

Craven Conservation Areas Assessment Project

Statement of Community Engagement

February 2023

Introduction

The Craven Conservation Areas Assessment Project has produced 19 conservation area appraisals for settlements in the planning area of Craven District Council. The appraisals cover 16 existing conservation areas and three proposed conservation areas, and share a common general introduction. This statement explains how people and organisations have been encouraged to participate in the process, what they have contributed and how their contributions have shaped the final documents.

Carrying out public consultation is not a statutory requirement in the production of conservation area appraisals, but is considered good practice and the Council has committed to do so in its Statement of Community Involvement for Planning (SCI). Therefore, public consultation on the draft conservation area appraisals and general introduction was carried out from 19th October 2020 to 14th December 2020. This was an extended 8-week period in view of the number of appraisals involved. The consultation was publicised by means of a press release, a news bulletin and dedicated consultation page on the Council's website, and direct email notifications to all (over 700) subscribers to the Council's spatial planning consultation service. People and organisations were encouraged to participate by submitting comments on the draft documents. Over 100 responses were received, including several detailed submissions. Three comments were received prior to the public consultation and these have also been taken into account. The overall response was very positive with many statements of support, constructive suggestions and only a few objections.

The following tables provide details of who commented, a summary of their comments and a response from the appraisal authors, Alan Baxter Ltd (AB), including a summary of how the appraisals have been changed, as a result. There is a separate table for each settlement/conservation area appraised and the Table of Contents, below, includes hyperlinks to make finding tables easier. Comments have been taken on-board and suggested corrections, updates, additions and other changes have been incorporated, wherever possible and appropriate. The final documents have benefitted significantly from this process, ensuring their robustness.

Table of Contents

General Introduction

Burton-in-Lonsdale

Carleton

Cononley

Cowling

Eastby

Embsay

Farnhill

Gargrave

Ingleton

Kildwick

Kildwick Grange

Lothersdale

Low Bradley

Settle-Carlisle Railway

Sutton-in-Craven (no responses received)

Thomton-in-Craven

General Comments

Craven public responses – review notes and AB responses

General Introduction

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
24/11/2020	David Gulliver	Resident, Cononley		
Comment				AB Response
Incidentally, I have also read the 'Introduction' which is accurate and helpful.				Noted and thanks

Burton

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
7/12/2020	Susan Gregory	Burton in Lonsdale Parish Council		
Comment				AB Response
General Main Street/High Street – the name is used inconsistently; should be 'High Street				Text amended

<p>Names of various properties are inconsistent and require correction e.g. Castle Hill (not Hills), etc (see below comments)</p>	<p>Noted and text amended as detailed below.</p>
<p>The village falls on the boundaries of National Character Areas 19, (South Cumbria Low Fells, 20 (Morecambe Bay Limestones), 21 (Yorkshire Dales), & 34 (Bowland Fells); https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making/national-character-area-profiles</p>	<p>We are referring to the north Yorkshire landscape character assessment which is more detailed than the National Character Areas. Text amended to make this point clearer.</p>
<p>There have been more windows and doors replaced with plastic/metal double glazed units, not all sympathetic to the Conservation Area</p>	<p>Agreed. This is an ongoing challenge for the majority of conservation areas in the Country as a whole. It is only where there are robust policies in place that there is some degree of control hence our recommendation that at least there should be an Article 4 in place which ensures that an individuals rights under permitted development is rescinded. This does not mean that uPVC is banned <i>per se</i> but it does mean that planning permission has to be applied for and conservation officers or planning officers have an opportunity to comment. It helps if there is a local policy too but that is beyond the scope of this project. We have strengthened the wording of all our recommendations.</p>
<p>The signpost at the junction of Irbey and Westhouse Roads has been restored; the only original part is the West Riding roundel on the top of the post.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p>Old West Riding bridge posts have been restored (at Bogg Beck and River Greta)</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Pg 1 Para 2: Castle Hill (not 'Hills') Harris Garth is part of the building known as Stone Bower/Stonebower; the property was divided into 3 separate properties in late 1960s</p>	<p>We are using the listed building descriptions drawn from Historic England's on-line data.</p>
<p>Pg 2 Map: listed buildings names: Stone Bower; Constable Cottage; Bleaberry House; Frount Cottage (refers to The Frount fields to east of village)</p>	<p>We are using the listed building descriptions drawn from Historic England's on-line data.</p>
<p>Pg 4 Para 2: Castle Hill (not Hills); All Saints Church (not Saint's)</p>	<p>Text amended</p>
<p>Pg 5 Para 2: Castle Hill (not Hills) Para 5: between 17th and 20th century there were 13 potteries; they did not all operate at the same time</p> <p>1.2 Spatial Character: there are no bungalows on Manor Close. There are bungalows on Burton Hill and in Greta Heath; there is a mixture of detached and semi-detached houses in Manor Close.</p>	<p>Text amended. There are dormer bungalows on manor Close. Text amended to make this clearer</p>

<p>Pg 6</p> <p>Para 1: most hedgerows are now cut</p> <p>Para 2: does this refer to Mill Hill wood, to the south west of the village, on south bank of River Greta? See attached list of TPOs and map</p> <p>Para 4: Burton Hill is a mid 20thC development (c late 1950s); Greta Heath c 1960s- 1970s; Brookland c 1960-70s; All Saints (not All Saint's)</p> <p>Para 5: Constable Cottage (not Constable's Cottages)</p> <p>Para 6: High Street (not Main Street); Constable Cottage (not Constable's Cottages)</p> <p>Para 8: Area of grass = Village Green, a registered village green; a gravelled path on the east side, a tarmac road diagonal across and to west of grass provide access to the Village Green (MF2)</p>	<p>We accept that there has been change since we undertook our appraisal in 2015/16 and text has been amended to reflect this. Mill Wood means Mill Hill Wood. Text amended. Burton Hill has been dated via the 1958 OS map. Anything after 1960 is deemed late 20th century: Mid 20th century is anything between C. 1925 to 1959. Reference to Village Green added.</p>
<p>Pg 7</p> <p>Para 1: cafe no longer; take-away drinks;</p> <p>Para 2: Joiners Arms converted to residential 1980s</p> <p>Para 1:3 Public Open Space There are 3 sections to the churchyard – the current churchyard to the southeast of the church, the Very Old & Separate Churchyard (closed 1972) to the east of the church, and the previous churchyard , used between circa 19thC and 20thC; the 'green' is a registered Village Green in front of the Church (VG 58 NYCC) and is accessed from a gravel path on the east side and a tarmac road diagonal across and to west side All Saints (not Saint's)</p> <p>Para 1.4 Relationship with other Settlements: Cantsfield (not Cantfield) (Lancashire)</p>	<p>We accept that there has been change since we undertook our appraisal in 2015/16 and text has been amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Churchyard text and Village Green text amended</p> <p>Text amended.</p>

<p>Pg 8 Listed Buildings: Castle Hill Farm (not Castles Hill)</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>
<p>Pg 9 Para 1: walls are predominantly mixed stone</p> <p>Para 8: street furniture: street lights upgraded to metal columns, majority now 70w SON, iridium. The 'harbour style' bollard originated from Settle with Settle RDC insignia</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>
<p>Pg 11 Land Around Castle Hill (not Castles Hill)</p> <p>Para 1: Castle Hill (not Castles Hill) motte and bailey.... Para 2: All Saints(not Saint's)</p> <p>Para 4: Leeming Lane</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>
<p>Pg 12 Para 2: Tranquil Vale (not View), Castle Hill (not Hills), Bull Farm (not Bull House Farm)</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>
<p>Pg 13 Leeming Lane (not Leeman Lane)</p> <p>Para 2: land to east of former Richard Thornton's School (listed building now known as Thornton Lodge): significant view over HD1 toward YDNP boundary.</p>	<p>Text amended.</p> <p>The view to the YDNP is noted but we do not think this is relevant to the Appraisal but note that we have included views of Ingleborough Hill which we see as relevant. Text amended however, to take this point.</p>
<p>Pg 14 3.1 Highly significant fixed views (HF) HF1: should include view from former Richard Thornton's School (listed building now known as</p>	<p>HF1 is a fixed view as described and shown on the interactive map. The key long distant view is of the Forest of Bowland.</p>

Thornton Lodge): toward Masongill, with Gragareth behind (YDNP)	
Pg 15 HF3: Views from the junction of Leeming Lane, Chapel Lane, Low Street and Burton Hill (not Lane)	Text amended.
Pg 16 MF1 Para 1: Castle Hill Farm barns (High Street) (NB: large complex of 3 structures of different periods, making a single building) Para 2: The visual and physical dominance of the Listed Grade II All Saints Church and the adjoining Scheduled Ancient Monument of Castle Hill (not Hills).... Para 3: ... rears of the Listed Grade II Castle Hill Farm Barns (not Hills)... Para 4: ... development of Manor Close (capital 'M') HD 2: ... The Cross, Hill House (not Hill Cross House) MF2 View of Castle Hill Farm Barns	We think HD1 is meant. Text amended where necessary.
Pg 17 MF1: The Cross, Hill House (not Hill Cross House)	Text amended.
Pg 19 MF4: view slightly obscured by timber structure erected early 2020 MF6: Tatham House part of gentleman's property (not a farm) the land of which was taken out of land owned by the Tatham family, later sold to Yates and Jackson Brewery. MF7: Constable Cottage (not Constables Cottages)	We accept that there has been change since we undertook our appraisal in 2015/16 and text has been amended to reflect this. Text amended.

Pg 20 4.1 Pedestrian: Chapel Lane (not Street)				Text amended.
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
4/12/2020	Chris Weedon	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>General</p> <p>As residents of Burton in Lonsdale we were pleased to see the revised Draft Appraisal Consultation Document for the Burton in Lonsdale Conservation area.</p> <p>As individuals we broadly support the comments/conclusions reached</p>				Thank you
<p>the alternate use of 'Main Street' and 'High Street' when referring to the High Street.</p> <p>Meaning is clear to residents but perhaps not immediately clear to others.</p>				Text amended for clarity. We have confused the historic name of this street with the modern name.
<p>Some street furniture is not of an attractive or maintained condition – for example on the in the north side of the eastern end of the High Street. It is hoped they are not to be conserved!</p>				Noted. But we also note that change has happened since 2015/16 when we undertook the appraisal. See the new recommendations.
<p>Page 3</p> <p>Separately we would also draw your attention to inaccuracies in the plan on page 3 of the document in respect of an area outside the conservation area. The status of the plan provided is not clear and the presence, absence or position of any line cannot be taken as an indication of any ownership, right of access etc. In case these inaccuracies are of significance to you I attach an enlarged map of part of the area to the north of the village . The points noted on the plan are (Attached map as PDF)</p>				The base map we are using is the current Ordnance Survey map. Any inaccuracies are theirs and not ours. Having said that, any inaccuracies do not effect the appraisal in our opinion.
<p>1. This short east west line does not represent any wall/hedge/division. It is merely a line on the</p>				Ditto

plan.				
2/3. At positions 2 and 3 are garden gates at the end of driveways from the two adjacent properties Thornfields and Asplands.				Ditto
4. This area is a short length of asphalt giving providing privately owned access to 'The Croft' for the two properties. It is not part of The Croft (a road not adopted by the council).				Ditto
5. This line represents the end of the Croft				Ditto
6. This area is part of the garden of Thornfields.				Ditto
7. This is an area of grass being communally used and maintained by residents.				Ditto
8. This line appears to mark a boundary some 6-10 metres to the north of the present boundary at the end of Manor Close.				Ditto
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
24/10/2020	Ian Thompson	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
General The assessment accurately represents the environment of Burton in Lonsdale but the dozens of minor errors detract from the overall impression of the report.				Thank you and agreed.
The report considers the most significant dynamic view in the village to be HD1 but does not include that photo.				Suitable photo added

The title of view HD2 has been copied from the title of HF2 and the description has been copied from MF1.	Text amended.
In 2.2 there is reference to the setting of the SAM but there is no explanation of this abbreviation.	Text amended.
Main Street should read High Street	Text amended.
Chapel Street should read Chapel Lane	Text amended.
Castle Hills should read Castle Hill	Text amended.
Cantfield should read Cantsfield	Text amended.
Leeman Lane should read Leeming Lane	Text amended.
Ingleborough Hill should read Ingleborough	Text amended.
Castle Farm Barns should read Castle Hill Farm barns	Text amended.
Grade II All Saints Church should read Grade II* All Saints Church	Text amended.
manor Close should read Manor Close	Text amended.
non-designate should read non-designated	Text amended.

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
21/10/2020	Richard Greenen	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
General Firstly I'd like to commend the content of the document and the intent of conservation areas generally.				Thank you
If it's possible to consider additions I think the footpath approach to Burton in Lonsdale from the West as marked in green on the attached map has Fantastic views of the motte and bailey, church and village over open fields. (attached PDF)				Footpaths are now added to the interactive map
I'd recommended the conservation area is extended to include the fields outlined in blue to preserve this aspect.				Noted but no extensions are proposed by this review
I've also included a couple of pictures from the footpath to the south of the old vicarage.				Noted

Craven public responses – review notes and AB responses

Carleton

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	

11/11/2020	Aimee Bramleys - Procter	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>General</p> <p>I have read the document and i agree with the proposal for carleton made by alan baxter</p>				Thank you
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
26/11/2020	Andy Darbyshire	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>Having read the local plan proposal re the conservation area for Carleton Village I would like to strongly support the proposed extension to this area as proposed by the local Carleton Parish Council in order to conserve the context of the village within its local environment.</p>				Thank you
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
16/11/2020	Angela Dowbiggin	Resident		
Comment				AB Response

<p>General</p> <p>HAVING READ ALL THE DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE CARLETON CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL I WOULD LIKE CRAVEN DISTRICT COUNCIL TO FOLLOW THE ADVICE OF ALAN BAXTER ASSOCIATED AND HIS LEARNED PEERS, THE EXPERTS YOU COMMISSIONED TO WRITE THE REPORTS (Page 23 – ~ Bring forward proposals to extend the Conservation Area Boundary in order to conserve the significant relationship between the historic settlement and the surrounding open space. This includes fields to the north and east of St Mary’s church; Fields to the South east; and to the north and south on Carleton Lane on the approach into Carleton).</p>	<p>Thank you</p>
<p>I wrote to Craven DC Local Plan back in 2017 & 2018 to request the Conservation area was extended as above (at the time we had over 100 signatures requesting this)but we were told that there was no resource at that time to accommodate our request but as soon as the Local Plan was adopted work would commence on the CA Appraisals.</p>	<p>Thank you</p>
<p>I also highlighted the note on page 15 of the report where Craven DC disagreed with Alan Baxter Associates and his colleagues regarding the fields surrounding Grundy Farm. Alan Baxter & Associates advised that the fields made a strong Contribution to the Character & Appearance of the Conservation area whereas CDC though it only made ‘some contribution’. Historic England have since reported on a planning application regarding this field, as have the independent consultants I Voyage Ltd who carried out a Heritage Impact assessment and concur the whole field should be included in the Conservation area because of the Strong Contribution to the setting and Heritage assets and wider Rural setting.</p>	<p>Thank you</p>
<p>Having studied Historic England’s ‘ CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL, DESIGNATION AND MANAGEMENT DOCUMENTS’ and their MANAGING & REVIEWING CONSERVATION AREAS ADVICE’ , it is clear that involving the opinions of the Community is an integral part of the process particularly where the Boundary of the Conservation area should be drawn. The advice states that : FOLLOWING CONSULTATION AND REVISION OF THE APPRAISAL TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF PUBLIC RESPONSES THEY CAN BE ADOPTED FORMALLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH LOCAL PROCEDURES, It states ‘ADOPTION NEED NOT BE AN ONEROUS PROCESS AND COULD BE ACHIEVED THROUGH</p>	<p>Thank you</p>

FORMAL ENDORSEMENT.				
<p>I, like many in the village feel that the Conservation area should be extended as a matter of urgency. Craven DC paid for expert advice on Craven's Conservation areas so now is the time to follow that advice and not incur any further costs or time.</p> <p>I have attached the documents I have referred to for reference together with a sketch of the revised Conservation area(Highlighted in Blue and will be formalised via the PC response). (attached PDF's)</p>				Thank you
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
11/11/2020	Andrew Hill	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>General</p> <p>Regarding CDC PLANNING POLICY CONSULTATION at carleton in craven. I HAVE READ THE DOCUMENT AND I AGREE WITH THE PROPOSAL FOR CARLETON MADE BY ALAN BAXTER.</p>				Thank you
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
9/12/2020	Anne Nolan	Resident		
Comment				AB Response

General				Thank you
<p>I have read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal. I feel that the proposed extensions to the conservation area boundaries to include the fields identified within the report should be adopted. I also believe that the other recommendations should be followed so that the historically relevant character of the village can be preserved for future generations as the village develops over time.</p>				
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
9/12/2020	Mr A.S.McInnes	resident		
Comment				AB Response
General				Thank you
<p>Expansion of Conservation Area. Hello, having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal, I would like Craven District Council to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts and extend the Carleton Conservation Area boundary as recommended in the report and as highlighted by Carleton Parish Council.</p>				
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
1/12/2020	Tony Wilson	Resident		
Comment				AB Response

<p>General</p> <p>I have read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal and my response to the consultation is as follows:</p> <p>I would like CDC to follow the advice & recommendations of the experts it has commissioned to carry out the Carleton Appraisal.</p> <p>I would like the Carleton Conservation Area boundaries extended to include the fields surrounding St.Marys Church, those to the South & East and on the North & South approaches to the village, as highlighted on the map provided by Carleton Parish Council.</p>				<p>Thank you</p>
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
19/11/2020	Ann B(randon?)	Resident		
<p>Comment</p>				<p>AB Response</p>
<p>General (by hand written letter)</p> <p>Having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal we would like the Craven District Council to follow the advice of the experts you commissioned to carry out the appraisal a.nd extend the conservation area boundary as they recommended so as to include the fields surrounding St Marys Church. Fields to the south and the east and to the north and south on the approaches into the village as highlighted on the map (presumably the interactive map). That is to include Grundy farm its buildings and the domestic double garage, the workshop and the fields behind....we know we are not alone in our comments. The whole village feels the same. (there is a little more but it is difficult to read)</p>				<p>Thank you</p>

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
16/11/2020	Benjamin Hall	resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>General</p> <p>I have read the appraisal document and I agree with the proposal to extend the Conservation area in three places around Carleton made by Alan Baxter.</p> <p>I see no reason why the experts' recommendations in other villages will not be acted on by the council.</p>				Thank you
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
21/11/2020	Bess Martin	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>General</p> <p>Having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal I would like Craven District Council to follow the advice of the experts you commissioned to carry out the appraisals and extend the Conservation Area Boundary as they recommended so as to include the fields surrounding St. Mary's Church, Fields to the South and East, and to the North & South on the approaches into the village (as highlighted on the map provided by Carleton PC) that is to include Grundy Farm, its buildings, the domestic double garage, the Workshop and the fields behind too.</p>				Thank you

<p>We are very concerned about the current levels of approvals given the problems we experience with drains at capacity, roads congested and cars parked on pavements and the school full etc etc so it is vital that the extent of the Conservation Area is drawn as recommended by the Consultant (paid for by us) and the areas referred to above are included. (see attached photo of current congestion on Park Lane taken on 20.11.2020)</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>It is a matter of concern to us and all the people I have spoken to in Carleton that despite CDC having agreed appointed and paid for a specialist consultant out of our money that they then appear to unilaterally try to ignore sections that are not consistent with their wider (non planning) agenda. It is nothing short of disgraceful, in our opinion.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>There is no logic (in conservation terms) to exclude Grundy Farmhouse and buildings on Park Lane from the Plan area. It is already Grade II listed and in a high profile central location of the village. It should be included and the advice of your appointed consultant followed.</p> <p>Similarly, there is no planning logic in trying to exclude the domestic garage, the Workshop and the field behind Park Lane from the Final Plan area.</p> <p>The fields either side of the Church should also be included in the Plan Area for the reasons stated above.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Pg 9</p> <p>1.3 materials and pallet</p> <p>A gate pier at Grundy Farm is highlighted and pictured as a good example, yet Grundy Farmhouse, boundary walls and buildings (itself Grade II listed) is excluded from the draft CA map. It should be put back in, along with its field and the domestic garage and workshop immediately to the South of it and as recommended by CDC's own appointed Consultant. They are prominent in the centre of the village and add to the historic context and landscape of Carleton.</p>	<p>The map has been amended and added to. There is now more historic context</p>

<p>Pg 10</p> <p>1.4 key buildings</p> <p>The terrace at Park Lane is included and yet the Farm, its field, the domestic double garage and the Workshop is not. This is illogical as the latter are clearly of more significance than the terraced houses in conservation terms. They should all be included in the Plan area (especially as the former is already a Grade II listed property). https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1166884</p>	<p>The Key (now Landmark) buildings are only in as a guide. See the new recommendations for further information.</p>
<p>Pg 15</p> <p>Grundy Farm, its field and the adjoining workshop is currently outside the draft plan boundary. This does not make sense in conservation terms especially as it is accepted that it makes a 'strong contribution' to the nature of the village and again as recommended by CDC's own appointed Consultant and also because Grundy Farmhouse and buildings are Grade II listed and the Workshop in a central and elevated, visible location next to the Farm. Please put all these areas back in to the area and follow the Consultants recommendations.</p>	<p>See the revised document for further information.</p>
<p>General</p> <p>appointed and paid a Consultant to assess all CAs in Craven. That Consultant made recommendations for changes and in Carleton the recommendation was to include the whole of the Workshop area plus the adjoining domestic double garage, Grundy Farm and field in an extended Conservation area. That report should have gone out to public consultation and we would have supported the Consultants recommendations to help protect this area from over development and yet more traffic congestion by including them in the Conservation Area.</p> <p>We know many of our friends and neighbours share the same concerns</p> <p>Kindly acknowledge receipt of these comments and confirm my comments will be taken in to</p>	<p>Noted</p>

account in conservation terms.				
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
27/11/2020	Bridget Moore	resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>General</p> <p>I have studied the report by Alan Baxter & Associated Ltd, and feel strongly that CDC should follow the recommendations made by the conservation experts in relation to extending the conservation boundaries in Carleton. It is essential to protect the fields and the rural setting of the village for residents, now and in the future.</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
26/11/2020	Chris Judge	resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>General</p> <p>Having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal, I would like the CDC to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts and extend the Carleton Conservation Boundary as recommended in the report and as highlighted by the Carleton Parish Council.</p>				Noted

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
30/11/2020	Corinne Ludford	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>General</p> <p>As a resident of Carleton who resides within the current Carleton Conservation Area I wish to express my desire to see the boundary extended as recommended in the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal. Having read the report which highlights the historic nature of the village characterised by its setting within the landscape which has endured for centuries I strongly concur with the expert report and the recommendation by the Parish Council to extend the Carleton Conservation Area boundary.</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
29/11/2020	Clare Moore	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>General</p> <p>I am a resident of Carleton-in-Craven. I have just read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal and I would like CDC to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts and extend the Carleton Conservation Area boundary as recommended in the report and as highlighted by Carleton Parish Council. I live on the edge of the village and any expansion would significantly impact on my family's peaceful way of life.</p>				Noted

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
1/12/2020	Cressida Woodall	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>General</p> <p>I've read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal. I'd like CDC to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts you commissioned to carry out the Carleton appraisal.</p> <p>This was to extend the conservation area boundary to include the fields surrounding St Mary's Church, those to the south and east, and to the north and south of the approaches into the village (as highlighted on the map provided by Carleton PC).</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
1/12/2020	Clerk	Carleton-in-Craven Parish Council		
Comment				AB Response
<p>General</p> <p>Comment on Grundy Farm in scanned PDF(see attached document)</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	

12/12/2020	Cllr Richard Pringle	Ward Councillor		
Comment				AB Response
In my home village of Carleton (I'm not sure if I need to declare an interest) I have had nothing but support (and quite a lot of it) for the idea that the recommendations of Alan Baxter Ltd to extend the Conservation Area around the village in 3 places is implemented. The Parish Council are very keen to see this happen. And for what it's worth, I tend to agree with their views.				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
1/12/2020	David Charleton	resident		
Comment				AB Response
It seems extremely sensible for CDC to follow the expert advice and recommendations within the recent Appraisal by those commissioned by you. That is to extend the conservation area boundary to include the fields surrounding St. Mary's Church - those to the south and east and to the north and south of the village approaches[per the map provided by Carleton Parish Council]				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
1/12/2020	Eileen Wilson	Resident		
Comment				AB Response

<p>1. I would CDC to follow the advice & recommendations of the experts it has commissioned to carry out the Carleton Appraisal.</p> <p>2. I would like the Carleton Conservation Area boundaries extended to include the fields surrounding St.Marys Church, those to the South & East and to include the fields on the North & South approaches to the village as highlighted on the map provided by Carleton Parish Council.</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
14/12/2020	Elizabeth Taylor	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>Having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal, I would like Craven District Council to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts commissioned by you to carry out the Carleton Appraisal and to extend the conservation area boundary to include the fields surrounding St Mary's Church, those to the south and east behind Street Houses, Ivy Cottage Farm and the Rectory, and to the north and south of the approaches into the village and to the north west of Dale Road (all as highlighted on the map provided by Carleton Parish Council). As a resident of Carleton for over 70 years, I feel that the expansion of the Conservation Area will be ensure that Carleton retains its rural character and its unique heritage for generations to come.</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
12/11/2020	Fiona Wood	Resident		
Comment				AB Response

I have read the document and I agree with the proposal for Carleton made by Alan Baxter.				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
26/11/2020	Gareth & Linda Lewis	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>As permanent residents of Carleton in Craven, we have read the above document and we agree with the proposal for Carleton made by Alan Baxter.</p> <p>Furthermore, we agree with, and support any proposal to further extend the conservation area boundaries, in the future, to include the fields North of the Carleton Lane approach into the village.</p> <p>We feel very strongly that it is extremely important to maintain and protect the character and heritage of our beautiful village, as this was the very reason we moved here permanently from Chesterfield in 2019</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
26/11/2020	Gillian Farthing	Resident		
Comment				AB Response

<p>Having read the Carleton conservation appraisal I agree with the proposal put forth by Carleton parish council and I would like the CDC to accept the recommendation to extend the boundaries of the conservation area.</p> <p>As a resident of Carleton I would welcome any measure that preserves the character and integrity of the village.</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
13/12/2020	G V Woodhead	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>Having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal, I would like Craven District Council to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts commissioned by you to carry out the Carleton Appraisal and to extend the conservation area boundary to include the fields surrounding St Mary's Church, those to the south and east behind Street Houses, Ivy Cottage Farm and the Rectory, and to the north and south of the approaches into the village and to the north west of Dale Road (all as highlighted on the map provided by Carleton Parish Council).</p> <p>Stated in the Carleton Appraisal Document, the experts felt that the village would benefit from an expansion of the conservation area and this was their recommendation. I hope CDC will accept the expert's findings and also the new map drawn up by Carleton Parish Council clearly showing the expansion area, and also take into consideration the strength of feeling of village residents including myself. It is of paramount importance that our village retains its character, its heritage and its rural culture. Carleton in Craven is unique in having its roots in agriculture followed by its expansion as a mill village.</p> <p>The village benefits from a wealth of Grade II listed buildings and from areas of the village that afford strong character views across agricultural fields. The expansion of the conservation area will protect the village for future generations.</p>				Noted

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
13/12/2020	Glen Mc	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
Having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal , I would like CDC to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts and extend the Carleton Conservation Area boundary as recommended in the report and as highlighted by Carleton Parish Council				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
26/11/2020	Hayley Kitching	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
Having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal , I would like CDC to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts and extend the Carleton Conservation Area boundary as recommended in the report and as highlighted by Carleton Parish Council				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
7/12/2020	Joyce Chapman	Resident		
Comment				AB Response

I am writing to support the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal. Please allow the CDC to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts who were commissioned by you to carry out the Carleton Appraisal and extend the conservation area boundary to include the fields surrounding St Mary's Church, those to the south east and to the north and south of the approaches into the village. (highlighted on map). I fully support the recommendation to keep this historic village environment for future generations of residents of Carleton.				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
26/11/2020	John David Farrar	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
Having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal , I would like CDC to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts and extend the Carleton Conservation Area boundary as recommended in the report and as highlighted by Carleton Parish Council				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
9/12/2020	Jane Greenwood	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
I am a resident of Carleton in Craven and would like to affirm that I am in agreement with the proposed expansion to protect our rural village. I would like Craven District Council to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts commissioned by you to carry out the Carleton Appraisal and extend the conservation area boundary to include the fields surrounding St Mary's				Noted

Church, those to the south and east, and to the north and south of the approaches into the village.				
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
26/11/2020	Jane Heys	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
Having looked carefully at the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal, I am in favour of the boundaries outlined in the revised proposals for Carleton conservation area. I would like the CDC to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts to protect and conserve the village's historic identity through the protection afforded by this revision supported by Carleton Parish Council				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
3/12/2020	Mr J R & C R Brown	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
Having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal we would like Craven District Council to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts commissioned by the Council to carry out the Carleton Appraisal and extend the conservation area boundary to include the fields surrounding St Mary's Church, those to the south and east, and to the north and south of the approaches into the village. As highlighted on the map provided by Carleton Parish Council.				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	

2/12/2020	John R Wharton	Architect		
Comment				AB Response
<p>I am concerned that the tactics being employed by the Parish Council and Carleton Courier are not representative of the whole village and are not in the best interests of the village. I enclose an example (copy attached to letter) of the totally unbalanced methods being used being spoon-fed to the whole village. Many respondents will be unaware of what they are supporting. They will not have seen the appraisal nor the maps. The map on the Parish Council website has been cropped to omit the colour key to make it meaningless....The purpose of a local plan is to identify potential development sites, of which the village already has few. These are most likely to be adjoining farms whose businesses are by no means secure – so it is positively unhelpful to try and ‘protect’ sites adjacent farms. There needs to be a more balanced approach to the future of the village to maintain its vitality, which we hope will be the stance taken by Craven District Council...this is a formal objection to moves to increase the village conservation area.</p>				<p>The document has been revised following public consultation and the recommendations section strengthened. The purpose of the conservation area appraisal is to assess the character and appearance of the conservation area and to make recommendations based on this assessment. It is up to Craven District Council whether they accept our recommendations. Our recommendation to extend the conservation area is based on our professional judgment and has not been influenced by any third party intervention.</p>
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
13.12/2020	Joanne Riley	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>Having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal , I would like Craven District Council to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts and extend the Carleton Conservation Area boundary as recommended in the report and as highlighted by Carleton Parish Council.</p>				<p>Noted</p>
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	

15/11/2020	Jane Taylor	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
I have read the above document and I agree with the proposals for Carleton made by Alan Baxter.				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
8/11/2020	John Waterhouse	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>Having read the consultation documents for the Craven Conservation Areas Project, I would like to register my support for Historic England and Alan Baxter's suggestion that the conservation area in Carleton in Craven be extended. That is, as it says in the document:-</p> <p>Bring forward proposals to extend the Conservation Area boundary in order to conserve the significant relationship between the historic settlement and the surrounding open space. This includes fields to the north and east of St Mary's Church; to the south east; and to the north and south of Carleton Lane on the approach into Carleton.</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
13/12/2020	Janis Willingham	Resident		

Comment				AB Response
I have read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal, and I would like Craven District Council to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts commissioned by the Council to carry out the Carleton Appraisal. I refer specifically to the extension of the Conservation Area boundary to include the fields surrounding St Mary's Church, those fields to the south and east, and to the north and south of the approaches into the village (as highlighted on the map provided by Carleton Parish Council)				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
26/11/2020	Katherine Darbyshire	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
I have read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal. I would like CDC to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts and extend the CCA boundary as recommended in the report and highlighted by Carleton Parish Council				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
27/11/2020	Linda Critchley	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
After reading the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal August 2016, I would like Craven District Council to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts and extend the Carleton				Noted

Conservation Area boundary as recommended in that report and as highlighted by Carleton Parish Council				
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
26/11/2020	Linda Smith	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal , I would like CDC to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts and extend the Carleton Conservation Area boundary as recommended in the report and as highlighted by Carleton Parish Council				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
13/11/2020	Mark Willingham	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
Having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal document, I would like Craven District Council to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts commissioned by yourselves to carry out the appraisal, and extend the conservation area boundary to include the fields surrounding St Mary's Church, those to the south and east, and also those to the north and south of the approaches to the village (as highlighted on the map provided by Carleton Parish Council)				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	

16/11/2020	Malcolm Bray	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
I have read the document and I agree with the proposal for Carleton made by Alan Baxter				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
7/12/2020	Michael Chapman	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
I am writing to support the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal. Please allow CDC to follow advice and recommendations of the experts who were commissioned by you to carry out the Carleton Appraisal and extend the conservation area boundary to include the fields surrounding St Mary's Church, those to the south and east, and to the north and south of the approaches into the village (highlighted on map). I fully support this recommendation to keep this historic village environment for future generations of residents of Carleton.				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
15/11/2020	Marian Taylor	Resident		
Comment				AB Response

<p>I have read the appraisal document and I agree with the proposal for Carleton in Craven made by Alan Baxter.</p> <p>I do not wish to add anything to the report at this time.</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
30/11/2020	Neil Casey	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>Having viewed the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal, I would like to register my support for the proposal to extend the conservation area boundary to include the fields surrounding St Mary's Church, those to the south and east, and to the North and South of the approaches to the village.</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
28/11/2020	Nicola Sutcliffe	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>I would like to note that having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal , I would like CDC to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts and extend the Carleton Conservation Area boundary as recommended in the report and as highlighted by Carleton Parish Council.</p> <p>This is very important to preserve both wildlife and areas of historic points of interest and preserve a rural setting.</p>				Noted

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	AB Response
12/11/2020	Olly Cutler	Resident		
Comment				
Having reviewed the document produced by Alan Baxter, I agree with the Craven Conservation Appraisal Document and proposal made in regards to Carleton-in-Craven.				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	AB Response
13/12/2020	Michell and Phil Ward			
Comment				
Having read and reviewed the Carleton in Craven Conservation Area Appraisal, I would like CDC to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts commissioned by you to carry out the Carleton Appraisal and extend the conservation area boundary to include the fields surrounding St. Mary's Church, those to the south and east, and to the north and south of the approaches into the village (as highlighted on the map provided by Carleton Parish Council).				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	AB Response
26/11/2020	P & M Harris	Resident		
Comment				

<p>We would like to comment in particular on the section referring to Carleton, our parish, in the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>After reading the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal I am compelled to suggest that the Craven District Council takes the advice of the experts commissioned by you ad paid for by us to carry out the appraisal.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Conservation Area Boundary should be extended to include the fields surrounding St. Mary's Church to he south and east, and the North and south on the approach to the village i. e. to include the Grundy Farm, its buildings, the domestic double garage, the workshop and the fields behind them as highlighted on the map provided by Carleton Parish Council.</p> <p>We are concerned about the level of approvals given for development at the moment as the village already experiences problems with drainage, car parking and other things that occur when the infrastructure is stretched.</p> <p>We would therefore request that the Conservation Area is drawn and implemented as recommended by the consultant that you employed to give you advice.</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	AB Response
26/11/2020	Peter Gunn	Resident		
Comment				
<p>I am writing in support of the proposal to extend the conservation area in Carleton - having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal, I would like CDC to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts and extend the Carleton Conservation Area boundary as recommended in the report and as highlighted by Carleton Parish Council, and ideally even further</p>				Noted

to encompass all green space surrounding the village.				
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	AB Response
12/12/2020	Philip Holmes	Resident		
Comment				
I have read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal with interest and I would like CDC to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts and extend the Carleton Conservation Area boundary as recommended in the report and as highlighted by Carleton Parish Council. It is important to maintain and extend the conservation area in this village.				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	AB Response
30/11/2020	Ryan Cowley	Resident		
Comment				

<p>Having read over the carleton conservation consultation area appraisal I would like Craven District Council to follow the advice and recommendations Within the report and to extend The carleton conservation boundary as recommended by Carleton Parish Council.</p> <p>Having moved from skipton to Carleton just over two years ago I have a good understanding of the locality. Being a regular fell runner I am also aware of the many public footpaths covered within the new boundary which are vital for community life.</p> <p>I have also, sadly seen significant developments on the fringes of carleton which have had considerable impact on flooding locally, extra pressure on school places and higher traffic flow through the small village roads.</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	AB Response
8/12/2020	Roy Harvey	Resident		
Comment				
<p>Having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal I would like Craven District Council to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts commissioned by you to carry out the Carleton Appraisal and extend the Conservation Area Boundary to include the fields surrounding St Mary's Church those to the south and east and to the north and south of the approaches to the village as highlighted on the map provided by Carleton Parish Council</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	AB Response
14/12/2020	Michael Gordon	Rural Solutions on behalf of, RN Wooler & Co Ltd		

Comment	
<p>These representations are submitted on behalf of RN Wooler & Co Ltd, in response to the current public consultation to the Craven Conservation Area Project. This representation is submitted in response to the draft appraisal for Carleton.</p> <p>We have reviewed the draft Conservation Area Appraisal for Carleton, prepared by Craven District Council, Historic England and Alan Baxter Ltd. We consider the Conservation Area boundary to be entirely appropriate to the settlement and its identified heritage assets and do not consider the need to extend this boundary.</p> <p>It is noted on page 15 that 'Land south of Carleton' is identified as predominately making a strong contribution to the character and appearance of the village.</p> <p>Bullet point three states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land to the south-east of the grade II-listed Grundy Farm helps contextualise the farm and reinforces the relationship between the historic core and its agricultural setting. The strip of land adjoining the rear of the properties on Park Lane is compromised by this relationship and consequently makes only some contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area (note this is not the opinion of Alan Baxter Ltd and its subconsultants*) <p>It is noted that the bullet point includes the note:</p> <p>*The authors, Alan Baxter Ltd, and the two commissioning partners, Craven District Council and Historic England, were able to reconcile their views throughout the course of the project, except on a limited number of occasions when all parties were satisfied with the inclusion of this note to qualify the opinion expressed. In the 16 appraisals produced by the project, the note appears in only three places: Carleton, page 15; Embsay, page 12; and Settle-Carlisle, page 14. (This explanatory footnote is provided by Craven District Council.)</p> <p>As noted above, the Conservation Area Appraisal has been created in partnership with Historic</p>	<p>The document has been revised following public consultation and the recommendations section strengthened. The purpose of the conservation area appraisal is to assess the character and appearance of the conservation area and to make recommendations based on this assessment. It is up to Craven District Council whether they accept our recommendations. Our recommendation to extend the conservation area is based on our professional judgment and has not been influenced by any third party intervention.</p>

<p>England who are the government's statutory adviser on the historic environment and who have been directly involved in the preparation and publication of the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal. We consider that it is fully logical to make this assessment of the overall contribution to the land to the south-east of Grundy Farm and we support this conclusion within the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal.</p> <p>In light of the above we re-assert that the council are correct in their assessment of the Carleton Conservation Area and we do not consider the need for any amendments to the appraisal following this consultation.</p>				
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	AB Response
26/11/2020	Ruth Skinner	Resident		
Comment				
<p>Having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal , I would like CDC to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts and extend the Carleton Conservation Area boundary as recommended in the report and as highlighted by Carleton Parish Council.</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	AB Response
4/12/2020	Sally and Steven Hall	Resident		
Comment				

<p>I have studied the report by Alan Baxter & Associates Ltd and would like Craven District Council to follow the recommendations made. In particular when referring to the visual entry to the village - retaining the village identity, with drystone walls on entry to the village The land south of the village predominantly makes a strong contribution to the character and appearance. Hillside enclosures throughout comprise historic boundaries which help to define the historic core and relationship to the rural landscape.</p> <p>I also feel very strongly that the CDC should follow the recommendations made by the conservation experts; paying particular attention to extending the conservation boundaries in Carleton.</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	AB Response
26/11/2020	Samantha Mould	Resident		
Comment				
<p>Having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal , I would like CDC to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts and extend the Carleton Conservation Area boundary as recommended in the report and as highlighted by Carleton Parish Council. I feel this would be a valuable addition to ensure the village retains both its feel and doesn't lose part of what makes it a wonderful place to live as a village.</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	AB Response
1/12/2020	Sophie Rymer	Resident		
Comment				

<p>I have recently read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal and I would like the council to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts commissioned by yourselves. I agree with extending the conservation area boundary to include the fields surrounding St Mary's Church, those to the south and east, and to the north and south of the approaches into the village.</p> <p>Maintaining this area is very important to our village!</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	AB Response
8/12/2020	Sandra Waterhouse	Resident		
Comment				
<p>I have read the Carleton in Craven Conservation Area Appraisal and I would like Craven District Council to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts and extend the Carleton Conservation Area Boundary as recommended in the report and as highlighted by Carleton in Craven Parish Council.</p> <p>Please see the map below (jpg map same as parish council map attached).</p>				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	AB Response
13/12/2020	Sarah Williams	Resident		
Comment				

I am writing as a resident of Carleton who loves the village and wants to preserve what makes this area special. Having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal, I would like CDC to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts and extend the Carleton Conservation Area boundary as recommended in the report and as highlighted by Carleton Parish Council.				Noted
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	AB Response
14/12/2020	Susan Wrathmell	Resident		
Comment				
<p>General:</p> <p>The map does not include the site of the earthworks of the medieval village site to north and west of the church and notable for a deep boundary ditch / sunken way close to the gardens of Leys Close.</p>				The document and the interactive map have been revised to take account of historic character and archaeology.
The site of the early village is noted however in the report: 'protected by scheduling... prominent earthworks on the south west side of Leys Close'.				Noted
See Landscape and Open Space 2.3 MF4 - Please add the boundary for this important site, and a note that the recreation ground and East View / Orchard Hills Terrace / Orchard Hills Cottages [a barn conversion] are also on the medieval settlement area.				Noted
<p>Photo 1.2</p> <p>Note the significant field gate post at the end of Vicar's Row, it has evidence of its use as an early barrier gate with slots for horizontal poles, indicating likely C16 or earlier.</p>				Not sure where this is

<p>New Street is an important terrace with direct entrance from the street which is perpendicular to the routeway, shown to be pre-1850.</p>	<p>See revised interactive map and Landmark</p>
<p>Pg 15:</p> <p>Land to South, with reference to the strip of land to rear of properties on Park Lane. Some clarity is needed to help an understanding to the statement 'compromised by the relationship between the historic core and the agricultural setting.</p> <p>The small garages, current industrial unit, social club premises and former carpentry workshop is an important assemblage of C19 -C20 infill in the industrial / agricultural village, and represents several important aspects of community history.</p> <p>For this reason it does not detract from the historic / landscape significance of the land rear of Grundy Farm, rather they require consideration in future development here, and the term 'some contribution' should be reconsidered.</p>	<p>The final paragraph has been deleted. The new information you have provided allows us to reevaluate the original statement. The text has been amended to make it clearer why we consider this area to make a strong contribution.</p> <p>The open space text has been revised and amended.</p>
<p>Pg 17:</p> <p>HF3 view into village from Spences Court- the extent of tarmac and narrow pavements encourage traffic speeds; road versus pavement widths require consideration and adjustment to enhance the CA.</p>	<p>Noted. But we also note that change has happened since 2015/16 when we undertook the appraisal. See the new recommendations.</p>
<p>4.1 footpath signage could be revised and renewed</p>	<p>We agree but this is probably the responsibility of Public Rights of Way.</p>

4.2 the road through the village is a major route between Skipton and Colne / Burnley, the vehicle numbers greatly increasing during the last five years and impacting on road and pavement use. Attention to pavement widths and junctions is desirable.				The appraisal was carried out in 2015/16 But within reason we will endeavor to update the report. Please see the revised and enhanced recommendations.
4.3 Parking is an issue for the terraced housing. Village parking and charging points for electric vehicles need to be addressed.				Agreed, see recommendation 7
5.0 I support the recommendations for further work, particularly in relation to the streetscape and Article 4 directions.				Please see the revised and enhanced recommendations.
[National Planning Policies apply, with particular reference to SD1,SD2, ENV2,3,4,5,9, H2, NF4]				We have revised the text to incorporate Policy where we can
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	AB Response
29/11/2020	Tom Goose	resident		
Comment				
<p>Having read the Carleton Conservation Area Appraisal , I would like Craven District Council to follow the advice and recommendations of the experts and extend the Carleton Conservation Area boundary as recommended in the report (page 23) and as highlighted by Carleton Parish Council.</p> <p>This is key to preserving the rural identity of our village and conserving the significant relationship between the historic settlement of Carleton and the surrounding open space.</p>				Noted

Craven public responses – review notes and AB responses

Cononley

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
23/10/2020	Cllr Andy Brown	Councillor		
Comment				AB Response
<p>On page 6 on village layout please include a reference to the importance of the historic network of footpaths and alleyways connecting Main Street with Meadow Lane. Reason = preservation of this network is important.</p>				<p>Added new text to pick this point up.</p>
<p>Page 7. It is not clear why the Station Mill is outside the conservation area. It is described at several points in the text as a key part of village history and as having a “profound visual impact” on the landscape yet it is not included in the conservation area. The text is also out of date and does not reflect the recent sensitive development of the mill and the rear of the site. Can the boundaries please be altered to include the Mill</p>				<p>At the time of our appraisal, 2015/2016 Station Mill was outside the Conservation Area as designated in 1979. Although we recommended an extension of the conservation area to include the Mill, since our appraisal the Mill and its wider site has been developed. There is now no reason to continue with this recommendation. What survives as the Mill will continue to be recognised as a Landmark (formerly Key) and we expect Craven District Council to take forward our recommendation regarding the local list.</p>

<p>Page 9. Please add to “there is very little traditional paving” to add to the exceptions “except also for flags on the footpath route from Main Street to Gordon Terrace alongside Gordon House”</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>
<p>Page 10. It is not clear why three of the four key buildings are unlisted. I would advise including the mill and aire view terrace which has become of major historical significance</p>	<p>For explanation please see the revised introduction to this element. Station Mill and Aire View Terrace are included.</p>
<p>Page 14. Reference is made here to the former strip fields. This needs significant strengthening. The land to the north of the village contains large areas of very valuable strip and lynchet landforms. These need protecting and must be given a stronger mention in the text throughout.</p>	<p>There is only one enclosed strip field that we can identify and the text has been amended. Please see the revised introduction to open space. The lynchets are further north than we have examined for this appraisal.</p>
<p>Page 15. The row of 1930s buildings are behind Cononley Hall but not in its grounds.</p>	<p>Text amended to “former” grounds</p>
<p>To page 24. Significant views. Views of the two village pubs are not mentioned as significant but are and their contribution generally to the historical character of the village is seriously under estimated and needs to be included.</p>	<p>It was not our intention to include all views, However, the two pubs have been incorporated into Landmarks.</p>
<p>4.2 on vehicle movements is seriously flawed and needs to change. Please change to “Highways Signage at Cononley Lane End indicates that the village is unsuitable for HGVs. Traffic flows can be significant at peak times such as the start and close of the school day and when the railway crossing is opened.”</p>	<p>Agreed, have amended the text.</p>
<p>4.3 on parking is wrong. Should say “There is one Craven District Council public car park for around 10 vehicles and one Network Rail car park. On street parking is significant throughout the working day particularly close to the railway station and is much used by commuters”.</p>	<p>Agreed, have amended the text.</p>

Finally I would add that Cononley Woodside is now coming under increased threat of changes to its character from conversions, new build and alterations. There is a case for including this in a second conservation area.				This is not our current remit and is one for the District Council to consider.
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
30/11/2020	A Robinson			
Comment				AB Response

I am writing to highlight the traffic situation in Cononley, which is in contradiction to the information produced in the Cononley Area Conservation Proposal of August 2016.

Section 4.0 Traffic and Movement:
 'Vehicle movement is relatively low from all directions and no HGV's were observed passing through during site visits'

For the past three and half years Cononley villagers have been monitoring traffic through our village as part of a North Yorkshire Police initiative to reduce speed and increase driver awareness. For the past two years I have part coordinated these sessions and consequently collated the relevant information.

The information below is the result of 94 individual speedwatch sessions lasting for a maximum of one hour. This was gathered at different sites around the village, and at various times of the day and week. It is also worth noting that the traffic data is in one direction only, therefore if the vehicles were monitored in both directions this would increase the traffic volume shown considerably.

The total vehicle count for the 94 sessions was 10,649 vehicles, an average of 117 vehicles per hour or virtually two vehicles a minute (definitely more than two if you account for traffic travelling in both directions).

There is no doubt that Cononley is used as a 'rat run' for drivers attempting to avoid congestion in other areas. Although due to Covid-19 the rail system is not being used as much by any means, generally there has been a welcomed sharp increase in people using the train and Cononley Station. This again has added to the volume of traffic in the village.

In conclusion, Cononley is a congested village with an increasing traffic problem, which has a significant negative impact on the village as a whole.

We have amended the text but must point out that we carried out this appraisal in 2015/2016 and we know much has changed.

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
8/12/2020	Mark Allum	Cononley Parish		

		Council		
Comment			AB Response	
<p>General:</p> <p>We are aware that David Gulliver, a respected local historian, has provided detailed comments on the document. The purpose of our response is to provide feedback on the higher level aspects of the document.</p> <p>Cononley Parish Council welcome the Conservation Area Appraisal which they believe provides a good starting point and basis for further work to ensure that the historic features of the village are conserved and, where possible, improved.</p>			<p>Noted and thank you</p>	
<p>Front cover image. Please swap for one without a For Sale sign. We can help with this if required.</p>			<p>Agreed and will do as requested.</p>	
<p>1.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. After "principal street and back lane configuration" add "connected by a series of alleys and minor lanes" 2. Include actual number of designated heritage assets 3. In the lead mining section. Add "there are a series of designated buildings related to lead mining on Gibb Hill which although outside the Conservation Area provide context to the historic environment of the parish." 			<p>The interactive map now includes historic routes including the surviving lanes between main Street and Back Lane.</p> <p>Added suggested sentence to the lead mining section.</p>	

<p>1.4 We believe this should include a full list of all designated heritage assets rather than simply the one building. Another useful addition could be: Non designated heritage features:</p> <p>Stone troughs, including a covered trough, on Crosshills Road and another stone trough close to Moorfoot Lane.</p> <p>A high number of property boundaries using iron railings.</p> <p>The large number of small outbuildings on frontages.</p>	<p>We do not agree that there are a high number of property boundaries using cast iron railings. The dominant character is of drystone walling. However, the text has been slightly amended.</p> <p>Frontage outbuildings are certainly a feature of Airedale Terrace and the text has been amended to reflect this.</p>
<p>4.3 one small parking area located on Moorfoot Lane</p>	<p>The parking section has been amended.</p>
<p>4.4 Train. A well used train station which links to Skipton, Bradford and Leeds.</p>	<p>Agreed, text amended.</p>
<p>We are also aware a number of responses has highlighted that the traffic situation in the village is worse than represented. Walking around the village is difficult in many locations because of the lack of pavements and pavement parking forcing people into the road. There are significant numbers of vehicle movements through the village, particularly at rush hour and school drop off and pick up times.</p>	<p>We have amended the text but must point out that we carried out this appraisal in 2015/2016 and we know much has changed.</p>
<p>View MF3 to become view HF4 and be located at the junction of Crosshills Road and Main Street. This provides an excellent view of the historic core of the conservation area including a number of non designated, but important, buildings as well as designated buildings such as New Inn and Milton House. Also provides a clear view of Cononley Beck and down to Station Mill chimney.</p>	<p>The views have all been edited and in some cases changed. Also the depiction of a view in the report does not exclude there being other 'important' views</p>

View HF2 to also include view at junction of Netherghyll Lane and Main Street. This includes views of the Institute and the cluster of non designated but important buildings at the bottom of Netherghyll Lane.				As above
<p>Cononley Parish Council would also welcome the inclusion of any identified negative aspects, particularly those which could be addressed in the future. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The use of upvc doors and windows <input type="checkbox"/> The removal of drystone walls in front of properties to provide parking areas <input type="checkbox"/> Street furniture clutter <p>Cononley Parish Council supports the report's recommendations and would like to see them taken forward. Namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further study of opportunities and detractors. • Detailed assessment of streetscape. • Article 4 direction and guidance on external appearance of dwellings in the Conservation Area. • Bring forward proposals to extend the Conservation Area boundary to include Station Mill. <p>Cononley Parish Council also supports the proposal received by Craven District Council to extend the conservation area to include include the area F2, including the whole length of Shady Lane from Skipton Road to the Railway. In addition to F2, to include two fields 'above', and to the west of, Spring Head Farm, Woodside Lane. Cononley Parish Council would also like to see the adjacent area known as the Delph included.</p>				We have added a revised recommendation 3
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
24/11/2020	David Gulliver	Resident		
Comment				AB Response

<p>General:</p> <p>I have studied with interest the Draft Conservation Appraisal for Cononley. It is a valuable exercise to attempt to summarise the features of an area in this way. While accepting that it is only a draft, it gives rise to some concerns about its emphases and reliability. The first part of this letter highlights a very historic part of the village which receives only a brief mention in the Appraisal. Secondly, it strongly advocates an extension of the Cononley Conservation Area. Lastly, it notes some misleading statements in, and omissions from, the Appraisal. Incidentally, I have also read the 'Introduction' which is accurate and helpful.</p> <p>I make references to manuscript map of Cononley and Farnhill dated 1813 (WYJS Archives, Bradford WYB 671) and the field names used in the 1842 Tithe Award (NYCRO PC/CNN)</p>	<p>As much as we would like to access all the available maps and written sources, we do not have the time for this appraisal and we have only skimmed the surface. That said, we will make corrections and amend the text to take account of your knowledgeable comment.</p>
<p>I have studied with interest the Draft Conservation Appraisal for Cononley. It is a valuable exercise to attempt to summarise the features of an area in this way. While accepting that it is only a draft, it gives rise to some concerns about its emphases and reliability. The first part of this letter highlights a very historic part of the village which receives only a brief mention in the Appraisal. Secondly, it strongly advocates an extension of the Cononley Conservation Area. Lastly, it notes some misleading statements in, and omissions from, the Appraisal. Incidentally, I have also read the 'Introduction' which is accurate and helpful.</p> <p>I make references to manuscript map of Cononley and Farnhill dated 1813 (WYJS Archives, Bradford WYB 671) and the field names used in the 1842 Tithe Award (NYCRO PC/CNN)</p>	<p>ditto</p>
<p>1 To the left – Kiln Cottage [no. 123] The gable end is dominated by the blocked arched entrance to a former corn drying kiln (pre 1813 but the upper part re-built as a house, probably in the 19th c.)</p>	<p>ditto</p>
<p>□ A row of cottages (nos. 129-135), terminating in Kiln Hill Farm. Map evidence (1813) shows the same footprint and suggests that the row originated more than 200 years ago (except for the later 19th c. house at the east end which blocks the ancient route to Cononley Moor and Gib Side).</p>	<p>ditto</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Beyond, and at right angles to the road, stands an essential component of the view: Kiln Hill Farm Barn (the northern half is late 17th c. with a now hidden date stone 'EF 1697'. (This building is surely a strong candidate for listing by English Heritage), 	ditto
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ A glimpse of St. John's Church (1864) and its mature churchyard trees. 	ditto
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ On the north side of Main St., opposite the 17th c. barn, another farm building, which despite considerable rebuilding over the last couple of centuries, closes the view in an attractive way. At the west end is the elevated doorway of a 19th c. school room. 	ditto
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ On the north side of Main St., a row of houses (nos. 128-134) said to be 'early nineteenth century' in the Appraisal, but in fact retaining some remarkable 17th c. interior features. (Between the far end of this row, and the barn, stood 'Monk House', a circa 17th c. building demolished in 1929 - but giving a clue to the possible origin of this group of buildings) 	ditto
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ To the right: Skipton Road with the listed 'Shady Grove' (probably late 17 c.) on the west side, and on the east side, the end houses of the ground breaking redevelopment which was awarded a Department of Environment award for good design in 1980. 	ditto

B. An extension of the Conservation area to include the open space F2 and two fields to the west of Woodside Lane already identified as making a strong contribution to it. The appraisal identifies F2 (yellow on the plan) but does not adequately recognise the contribution it makes to the long views of Cononley from the East, to the historical framework of the village, and to preserving accessible countryside.

These fields, together with 'Shady Lane' (a major historical route to the fields and ings), include valuable ancient hedgerows with a surprising range of flora. There has been negligible change in this area since it was first recorded in the 1813 map. A key area is the hillside, below Woodside Lane at Spring Head Farm, with the two fields, historically two 'Royds' (signifying later medieval enclosures), and the narrow field adjoining Shady Lane (once common land called 'Greaves', recorded as being enclosed in 1608). The two fields (to the east of Shady Lane, public footpath 05.13/13), are survivors of the late medieval village field pattern ('Croft Lands' & 'Big Ridding') and are bisected by the public footpath 05.13/14.

I suggest therefore that there is a strong case to extend the Conservation area to include the area F2, including the whole length of Shady Lane from Skipton Road to the Railway. In addition to F2, it would be logical and desirable to include two fields 'above', and to the west of, Spring Head Farm, Woodside Lane. This land entirely lies between public footpaths 05.13.5 and 05.13.4 (Coppice or Copsy Lane). Reference to the Appraisal map shows that the value of this area has already been recognised as it is coloured purple. The fields, then three in number, were named Near, Middle and Far Royd in 1842. The site is dominated by a fine belt of trees bordering the small Royd Gill. It is a natural extension of the 'dynamic view' west from Skipton Road recognised on the map on p4.

I do not agree that the development of Meadow Croft (1950s) and adjacent housing invalidates the case to include any part of this area within the conservation area. Much of the proposed addition formed a single medieval farm centred on Spring Head Farm. Moreover, it is highly visible, preserves fine hedgerows and trees, and is accessible and viewable from no less than four public footpaths.

Although we agree with your substantive point, the appraisal of the Conservation Area is quite specific in its remit – We have changed the definition to Strong Contribution but do not see any reason to extend the Conservation Area. We have strengthened our definition of Strong Contribution to provide more specific guidance to development management.

We have also included Historic Routes on the interactive map which picks up the importance of Shady Lane

Fi is now making Some Contribution but although of clear importance in historic terms does not make a Strong Contribution to the Conservation Area – we have however, amended the text to strengthen the historic and archaeological case.

<p>C. Misleading information and omissions.</p> <p>I appreciate the compilers of the Appraisal have acknowledged our book in the list of their sources. (The History of Cononley, an Airedale Village, Hodgson, T & Gulliver, D.M., 2000). However, some of the information in the Appraisal is misleading and sometimes incorrect. While some geographical & historical points may seem pedantic in the overall context, they are still capable of undermining the value of the Appraisal and should not be disseminated further.</p>	<p>Thank you, local knowledge is always valuable and we are acutely aware of our own failings. The text has been amended where we can.</p>
<p>Placenames.</p> <p>The credibility of the Appraisal locally is not helped by its loosely worded references to the geography of the area. The Appraisal makes constant references to Eslack (sic) Moor and Glusburn Moor e.g. pp 2,3,4,7,11,14,16,21 & 22. Elslack Moor is approximately three miles from Cononley and beyond other parishes and a distant watershed. Viewed from much of the village the western horizon is in fact at 'Stockshott Lane' and 'Scar Cliff' and, only in certain long views can high points such as 'Tow Top' be seen beyond boundary of the (former) Cononley Moor. The (former) Glusburn Moor, abutted Cononley Moor near a watershed and is invisible from the village. While 'Gibb Hill' is not incorrect (it was used on 19th c. O.S. and Tithe Award maps) the terms 'the Gib' and 'Gib Side' (used locally and on modern maps) would be better understood. (see photo in submission)</p>	<p>Text amended but add that in our opinion, Gib Hill is part of Glusburn Moor or at least that is how the OS refer to it as. We have nevertheless added Gib Hill in brackets after each mention. We have deleted reference to Eslack Moor.</p>

List of misleading or omitted references:

Map. p4. Listed Buildings:

The so called 'King's Farmhouse' (a converted barn now named 'Kings Farm') is wrongly highlighted. The now entirely separate 'Kings House' on Cross Hills Road is the listed building and should be highlighted.

The problem could be incorrect or unclear English Heritage data.

'Ghyll Farmhouse' (also p15) should read 'Shackleton and Ghyll Farm'. As far as is known the name 'Ghyll Cottage' is not used for a listed property. [How Mr. Gill's surname came to be spelt 'Ghyll' is a mystery!]

'Hall Croft', 106/8 Main St., is only visible on the interactive version of the map.

1.1 Page 5. The emphasis on lead mining is misleading – it thrived for only a few decades in the middle of the 19th c. and left relatively little evidence of its presence within the Conservation Area. Farming and Textiles, however, were the principal occupations for centuries and the buildings reflect this.

The Lead Mine was on Gib Side where the key buildings are listed, the 'workings' at 'Netherghyll Bottom' include the former mine manager's house and traces of the smelt mill. From the smelt mill a duct ran to the surviving chimney on top of the Gib.

Page 6. The facts about history of c1837 High & Low textile mills which were substantially replaced by the existing building, Station Mills, are confused. Incidentally, Station Mills' chimney pre-dates the late 19th c. building alongside Cononley Lane within which it now stands. Other than the reference on the O.S. map surveyed in 1848 (although not published until 1853), no records have been found which would support the existence of a 19th c. 'Cononley Corn Mill'. All the other known sources refer to textile mills or their workers. Crag View. '1930s'. The building of the houses commenced in 1925.

1.2. p6. I can confirm the reference to 'field boundaries clearly predate the railway are part of the historic field pattern of Cononley' is correct and is confirmed by map evidence of 1813 and documentary evidence from early 17th c. onwards.

1.2. p7. 128-134 'Netherghyll Lane' is incorrect - should read 128-134 Main Street. See also section A above.

1.2. p7 'Hall House' – an incorrect name. Perhaps a confusion between 'Hall Croft', 106/118 Main St. and 'Bay House', 116/108 Main St. which is behind no. 120, Main St. The 'infill dwelling' may possibly be a small workhouse erected c.1760.

1.2. p7 The Institute was built in 1909 not in the '1920s'. The clock tower was added in 1921.

We are using Historic England names, descriptions and locations supported by Craven District Council GIS data. We accept that there may be discrepancies in the data but correcting this is beyond our current remit.

It is our understanding that lead mining resulted in the population of Cononley substantially increasing and new housing being constructed. Therefore lead mining, although short in time span made a substantial contribution to the character and appearance of Cononley. Text amended to take account of comments.

Comment on Station Mill noted and text amended.

Text amended.

<p>1.3. p9 Roofing: 'Westmorland Slate and Yorkdale (sic?) Sandstone slates'. This implies a misleading emphasis. Most buildings built in Cononley before the later 19th c. used, and often reused, sandstone slates from relatively nearby quarries. These buildings give the historic core of the Conservation Area its character. Identifying the origin of slate is not easy, but traditional slate is far subtler in colour than the brash 'blue slates' that have mushroomed lately and been used inappropriately in the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Text amended</p>
<p>1.4. p10. Key buildings. Add St. John's Church (1864) and perhaps even the prominent and listed 'New Inn' (probably pre-1600 in origin as a section of a cruck frame is in situ inside). 2.1. p11 'It nestles in the lower slopes of Eslack (sic) and Glusburn Moors (Gibb Hill)'. Not likely to be recognised as true locally!</p>	<p>The New Inn and St John's Church have been included as Landmarks. Other text has been amended.</p>

2.2. p13 See section B above.

2.2 p14 & 15 Yet more incorrect references to Glusburn and Eslack (sic) Moors. The fine example of 'strip fields' are off Skipton Road before it becomes Woodside Lane (and are indeed referred to in Bolton Priory c13th c. charters).

2.2 p15 '1930s buildings in the grounds of Cononley Hall'. In fact, four of these houses were completed by 1914, the three at the western end in the summer of 1920.

2.2 p15 Incorrect references to 'Ghyll Farm' see note above re. p4.

2.2 p15, 3.0 p19, 3.1 p20. The 'impressive' view used to illustrate HF1 no longer exists due to a recent housing development on the site.

2.2 p17 Since 2017 Station Mills have been entirely redeveloped, enlarged and renamed. The preservation of the 19th c. chimney and the shell of the original 'High Mill' building (c1837) is to be welcomed. However, the impressive original internal timber roof structure of the latter has been destroyed and the building has over intrusive balconies. Inclusion within the Conservation Area could help to preserve the surviving original features.

3.2 p21 HD1. Glusburn Moor cannot be seen from Cononley Lane in the way that the Appraisal suggests. (It may be glimpsed from Cononley Lane near the A629 only because some part of Glusburn is in the Aire Valley. HF2: Please dispense with 'the lower slopes of Glusburn Moor' and replace with 'Gib Side'.

3.2 p22 HD3. 'the lea of the lower slopes of Eslack and Glusburn Moors'!

3.2 p22 HD3 the 'former agricultural buildings' are surely, in fact, all part of Kiln Hill Farm and still in use, including the late 17th c. barn referred to in A above.

3.2 p22 HD3 'a backdrop of the wooded slopes of Kildwick Moor'. It is Farnhill Moor and woods which can be seen looking down Netherghyll Lane.

3.2 p22 HD4 'The late 20th c. development of Crag View'. Clarify. Probably intended to refer to 'High Gate' completed in the last decade rather than the 1920s 'Crag View'.

3.3 p23 MF1-3. Suggest addition of 'MF4 'as in section 'A 'above. A 360o view at the junction of Cross Hills Road and Main Street would also take in many historic buildings including five listed ones – that could be MF5.

'4.1p25 Pedestrian. Comment: Several well used footpaths do commence in or near the village but they are not necessarily as easily accessible by everyone as the Appraisal implies. The steady increase of traffic has made walking on roads out of the village hazardous e.g. Woodside Lane and Cross Hills Road. Some rural villages could end up with less opportunities for children and the elderly to walk than in some 'green' suburbs. 4.1 p25 'Some areas where pavements exist on one

Text amended.

Crag View is intended.

Text amended and will re-visit

side only'. Ought to continue '...and several areas where no pavements exist at all including:- most of Cross Hills Road, New Inn Fold, the upper part of Main Street (west of No 120).

4.2 p25 'Vehicle movement is relatively low' – maybe by comparison with settlements on major roads but not in relation to the constricted roads and lack of pavements here.

4.3 p25 'There are no designated parking areas'. There is a small designated parking area for 10 vehicles at the entrance to Moorfoot Lane.

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
11/12/2020	Keith Clark	Cononley Speed Watch Group		
Comment				AB Response
<p>4.0 Traffic & Movement. I dispute the content of this section as inaccurate. When Madge Bank field was at risk of development in 2014, residents monitored traffic volumes along Crosshills Road. During peak times (8-9am/5-6pm), over 200 vehicles an hour were counted (both directions). Now in 2019/2020 (non-Covid times), it is quite common to for Speed Watch volunteers to count up to 200 vehicles an hour in one direction at those same peak times on Crosshills Road, and this can therefore not be described as "relatively low" – rather - "data demonstrates that traffic volumes travelling through the village are increasing annually which is putting pressure on the existing infrastructure and increasing risks to vulnerable road users, particularly where pavements are not provided".</p>				<p>We have amended the text where we can but must point out that we carried out this appraisal in 2015/2016 and we know much has changed.</p>

<p>Cononley Speed Watch was initiated in July 2017 in response to residents' fears over rising traffic volumes and increasing speeds of rat-running commuter traffic travelling through the village which is largely a 20mph zone. Speed Watch has confirmed that on average 6% (up to 10% on many occasions) of all traffic counted during peak times is reported to be exceeding the 20mph speed limit, with the repeat offending rate being one of the highest in North Yorkshire. A Vehicle Activated Sign has been purchased and installed by Cononley Parish Council in order to reinforce the village speed limit. "Some areas where pavements exist on one side only". This doesn't reflect the true picture. There are some stretches of road – for eg. Cononley Road and Crosshills Road - where there is no pavement at all. In some cases a painted white line separates pedestrians from traffic however this offers very little or no protection as traffic volumes and speeds increase.</p> <p>"No HGVs were observed". This infers that no HGVs come into the village! There have been and continue to be numerous incidents involving HGVs coming into the village and getting stuck or causing an obstruction. Residents are actively encouraged to report details of HGVs entering the village to the Parish Council. Additional signage has now been installed by NYCC due to the number of HGVs entering the village, however the problem still occurs.</p> <p>Despite the title of Traffic & Movement, there is no mention of rural bus services, cycling infrastructure, pedestrian safety or Cononley Railway station – which are a more sustainable form of transport/movement compared with single-occupancy cars.</p>	<p>The text has been amended. We now reference the railway station and buses and reference to HGVs has been updated.</p>
<p>1.3 Materials and Palette</p> <p>The Conservation Appraisal needs to encourage the use of traditional materials in new builds. It is very noticeable how many of the recent new housing developments in the village have extensive areas of bitmac – not only in lieu of traditional surfacing materials such as flags, cobbles or setts, or even more modern block paving - but also in preference to more natural surfaces, such as grass, hedging, trees or small pockets of green spaces which we should be encouraged for conservation reasons.</p>	<p>We have amended the text.</p>

Craven public responses – review notes and AB responses

Cowling

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
12/12/2020	Cllr A Lynch	Cowling Parish Council		
Comment				AB Response
<p>Pg 19:</p> <p>View from Old Lane towards Pinnacles over the fields (see below).</p> <p>The draft conservation plan says of the fields over the wall: "Land between the former mill sites and Old Lane has been compromised through late twentieth and early twenty first century development to the extent that these fields make no contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Cowling Parish Council entirely disagrees with this statement and want it changed to "a strong contribution" in the final version. How can anyone look at this view and say that these fields should be built upon. The view to the Pinnacle is aesthetically as good as any in the village and the wall with the green fields beyond is worth conserving for future generations. To say that this vista makes "no contribution" to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area shows an amazing lack of appreciation of the subject matter.</p>				<p>We stand by our original assessment of these fields now referenced as F6 and making some contribution. The explanation for some contribution now includes the following sentence: "Open space that makes some contribution to character and appearance of the Conservation Area (development in these areas should be conservation led and make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area)."</p> <p>We think this deals with the issue.</p>
<p>Pg 19:</p> <p>This is a view from Fold Lane toward Croft Mill. This is described in the Plan as making a "contribution" to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Cowling Parish Council considers that this type of view typifies Cowling and should be conserved. How can anyone look at this vista and consider that it should be built upon in a Conservation Area. Again this shows an amazing lack of appreciation of the subject matter. This area should be altered to "makes a strong</p>				<p>We agree. Having re-appraised our original comments and designation we have edited and updated the text. F5 is now making a strong contribution and has been edited accordingly.</p>

<p>contribution” in the final version.</p>	
<p>Pg 22:</p> <p>The Parish Council note that section HF4 describes the “gateway” view from the A6068 towards the Pinnacle Crags and monuments as being “Highly Significant”. The Parish Council, agree with this entirely. With reference to this view and the CDC Local Plan, the Parish Council point out that one of the areas designated as potential development in the Local Plan includes about a third of this “Highly Significant gateway view”. Future planning applications should take into account that developing this area would spoil such a Highly Significant view, and be refused appropriately.</p>	<p>The text associated with this area, now called “Land between lands End and Cowling” and F2 has been amended to make this point clearer. We agree. However, this is a matter for Craven District Council to resolve.</p>
<p>General:</p> <p>A. Cowling Parish Council note that the Local Plan agreed last year suggests 38 properties may be built in our village in the period up to 2032. The Parish Council considers that Cowling has already been overdeveloped with houses and that any more would seriously impact on the village as a Moorland Community in a Conservation Area. The Parish Council request that the figure of housing needs of 38 is set as a maximum and that subsequent planning applications for new houses takes serious account of the rural nature of Cowling and its areas which need to be conserved; particularly those described above.</p> <p>B. The Parish Council does agree with Section 5.0 – Further Work Recommendations. The last bullet point : “Traffic calming on Keighley Road and further crossing opportunities”. is particularly important to the village as cars and lorries regularly speed through. Cowling Parish Council has repeatedly attempted to tell Highways at NYCC of this problem. At least the Police now accept that the road is dangerous. We need assistance from CDC on this issue and we consider that this recommendation is taken up as soon as possible.</p>	<p>We have amended and strengthened the recommendations in the appraisal, however, we cannot comment on the Local Plan. This is a matter for Craven District Council to resolve.</p>

Cowling Parish Council request that the above points and requests are taken into serious account when finalising this Conservation Area Appraisal, and that the editors appreciate the term "Conservation". CDC are requested to seriously take into account the conservation requirements of our village when considering future planning applications.				Noted.
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
11/02/2018	Joan Tindale	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
Page 3 - Query SUTTON MOORS– should be Ickornshaw and Keighley Moors, (with Emmott Moor over the Lancs. Border)				Text changed
NO LIST OF OUR 38 LISTED BUILDINGS – we have 38 including 2 Grade II* - Carr Head and Long Croft				To be added to the final copy
MAP -				
Query AREA OF COVERAGE–Doesn't include our very historic c. 770 acres of ICKORNSHAW MOOR with its stone shooting lodge, and approx. 12 weekend huts, the moor was used for peating, shooting etc. Dispute over ownership again c. 1980 – outcome was - vested in the local authority under the Commons Registration Act 1965				The role of AB was to appraise the existing conservation area and available resources did not allow us to expand our area of interest.

<p>Also NOT included - our v. historic CARR HEAD area - former mansion house owning many farms and land etc., and COWLING HILL ANCIENT SETTLEMENT – former old road to Lancs. pre the present main road. See books – the Tillotsons of Cowling Hill etc.</p>	<p>AB were not commissioned to undertake an exhaustive survey of all the available literature. That would have involved considerable extra expense. Both Historic England and Craven District Council felt it more appropriate to go for a more simple overview of character. We have therefore based our analysis on the early OS maps rather than published histories. Consequently there is much that we have missed on history and other context. We will however signpost readers to the book, "Tillotsons of Cowling Hill" and we have enhanced the interactive map and text. There is no mention of the Cowling Hill Ancient Settlement in the NYCC Historic Environment Record.</p>
<p>DICK LANE – dividing line runs down middle of Dick Lane – Con. Area includes newer houses there, while the v. old houses on the main road nearby are NOT included.</p>	<p>Interactive map has been amended.</p>
<p>LAYCOCK FIELDS – former Briggs Garage site – dividing line runs through houses at the bottom of the estate</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>WOODSIDE FARM - THAT IS NOT WOODSIDE FARM, IT'S WOOD HOUSE - which used to be the estate offices for Carr Head until farms were sold off in 1923. Wood House and Carr Head should be included</p>	<p>Map to be amended</p>
<p>Page 5 – TWO OF OUR FORMER SIX MILLS STILL SURVIVE FOR OTHER PURPOSES - FREEGATE AT THE BOTTOM OF NAN SCAR, AND ICKORNSHAW</p>	<p>Our appraisal is not designed to be an exhaustive account of the historic context. We have missed a lot out, we know. However, the interactive map and text have been enhanced</p>

<p>MIDDLETON also housed quarry workers for the nearby Knoll Hill Quarry – in 1853 there was a pub/ale house in the street - called the Masons Arms. The streets around Fold Lane were built from the land of Fold Farm – see documents Cowling had several quarries – see old maps.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>SPIRITUAL NEEDS – WE HAD SIX CHURCHES – the old/former Bar Chapel was built in 1832 near the 125 toll bar site, then later rebuilt. Parish Church, Cowling Hill Baptist, Middleton Baptist, Bar Chapel, Mission Room and Ickornshaw (now flats)</p>	<p>Text amended</p>
<p>Prior to our SIX MILLS – ICKORNSHAW, FREEGATE, HARTLEYS, CROFT MILL, CAR MILL, ROYD MILL we had Gill Beck Mill and rope walk, and Ridge Mill pre 1700 and many home weaving premises in houses and farms etc</p>	<p>Noted but, our appraisal is not designed to be an exhaustive account of the historic context. We have missed a lot out, we know. However, the interactive map and text have been enhanced</p>
<p>Page 6 - (eg. Fold Lane, Gibb Street, Sun Street, Walton Street, Green Street, Woodland Street)</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>
<p>Page 9 – Cinder Hill or Old Corpse Way which was the route to Kildwick Church for weddings, funerals, baptisms prior to Cowling Parish Church c. 1845.</p>	<p>Added Old Corpse Lane to text.</p>
<p>Page 12 – “almost exclusively a commuting community” - SINCE THE CLOSURE OF OUR MILLS, THEN SHOPS AND SMALL BUSINESSES ETC. WHICH HAVE BEEN REPLACED BY NUMEROUS NEW DWELLINGS AND ESTATES – In the 1950’s we had c. 50 shops including small businesses, and in the 1950’s c. 30 shops and small businesses – I CAN PROVE IT.</p>	<p>Cowling is now as we have described it.</p>
<p>Page 13 – Earls Crag and Wainman’s Pinnacle, not Lunds Tower please. And mix of “ancient” hedges and drystone walls etc</p>	<p>We have changed Lund’s Tower but kept the hedge comment as is because for us to do otherwise would be to carry out a detailed survey of hedges for which we did not have the resources.</p>

Page 15 – Martins Barn at Hardfield Farm is still a working farm (my son in law)	Text amended.
Page 23 - Photo HD4 IS NOT LOOKING TO ICKORNSHAW, ITS LOOKING UP WINKHOLME FROM WINKHOLME BRIDGE ! Pls. Correct this	This has been amended
Page 24 – WHERE IS LYDGATE?	Good question! Text changed to Lingcrag Gardens
Page 25 -MF7 WOODHEAD FARM IS IN LOTHERSDALE	Noted but no change to the text necessary.
MF8 NOT CROFT MILL WHICH WAS DOWN THE MAIN RD.SIDE, BUT CARR MILL – converted former Wheel House and Coach House BOTH CROFT AND CARR MILLS WERE OWNED BY BINNSES (my own ancestors)	Text amended
Page 26 4.2 – Traffic through Ickornshaw and Middleton is very light and rural in character ???	Well, it was in 2016 but the text has been amended to take account of our visit in 2022.
FREGATE AND NANSCAR, ALSO MIDDLETON ARE CHOKED UP WITH VEHICLES – EVEN MORE SO AT WEEKENDS – ITS HORRIFIC THESE DAYS!	See above.
Page 26 4.3 – ON STREET PARKING IS A BIG PROBLEM IN MIDDLETON AND ICKORNSHAW, BUT WORSE IN MIDDLETON, ABOUT 50 +CARS HAVE TO PARK ON GILL LANE EVENINGS AND WEEKENDS – WHICH SOMETIMES CAUSES FRICTION	Text amended.
Pls. Refer to “Cowling a Moorland Parish 1980” and David Gulliver’s books “The Tillotsons of Cowling Hill”, Manorial Courts etc.	This is added to the bibliography.

Craven public responses – review notes and AB responses

Eastby

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
23/11/2020	Chris Lunnon	Embsay with Eastby Historical Research Group		
Comment				AB Response
<p>Historical background:</p> <p>Eastby is first recorded in 1241 when the village is given to Bolton Priory, but the village name implies pre-conquest, possibly Viking heritage (East-by, Eastern farmstead).</p>				Text amended to take account of Domesday.
<p>The origins of the settlement of Eastby lie to the east of Rowton Beck. There is clear evidence of a ditch and bank enclosure visible at Garros Lane, below Bower House. This enclosure continues eastward joining, and possibly crossing, Bark Lane. More recent wall-lines probably show the enclosure continued westward to Rowton Beck. The old village appears to be built to the south of the road-line; all listed buildings are to the south. Field names shown on the 1847 Tithe apportionment indicate close links to Bolton Priory, for example field 83 on the 1891 map was called 'Prior's Croft' in 1847.</p>				Not sure about the bank and ditch – beyond our brief to investigate further – Have added archaeology to interactive map.

<p>The road through the village, continuing along Bark Lane, probably lies on the line of an early monastic track between Bolton Priory and the earlier site of Embsay Priory. Bark Lane takes its name from the Danish for 'hill'. At some point, probably after fields in Embsay were enclosed, the track-way from Bower House, through Rowton Laithe and alongside Rowton Beck became the main route to go to Embsay and Skipton. Hunters Lane is also clearly an ancient trackway, as shown by the depth of the track and the braided trackways linking to it further uphill. Hunters Lane links to the Rowton Beck trackway with properties on alongside now listed. The present day line of the road that ascends Eastby Bank was probably consolidated by the Skipton-Pateley Bridge turnpike at the start of the nineteenth century. There is evidence of the road following a slightly different line at Black Park, so the turnpike did not break wholly new ground. On balance, it would appear that the route originated as the shortest travelable route between Skipton Castle and Barden Tower, probably in the sixteenth or seventeenth century.</p>	<p>Historic routes added to the interactive map.</p>
<p>The hillside to the north of fields 77, 80 and 83 on the 1891 map were unenclosed until the 18th Century. The layout of the fields to the south of the village indicate sequential enclosure. Some field names on the tithe map include surnames of people which indicate the fields were probably enclosed from the seventeenth century onwards. Within the ditch-bank enclosure, fields appear to be associated with cottages and farms along the road.</p>	<p>Not part of our brief – it would be nice to be able to examine enclosure maps and tithe maps but this would take our research beyond appraising the conservation area.</p>
<p>Bower House appears to have been the dominant residence in the village. This eighteenth century house probably occupies the site of an earlier construction, which would be associated with the large field numbered 31 on the 1891 map, immediately alongside the house,. It is probable that Eastby Hall, at the western end of the ditch-bank enclosure and village , was a second or earlier dominant residence.</p>	<p>Agreed. Have added new layers to the interactive map. Further research is clearly needed.</p>
<p>At the end of the eighteenth century a cotton spinning mill was constructed, drawing power from Rowton Beck. The remains of mill ponds can be seen to the north of the site. The mill remained active until the end of the nineteenth century. It was demolished at the start of the 20th century. Further cottages were built along the road to house mill workers, but it is likely that many workers were housed also in Embsay.</p>	<p>Archaeology layer added to the interactive map and text amended</p>

Listed buildings:

Listed Buildings dated buildings, buildings on Archaeological Data Service (ADS), other key buildings and features within the conservation area.

For Building Listings see.

<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/results/?searchType=NHLE+Simple&redirect=advancedsearch&search=eastby>

The locations recorded in the ADS are so identified.

4. Eastby Mill. (ADS) Cotton Spinning mill built in 1790s. Originally water powered from mill ponds to the north of the site. Converted to steam by 1853. Demolished in early 20th century.
5. Road from Rowton Beck bridge.
When the cotton mill was in existence the road ran further south than the current line. The wall line to 13-14 Barden Rd follows that line.
6. 14 Barden Road. Listed building. Probably built over the line of the trackway joining Hunters lane and Rowton Laithe
7. 12 Barden Road. Listed building showing stone mullioned buildings. Frontage of building faces south onto line of trackway extending from Hunters Lane to connect with main trackway at Rowton Laithe and alongside Rowton Beck

The LB layer which is based on current Historic England and Craven DC data. We are aware of some inaccuracies but that is a different piece of work we have not been commissioned to undertake.

<p>8. Hunters Lane. Ancient holloway enclosed on both sides and probably providing access for livestock through cultivated lands to common land and moorland on upper slopes. Connects with deep braided trackway on slopes.</p> <p>9. Hunters Croft. Complex of 3 barns from 19th century and earlier. Position is isolated from main farmhouses in village. 'Cruik Barn' has early carved stone door surround</p> <p>10. 22 and 24 Barden Rd. Listed building. South facing 17th century building with stone mullioned windows.</p> <p>11. Bower House. (ADS) 18th C building. South facing onto large open field.</p> <p>12. Wall enclosing early orchard. Listed Structure. Bonded wall 3m high. Shown in 1847 tithe map as being an orchard associated with Bower House. Probably 18th C.</p> <p>13. Trough. Old stone trough inset into wall line opposite Bower House</p> <p>14. Open space view southwards. View over ancient pasture. Field called Garros in 1847</p> <p>15. Former Masons Arms Public House, now called Eastby House</p>	<p>As above</p>
--	-----------------

- • Eastby Jail. The small building with the entrance from the road and bars on the window is known locally as Eastby Jail. There is some dispute, but it was supposedly used for Navvies working at Barden Reservoir to sober up after drinking at the Masons Arms. It would therefore be used in the last quarter of the 19th C.
- • Trough. Stone trough set back into layby.
- • Dale Head Farmhouse, 38 Barden Rd. Listed Building, 17th Century south facing building with some stone mullioned windows.
- • Wesleyan Methodist Chapel built in 1818 on land given by Jane Baines of Embsay Kirk
- • Eastby Hall and gateway to garden. (ADS). Listed 17th C building facing south and set below today's road level, probably at the level of the trackway that continued along Bark Lane. Stone mullioned windows. To west of building the entrance to the garden is through a stone archway, listed as 18thC. The verticals are well carved gritstone and could have been taken from the site of Embsay priory.
- • Bark Lane. Ancient roadway to Bolton Priory. The boundaries on either side of the road still show revetted banks with hedges. Ditches ran down either side of the road within living memory.

As above

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pound. A pinfold or pinder remains on the northern side of Bark Lane, close to the junction with Barden Road. Known to be still in use in the 1860's • Layby to side of Barden Rd. A dry-stone-and-cobbled layby has been constructed immediately above the sharp bend as Barden Rd climbs Eastby Bank. The bank behind the layby has been walled from the surrounding fields and includes well-constructed drainage. It is likely that this relates to the Skipton-Pately turnpike, probably a place to hold a team of horses to assist in pulling carts up the steep hill of Eastby Bank 	<p>As above</p>
---	-----------------

Craven public responses – review notes and AB responses

Embsay

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
25/10/2020	Allan Haspell	Resident		
Comment				AB Response

<p>It is a great shame that the Significant View MF4 in the Embsay Conservation Area will, presumably, not be on the next iteration of conservation plans.</p> <p>This view has already been dramatically degraded due to the field adjacent to the conservation zone now being a wasteland/soil transfer site and has been for around two years. When the modern estate is eventually built it will end any Significant View from this point within the conservation zone.</p> <p>Such a shame this was not taken into account when CDC allowed permission to build on this field.</p> <p>I do hope that CDC will in future protect Significant View points in Conservation areas when reviewing new plans.</p>				<p>We take the point about the view but is one of our moderately significant fixed views and the area actually makes <u>some</u> contribution – see our revised explanatory to the front of the open space section. We expect any development to enhance rather than detract – the view is still important therefore.</p>
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
23/11/2020	Chris Lunnon	Embsay with Eastby Historical Research Group		
Comment				AB Response
<p>Historical background:</p> <p>Embsay village originates in the Saxon period, as part of an important estate linked with powerful earls who ruled pre-conquest Yorkshire. Domesday Book shows that the village was part of an estate held by Edwin, brother of Morcar, Earl of Northumbria. Edwin held estates that were key to the defence of Pennine crossing roadways.</p> <p>Domesday shows that the village suffered during the Harrying of the North in 1085. The pre-</p>				<p>Domesday is now mentioned.</p>

<p>conquest layout of the village seems to have been lost at this time.</p>	
<p>It is likely that the modern layout of the village within the conservation area was created when an Augustinian Priory was founded in the village in 1120. The Priory buildings were constructed on the site where Emsay Kirk now stands. Although the Priory centre was moved to the present-day Bolton Abbey site in about 1155, a chapel and other buildings were maintained on the site until at least the dissolution.</p>	<p>The former Priory is referenced in the text.</p>
<p>With an axis running along Pasture Rd and Main Street to Green Bottom Farm, the village follows a classic toft-and croft layout. Houses were constructed along the North side of the road with ridge and furrow fields running northwards up the hill. Lidar and field walking shows that the full extent of the ridge and furrow extended from Rowton Beck in Eastby continuing westward through lands behind Holly Farm and continuing until the edge of Emsay Pasture encompassing field 171 shown on the 1891 Ordnance Survey map. Further ridge and furrow fields can be found outside the conservation area alongside the modern houses north and south of Brackenley Lane</p>	<p>Text amended (historic background)</p>
<p>The land to the south of the Pasture Rd/Main Street axis was common land (Emsay Green) continuing down the hill towards Haw Beck. Sections of the common land remain uncultivated in fields 324, 326, 328 and 333 on the 1891 OS map, together with land between Laurel Bank and Main Street.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>In the year c.1615 much of Emsay was leased to local landowners for a term of 3000 years. It is likely that three sections of the village were leased out at this time. In common with other areas of Yorkshire, Emsay benefitted from the 'great re-building' of the 17th Century and beyond. A number of houses along Pasture Rd and Main Street are certainly, or probably built at this time. There are large houses, such as the Manor House, and smaller houses which have 17thC datestones to identify their date of building or significant re-building. Barns and agricultural buildings were also constructed, particularly on Main Street. Many of these were later converted to housing.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p>Also at this time, buildings were constructed (or reconstructed) to the south of the Pasture Rd/Main Street axis. The Fold, 26 Elm Tree Square and 26 Main street probably fall into this category. Construction of agricultural buildings, and the presence of the monastic tithe barn defined East Lane at around this time. 16 and 17 Elm Tree Square carry a date stone of 1744</p>	<p>Noted. We have tried to capture what we can of the character of place but detail is beyond the scope of this project. Having said that, we have refined the interactive mapping and made textual changes.</p>
<p>It is likely that Elm Tree Square had become the village centre before this date. However, a fire engulfed and destroyed 46 houses, barns and outbuildings in the village in 1733.</p>	<p>Not part of our brief – it would be nice to be able to examine enclosure maps and tithe maps but this would take our research beyond appraising the conservation area.</p>
<p>Field enclosure was carried out in stages by agreement, probably from the monastic period until the final phase, the enclosure of Embsay Pasture in 1760. The ridge and furrow fields to the north of the Pasture Rd/Main Street axis were probably consolidated into long fields during the monastic period. The field boundaries are of ditch/bank and hedge construction, which appears to be any early form of field boundary construction. This can be best seen in the field numbered 41 on the 1891 Ordnance Survey map, a field which forms part of the 'open space analysis'. The early dating of these field boundaries is indicated by an Eastby field named Aldermire which features in both the 1847 tithe apportionment and in the Bolton Priory Compotus for 1285-1325 as a hay meadow. The construction of the boundary between the road and the field is almost identical to that seen in field 41.</p>	<p>Not part of our brief – it would be nice to be able to examine enclosure maps and tithe maps but this would take our research beyond appraising the conservation area.</p>

<p>Enclosure defined many of the road lines in the village, including Shires Lane, which located the old road through Embsay Green. The exception to this is what is now the main road to Eastby. Although it is very likely that there was a track from Main Street to the original Embsay Priory site, it is very unlikely that the road from Embsay Priory to Eastby has always followed the current route, as it would have crossed through the ridge and furrow fields. The present day road past Embsay Kirk was only established as the main road in 1805. The earlier main road runs from what was the Eastern side of Embsay Green (at Aldhams Copse on Low Lane), crossing and then running alongside Rowton Beck, emerging onto the main road at Eastby next to Bower House Farm. The present day route of the road from Embsay to Eastby was probably defined at the time of the construction of the Skipton- Pateley Bridge turnpike. This old turnpike is evidenced by the 1851 Ordnance Survey and the wall- mounted sign at Cross End showing directions to Pateley Bridge. It is not clear when West Lane was defined, but, as it runs alongside the valley created by Embsay Beck, it is likely the track most- travelled when accessing Pasture Rd from Millholme.</p>	<p>Not part of our brief – it would be nice to be able to examine enclosure maps and tithe maps but this would take our research beyond appraising the conservation area.</p>
<p>Embsay changed rapidly from 1795 when the first cotton spinning mill was built on the site which was the Tannery and is now the Primrose Glen Estate. It is likely that this site was chosen, amongst other reasons, because a late-monastic or Early Modern corn mill was nearby and there was already an existing mill-pond (The site of the earlier mill is in the valley of Embsay Beck, opposite the Manor House). Five more spinning or weaving mills were constructed in Embsay within one or two decades. This drove a massive demand for worker housing. New houses were built, existing houses were modified, and agricultural buildings were converted for residential use. As Skipton also grew, Embsay prospered, and over-crowding became less acceptable, more genteel houses were constructed in the village. Large houses, such as Laurel Bank and Rock Ville were built, creating the village that is shown in the 1891 Ordnance Survey map.</p>	<p>Not part of our brief – it would be nice to be able to examine enclosure maps and tithe maps but this would take our research beyond appraising the conservation area.</p>

As the population increased during the 19th Century, the spiritual welfare of the residents was first catered for by Non-Conformist chapels. The earliest was on East lane, which started out in 1821 as a Union Chapel for all faiths before becoming a Primitive Methodist chapel. On Main Street a Methodist chapel was constructed in 1836. A New Jerusalem Church (Swedenborgian) community developed on Pasture Rd. A wooden chapel was first built, followed by the stone building that is now the Emsay Children's Centre. Centenary Row was constructed by the Swedenborgian's to commemorate the 100 year anniversary of the founding of the New Jerusalem Church , predominantly to house members of the congregation that worked in the Swedenborgian owned Crown Spindle Mill. In response, the Church of England built St Mary's Church in 1853 on land donated by the then owner of Emsay Kirk.

Not part of our brief – it would be nice to be able to examine enclosure maps and tithe maps but this would take our research beyond appraising the conservation area.

Listed buildings:

The locations recorded in the ADS are so identified.

1. Hill Top farm

This farm is constructed at the northern boundary of early ridge and furrow and the southern boundary of the final 1760 enclosure of Embsay Pasture. It sits upon a trackway which originates along the rear of the houses along Main Street/Pasture Rd and continues to the ancient farmstead at Non -go-Bye on Grassington Rd.

2. Manor House. (ADS). Listed Building

1635. It is likely that this house was constructed by one of the three people to whom the original 3000-year leases were granted. The house is very close to the site of a corn mill which probably dates from the early modern period or before. It is likely, therefore, that an earlier house occupied this site. A large barn to the rear of the house is probably associated with it and thus likely be of similar age or origin.

3. Mill Ponds (ADS)

The mill ponds, in their current form, were to power the watermill, and later the steam generators, for Primrose Mill/The Tannery. The eastern extension probably dates to the period of maximum water requirement for the mill in the first half of the 19th Century. The western millpond was probably first constructed for the corn grinding mill. It is possible that the current size of western millpond is original, but it is also likely that its size was maximised in the early 19th century to feed the watermill at Primrose Mill

The LB layer which is based on current Historic England and Craven DC data. We are aware of some inaccuracies but that is a different piece of work we have not been commissioned to undertake. There is now an archaeology layer and a layer depicting building history on the interactive map

<p>4. The Garth (ADS) Listed Building The house was built for the works manager of Primrose Mill in c1840</p> <p>5. The Fold, 31-33 Pasture Rd. (ADS) 17th C Farmhouse constructed to south of Pasture Rd and facing south onto Embsay Green</p> <p>6. Holly Farm Farmhouse with attached barn. Farmhouse probably constructed in the 18th century. Located to north side of Pasture Road at the southern end of medieval ridge and furrow. Likely to be on site of earlier farm.</p> <p>7. Swedenborgian Chapel and Centenary Row Stone chapel built in early 20th C on site of earlier wooden building. The site includes row of terrace houses (Centenary Row) built by Swedenborgian community and a building used as a school in the 19th Century (the latter now a private house)</p>	<p>As above</p>
---	-----------------

<p>8. and 8 Elm tree Square Two storey stone-built cottages. No 8 has stone mullioned windows. No 7 has 1646 datestone over the door.</p> <p>9. Elm Tree Inn (ADS). Listed Building Late 18th century village inn incorporating cottages and buildings to the rear. Stone mounting step (ADS) to the front of the building</p> <p>10. 26 Elm Tree Square Building to south side of Main Street/Pasture Rd axis and at junction of East Lane and Elm Tree Square. Generally hidden from view by nineteenth century buildings. Western end of building used as petrol filling station in early 20th C.</p> <p>11. 16/17 Elm Tree Square Datestone on this building records construction/reconstruction in 1744 Houses probably converted from earlier agricultural buildings (including Nos 14 and 15)</p> <p>12. Primitive Methodist chapel, East Lane Constructed as a shared chapel for a number of non-conformist denominations, the datestone records the conversion to a chapel solely for the use of the Primitive Methodists in 1822</p>	<p>As above</p>
--	-----------------

<p>13. Embsay Cottage 18th Century house with attached (now residential) barn, possibly constructed on the site of an earlier 17th century building. Roof beams possible from earlier building. Owned by Lister family and has links to Martin Lister, Physician to Queen Anne. Building probably established by Dr Martin Lister as a convalescent house for his patients, and as a summer residence for himself & his family.</p> <p>14. Laurel Bank 19th Century building constructed for mill owner in Skipton</p> <p>15. 26 Main Street Houses constructed to south of Main Street and facing south onto Embsay Green</p> <p>16. Scissors Inn, 39 Main Street Cottage within terrace with carved door posts and lintel with carved stone dated 1693. Tradition has it that this was the 'Scissors Inn'</p> <p>17. Methodist chapel The chapel shows a stone dedication the building as a Wesleyan chapel in 1836</p> <p>18. Cross End. Named because of a lost medieval cross, the houses at the Kirk Lane junction were occupied in the first part of the 20th C by a vegetable wholesaler. The first buildings on Kirk Lane are converted warehouses. The company was run by the Davy family, hence the alternative name of Davy's Corner.</p>	<p>As above</p>
---	-----------------

<p>19. Green Bottom Farm. Listed Building Farmhouse with barns at eastern limit of Main Street. Houses have mullioned windows. Ridge and furrow fields to north and East of location</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>20. Greenside (ADS) 17th century farmhouse with barn (ADS) located within ridge and furrow fields and alongside road to Emsay Kirk</p>	
<p>21. St Mary's Church (ADS). Listed Building Church of England building completed in 1855. The churchyard is a Commonwealth War Grave site.</p>	
<p>22. Emsay Kirk (ADS). Listed Building Eighteenth century building constructed in about 1795 with outbuildings and cottages. The current house was built on the site of an earlier, possibly seventeenth century, house which was, in turn, built on the site of Emsay Priory (1120). Landscaped gardens enclosed by a ha-ha. To the north of the site is a spring known as Monks Well, St Cuthbert's Well or Holy Well (ADS)</p>	

Craven public responses – review notes and AB responses

Farnhill

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
27/11/2020	Sue Harding-Hill	Farnhill Parish Council		
Comment				AB Response
<p>General:</p> <p>The introduction to the Appraisal Document 2016 does not explain its purpose and the additional referenced documents on the CDC website do not help, consequently it is somewhat confusing to read.</p>				<p>We have amended the text</p>
<p>The document is repetitive, contains both spelling mistakes and grammatical errors and does not give an accurate and complete portrayal of Farnhill either visually or historically.</p>				<p>The text has been edited</p>
<p>We believe that it would be most beneficial that an updated version is published which will contain clear definition of a Conservation Area, some information about the manner in which Conservation areas are designated and some clarity about the purpose of the document.</p>				<p>New version is now produced (2022-23)</p>
<p>We would urge the authors of any future or revised versions of this document, to seek the advice of local individuals, with a lifetime experience of living in this parish, who know and understand its geography and history, as well as seeking the knowledgeable opinion of any local village research groups, such as the Farnhill History Group, to ensure accurate and comprehensive information and detail.</p>				<p>This is not part of our brief either back in 2015/2016 or now (2022). In an ideal world we would do exactly what you suggest.</p>

<p>Pg 3:</p> <p>Low Farnhill</p> <p>“Low Farnhill is a dense series of streets that hug the canal and are continuous with Kildwick to the east”</p> <p>The word dense implies many more streets than actually exist. The only street(s) which hugs the canal is Newby Road. The historic houses along that road, many of which are now listed, were, prior to the construction of the canal in 1774, originally within the Parish of Kildwick. (See the working documents for the construction of the Kildwick section of the Leeds - Liverpool canal - appendix 1).</p> <p>Those street(s) are not now continuous with Kildwick to the east but rather are contiguous with Kildwick to the east.</p>	<p>Text edited</p>
<p>Pg 4:</p> <p>The boundary between the Parishes has recently been redrawn and the houses along Kirkgate to the south and east of the culvert, which include the historic properties of the onetime “Ship Inn” and “Byeways”, are now situated in the Parish of Kildwick.</p>	<p>See revised interactive map.</p>

<p>Pg 5: para 1:</p> <p>As can be seen from the photograph of the working drawing for the construction of the canal, (Appendix 1) (original held in the Canal and River Trust Archive), the historic houses (some of which are shown in the photograph on page 5), which hug the north bank of the canal above the culvert and aqueduct, were originally part of Kildwick prior to the construction of the canal in 1774.</p> <p>.</p> <p>High and Low Farnhill may abut but they are recognised by many local residents to be separate and distinct. The development of a great part of that part of modern Farnhill between the old historic houses which now sit to the north of the canal, which were once part of Kildwick and the linear development of the more rural High Farnhill, would have taken place as a result of the industrialisation of Farnhill at the time of the Industrial revolution and the building of the canal and mills. Warburton's map and text of the road journey from Keighley to Skipton in 1720 describes the journey from Kildwick to Bradley "leave ye village – Houses scattered both sides (Farnell village); away ye left to Farnell Hall 1/2 furlong to ye left; Ye left Farnell Wood and a wall; Ye common".</p>	<p>The historical overview is not intended to be exhaustive and we have not had the time or resource to examine all the available map evidence. However, text has been amended.</p>
<p>Pg 6:</p> <p>The site of Airedale mill was within the village of Farnhill.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Para 1, pg 6:</p> <p>The working plan drawn for the construction of the Leeds to Johnson's hillock – Appendix 1 identifies that the houses at the south of Starkey Lane were already constructed in 1826</p>	<p>See revised interactive map which now includes historic character</p>
<p>Para 2, pg 6:</p> <p>miss-spelling of Keighley.</p>	<p>Text edited</p>
<p>Pg 7:</p> <p>Why are there no references to quarrying and farming, both of which were important to Farnhill?</p>	<p>See archaeology layer on revised interactive map and text amended.</p>

<p>Pg 8:</p> <p>The significance of the geography and topography of the villages of Kildwick and Farnhill cannot be overstated. The appraisal document on page 12 refers to the “overwhelming impression of the rural landscape” and “the impression is one of countryside”. In this aspect it is more valuable to consider the two villages as one conservation area. Situated on a steep bank rising from the northern side of the valley floor, at the point in the Aire Valley where it meets the tributary valley of Glusburn beck, where the valley itself changes direction through almost 90 degrees, and where there has been a significant and historically important river crossing point for at least 700 years (Bridge constructed in 1305 – 1313), the villages stand prominent and visible from almost all points of the compass. The long views towards the villages are immensely important and should be considered as “highly significant”</p>	<p>We are now recommending that the two conservation areas are conflated into one and the area divided into separate character areas as outlined in our recommendation.</p> <p>The landscape context is clearly recognised in the open space section in our opinion. Text amended however.</p> <p>The views we have identified are not the only views. We have identified a representative sample only. Text amended however.</p> <p>We have created three character areas for Farnhill which will hopefully help and we are also recommending that Kildwick and Farnhill are conflated into a single conservation area.</p>
<p>16. Travelling west along the valley from Silsden, leaving the more urban landscape of the Bradford Metropolitan District area, the significance of the “overwhelming impression of the rural landscape and the “the impression is one of countryside” is important and makes a strong contribution to the Conservation areas. Likewise the historically important Lang Kirk of Craven (Grade 1 listed) and Kildwick Hall (Grade 11* listed) to the north of the river are fundamental to the villages and to the Conservation area. The presence of fields to the north of the river, which lie east of Farnhill, within the Kildwick conservation area, and which rise up the hillside, create a highly significant view of the conservation area from the river, roads and canal of the valley and should be restricted for development and preserved.</p>	<p>See above</p>

<p>Travelling south and east from the bend in the road at Cononley Lane End, the view to the north and east of the horizontal line of the elevated towpath of the canal, abutted to the north by the four story housing built from the infrastructure of defunct textile mills, is both historically significant and an almost unique perspective on three centuries of development and change. The fields to the south of the canal allow for this highly significant view of the canal and village and must be preserved.</p>	<p>See above</p>
<p>Travelling north from Glusburn and Crosshills, or looking across the long vista over the Aire valley, north east from the Towers on Earl Crag above Sutton in Craven and Cowling, the highly significant composition, structure and history of the villages of Kildwick and Farnhill and their highly significant site on the steep northern side of the valley, which almost forms a natural bastion between rural North Yorkshire and the more Urban Bradford Metropolitan District, makes a strong contribution to the conservation area and must be preserved.</p>	<p>See above</p>
<p><i>This conservation capsule of Kildwick and Farnhill must not be allowed to be compromised by development to the south, east or west. It is vital that these highly significant long views which make a strong contribution to the conservation area/s are recognised, retained and not allowed to be obscured and diminished by unnecessary or inappropriate development. They are a hugely important part of the conservation area/s.</i></p>	<p>See above</p>
<p>Whilst there is a photograph of the lower end of Starkey Lane, there is no reference to the long terrace of houses which is both visually and historically an extremely important feature of Farnhill.</p>	<p>More images have been added.</p>
<p>Pg 9: The photograph of the "lanes in the conservation area" is unsupported by any explanatory text or rationale for inclusion. Likewise where are the "series of footpaths that snake down the hill"?</p>	<p>Caption amended</p>
<p>Para 1, pg 9: Typing error. Newby Street should read Newby Road.</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>

<p>Para 4, pg 9:</p> <p>The boundary between the Parishes has recently been redrawn and the houses along Kirkgate to the south and east of the culvert which include the historic properties of the onetime "Ship Inn" and "Byeways" are now situated in the Parish of Kildwick.</p>	<p>We have not shown parish boundaries but we are now recommending that the two conservation areas are conflated into one and the area divided into separate character areas as outlined in our recommendation (see above)</p>
<p>Pg 10 para 7:</p> <p>The number of traditional type lampposts has been increased with four such posts between Parson's Bridge and Redman's Bridge, one on Main Street in Higher Farnhill at the junction of Grange Road and Bradley Road and one halfway up the Main Street rising from the canal. There are plans to improve that number over time.</p>	<p>We have recorded what was visible in 2015/2016 but text amended.</p>
<p>Ashlar is certainly not a prominent feature on buildings in the village.</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>
<p>Pg 11:</p> <p>Key buildings: The grade 11 listed "Mullions" shown on page 11, together with the grade 11 listed historic buildings along Newby Road shown on page 5, were, prior to the construction of the canal, part of the village and Parish of Kildwick.</p>	<p>This section has been re-written but we are recording contemporary structures within the current conservation area.</p>
<p>The aqueduct under the canal is also a grade 11 listed structure.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><i>It is important that the historic buildings to the south and east of the culvert (Byeways – which appears to have been underpinned when the culvert was constructed) and the building which used to be the "Ship Inn" sitting under the south bank of the canal, although recently transferred into Kildwick Parish, should have listed status,</i></p>	<p>This is not our remit. Please see recommendation 1.</p>
<p><i>Likewise the historic coal shutes, located on the South Bank of the canal opposite Newby Road, although within the Parish of Kildwick, have great historical and heritage interest and should be listed and preserved.</i></p>	<p>This is not our remit. Please see recommendation 1.</p>

<p>The Farnhill Conservation area boundary is actually the stream and is poorly described as being simply west of the footpath to the old vicarage (Parson's walk).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Pg 12: Main Street in High Farnhill is relatively level and although at a higher position on the valley side is not "at a higher gradient". The views to the South which give "an overwhelming impression of the rural landscape" are due in no small part to Farnhill Ings which gets no mention in the appraisal. Likewise, the views from the South, East, and West toward the village, some of which look across Farnhill Ings are also highly significant – please see the comments for page 8.</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>
<p>Pg 14: 2.3: para 2: Please refer to comments for page 8 above Para 3: Although dealt with separately in the Appraisal reports published in 2016, there is good reason for the conservation areas of Kildwick and Farnhill to be read in conjunction with each other or perhaps even be identified as one area. <i>Certainly the Leeds Liverpool Canal (1773) with its northern bank in Farnhill and its southern bank in Kildwick at the east, provides a corridor of heritage history which deserves conservation recognition as a unique heritage area in its own right.</i></p>	<p>Text amended.</p>
<p>To walk from North West to South East, along what was the first section of the Leeds Liverpool Canal to be built (between Skipton and Bingley completed in the late 18th century); from the grade 11 listed Bridge (number 183a) at Cononley Lane End to Wharf Mill where the road bridge (Priest Bank) and ancient route way crosses the Canal, is to walk through ten centuries of development and change.</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>

On the north bank in Farnhill is Grade 1 listed Farnhill Hall with its 14th century windows and door heads

Further along the towpath, above the fields running down to the canal on the north bank, first the linear housing of Higher Farnhill followed by the terraced cottages of what is colloquially named Kitson's Row. These are three storey cottages built in the 18th Century and once owned by the Independent Order of Oddfellows

Below the cottages, opposite the Arbour (itself significant), still on the north bank, stands the old Methodist Church built in 1896, sold in 2015 and now converted into two grand apartments.

Twin gabled houses rise from the north bank of the canal, in the building which was once Aked's Textile Mill, whose warehouse on the opposite side of Main Street is now Kildwick and Farnhill Institute

Further south east on the north bank are the canal side properties of Bainbridge Wharf, which were developed from an engineering works, which itself had previously been a second textile mill, Farnhill Mill, and which was originally built around 1895 and burned down on 20.12.1905

To the south of the canal sits Airedale House which has been developed on the site of Airedale Mill which was also burned down on 31.03.06

Text amended.

Keeping on the south bank, are the historic coal wharf and arched stone hoppers on the bend of the canal (Now Hollytree house)

Next, the grade 11 listed Kildwick Aqueduct constructed in 1780

Followed by the Grade 11 listed 17/18th Century cottages which predate the canal, to the north of the towpath opposite the old coal wharf

And then the grade 11 listed 18th century "Mullions"

Text amended.

<p>On the south of the canal, are the buildings to the east of the culvert, one of which was a coaching Inn called "The Ship" (and presumably a stop of for bargees transporting goods along the canal) and the other, opposite, a fine historic House (Byeways) which predates the canal and appears to have been underpinned when the road under the culvert and the aqueduct were constructed</p> <p>Next on the north bank, the historic terraced houses of Starkey Lane - already identified in 2016 Appraisal as a significant view and identified on a map of 1826</p> <p>Followed by Parson's bridge (Grade 11 listed) which carries a footway from the church to the old vicarage at the top of Parson's Walk</p> <p>To the east and south of Parson's Bridge, the Grade 1 listed Lang Kirk of Craven, as well as being important in its own right, houses fragments of a 9th century Saxon cross</p> <p>Opposite the Church, is the highly significant view to the north across open parkland to the Grade 11* listed Kildwick Hall</p> <p>Kildwick Cof E School sits to the south</p> <p>Wharf Mill - originally a canal wharf and warehouse for goods, stands where the historic roadway (recorded in Warburton's map of 1720 as the principal route to Silsden and Kildwick Hall " a street back direct to Silsden – Kildwick Hall 2 furlongs ye rt"), crosses the canal at Barrett's Bridge</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p><i>This unique timeline view deserves to be recognised and be awarded important heritage status to protect it from the overdevelopment which has been allowed to take place in recent years. While the villages have their own characteristics, their history is intertwined. They are both separated, and yet brought together, by the building of the canal, and they deserve recognition as a special area worthy of conservation.</i></p>	<p>Agreed and where possible and appropriate we have made changes to the text and interactive mapping.</p>

<p>Pg 15, para 3</p> <p>"The moorland landscape that is visible in this direction (to the north of High Farnhill) makes a strong contribution to the setting of the village but beyond it (F2) makes no contribution" This statement is questionable as the area (F2) in that locality is mostly pastureland not moorland. In addition there is a strong case for saying that it is the moorland beyond the pastureland that provides the dramatic backdrop which "makes the strong contribution" rather than the pastureland.</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>
<p>Pg 16:</p> <p>"Open space to the north east of the Conservation area including woodland". It is not clear which area (which makes "no contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area") is being referred to, but the former Low Delph Quarry to the south of Crag Top, is important both visually and historically and should certainly be included within the Conservation Area, possibly with the even more important Hardacre Quarry to the North. It seems strange that the folly in Kildwick, which runs from Grange Road towards Crag Top is worthy of Conservation status but Low Moor and Low Delph are not.</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>
<p>Pg 17:</p> <p>It is a pity that, despite the existence of the Appraisal document; and despite the fact that the view between the Methodist Chapel and Main Street and number 41 is identified as making a "strong contribution" to the conservation area, planners have allowed the view to be compromised by the development of a pathway and walkway down the side of the Chapel as part of its development into two luxury apartments.</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>

<p>Pg 18:</p> <p>Should also include the view walking eastwards along the canal towpath towards the village along the horizontal elevated towpath of the canal, abutted to the north by the four story housing built from the infrastructure of defunct textile mills, which is both historically significant and an almost unique perspective on three centuries of development and change and makes a strong contribution to the conservation area – see also page 8 and page 14 above.</p> <p>The bearing and position of the photograph of Starkey Lane showing the “highly significant “ view misses the more interesting and significant section of the lane and view which would include the historic houses and lane together with the long view across the valley.</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>
<p>Pg 19:</p> <p>See also comments for page 8 and page 14</p> <p>Typing error. Should read Newby Road not Newby Street.</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>

<p>Pg 20: There is clearly a pressing need for parking in the village with the existing housing stock, yet planners seem to pay little regard to that issue when considering planning applications. Whilst vehicular traffic through the village may not be heavy in comparison with trunk roads, congestion on the A629 Skipton Road does lead to short term difficulties in the village as the Main Street provides an alternative route for through traffic.</p> <p>Both these issues make a negative contribution to the Conservation Area. 5: recommendations for further work Further research into the historic development of the village, the settlement pattern and morphology</p> <p>There is an active history group in the village which is extremely proactive and academic research based.</p> <p>The documents held by the Canal and River Trust Archive at Ellesmere Port are significant as indeed is the archive of the Yorkshire Record Office.</p> <p>Identification of problems, pressures and potential solutions – 1. Might include pressures of vehicles, both parking and speeding 2. Might include pressures arising from poor regular maintenance of historic drains and springs</p> <p>in the village which can result in blocked drains and flooding and consequent damage to heritage structures.</p>	<p>The historical overview is not intended to be exhaustive and we have not had the time or resource to examine all the available map evidence. However, text has been amended.</p> <p>As to traffic issues, we agree, and have amended our text where possible. See Recommendation 5.</p>
<p>In support of some comments please find appendix 1 (see original document) - page 25 of the portfolio of working documents for the construction of the Kildwick section of the Leeds - Liverpool canal below. Note from researcher: “ we do however have a plan of the Leeds & Liverpool Canal from Leeds to Johnson’s Hillock dated 1826. This is a working plan drawn for the actual construction of the canal and as such it does not show any proposed routes, only the one that was approved by an Act of Parliament.” Document reference 2014/26 Carole Must – Researcher National Waterways Archive. Ellesmere Port</p>	<p>The text has been strengthened where we can but our brief was not to explore detailed documentation and carry out exhaustive research</p>

Please also refer to "From Keighley to Skipton – a journey of 1900 years - Farnhill History Group
http://www.farnhill.co.uk/History_Pages/Articles.html

Noted

Craven public responses – review notes and AB responses

Gargrave

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
7/12/2020	Donald Clark	Resident		
Comment				AB Response

<p>I live on Church Lane and own 50% of the small Croft linking between Church Street and Church Lane.</p> <p>It is difficult to understand why this relatively small area of land is included in the top category of Open Spaces with the formal Village Greens, the Church Yard etc and how it can be classed as 'making a strong contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area'.</p> <p>The Croft is not relevant to any of the 'views' listed in the appraisal and is surrounded largely by the backs of properties on Church Street, Church Lane and Riverside; the boundaries of the properties are a mixed collection of walls, fences and hedges in various states of repair.</p> <p>Less than 18% of the croft perimeter is visible from the public roads and these boundaries are partially screened by traditional dry stone walls. The Parish Council refers to the Croft as a 'Community Asset' but is not prepared to contribute to maintenance.</p> <p>To summarise, the land is privately owned, expensive to maintain and too small to be of much interest for any serious grazing. The likelihood is that the current situation will not last much longer. If some sensible use cannot be found the Croft will deteriorate into 'Urban Wasteland'.</p>				<p>We have examined this parcel of land and concluded that it makes a strong contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area, especially character area 2. The Croft has been re-designated as a parcel in its own right and the points made here have been reflected in the text. The Croft is an historic piece of open grazing land within character area 2 and helps to underpin the semi-rural character of this part of the conservation area.</p>
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
9/11/2020	Kath Ashby	Gargrave parish council		
Comment				AB Response
<p>Having consulted with members of the Parish Council, Village Heritage group and other members of the village, we would like to put forward Gargrave House and its attending buildings which are at Home Farm and the walled areas along with the trees inside the Mark House Lane boundary wall. Also Gargrave House Gardens.</p>				<p>We have recommended that this area is included in the conservation area – see recommendation 8.</p>

<p>We are aware there are TPO's already on these woodland areas and new houses developed within the old walled garden, called Gargrave House Gardens now. The original farm buildings and houses are now called Home Farm. We feel it is a very important feature of the village as it borders the Pennine Way and entrance to the National Park.</p>				<p>See above.</p>
<p>We considered other features such as the refurbished Water Wheel on the site on Marton Road and Milton House Grand II listed despite the boundary finishing at Walton Avenue. Also the fact that our Neighbourhood Plan protects green spaces already.</p>				<p>We have amended our document to include public open space and amended the open space section to make the text clearer. The refurbished water wheel, although of considerable interest lies outwith the conservation area.</p>
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
26/10/2020	Jeff Adams	resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>Could you please give consideration to extending the conservation area (Character Area 2) on the south side of Marton Road to incorporate the fields to the west of the existing conservation boundary through which the Pennine Way runs or is clearly visible from, up to scawber lane This would protect the views from the pennine way into the village and link up with the area which is in the current proposals through which these views are already protected. The pennine way is an important and historical right of way and provides unparalleled views into and from the village of Gargrave which should be protected.</p>				<p>We have called Scawber Lane, Mosber Lane which is its historic name. We have re-examined our original document in the light of this comment and agree that the conservation area should be extended. See recommendation 8</p>

Craven public responses – review notes and AB responses

Glusburn

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
5/12/2020	Judith Naylor	Cross Hills Parish Council		
Comment				AB Response
<p>The Parish council has asked me to contact you regarding the proposal of Glusburn to be classed as a Conservation Area.</p> <p>Glusburn has many old building in the villages and are of Historic Value and some are Grade II Listed buildings and these need to be part of the Conservation Area and therefore protected.</p> <p>The Historic areas in Glusburn have Architectural and Historic character that the Parish Council feel should be also part of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Parish Council agree with your proposal that Glusburn should be designated as a Conservation Area.</p>				Thank you. No action needed.
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
26/11/2020	Lorna Smith	Resident		
Comment				AB Response

<p>Having read these documents, including a case for including Glusburn made a few years ago, it would seem the idea of conservation means different things to different people ... When one considers the abomination that is the new build up Green Lane. The problems of the busy Colne Rd were mentioned but clearly of no importance. The road, which continues into Crosshills of course, is even busier!</p>				<p>The new build off Green Lane post dates our 2016 assessment. We have amended the proposed boundary. We thought we have been clear about the traffic in our section on traffic and movement but we have amended the text slightly.</p>
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
00/12/2020	John Patrick Hargreaves	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>I agree with the recommendation in the introduction that Glusburn should be designated as a conservation area.</p> <p>However the suggested red line should be amended as I will explain in my comments below. I base my comments on having lived in Glusburn from 1947, with a continued connection with the community during life elsewhere during my career, and a continuing interest in the community and its history. Thirty years ago I returned to residency in the village</p>				<p>We have amended the proposed boundary to take account of these comments and other factors.</p>

<p>Comments on 1.0 Character:</p> <p>Note on 1.1: The Colne Road properties from the early rural settlement still remain. Evidence exists in a date stone at Harrison Place which reads as 1587. Hayfield Mill was founded by 1851, taking over the site of some small residential development and small squares off Colne Road. The textile workers terraced housing was constructed, as described in the appraisal, first with Croft Head Terrace, but followed soon afterwards by some semi-terraced and semi-detached houses called Sunny Bank Villas, off Bungalow Road. They were celebrated and described as being a distinctive feature 'in the Italianate style.' These dwellings were probably for junior managerial employees of John C. Horsfall of Hayfield Mills and pre-dated the terraced mill housing except for the back to back houses in Croft Head Terrace. Sunny Bank Villas are earlier in date than the terrace to the west side of Croft Street, all of Higher Hartley Street the west side of Lodge Street, and all of Higher Lodge Street as evidenced by the 1906-7 6" OS map. Other early terraced housing also pre-existed these mill streets in the form of C19th Sunny Bank Terrace and Sunny Cottage, also evident on the 1906-7 OS map, and should also be considered for inclusion for conservation together with Institute Street and Sunny Bank Villas as being historically significant.</p> <p>A note on 1.1 paragraph 6 – There is no Bungalow Street. The reference must be to Bungalow Road.</p>	<p>Agreed . The boundary has been amended to include the Sunny Bank Villas and other late 19th century properties. Text of 1.1 has been amended.</p> <p>Text amended.</p>
<p>Comments on 2.0 Landscape and Open space:</p> <p>Note on 2.2: The fields to the West of Green Lane have been subject to some linear infill along the edge of the Lane, but the historic edge of settlement and transition to open rural landscape with ancient enclosure boundaries beyond has been retained.</p> <p>Note on 2.2, F1 – some fields to the north of Bungalow Road have been developed (2017-2020.) The character of the resulting dwellings on them partially display the look and features of pre-existing local structures, in natural stone with vernacular features such as shaped stone quoins. There was an intention to retain the pre-existing field boundaries dating to the enclosures of the 1770's, which regrettably has partially been lost, but the look of the newly constructed stone walls on the site adds to the local character. This appears to be in line with the Consultation document conclusion in F2.</p>	<p>The new build off Green Lane post dates our 2016 assessment. We have amended the proposed boundary. We agree with your assessment however.</p>

<p>Note on 2.2 F3 - The Area of open space off Rycroft Road is a very important addition to retention of the ancient landscape, and full of character. I disagree that it makes no contribution to the character of the settlement. It is important as a byway. Ancient Rycroft Road running via 'Washer Lane' and the back of Institute Street is a byway which historically was a principal route between the west and north-west from Binns Lane/Green Lane via Shutt Lane to Sutton Fields to the south and east. It was very important route through the ancient part of the village.</p>	<p>We have taken a different view, especially in the light of the new developments to the west. At the end of the day we are recommending a conservation area in a settlement that previously had none</p>
<p>Note on 2.2 - Land to the East of Green Lane – Development has taken place, but as stated above, some character has been retained. See above.</p>	<p>The new build off Green Lane post dates our 2016 assessment. We have amended the proposed boundary. We agree with your assessment however.</p>
<p>Comments on 3.3 Views</p> <p>Note on 3.3 – MF2 View up Croft Head Terrace.</p> <p>I agree that the view evokes an earlier age, but weight should be given in this appraisal to the situation with regard to the Mill Streets of Glusburn. The poorly maintained road surfaces are a function of decay which has progressed relatively recently, and does not lend itself to a concept of conservation. The history of the streets is that, for the century up to the 1950's, they had largely a rough natural surface with compacted dirt and stone. They did have sandstone flagged pavements for the most part. Exceptions to the rough surfacing were areas of stone setts at the foot of Croft Street, the back street between Croft Street and Higher Hartley Street with stone setts and pavements, the lower part of which was flagged. Also Higher Lodge Street was concreted, and Lodge Street set with stone flags and central drainage (see illustration at 1.5 – stone setts.) At the end of the 1950's into the 1960's Hayfield Mills undertook the preparation and surfacing of the terraced streets with asphalt and drainage. This surfacing has broken down completely over 60 years as a result of wear and tear, blocked drainage and weathering, with patchy excavation and reinstating to a low standard exacerbating the deterioration.</p>	<p>We are assessing character and there is a tendency for Local Authorities to tidy things up to such an extent that local character has been lost. We believe, if a conservation led approach was to be adopted to all highway issues as outlined in our recommendation 5, then a happy compromise can be reached between "improvement" and "conservation" Our job, as we see it, is to alert people to what the local character might be.</p>

<p>Comments on 4.0 Traffic and Movement -</p> <p>The intensity of traffic through the village and its adverse effects cannot be underestimated. I encourage its reporting in connection with these considerations for conservation. This would contribute to initiatives to mitigate this problem on the A6068.</p> <p>The importance of footpaths at 4.1 is as mentioned in relation to Rycroft Road, and is ably demonstrated by the image at MF4. The village core as outlined in the proposal is integral to pedestrian routes around and through the village. Street improvement I would see as vital to this, as in their present state, the condition of the streets is potentially a greater hazard to pedestrian safety than the conditions were a century ago.</p>	<p>This is a key issue facing almost all settlements in the early 21st century whether they are conservation areas or not. We hope that the local authority will address this issue robustly. We have amended our text in the traffic and movement section slightly</p>
<p>Comments on 5.0 Recommendation -</p> <p>Glusburn's principal historical significance is as set out, tied with the evolution and dominance of Hayfield Mill and its community. The mill and its surrounding built environment gives great weight to the argument for conservation. The earlier settlement is still easily to be found – historic dwellings on Colne Road around Harrison Place, the former blacksmith's shop at the junction with Green Lane, Glusburn Old Hall, and the former Corn Mill. I would welcome further study as suggested in the proposal with more research to uncover original fabric. An example: For villagers, the former long established Corn Mill at Glusburn Bridge, which was owned and operated by the same family for over 200 years, and which took over the milling activity of Ridge Mill, a mile to the west, at the junction of Gill Beck and Ickornshaw Beck which was destroyed by fire in the 1760's, however it was outside Glusburn Parish. Now returned to the Parish, following boundary reorganisation, is The mill at Lumb Mill, a quarter of a mile to the west, a water driven weaving mill and, according to Alec Wood; 'one of the oldest cloth producing mills in the North of England, and now listed... as a building of historic interest and importance.' For this study Lumb Mill is probably too distant to be included.</p> <p>I would recommend consulting the publication <i>Glusburn 'The Old Community' by Alec Wood (1999.)</i> "The tracks of Binns Lane, Rycroft and Croft Head is probably the site of the oldest settlement."</p>	<p>As much as the authors of this appraisal would like to carry out more research, the constraints of this project do not allow it. We have tried to capture the main historic narrative but are conscious of much we have left out. Your contribution is recognised and some changes to the text have been made.</p> <p>We have also added several new layers, including historic character, historic boundaries and archaeology, to the interactive map.</p>

<p>Comments on recommendations 5.3:</p> <p>I would disagree strongly that 'the terrace at the northern end of Institute Street', identified as Sunny Bank Road should be excluded because of a lack of historic character. As I outlined, it borders the ancient track-way known locally as 'Washer Lane,' an extension of Rycroft, is integral to the pre- industrialised village. It included the dwelling of a family which has farmed up to the recent times within the village including the field (included within the red line,) to the east of Institute Street, and incorporating a barn (still existant,) on Colne Road 100 yards to the east of the Institute.</p> <p>Also Sunny Bank Villas deserve inclusion based to the fact that they pre-date most of the terraced mill housing, and the fact that when built by Hayfield Mills, they were celebrated for their distinctive 'Italianate' style, being featured on many illustrations, post card images. These dwellings are integral to the concept of the mill village developed, much like the example set by Sir Titus Salt at Saltaire, in the hands of a philanthropic patron and mill owner, in this case John Cousin Horsfall.</p>	<p>The text, boundary and interactive map have been amended accordingly. We agree with these comments.</p>
<p>Glusburn Old Corn Mill:</p> <p>The assessment favours inclusion of a triangle of land to the west of Walker Close, and between the A6068 and Glusburn Beck but with very limited historic relevance, yet Crag Vale Terrace, incorporating earlier properties than those to the south of the highway is excluded. This does not make sense. It would be better to extend the proposed conservation area to the west, north of the highway, to include the still existing original buildings comprising the Old Corn Mill, which is now surrounded by sympathetic newer development. The Corn Mill at Glusburn Bridge, has a long history dating back to the 12thCentury. The Corn Mill is mentioned in the documents of Bolton Priory in 1192. The important historic western aspect of Glusburn should be given serious consideration for inclusion. I would encourage a re- examination of the red line border to the west of Walker Close and bordering the Cocking Lane End Trust Road A6068.</p>	<p>We recognize the survival of the corn mill but consider it too far out to be include in the proposed conservation area. We have however, adjusted the boundary to take account of other comments.</p>
<p>I would trust that in your assessment and conclusion you will give consideration to the assets which I have outlined above. I would strongly suggest that it would be appropriate to take into consideration informed opinion from within the community. I speak, drawing on knowledge and views shared by others eminent in our local history, such as the late Allan Butterfield, and the late Alec Wood.</p>	<p>In an ideal world we woud love to carry out further research and talk with the people you mention. Sadly, the constraints of this project do not allow it.</p>

<p>Appendix: Additional comments including some previous proposal studies.</p> <p>By way of supporting information, I append an earlier document prepared through Glusburn and Cross Hills Parish Council ad hoc conservation group (AHCG,) which listed suggestions of assets for conservation in liaison with Craven District Council 2016-2017 There was communication on this with officers of CDC, including Ruth Parker of CDC Local Development Framework:</p> <p><i>Area of C19th village streets, related to the philanthropic development of Hayfield Mills by Sir John Cousin Horsfall between 1850 and 1925.</i></p> <p><i>Comprising Institute Street; Sunny Bank House; Sunny Bank Road; Sunny Bank Villas; Croft Head Terrace including back to back properties; Croft Street; Hartley Street; Higher Hartley Street; Lodge Street; Higher Lodge Street; Bungalow Road including The Bungalows.</i></p>	<p>This area is included in the proposed conservation area</p>
<p><i>The area around Glusburn Green, including older C18th-C19th properties on Green Lane adjacent to Glusburn Green; part of Ryecroft Road Ryecroft and Croft Head Farms.</i></p>	<p>This area is included in the proposed conservation area</p>
<p><i>Area along the A6068 west of, and including the Road Mileage Marker adjacent to The Hayfield Lodge House 'Cornerways,' showing Blackburn Addingham and Cocking End Road, and including the C16th cottages at Harrison Place, Pear Tree Cottage, The former Smithy to the junction of the A6068 and Green Lane.</i></p>	<p>This area is included in the proposed conservation area</p>
<p><i>The area of The Gib to include Gib Side, the woodland to the East of Lingstead, and north of Lothersdale Road and including the ruined reservoir at MR(3)996(4)455, plus the early C20th cast road sign at Highgate, Lothersdale Road, & including Glusburn Park.</i></p>	<p>Some of this has been recognised as significant open space.</p>

<i>Allotments at (4)004(4)448 including cast plaque in highway wall dated to World War II identifying ARP Gas Supply Cock.</i>	Not sure where this is so have not noted it.
<i>Cast sign on north face of Hayfield Mill to 19th century Kildwick Parish Gas Company (KPGC.)</i>	This area is included in the proposed conservation area
<i>Cast sign on north side of Station Road Cross Hills to Kildwick Parish Gas Company (KPGC.)</i>	This area is included in the proposed conservation area

Craven public responses – review notes and AB responses

High Bentham

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
14/12/2020	Pamela Woof	Resident		
Comment				AB Response

<p>The buildings:</p> <p>The buildings proposed for conservation are all worthy observations but they do not include any of the mill buildings that play such an important part in the history of Bentham.</p> <p>This may be because the writer concludes that the area around the old mill site was known as Bentham Bridge a "satellite of the main town". I do not believe this to be the case. The presence of the Railway station from 1850 and the access down to the mill area by both the Main road and Duke street (Old Laney as it is known) indicate that the mill area by the river has been an integral of Georgian and Victorian Bentham.</p> <p>The town had roots as an agricultural market town but the textile industry has had a key part to play in its development. Surely the old mill cottages of Wenning Avenue, which are shown to have been in place on the 1850 plan of the mill at High Bentham are worthy of conservation as much as the buildings along Main street</p> <p>The "notable buildings" mentioned on Station Road i.e.: Nat west Bank and the Town Hall are of a date following the growth of the textile trade and subsequent prosperity of Victorian Bentham. Indeed the NatWest bank is no longer required as a bank and is being altered into apartments with the building retaining its original facade.</p> <p>The buildings proposed for conservation along Main Street are much appreciated by locals and we would not wish to see them disappear but there also still some older buildings to be found around the old mill site. Wenning Avenue Cottages and the old mill building, now used by Atkinson Vos, were in existence by 1850.</p>	<p>We have added an historic character layer to the interactive map. We have also added historic routes and boundaries all taken from the 1850 OS map. Although we agree with you that there was a strong connection between Bentham and the mill site on Wenning Lane, we consider this to be too spatially distinct from the proposed conservation area. Having said that, we are suggesting an extension to incorporate the church. The site of the current Kidde Factory is less clear so we have added a separate section under open space to cover this issue.</p> <p>We are recommending that Craven District Council or its successor set up a local list of heritage assets which should incorporate all former undesignated mill buildings.</p>
<p>The old lane (Duke Street is also very historic with views across fields and a wonderful view up the railway line from the footbridge. The views below show the old cobbles at the bottom end of the Lane (A) compared with the currently poorly looked after top section near the Horse and Farrier (B).</p>	<p>We have MF3 . The views are principally of the conservation area but will examine whether we should incorporate more.</p>

<p>The environment:</p> <p>The surrounding countryside part of the “drumlin fields” of Craven is not protected. I would like to see the whole of Craven made into a conservation area. Surely in this current environmental crisis of climate change, we could do well to create a “Craven Conservation Area” linking the southern edge of the Yorkshire Dales National Park with the Forest of Bowland AONB.</p> <p>The drumlin field topography is distinctive and the environment is invaluable. The conservation of man made history should not, in my view be considered above the need to conserve the natural environment. We are in danger of neglecting this section of Craven between the Yorkshire Dales National Park and the AONB Forest of Bowland.</p> <p>Human development should in my view be allowed to use the existing built up area with due respect to historic buildings. The need for new houses etc should be strictly controlled to save the environment and agricultural practices should be discouraged when they cause damage to the hillsides, soil and wildlife.</p>				<p>Designation of a “Craven Conservation Area” is outside the remit of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and is not, therefore, a realistic prospect. Other matters are outside our remit and are a Policy issue for Craven District Council or its successor Authority.</p>
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
7/12/2020	Shirley Brown	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>Pg 14:</p> <p>To the best of my knowledge and others who have lived here much longer than I have, the Horse & Farrier has never been known as Bay Horse & Farrier</p>				<p>Text amended.</p>

Pg 15: It is King Street, it is not King's Street	Text amended.
Pg 17: It is Grasmere car park, it is not Grassmere Road	Text amended.

Craven public responses – review notes and AB responses

Ingleton

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
10/12/2020	Diane Moor	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>I am writing regarding the Ingleton Conservation Area Appraisal 2016. Please can you leave the whole content of this appraisal as it is because it is valuable and important to the welfare and conservation of Ingleton.</p> <p>Ingleton has many heritage assets and heritage settings that need protecting. As Ingleton is bordered by the Yorkshire Dales National Park, it is crucial that Ingleton is recognised with this appraisal.</p> <p>Please do not remove any content from the Ingleton Conservation Area Appraisal 2016.</p>				<p>Noted and thanks We are however, editing the document but adding rather than taking away.</p>

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
6/12/2020	Janine Bickerstaff	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
I support the following recommendations in Section 5:				Thank you. They have been strengthened and expanded.
Further research into the village's development history				We have added a historic character layer to the interactive map.
Consider extending the Conservation Area boundary to include the former railway viaduct and the River Twiss bridge				Noted. We are recommending that the conservation area is enlarged to take account of the viaduct. and the River Twiss bridge
Exploration of the potential of the viaduct to become a cycleway/public footpath				We have referenced this in the text.
Please can you tell me if all areas of woodland are protected in any way? If not, I would like to see additional tree preservation orders in all areas of existing woodland.				See our new recommendation 6
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
14/12/2020	Matthew Young	Matt Young Translations Ltd.		

Comment				AB Response
<p>I'm writing to you with regard to the Ingleton Conservation Area Appraisal August 2016, and more specifically 2.3 Open space assessment.</p> <p>As my home village, this is of great concern to me.</p> <p>As a village, Ingleton is very dependent on tourism for its well-being. This has been more obvious than ever this year, when overseas holidays have been significantly restricted and far more people have been holidaying closer to home.</p> <p>As such, any moves to reduce the size of the village's conservation area would have a negative impact on the village and would only contribute to a downfall in the financial well-being of Ingleton.</p>				<p>We are not intending to recommend that the conservation area should be reduced. We are however recommending that it is enlarged to take account of the viaduct. The open space assessment is to provide clear guidance on how we view the setting of the conservation area. We have amended this text to make it clearer.</p>
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
13/12/2020	Nicola Young	Lily Pad Bakery		
Comment				AB Response
<p>This email is to confirm that I have seen the local plan and as a resident of the village I would like to let you know that I think it should stay as it is or even be enlarged. The conservation area, I think, is crucial for the character of the village to be preserved.</p>				<p>Noted. We are recommending that the conservation area is enlarged to take account of the viaduct.</p>

Craven public responses – review notes and AB responses

Kildwick

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	

13/12/2020	Helen Moran	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>The opportunity for the conservation area appraisals to be revisited is very welcome as those for Kildwick are in need of updating – not just to take account of recent developments but also to address the omissions and inaccuracies that have been present from when these were first produced. This is important to ensure that the heritage and character of the area is accurately reflected and can be properly protected for the future benefit of all. A refresh of the documents will ensure that officers and planning committee members have robust and accurate information on which to base advice, recommendations and decisions, as the current draft documents cannot be relied upon.</p>				<p>We are now recommending that the two conservation areas are conflated into one and the area divided into separate character areas as outlined in our recommendation 8.</p>
<p>General comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Priest Bank Road is incorrectly spelt throughout. - The boundary of the conservation area needs amending to include that part of Farnhill now in Kildwick. - Descriptions need amending to take account of the number of new properties built in the parish since the draft appraisals were first written - There are a number of omissions and inaccuracies – further details 				<p>Text amended where necessary and the conservation area boundary is the same as supplied by Craven. See our recommendation 8 for review of boundary. We are suggesting that Kildwick and Farnhill become one Conservation Area</p>

<p>1.1 Character Area 1</p> <p>The Local Plan highlights the importance of the canal corridor yet the importance of this in Kildwick is completely understated. Many of the features in the northern part of area 1 are associated with the canal and have collectively shaped the character and appearance of the village. Their individual and collective significance should be reflected in the appraisal:</p>	<p>Fair point. The text has been amended and the open space element of the interactive map has been amended.</p>
<p>There is no mention of the canal chutes which are an important and unique feature in the area and are circa late 19th century in date. They have been well-conserved and are a fine example of their type. I am not aware of other chutes like this in Craven but if you know of any please let me know.</p>	<p>Noted. Our work is to give a broad overview of character and where possible we have identified historic features through the archaeology layer or the historic character layer of the interactive map. Any more would require extensive research which we cannot undertake. A local history will add flesh on the bones of our appraisal.</p>
<p>The "vicarage" to the east of the coal chutes was originally built as the private residence of the Sugden family who were the local coal merchants. The extent of the property included the above mentioned coal chutes. It was known as Holme Bank and did not become a vicarage until May 1936. It is now once again a private residence and no longer a Vicarage. This needs amending in the appraisal.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>The "vicarage" is located by the canal aqueduct – the eastern part of which lies within Kildwick and needs to be included within the conservation area. The aqueduct dates back to 1774 and is grade 2 listed. It is one of the earliest structures on the Leeds Liverpool canal, this stretch being the first to be completed. Very few aqueducts were built due to the expense of construction and it is therefore of significance not only to Kildwick but the Leeds Liverpool Canal in its entirety.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Kirkgate House, the building closest to the aqueduct on Kirkgate was until 1935 The Ship Inn so named because of its associations with the canal and can be traced back in documents to at least the first half of the 18th century but most likely pre-dates this.</p>	<p>As above</p>

<p>The Wharf Mill buildings (now housing) are referred to in the appraisal but their significance in relation to the wider canal heritage is not drawn out. These date back to the building of the canal in 1774.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>The northern half of character area 1 is steeped in canal history yet this is not accurately reflected in the appraisal and needs addressing. The properties on Main Road are described as Victorian yet a study of earlier maps/documents would confirm they are much older as would a visual inspection of the properties by a heritage expert. Although some features such as windows have been altered, and an old date stone of 1672 replaced with a modern version, sufficient architectural features of the period remain to affirm this date.</p>	<p>As above and in relation to the Parish Council's first comment below.</p>
<p>1.1 Character Area 2 At 1.4 - the medieval river bridge (constructed 1305-1313) has been omitted from the list of key buildings and structures. It is classified as an ancient monument as well as being grade 1 listed and should therefore be included. At 1.5 – although Farnhill is the larger settlement it is incorrect to say many of the services for both settlements are found there as the reverse is true. The institute which serves both villages is in Farnhill, but the school, church, pub and parish rooms are all in Kildwick.</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>
<p>Extension of this conservation area, or creation of a further area should be considered to protect the open countryside that separates this part of Kildwick from neighbouring Silsden. Although the Grange is today associated with the cluster of houses contained within this appraisal, the whole area towards the boundary has been known for centuries as Kildwick Grange and has barely changed. For example the field patterns and locations of farms to the north and south of Skipton Road at Crossmoor and Woodside which are located at the western boundary are the same today as they were 400 years ago according to documentary evidence (maps and indentures dating back to 1623).</p>	<p>We are now recommending that the two conservation areas are conflated into one and the area divided into separate character areas as outlined in our recommendation 8.</p>

<p>I hope the above will be of assistance and would urge that the recommendations in the conservation area appraisals to undertake further research be actioned. This should be done by a qualified heritage officer who has a proper knowledge and understanding of the area. It should also include a broader range of source documentation and more thorough field work than has been undertaken to date. I would also request that Kildwick Parish Meeting and the Kildwick and Farnhill Local History Group (history@farnhill.co.uk) be given the opportunity to comment on the updated draft appraisals before they are finalised.</p>				<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The ancient township and parish of Kildwick contains a number of important buildings and features which define the character and heritage of the area. This must be fully and accurately reflected in the conservation area appraisals so that future development proposals and planning decisions are fully informed and the character of the area is protected.</p>				<p>Noted.</p>
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
Comment				AB Response
8/12/2020	Jenny Scott	Resident		
<p>Please note: I downloaded a current-version Acrobat Reader on to a 2020 MacBook Air, as per instructions. I was unable to view the interactive maps. On an IMac (OS X 10.9.5) and a current-version Acrobat Reader I eventually got access to the interactive maps. This took a considerable amount of time and experimentation. Following the instructions in your document did not work.</p>				<p>We are aware that some people have had trouble downloading this document. We have revised the instructions and reformatted the document.</p>

<p>Correction: The road east from the top of Starkey Lane is labelled 'Skipton Road. But is actually Grange Road at least at its junction with Starkey Lane. There, a street nameplate is affixed to the wall of Grange Road, outside Stonegate Cottage.</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>
<p>Pg 8 and pg 13 The Old Priory</p> <p>I would suggest that The Old Priory plus adjacent buildings immediately south and surrounding fields need special consideration and protection. This ancient building is regularly admired and remarked upon by visitors. Not only in present times, but as evidenced by old postcards.</p> <p>The Old Priory and its adjacent buildings to the south are just within the current conservation area. But their setting would be ruined by development in adjacent fields. Therefore I would suggest that the boundary of the conservation area be extended to the east by at least one field away from The Old Priory.</p> <p>And well, this listed building is a critical component of the historical development of Kildwick. Therefore I suggest it merits the special definition 'Key Building'. (there is an attached postcard)</p>	<p>Please see new Recommendation 1</p>
<p>Pg 8 and pg 14 map layer TPO's</p> <p>Land north of Grange Road (labelled as Skipton Road on your map) supports many sizeable trees. Among others, those opposite my house are TPO'd. They contribute to views up (ie north) from the lower village and indeed from further afield. They provide a visual boundary and backdrop, and also a significant wildlife habitat. Recent tree felling this spring (emergency permission) was perhaps unavoidable. But it is regrettable that most of the work could not be delayed until after the bird breeding season. There was a rookery in those trees for generations, which now appears abandoned.</p>	<p>The TPO layer is now added to the interactive map</p>

<p>Pg 7 and pg 16 Canal corridor</p> <p>When one leaves Silsden on Skipton Road heading west towards Kildwick Grange And Kildwick, there is an immediate and noticeable change from industrial/urban/suburban West Yorkshire to rural/village-community North Yorkshire.</p> <p>The road passes through open fields with many wide and distant views to the south over the Aire Valley.</p> <p>This 'sets the scene' for the approach to the hamlet of Kildwick Grange and for Kildwick itself. There is a risk of ribbon development, which would be detrimental. In my opinion, this largely unspoilt approach towards Kildwick Grange and Kildwick itself is very valuable.</p> <p>It is deserving of protection in terms of its landscape beauty and should be so classified. Kildwick Grange and Kildwick should retain their characters as being different from and separated from Silsden.</p>	<p>We are now recommending that the two conservation areas (Farnhill and Kildwick) are conflated into one and the area divided into separate character areas as outlined in our recommendation 8.</p> <p>The new character areas and clearer open space should deal with these issues</p>
<p>KILDWICK, EXTERNAL LIGHTING.</p> <p>The assumption of the document appears to be concern with the environment as experienced by day.</p> <p>It now seems fashionable to illuminate the exterior of properties.</p> <p>This impacts wildlife - for instance owl activity has much declined near my property in the last year or so.</p> <p>The character of the environment is changed from rural to suburban. Perhaps this could be discouraged on new-build or conversion properties.</p>	<p>You are quite right but we are not sure a conservation area appraisal is the right place to push for this. Having said that, see Recommendation 3. We suggest that you might usefully pursue this matter via your local Councillor and examine how Article 4 Directions may help.</p>

<p>A GENERAL COMMENT ON DEVELOPMENT, WITH EXAMPLE. KILDWICK DOCUMENT p.12, para.3.</p> <p>Kildwick itself is very small - a population of around 200 at recent count. There has been a surge in new-build projects. Particularly disturbing: seven dwellings in the (now, former) Smithy Field, right at the centre of the village.</p>	<p>Noted and see amended text and interactive map</p>
<p>Your document rates this land as 'less important to the significance of the conservation area ... not particularly visible in important views'.</p> <p>Yet time and again I see visitors climb the steps to St.Andrew's churchyard, step into the churchyard and look around. Here is a perfectly obvious elevated position from which to admire the heart of the lower part of the village.</p> <p>In other words, the historical nucleus of 'character area 1'. Therefore, this IS an important view - but was not identified as such in the document.</p>	<p>The text and interactive map have been amended to take account of this very important point</p>
<p>That view to the east is now dominated by new-build which towers over the ancient buildings of the Old Smithy. At one time every village had a smithy and most of those would have had an adjacent field for horses awaiting shoeing - virtually all of which have succumbed to 'infill development'. Kildwick's Smithy Field was a rare survivor, enhancing the tranquil feel of the village centre. Now, very regrettably - and to the frustration of residents - lost to yet more housing.</p>	<p>Noted but this is a matter for Craven's Development Management Service and Local Plan Policy. Hopefully the revised conservation area appraisal will help.</p>
<p>I cite this in order to illustrate how easy it is to disregard or belittle this or that piece of land, or building. It is not sufficient to protect only buildings, views, etc. They only make sense when viewed in their surroundings.</p>	<p>As above and see revised open space and interactive map.</p>

Therefore, those surroundings must also be protected.				
For its size, Kildwick has already had too much new-build development. I would hope that its integrity will be properly defended against future unsuitable applications. Otherwise - there is absolutely no point in these conservation area appraisals.				Noted.
(There are images of Smithy Field before and during development) Initially proposed as as a development with detached houses - refused, appealed, refused. Re-submitted as a pastiche-designed row of seven. Narrowly passed after intervention with counsel's opinion. Then upgraded to include two big detached houses anyway! Such developments are absolutely out of character.				As above
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
16/11/2020	Mr K Midgley	Kildwick Parish Council		
Comment				AB Response
This appraisal is some five years old and consequently there have been many important changes during this period including the Parish Boundaries. There have also been some very important omissions which need to be recognised.				Noted, the text and interactive map have been amended to take account of public comments as has the impact of time since our original assessment in 2016. We were not commissioned at the time to undertake public consultation.

<p>The Appraisal recognises certain areas (marked in purple) which give a strong contribution to the character of the area. We feel however that this has not gone far enough and should include the brown areas of 'some contribution' and much more, for example the canal corridor has been completely ignored which is remarkable as it is such a unique feature in both Kildwick and Farnhill and so important to the character of both villages.</p>	<p>Noted, the text and interactive map have been amended to take account of public comments.</p>
<p>Some of the canal features are increasingly important ie the ancient coal chutes, the house that used to be the Vicarage and was built by Mr Sugden the coal merchant who also built the coal chutes, the canal aqueduct which is Grade II listed and rare, and the Parson's Bridge Grade II listed. These features are within 300 yards of each other in the centre of the villages. Kirkgate House used to be the 'Ship Inn' and is adjacent to the Aqueduct. Wharf Mill at Barrett's Bridge is yet another important building.</p>	<p>Noted. Our work is to give a broad overview of character and where possible we have identified historic features through the archaeology layer or the historic character layer of the interactive map. Any more would require extensive research which we cannot undertake. A local history will add flesh on the bones of our appraisal. Please see the new Recommendation 1 which we hope the Parish Council will act on.</p>
<p>The land to the north of Grange Road (wrongly named Skipton Road in the Appraisal) is agricultural land with large trees which are important as they form the visual horizon when looking up from the valley and must be protected.</p>	<p>Text has been amended</p>
<p>Grange Road runs from Kildwick Hall east to the Grange and on to the Kildwick border with Silsden, and the countryside on each side of it is very important and provides a beautiful setting for the Grange and the entrance to North Yorkshire from Bradford Met. This unspoilt pasture land to the north and south of Grange/Skipton Road from the Silsden border to Kildwick is particularly vulnerable and needs extra protection as it is divided into small- holdings which encourages all the owners to try to develop them.</p>	<p>Noted, the text and interactive map have been amended to take account of public comments.</p>

<p>The eastern boundary of Kildwick Parish is the Silsden boundary where the change from urban Bradford to rural North Yorkshire is very obvious and very important to protect as it defines the difference between the two counties.</p>	<p>We are now recommending that the two conservation areas (Farnhill and Kildwick) are conflated into one and the area divided into separate character areas as outlined in our recommendation 8.</p> <p>The new character areas and clearer open space should deal with these issues</p>
<p>In the centre of Kildwick the Parish boundaries have changed in the last five years, with the houses on Kirkgate that used to be in Farnhill now in Kildwick, thus simplifying the Parish border.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Development in future, in order to protect both Kildwick and Farnhill's unique Heritage should be a lot stricter, particularly to prevent important historic features being damaged by thoughtless development driven by the search for profit at the expense of the communities that live here and the historic settings. This particularly applies to the ribbon development from the Silsden border and the Green Wedge between Kildwick and Farnhill. Planners should feel free to say no to these developments and feel they have the backing of the Craven Plan to rely on.</p>	<p>As above and, the Parish Council needs to continue to be proactive in terms of development management and Local Plan Policy. Hopefully the revised conservation area appraisal will help.</p>
<p>Protecting the entrance to North Yorkshire from Bradford Met is such an important thing to do as it is a very dramatic change, it must be protected.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Farnhill border with Kildwick to the west towards Skipton is another area that is being eroded and must be protected in future.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>In the past 5 years Kildwick has had 22 houses built within the Parish. Most of these houses have been well built but nevertheless have damaged the village and heritage in which they are set.</p>	<p>As above</p>

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Five houses at the Grange - well made nice houses but out of character and overpowering in their setting with little in their design to reflect the housing in the Grange. 2. Four houses at Deep Spring, Grange Road – well built attractive houses but far too many for the size of the site. 3. Seven houses in Smithy field in the centre of Kildwick – well made attractive cottages but dominate the surrounding 18th century cottages and the ancient setting of the Grade 1 listed church. Also built on a field that was the jewel in the crown of the conservation area in this part of the village, against massive opposition and against all the guidelines in the Craven Plan. 4. Finally, three houses behind the school offer very little in design terms or quality and are at odds with Wharf Mill and the canal corridor here and do no favours to the view of the Grade 1 listed church in the background particularly when viewed from Priest Bank. 5. Other developments were barn conversions 	<p>Agreed. Much has happened since we first appraised Kildwick in 2016. We are aware of negative changes made between 2016 and 2022/23. This has been a matter for the development management service and the parish council we suggest.</p>
<p>The particular building schemes I have mentioned are to show how easy it is to damage an important heritage area particularly when whatever anybody does to object to it including Parish Councillors, District Councillors, County Councillors, Craven Plan and public opinion it still goes through and does all the damage everyone predicted.</p>	<p>We agree but this is a matter between the Parish Council and Craven District Council (North Yorkshire Council) and not the Conservation Area Appraisal.</p>
<p>If we are to protect our very valuable heritage in the future, which we must as it is going to become even more important to all of us including local councils, tourist boards etc we must stop development that is damaging the area or leads to it being damaged by ribbon development and say no to such plans and support local parish councils/meetings and Craven Plan, a lot more than in the past.</p>	<p>As above .</p>

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
13/12/2020	Helen Moran	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>The opportunity for the conservation area appraisals to be revisited is very welcome as those for Kildwick are in need of updating – not just to take account of recent developments but also to address the omissions and inaccuracies that have been present from when these were first produced. This is important to ensure that the heritage and character of the area is accurately reflected and can be properly protected for the future benefit of all. A refresh of the documents will ensure that officers and planning committee members have robust and accurate information on which to base advice, recommendations and decisions, as the current draft documents cannot be relied upon.</p>				<p>We are now recommending that the two conservation areas are conflated into one and the area divided into separate character areas as outlined in our recommendation 8.</p>
<p>General comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Priest Bank Road is incorrectly spelt throughout. - The boundary of the conservation area needs amending to include that part of Farnhill now in Kildwick. - Descriptions need amending to take account of the number of new properties built in the parish since the draft appraisals were first written - There are a number of omissions and inaccuracies – further details 				<p>Text amended where necessary and the conservation area boundary is the same as supplied by Craven. See our recommendation 8 for review of boundary. We are suggesting that Kildwick and Farnhill become one Conservation Area</p>

<p>1.1 Character Area 1</p> <p>The Local Plan highlights the importance of the canal corridor yet the importance of this in Kildwick is completely understated. Many of the features in the northern part of area 1 are associated with the canal and have collectively shaped the character and appearance of the village. Their individual and collective significance should be reflected in the appraisal:</p>	<p>The interactive mapping has been strengthened and the text has been amended where possible</p>
<p>There is no mention of the canal chutes which are an important and unique feature in the area and are circa late 19th century in date. They have been well-conserved and are a fine example of their type. I am not aware of other chutes like this in Craven but if you know of any please let me know.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>The “vicarage” to the east of the coal chutes was originally built as the private residence of the Sugden family who were the local coal merchants. The extent of the property included the above mentioned coal chutes. It was known as Holme Bank and did not become a vicarage until May 1936. It is now once again a private residence and no longer a Vicarage. This needs amending in the appraisal.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>The “vicarage” is located by the canal aqueduct – the eastern part of which lies within Kildwick and needs to be included within the conservation area. The aqueduct dates back to 1774 and is grade 2 listed. It is one of the earliest structures on the Leeds Liverpool canal, this stretch being the first to be completed. Very few aqueducts were built due to the expense of construction and it is therefore of significance not only to Kildwick but the Leeds Liverpool Canal in its entirety.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Kirkgate House, the building closest to the aqueduct on Kirkgate was until 1935 The Ship Inn so named because of its associations with the canal and can be traced back in documents to at least the first half of the 18th century but most likely pre-dates this.</p>	<p>As above</p>

<p>The Wharf Mill buildings (now housing) are referred to in the appraisal but their significance in relation to the wider canal heritage is not drawn out. These date back to the building of the canal in 1774.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>The northern half of character area 1 is steeped in canal history yet this is not accurately reflected in the appraisal and needs addressing.</p> <p>The properties on Main Road are described as Victorian yet a study of earlier maps/documents would confirm they are much older as would a visual inspection of the properties by a heritage expert. Although some features such as windows have been altered, and an old date stone of 1672 replaced with a modern version, sufficient architectural features of the period remain to affirm this date.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>1.1 Character Area 2</p> <p>At 1.4 - the medieval river bridge (constructed 1305-1313) has been omitted from the list of key buildings and structures. It is classified as an ancient monument as well as being grade 1 listed and should therefore be included.</p> <p>At 1.5 – although Farnhill is the larger settlement it is incorrect to say many of the services for both settlements are found there as the reverse is true. The institute which serves both villages is in Farnhill, but the school, church, pub and parish rooms are all in Kildwick.</p>	<p>As above</p>

<p>Extension of this conservation area, or creation of a further area should be considered to protect the open countryside that separates this part of Kildwick from neighbouring Silsden. Although the Grange is today associated with the cluster of houses contained within this appraisal, the whole area towards the boundary has been known for centuries as Kildwick Grange and has barely changed. For example the field patterns and locations of farms to the north and south of Skipton Road at Crossmoor and Woodside which are located at the western boundary are the same today as they were 400 years ago according to documentary evidence (maps and indentures dating back to 1623).</p>	<p>Apart from our recommendation that Kildwick is merged with Farnhill we are not recommending any extensions. We think that within the constraints of Conservation Area legislation and Local Policy, our assessment of the boundary is appropriate</p>
<p>I hope the above will be of assistance and would urge that the recommendations in the conservation area appraisals to undertake further research be actioned. This should be done by a qualified heritage officer who has a proper knowledge and understanding of the area. It should also include a broader range of source documentation and more thorough field work than has been undertaken to date. I would also request that Kildwick Parish Meeting and the Kildwick and Farnhill Local History Group (history@farnhill.co.uk) be given the opportunity to comment on the updated draft appraisals before they are finalised.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>The ancient township and parish of Kildwick contains a number of important buildings and features which define the character and heritage of the area. This must be fully and accurately reflected in the conservation area appraisals so that future development proposals and planning decisions are fully informed and the character of the area is protected.</p>	<p>Noted and text amended where possible.</p>

Craven public responses – review notes and AB responses

Kildwick Grange

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
---------------	------	--------------	---------	--

13/12/2020	Helen Moran	Resident		
Comment			AB Response	
<p>The opportunity for the conservation area appraisals to be revisited is very welcome as those for Kildwick are in need of updating – not just to take account of recent developments but also to address the omissions and inaccuracies that have been present from when these were first produced. This is important to ensure that the heritage and character of the area is accurately reflected and can be properly protected for the future benefit of all. A refresh of the documents will ensure that officers and planning committee members have robust and accurate information on which to base advice, recommendations and decisions, as the current draft documents cannot be relied upon.</p>			<p>Edited to take account of changes since 2016 and corrections made.</p>	
<p>Kildwick Grange In 1.0 the description that the houses are “enclosed within woodland” is misleading. This suggests the houses are surrounded by woodland on all sides but this is not the case – please see the map. Also, the beck runs through the western part of the Grange – not the centre. In 1.1 the description of the area being an “enclave surrounded by trees” is inaccurate. Both 1.1 & 1.2 need updating to include development to the east – sadly these new properties with their blue slate rooves are at odds with, and add nothing to, the character of the conservation area.</p>			<p>Edited to take account of changes since 2016 and corrections made.</p>	
<p>At 1.2 The modern agricultural buildings no longer exist – they have been replaced by the new housing referred to above.</p>			<p>Edited to take account of changes since 2016 and corrections made.</p>	
<p>At 1.3 the description of materials and palette are out of date and need updating to reference the new development e.g. modern style with blue slate roofing material</p>			<p>Edited to take account of changes since 2016 and corrections made.</p>	

<p>At 1.5 the statement that Kildwick Grange was established at the same time as the rest of the village in the 14th century is incorrect. The township of Kildwick pre-dates the grange and monastic involvement. Past renovations of the church revealed pre- norman carved stones which are on display in the church and have been documented in the Yorkshire Archaeological Journal. In the Domesday book of 1086 Kildwick is named as only one of two places in Craven where there is a church – the other being Long Preston.</p>	<p>Edited to take account of changes since 2016 and corrections made.</p>
--	---

Craven public responses – review notes and AB responses

Lothersdale

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
13/05/2018	Joshua Parkinson	Development Management Team, Craven District Council		
Comment				AB Response
<p>have noticed (or rather an applicant) has noticed an issue with the 'Lothersdale Conservation Area Appraisal July 2016'. The map of the conservation area shows MF1 as looking towards Burlington Farm through the gap between Burlington House and 13 Dale End. However, neither the description nor the photograph on page 18 correspond with the map</p>				<p>Agreed. The mapped view is wrongly located. This will be corrected.</p>

Low Bentham

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
8/12/2020	Trevor Blackwell	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>I am writing to suggest that an important area of Low Bentham has been missed out of the proposed Low Bentham Conservation Area, and that it should be included. I am referring to the Calf Cop Quaker Meeting House and adjoining fields. The Meeting House is situated up a path on the left of the Burton Road, about a mile up the road past the Sundial pub, at LA2 7ET.</p>				<p>Agreed. The proposed boundary has been amended to take account of these comments. An archaeological layer has also been added to the interactive map to record the burial ground.</p>
<p>This Quaker Meeting House is the second oldest religious building in Bentham, with the building in its present form dating back to the 1790s, when it was built to replace and then extend a Meeting House built in 1718 (which is the date over the door). It is a very attractive Grade 2 listed building which is currently being considered for upgrade to Grade 2 star, and it has wonderful views over the surrounding countryside in all directions. At the back of the Meeting House is a burial ground, and to the left there are allotments which are used by local people mainly to grow vegetables. There is an air of great tranquillity in this setting. The Society of Friends is still active locally and holds a Meeting for Worship in the Meeting House every Sunday. This is an area that merits conservation.</p>				<p>As above.</p>
<p>It is also important to include the next field lower down in the conservation area. This field is the site of the original Meeting House and earlier Quaker burial ground, which ceased to be used about 1750, and contains a stone marker which commemorates this. (I think it was in this field at Town Head that the first Quaker Meetings were held in a barn in the 1680s. Before that Bentham Quakers met in private houses.) The field is owned by the Meeting and is currently on a long lease to a local farmer.</p>				<p>As above.</p>

<p>The records of the Meeting, which are kept at the Brotherton Library at Leeds University, show that Quakerism has had a very long history in Bentham, stretching back to the very beginnings of Quakerism in the 1650s, and has had a significant influence on the life of the village. For example, the Ford family, who set up the silk mill in Low Bentham, were Quakers, and pioneered better working conditions at the mill and worker representatives on the board. In the 1914-1918 War Bentham had an unusually large number of Conscientious Objectors, partly because of the influence of this Meeting House (this history is currently being documented by the historian Cyril Pearce of Leeds University), and in the 1939-1945 War Bentham Quakers were involved in the setting up of a centre in Bentham for evacuees.</p> <p>I hope therefore that you will consider extending the Low Bentham Conservation Area a little way up the Burton Road to include this historic Meeting House and its surroundings.</p>	<p>As above.</p>
---	------------------

Craven public responses – review notes and AB responses

Low Bradley

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
14/12/2020	Mags Smith	Bradleys Both Parish Council		
Comment				AB Response

<p>The principal purposes of the act is to establish areas of special Historical Interest or Architectural Interest which it is desirable to protect and conserve. The establishing of these sites is in the responsibility of the local planning Authority. The setting up of these areas has been successful in many areas preserving land and buildings that might otherwise have been built on or destroyed. The cottages on the East of Crag Lane, were to be removed in the post war years due to the poor facilities but survived until they were brought under the protection of the Civic Amenities Act and enjoy the protection of the Conservation area where they have been refurbished to comply with present day standard</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>The designation of a site as a conservation area also extends to protecting plants and trees. Owners of land within the preservation area which contain trees will have to apply to the Local Authority for permission to remove or prune a tree. The Authority will consider the contribution that the tree makes to the area prior to granting permission to carry out the work.</p>	<p>See amended recommendations</p>
<p>Alteration to built property however small may require the consent of the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Landscape and open views may also be significant in assessment of a conservation area in determining the best perspective of a chosen historical object or the best vantage point of a geographical phenomena .</p> <p>Displaying of advertising boards or the flying of flags within a conservation area may prompt the seeking of advice of the Local Authority.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>The Parish Council are increasingly concerned at the speculative house building which is taking place in Low Bradley and is beginning to surround the old village which contains the areas of historic interest. New house buildings are beginning to crowd all corners of the conservation area. The whole purpose of the designation of this village of comfortable and sturdily built cottages and houses together with its Listed Buildings as a Conservation Area appears to have been lost by the local planners.</p>	<p>We accept that there has been change since we undertook our appraisal in 2015/16 and text has been amended to reflect this.</p>

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
14/12/2020	Edward Coulson	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>I have only just, and very much at the last minute, been alerted to the existence of this consultation even though it directly affects the area in which I live. That seems to me a most unsatisfactory situation and, in the circumstances, I have copied this email to our local councillor, Andy Brown, so that he is aware of the position.</p>				<p>We appraised the conservation area in 2015/16 and were not given any responsibility for public consultation.</p>
<p>As I understand it, the August 2016 document regarding the Low Bradley Conservation Area is in some way supposed to be the subject of the consultation although the scope and nature of the exercise remains wholly unclear on your website. That makes any sensible comment difficult.</p>				<p>We appraised the conservation area in 2015/16 and were not given any responsibility for public consultation.</p>
<p>The one conclusion of the earlier document with which I entirely agree is that the landscape history of Low Bradley (and indeed High Bradley) needs further investigation. In particular, the existing landscape combines the remnants of a medieval landscape including the area of the old medieval manorial demesne below High Bradley and stretching down to Low Bradley and other areas of apparently medieval origin above the canal to the north of Ings Lane with extensive pre-Enclosure Act enclosures, embracing much of the area around Low Bradley of (so far as I am aware) entirely unknown origin, with the product of the Bradley Enclosure Act of 1791 which affected the Ings (mostly but not exclusively land to the west of the current A629 (in itself a late eighteenth century diversion of the old toll road running through Bradley and following the course of the current B road from Silsden to Skipton), Low Bradley Common (land mostly to the south of Jackson's Lane) and High Bradley Common (land above and to the south of High Bradley).</p>				<p>We have strengthened the archaeology and history on the interactive map.</p>

<p>Given the almost complete lack of knowledge of this diverse and complex landscape heritage, it would be most unwise to tinker with the existing heritage area or to erode it in any significant way. You will see from what I have said above that it probably needs to be extended significantly rather than reduced – which for any number of reasons would be a most unfortunate turn of events.</p>				<p>We are recommending that the conservation area boundary remains unchanged. Planning Officers and their conservation advisors should give weight to the setting of the conservation area, especially where we are saying the contribution made is strong. We note that there has been development (between 2016 and 2020) in areas we highlighted as making a strong contribution to the character and significance of the conservation area.</p>
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
13/12/2020	Lyn and Andrew Binns	resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>The appraisal is already out of date in view of recent developments in the village e.g. the Matthew Lane development on land highlighted as making a strong contribution to the character/appearance to the conservation area. Many open views over the village from the canal or from higher ground have been severely impacted by this development</p>				<p>We note that there has been development (between 2016 and 2020) in areas we highlighted as making a strong contribution to the character and significance of the conservation area.</p>
<p>Dynamic views/ views of a feature have also been affected by the building of a structure on the canal and significantly altering a wall in front of view MF5</p>				<p>Agreed, we will investigate</p>
<p>Recent developments within the conservation area and Browns Court have significantly increased congestion along Ings Lane northwards towards the Methodist church, meaning that the photograph MF6 is totally misleading with parking on the footpaths on both sides being the norm. Congestion within the conservation area is a major road safety issue especially for wheelchair users or children's pushchairs</p>				<p>We agree that much has changed since we undertook the original appraisal in 2016. Many of the photographs have been updated and the text and interactive mapping has been amended where possible.</p>

<p>Our major concern is the appraisal's lack of awareness of the origins of low Bradley, focusing mainly on the Mills (one of which was allowed to be demolished for residential development within the last 20 years) and 19th century developments as opposed to the much earlier farming origins, as indicated by the number of listed 17th Century buildings</p>	<p>Amended historical text and further layers on the interactive map.</p>
<p>It is acknowledged that Low Bradley was built up at "College" i.e. College Road – the name referring back to the Dissolution of the Monasteries in the early 1500's and that the farm at College House was already paying rent to Bolton Priory as early as the Domesday Book.</p>	<p>Not really part of the appraisal but there is amended historical text and further layers on the interactive map</p>
<p>In addition to the Old Hall there are four other 17th century listed buildings on College Road.</p>	<p>See amended historical text and further layers on the interactive map</p>
<p>We are amazed that this historic part of the village receives little focus in the appraisal. With this in mind we would suggest that the view from the southern end of College Road is included as a Highly Significant Fixed View, to include the view south east across the open field in front of College House to the Village Cemetery- this is the only view of the cemetery from any public road in Low Bradley. This opinion is supported by a previous planning statement from Craven District Council which highlighted the importance of retaining this open visual aspect and boundary wall by stressing its value in preserving and enhancing the character of the conservation area and reducing any element of urbanization in this part of the village. This designation for the view would also include and protect the spatial foreground to four listed buildings and the special vista to High Bradley, again unique to this particular part of the conservation area.</p>	<p>Although the cemetery is outwith the conservation area we have investigated both the potential view and extending the conservation area. We have concluded that although of some significance and importance, extending the conservation area and identifying a new view will not make a substantial contribution to the appraisal. Therefore, we have concluded that no action is to be proposed by us.</p>
<p>The tight knit and dense nature of the conservation area as described in the appraisal, together with recent residential developments within its boundaries mean that the conservation area has reached saturation point from a vehicular and aesthetic point of view and that the remaining open spaces should be protected to maintain and preserve the unique character of the ancient village</p>	<p>Agreed and we have tried to capture this. Please see revised text and enhanced recommendations.</p>

Craven public responses – review notes and AB responses

Thornton in Craven

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
12/12/2020	Cllr Richard Pringle	Craven District Council Ward Councillor for Carleton and Thornton		
Comment				AB Response
In Thornton again the feeling is that the recommendations of the Expert Consultants should be implemented. There the PC are keen to deal with speeding traffic, which to my surprise, is covered in the consultant's report.				Noted and thank you
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
4/11/2020	Martin Lockyer	Resident		
Comment				AB Response

<p>I agree that the recommendations in Section 5.0 of the Thornton-in-Craven Conservation Area Appraisal August 2016 appraisal should be included in the Craven Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring forward proposals to extend the Conservation Area boundary to include the important historic enclosures between Booth Bridge Lane and Old Road, the field between Old Road and the A56, and the former railway bridge on Old Lane including this stretch of Old Lane. • Opportunities for further traffic calming through the village including a 20mph speed restriction should be considered. 				Noted and thank you
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
5/11/2020	Steven Briggs	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
<p>I believe that the appraisal of Thornton in Craven back in 2016 and its recommendations have not been implemented. Please can this be done In particular the following -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring forward proposals to extend the Conservation Area boundary to include the important historic enclosures between Booth Bridge Lane and Old Road, the field between Old Road and the A56, and the former railway bridge on Old Lane including this stretch of Old Lane. • Opportunities for further traffic calming through the village including a 20mph speed restriction should be considered. 				Noted and thank you
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	

5/11/2020	Mags Smith	Thornton in Craven parish council		
Comment				AB Response
<p>Following the Council meeting on 4th November Thornton in Craven Parish Council agreed that the recommendations in Section 5.0 of the Thornton-in-Craven Conservation Area Appraisal August 2016 appraisal should be included in the Craven Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring forward proposals to extend the Conservation Area boundary to include the important historic enclosures between Booth Bridge Lane and Old Road, the field between Old Road and the A56, and the former railway bridge on Old Lane including this stretch of Old Lane. • Opportunities for further traffic calming through the village including a 20mph speed restriction should be considered. 				Noted and thank you
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
10/12/2020	Mark Rushworth	North Yorkshire County Council		
Comment				AB Response
<p>This appraisal does not include reference to the site of the Old Hall, a little to the west of the proposed extension (pdf layer 1893-4 layer). We would suggest that this should be considered for inclusion.</p>				Included in OP2 (strong contribution) and historic map layer (as noted).
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
11/2/2019	John Tomlinson	Resident		

Comment	AB Response
Why does this report refer to the Shipley to Colne Railway? Does it mean Skipton to Colne Railway?	Text amended

Craven public responses – review notes and AB responses

Settle to Carlisle

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
27/10/2020	Ann Shadrake	Friends of the Dales		
Comment				AB Response
Whilst the general thrust of the Conservation Area proposals for the Settle-Carlisle Railway Conservation Area is much appreciated, Friends of the Dales do have concerns about the summary of issues concerning the main negative factors, problems and pressures for the Settle-Carlisle Railway Conservation Area.				Text amended
The first thing to note is that the link to the full YDNPA appraisal as listed in your document is incorrect. The correct link is https://www.yorkshiredales.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/13/2019/10/careview-settlecarlislerailway-full-final.pdf				Link changed

<p>It is important to note the negative issues listed in that YDNPA appraisal, as they were carefully considered at the time (2010) and have shown that, if ignored as they have often been since that time, the negative impact on the Conservation Area has been significant. In particular, the exemptions granted to the various utilities and organisations have resulted in some ugly structures that have appeared along the National Park's section of this conservation area, for example at Ribblehead and especially at Horton Station. Buildings totally out of keeping were put up without consultation. It is therefore important that the section on the negative issues in the Appraisal is amplified.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>The following should be included in that section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> presenting a welcoming appearance of the line and its setting, especially around the station areas, so people come and visit <input type="checkbox"/> repairing and modernising – including alterations and extensions – historic structures by using compatible materials and techniques and good design <input type="checkbox"/> finding appropriate uses for redundant structures safekeeping the archaeology of the railway and nearby <input type="checkbox"/> controlling interference with the natural landscape setting of the line, including the fragile rail-verge botany, caused by new plantings, stabilisation or maintenance works, site access points, and overhead power lines <input type="checkbox"/> retaining the character of the line while adopting modern operational and health-and-safety standards for both passenger and freight traffic. 	<p>Management recommendations have been revised and expanded</p>

<p>Actions. Some of these issues can be addressed through statutory action by Craven District Council. By expanding the current designated boundary, important features which are currently excluded will receive protection. In addition, Article 4 directions could provide stricter controls on alterations within the Conservation Area.</p>				<p>The boundary was reviewed but no changes were considered appropriate</p>
<p>Another concern in this appraisal is the disregard of secondary structures. A large number of minor structures were built along the Settle-Carlisle Railway, such as fog huts, platelayer's huts and others, generally referred to as Permanent Way (PW) huts, many of which only just survive. They are usually built from local resources and vary from vernacular buildings to specific designs. The ones which survive range in age from the building of the line in the 19th century to just before WWII. They have no architectural pretensions, but they are an essential part of the character and appearance of the railway corridor. At the time of the YDNPA appraisal a survey of these important structures was requested, but the then line operator replied that they should all be demolished as they present a terrorist threat. No explanation was given how this threat could manifest itself and many secondary structures have deteriorated since. (there are images in the original document)</p>				<p>Text amended</p>
<p>All these details should be included in Section 5 of this appraisal, which should be much more detailed and call for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) a full survey of secondary structures along the line and (b) greater protection against unsightly clutter and unsuitable building. <p>That section should at least include the concerns found in the YDNPA appraisal, as listed under 3 and 4 in this letter.</p>				<p>Appraisal recommends creation of a Local List and more coordinated management of the Conservation Area</p>
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	

13/11/2020	Paul Cochrane	Resident		
Comment				AB Response
the map entitled 'Hellifield' is Settle; the map entitled 'Settle' is Hellifield.				Corrected
If there are important sight-lines, vistas and views of the railway, these be included in the conservation area too. The railway is a conservation asset to be both looked AT and FROM.				Views section revised
Defining the area by the boundary of the embankments and cuttings offers minimal protection, little more than the railway fencing that secures these areas already.				Boundary review concluded present boundary is appropriate
The integration of this new conservation area with the existing conservation area in Settle should be discussed in the text. This exercise would identify the unprotected areas between the National Park and the existing Settle Conservation Area that need to be conserved for the continued enjoyment of the railway.				This is not a new conservation area. Future reviews can consider designation of other parts of Settle
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
8/11/2020	Mark Harvey	SCRA		
Comment				AB Response

<p>I coordinate a small independent group of volunteers who've been working hard since 2012 to "identify, catalogue and create a comprehensive record of key railway-related sites and structures within (or associated with) the Settle - Carlisle Railway Conservation Area (SCRCA)" and "to facilitate and encourage the interpretation and public enjoyment" of this fascinating area. Full details of our project - and the results to date - can be viewed via the SCRCA web-portal at: https://scrca.foscl.org.uk/</p>	<p>This fantastic resource is acknowledged and linked in the revised version of the Appraisal.</p> <p>Additional landmark structures have been identified in the revised version of the Appraisal as a result of this evidence</p>
<p>As a result of our work, we've acquired a unique perspective of the conservation area and a reasonable understanding of the challenges associated with managing it. We've also become acutely aware that the SCRCA has changed significantly since its designation in 1991. Based on our current knowledge, we've drawn-up a set of comments and suggestions (see attached). The headings double-up as an executive summary and they are as follows:</p>	
<p>The inclusion of the southernmost section within the boundary of the SCRCA needs to be explained / justified.</p> <p>B: A brief history of the southernmost section is required.</p> <p>C: The key 'character areas' within the SCRCA need to be defined, described and considered.</p> <p>D: Key changes since 1991 and 2010 need to be identified and reviewed.</p> <p>E: The conflicts between conservation and railway operation need to be acknowledged and managed.</p> <p>F: Long Preston Station warrants a higher profile.</p> <p>G: Suggested candidates for extra protection (e.g. listing and local listing). (There is an attached document with very detailed comments not included here)</p>	<p>Text amended – some good suggestions here</p>

Craven public responses – review notes and AB responses

General Comments

Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
7/12/2020	Fran Evans	CPRE		
Comment				AB Response
<p>The chosen format for the presentation of the documents, which relies on users having specific IT installations, will limit the usability of the documents and preclude many people from fully accessing the information contained therein. This is a missed opportunity as the content is useful. It would be helpful if the mapping layers could be made available as separate pages at the end of each appraisal so that this invaluable information is available to all. It would also enable hard copies to be provided which contained all the relevant information.</p>				<p>This has been dealt with in the 2022/23 versions</p>
<p>Notwithstanding the above, the CPRENY fully supports the adoption of each of the nineteen Conservation Area Appraisals. These documents will help both the Council and the local community manage development within the historic environment in a more informed and effective manner. The CPRENY also fully supports the designation of the three proposed Conservation Areas of Glusburn, High Bentham and Low Bentham.</p>				<p>Noted and thanks</p>
<p>The CPRENY would encourage the Council to pursue the making of Article 4 Directions within its Conservation Areas to limit the erosion of historic and architectural character which can occur through permitted development.</p>				<p>AB have beefed up the recommendations and Article 4 directions are noted.</p>

<p>The CPRENY seeks reassurance that no material amendments will be made to these documents, prior to adoption, other than to address factual errors or omissions, without further public consultation.</p>				<p>The documents have been amended to address factual errors and omissions, but have also been updated to take account of changes on the ground, and have been improved with things like additional map layers and beefed-up recommendations. As a result, the amendments enhance rather than diminish the documents, reflect public comments and ensure the documents' robustness.</p>
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
14/12/2020	Craig Broadwith	Historic England		
Comment				AB Response
<p>Thank you for consulting Historic England in connection with the draft appraisals for 16 existing conservation areas and 3 potential new conservation areas in Craven.</p> <p>Historic England sponsored and co-funded the Craven Conservation Areas Project, in partnership with Craven District Council in 2016, and provided detailed advice and comments on the draft appraisals throughout the duration of the project.</p> <p>We welcome the fact that all 19 draft appraisals informed the development of and were accepted into the evidence base for the Craven Local Plan. We fully endorse the content of all 19 Conservation Area Appraisals.</p> <p>We trust the above is satisfactory, and look forward to being notified of the formal adoption of all 19 Conservation Area Appraisals, and the designation of Glusburn, High Bentham and Low</p>				<p>Noted and thanks. Changes to the text and interactive mapping have been made following public consultation.</p>

Bentham.				
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
19/10/2020	No name	Marine Management Organisation		
Comment				AB Response
Thank you for including the MMO in your recent consultation submission. The MMO will review your document and respond to you directly should a bespoke response be required. If you do not receive a bespoke response from us within your deadline, please consider the following information as the MMO's formal response.				Noted and thanks.
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
10/12/2020	Mark Rushworth	NYCC		
Comment				AB Response
Officers have reviewed the documents and have the following comments from our Heritage Service: The interactive pdf maps are useful.				Noted and thanks.

<p>One of the things that is often missing from the Conservation Areas in general is the assessment of the immediate landscape setting in the form of strip fields etc and the contribution these make. We are pleased to see that this had been considered in one of the examples, Thornton-in Craven, where an extension is proposed for this very purpose. It is noted, however, that this appraisal does not include reference to the site of the Old Hall, a little to the west of the proposed extension (pdf layer 1893-4 layer). We would suggest that this should be considered for inclusion.</p>				<p>The have been significant changes to the text and interactive mapping following public and stakeholder consultation. Archaeology and Historic Character are now incorporated.</p>
<p>Most of the appraisals include the following recommendation 'Detailed analysis of building form and settlement character and morphology'. We would recommend that assessment of heritage assets of archaeological interest is also included.</p>				<p>As above.</p>
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
3/11/2020	Mark Roberts	North Yorks Police		
Comment				AB Response
<p>Many thanks for giving North Yorkshire Police the opportunity to take part in the above consultation. Having reviewed the associated documents I have no comments to make in relation to Designing Out Crime.</p>				<p>Noted.</p>
Date received	Name	Organisation	Contact	
30/11/2020	Gaby Rose	Yorkshire Dales National Park		
Comment				AB Response

<p>This is my consultation reply for any CAs affecting the National Park (Eastby, Embsay, Ingleton and the Settle-Carlisle Railway).</p>	
<p>The interactive maps are OK if you only want a digital document. We however found that paper copies are required for the elderly who don't have internet, and other people too may prefer a printed version. We also had hard copies in our offices, the village hall or church for consultation (I appreciate this is not possible at the moment due to Covid restrictions). Personally I would prefer to have the relevant map with each section, rather than scrolling back and forth and switching layers on and off.</p>	<p>Craven District Council provides information in alternative formats on request. This would include paper copies of the appraisals and map layers.</p>
<p>There are no character zones, condition assessment, and assessment of threats/detractors. The main focus seems to be on views and open spaces; however many of those have no photos.</p>	<p>There have been significant changes to the text and interactive mapping following public and stakeholder consultation. Archaeology and Historic Character are now incorporated. Some settlements have character areas where AB have felt they add value.</p>
<p>Photos are often poor quality and not annotated, so it is sometimes not clear what they are supposed to show.</p>	<p>New photos have been added.</p>
<p>There is no management plan, which should be integral to any CAA.</p>	<p>AB were not commissioned to undertake management plans but have beefed up the recommendations section.</p>

I am not convinced that the 'quick approach' is the way forward with conservation area appraisals. Besides its planning purposes, CAAs are also supposed to be educational documents for the stakeholders of such areas, so they need to be presented in an engaging manner and give more obscure details about the history of the place, to spark their residents' interest. Also, people like to pick at things that are not included in a CAA so you cannot be too inclusive. From my experience, local people can feel quite strongly about their CAs, and they are usually interested in the little details, whether it is historical facts or features, over which they can feel quite protective or just proud to have them in their area, and these are also elements which make a place unique and worth preserving.

The feedback AB have received elsewhere and from the public consultation on the Craven conservation areas suggests that the style of report is generally welcomed. Having said that, there have been significant changes to the text and interactive mapping following public and stakeholder consultation. The recommendations have been strengthened.