transport, and therefore provision of such services to sites is irrelevant. Many of these sites are currently accessed by dirt tracks, if at all, and the ease of improved access is also commented upon where Councillors felt this may be a problem.</p> <p>You should also be aware that NYCC is currently looking for a site for a new primary school in Bentham. Low Bentham school is expected to close in August, and the High Bentham site is considered inadequate for extension.</p>	<p>Site specific comments dealt with in Comments Annex.</p> <p>The consultants have met with NYCC's own consultant to assist in search for potential new school sites.</p>
			<p>There would still appear to be 2 sites that we expected that are not covered.</p> <p>The first is really the only significant brownfield [previously developed] site in Bentham. It is on the B6480 between High & Low Bentham and is called Felsteads. It is the opposite side of the Show Field to the Nursery, and is currently used as a vehicle repair place although it is on the market.</p> <p>The second is on Robin Lane as you go out of Bentham past the Golf Club, next to the sub-station.</p>	<p>The first site is considered to be unrelated to the built up area and in the green wedge, and was not therefore considered as part of the SHELAA.</p> <p>The second site is considered to be ribbon development (i.e. unsuitable) - in any event it is understood that this site is proposed by the golf club for their new clubhouse and so is not available for the purposes of the study..</p>
022	Gargrave Parish Council		<p>Noted two errors in plan numbering. Also made various detailed comments on sites.</p> <p>Also suggested that a number of potential housing sites had been omitted.</p>	<p>Apologise for errors which were not critical. Will be amended for final version.</p> <p>Site specific comments dealt with in Comments Annex.</p> <p>Additional site suggestion considered</p>
030	Yorkshire Forward		<p>Objective 6C of the Regional Economic Strategy (RES) seeks to secure a strong and diverse rural economy. In particular, it highlights that integrated rural renaissance programmes will be delivered in prioritised market towns, including Skipton and Settle. The Renaissance Market Towns (RMT) programme seeks to support the development of sustainable rural towns in the Yorkshire and Humber region, creating places where people want, and are able, to live, work, invest and visit. As part of this programme Initial Business Plans have been prepared which identify a</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Site specific comments dealt with in Comments Annex.</p>

Ref	Name	Site Ref	General or other Comments	Response
			<p>number of priority sites that will be important for the future development of the towns. It is important that these plans, and the proposals for the following sites, are reflected in the emerging Craven Local Development Framework.</p> <p>Skipton – SK 107 — Belle View Mills SK 060 — Firth Mill SK 050 — Land to the South of Carleton New Road west of Elder Beck</p> <p>Settle SG 018 — Kings Mill Depot</p>	
034	Clapham Parish Council	CL002		Site specific comments dealt with in Comments Annex.
035	Yorkshire Water	Various	<p>Water Supply</p> <p>Every site can be provided with a water supply on an individual basis, the costs to provide this supply will differ. It is likely that greenfield sites will require on and off site mainlaying as there will not be an existing connection. Brownfield [previously developed] sites are likely to benefit from existing infrastructure and may only require mains reinforcement, this is dependant on the future use of the site and what its previous use was. We do not have any water resource issues in the area due to the grid system we have, this allows us to pump water around Yorkshire.</p> <p>Sewerage</p> <p>Brownfield [previously developed] sites are much more likely to benefit from existing infrastructure. On brownfield [previously developed] sites we would want to see separate systems for foul and surface water. We will usually be able to take the foul flows but would want surface water discharges to the sewer kept to the same rate or less than the previous use of the site.</p> <p>There may not be capacity on greenfield sites for either foul or surface water flows. This is dependant on the location within Craven, how far away it is from existing infrastructure and the number of other sites in the vicinity. We would not want any surface water discharges to the sewer and other methods of disposal should be looked into.</p>	<p>Site specific comments dealt with in Comments Annex.</p> <p>The issue relating to potential WWTW and water supply capacity cannot be addressed by this study, but will be considered as part of the Council's Site Allocations DPD process.</p>

Ref	Name	Site Ref	General or other Comments	Response
			<p>If a site has a sewer crossing the site it has been noted.</p> <p>Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW)</p> <p>The three works which are at capacity in Craven are Bell Busk, Broughton and Coniston Cold. We work to the Water Industry standard of 5 year financial periods. The next one being 2010-2015, this is when any upgrades to the treatment works would be undertaken. We need to know by August this year which upgrades will be necessary, this is worked out by looking at future growth. In order for any works to be included in Craven we will need a good idea where future development will go in the next few months.</p> <p>Due to the nature of WWTW's we would not want to see any sensitive development within 400m. Sensitive uses include Class A, B1 and C, the most suitable development would be B2 and B8 in these locations.</p> <p>Additional comments made on various sites</p>	
040	National grid		<p>Submitted a letter explaining role of national grid. Requested further involvement in LDF preparation. Provided up to date contact details</p> <p>Tel: 0800 7312961 www.nationalgrid.com/uk/landanddevelopment</p>	Contact details noted
041	Skipton Properties	Various	<p>It is considered that all deliverable sites within Skipton and Glusburn / Cross Hills should be considered first, together with suitable smaller sites in villages within the South Craven / Airedale Corridor. Realistically very little, if any, development should take place in North Craven (with the exception of Settle).</p> <p>Emerging RSS states that development within the Craven District should be concentrated within Skipton and South Craven in order to realise the potential growth of the Airedale Corridor. Villages such as Cononley, Gargrave, Carleton, Bradley and Cowling are also within the Airedale Corridor and can be considered for small scale development. Cononley and Gargrave have rail links with the Airedale Corridor and Carleton, Bradley and Cowling all have reasonable bus services. These villages also all have reasonable services such as schools, shops and other community facilities, meaning that small scale development may be acceptable.</p>	The study will address the suitability of land for housing and employment development within and adjoining all key settlements included in the draft Core Strategy. The allocation of sites to meet the agreed settlement strategy (including appropriate housing and employment land) will be undertaken by the separate Site Allocations DPD as informed by the Core Strategy.

Ref	Name	Site Ref	General or other Comments	Response
			<p>A large number of sites have been put forward for consideration in small settlements in North Craven, an area that is unsuitable for development due to its lack of sustainability. Furthermore, development in these areas would be contrary to advice outlined in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). Settlements such as High Bentham are more geographically linked to Lancashire than Craven and development should be of a scale suitable to this rural market town.</p>	
			<p>A further issue that must be considered is the impending Interim Planning Guidance on Affordable Housing within Craven District Council. Whilst this is not currently in place, there is a possibility it will be adopted in the future.</p> <p>The guidance recommends that the existing affordable housing threshold (40% to be provided on developments of 15 or more dwellings) is to be removed. This would create an economy of scale — large development sites would be more likely to be able to carry the financial burden, whilst small sites would become financially unviable and would not come forward for development. Therefore very small sites can not be relied upon to be brought forward for development within the plan period.</p> <p>It is considered that Craven District Council should work towards developing a policy that restricts development in small settlements, in particular those that neighbour the Yorkshire Dales National Park. Essentially, the policy should mirror the policies in the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority Local Plan, in which residential development is only permitted to serve local and affordable housing needs. This would prevent potential over-development of villages that would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the Yorkshire Dales. Generally speaking these villages lack the required infrastructure to deal with an increase in development, and are considered unsustainable. Furthermore development of these areas would be contrary to guidance in the RSS.</p> <p>Craven District Council may consider small infill development within outlying villages as a suitable method of meeting affordable housing provisions</p>	