

# Craven Local Plan (Draft 5/4/16) Consultation

# Site Response Papers



The following tables provide a detailed summary of:

- Main issues raised in comments received
- The council's response on each issue
- Whether or not a change needs to be made to the draft plan
- Details of any changes made

**Jump to a settlement by clicking on its name**

**Jump back to previous pages by pressing the "Alt" and "←" keys together**

**Or navigate the document using the PDF bookmarks feature**

- Skipton
- Settle
- Bentham (High and Low)
- Glusburn and Cross Hills
- Ingleton
- Gargrave
- Burton
- Bradley
- Rathmell
- Cononley
- Carleton
- Cowling
- Embsay
- Farnhill and Kildwick
- Giggleswick
- Hellifield
- Sutton
- Langcliffe

## April – May 2016 Draft Local Plan

## Site Response Paper by Settlement: SKIPTON

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>SK013: East of Aldersley Avenue and south of Moorview Way</b>			
Partial development acceptable for retention of green corridor.	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SK013 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Skipton the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
Shown on Green Infrastructure map for Skipton			
Biodiversity risk and erosion of wildlife habitat.			
Site at risk of flooding including surface water			
Development effects of traffic generation on to Shortbank Road and Greatwood Estate			
Cumulative effects of all development sites on traffic generation on to Shortbank Road			
Erosion of greenbelt corridor and natural wildlife habitat			
Loss of view and light arising from development			
Impact on Roman Road			
Supporting comments			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>SK015: Cefn Glas and land to southeast, Shortbank Road</b>			
Partial development – keep to the building line	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SK015 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Skipton the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
Flood risk			
Development effects of traffic generation on to Shortbank Road			
Cumulative effects of all development sites on traffic generation on to Shortbank Road			
Heritage effects require consideration			
Skipton Town Council would prefer to see site removed			
Proximity to priority habitat			
<b>SK018: Land west of Whinny Gill Road (garages)</b>			
Allocation supported	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SK018 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis; however it does not pass all four District Level Analyses, as given the site size it is unlikely to deliver affordable housing. Therefore the site is not considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in</p>	No	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Skipton
Photographic record recommended			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
	the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
<b>SK044: Former allotments and garages, Broughton Road</b>			
Allocation supported as it will reduce pressure on greenfield sites	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.  Site SK044 passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Skipton, the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.  The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
Proximity to railway line			
Flood risk			
<b>SK049: East of A629; south of Sandylands, west of Carleton Road</b>			
Partial development for employment uses only	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.  Site SK049 - Although the site performs to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, the site is not deemed suitable to enter the Pool of Sites because the ELR recommends that this site should be considered for employment.  The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Skipton
Flood risk considerations			
Visible site. Create green area to shield cemetery			
Partial development sought due to heritage environmental issues			
Work to improve Engine Shed Lane required			
Urbanising effect on PROW			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
	the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
<b>SK052: Croft House, Carleton Road</b>			
Setting of Victorian Mill/villas	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SK052 is not suitable to undergo a Sustainability Analysis as the site has planning permission.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Skipton
Flood risk			
Congestion effects			
Important part of the Conservation Area			
No new build – kept to a minimum			
A distinctive Victorian Villa			
<b>SK058: Whitakers Chocolate Factory Site, Keighley Road</b>			
Prominent position on Keighley Road	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SK058 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Skipton the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a></p>	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
Valuable contribution to townscape			
Victorian dwellings should be incorporated into development of the site			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
	document.		
<b>SK060: Business premises and land west of Firth Street</b>			
Traffic effects arising from development – consider impact on Sackville Street	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.  Site SK060 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Skipton the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.  The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
Retain historic mill buildings			
Retain north light shed buildings and conversion of other buildings to retain variety of building types			
Important canal bank structure to be retrained			
<b>SK061: East of Canal, west of Sharpaw Avenue</b>			
Urbanising effect on PROW. Consider using green infrastructure to mitigate	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.  Site SK061 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Skipton the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.  The methodology of reassessing this site	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
Flood risk effects and run off.			
Congestion and access			
Buffer zone alongside canal to allow for green space and environmental importance Setting and character of town to be enhanced. Avoid solid surfacing			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
	together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
<b>SK080, SK081, SK082, SK108 – Land north of Gargrave Road and west of Park Wood Drive and Stirtonber, Skipton</b>			
Important open site on edge of town	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.  Sites SK081, SK082 & SK108 (incorporating site SK080a – formally SK080) perform satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and pass all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Skipton these sites are considered suitable as Preferred Sites in this settlement.  The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.	Yes	Sites SK081, SK082 & SK108 (incorporating site SK080a - formally SK080) are identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
Retain and enhance green corridor			
Congestion effects on surrounding road network. No traffic report published and concern that Gargrave Road data is incomplete			
Keelham Farm shop and Craven college expansion and effect on traffic generation			
Traffic conditions compromised by parked cars			
No further access from Gargrave Road, route through Rockwood/Whitehills			
Major over development when taken together with other sites			
Public transport needs to improve			
Infrastructure improvements for area should be commensurate with number of houses to be built			
Environmental impacts. Priority habitats in area.			
Partial development only. Retain woodland, trees along Gargrave Road and green area around watercourse and keep open space to enhance this important road approach to Skipton (already compromised by HML) (SK081)			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
Suggested as potential local green space designation due to richness of wildlife on site (SK081)			
Need to acknowledge steep topography and sewer running through site from HML (is it adequate?) (SK081)			
Forming an adequate access onto Gargrave Road and appropriate site lines would result in the loss of too many mature trees (SK081)			
Development would result in increase in traffic on Rockwood Drive and Gargrave Road both of which are already congested and over-parked at rush hour			
Impact of development on already strained infrastructure: schools, doctors, parking			
Maintain green corridor to ring road and White Hills Lane (SK082)			
Limit housing on this part of site due to heavy traffic noise from bypass and bridge (SK082)			
<b>SK087: East of Overdale Caravan Park, south of A65</b>			
Avoid development so far out of town – significant distance from facilities (unsustainable)	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Skipton.
Development of site would affect park homes and elderly residents	Site does not perform to an adequate standard		



Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<p>Employment zone: railway track alongside site, tip, line of quarry, some industrial archaeology</p> <p>Site supported for potential local green space designation. Allowance should be made for important green spaces on site</p> <p>Major gas pipe across site</p> <p>Poor access onto already busy road, with dangerous junction of A59 nearby</p> <p>Use green infrastructure to mitigate against urbanisation impacts on PROW</p> <p>Heritage assessment required for site: trackbed for 1785 quarry wagonway, late C18 water tower</p> <p>Part suitable for a travellers site</p>	<p>in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the <b>Pool of Sites</b>. The site presents an inadequate road access, which is a determining impediment to selection.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<b>SK088: Hawbank Fields, North of Otley Road and south of A6132</b>			
<p>Support of site for residential development: FZ2/3 addressed through sensitive design with development on remainder of site; buffer around the ecologically sensitive areas; provision of open space; access from The Bailey and Greenacres to avoid access from Otley Road. Flood Risk and Drainage Review, Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, Illustrative Masterplan and Promotional document submitted in support of site.</p> <p>Area of woodland on site (Little Wood) should be identified as green space. Informal recreation value</p> <p>Important road approach to Skipton.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SK088 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Skipton the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a></p>	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<p>Development strongly resisted</p> <p>Environmental impacts on wildlife and plant life. Consider retaining/improving woodland on site. Priority habitats in area.</p> <p>Impact on Skibeden site of archaeological importance</p>	document.		
<b>SK089: Land at Elseycroft, south of Otley Road</b>			
If site developed, access should be onto Otley Road and not through Shortbank Road	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
Important road approach to Skipton. Development strongly resisted on north of site. Green corridor with railway bridge providing a 'gateway' into built up area of Skipton	Site SK089 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Skipton the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.		
Use green infrastructure to mitigate against urbanisation impacts on PROW	The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
<b>SK090: Land north of Airedale Avenue east of railway line</b>			
If site developed, access should be onto Otley Road and not through Shortbank Road, which would not be able to support increase in traffic	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
Environmental impacts on this sensitive wildlife area	Site SK090 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other		
Use green infrastructure to mitigate against			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
urbanisation impacts on PROW	<p>Pool of Site options in Skipton the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<b>SK094: Land bounded by Carleton Road, railway line, and A629</b>			
Possible for employment, but not for residential	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SK094 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Skipton the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
Access issues into the Burnside estate			
Flood risk on site			
Environmental impact on plant and wildlife			
Impact on schools in the area which are already full			
Impact on doctors surgeries in the area which are already full			
Vacant apartments in Skipton, why the need for more new housing?			
Parking for existing residents is difficult during construction of any new homes			
New development should not be approved until Local Plan is adopted			
Carleton Road and Keighley Road are grid locked at peak times. New housing would exacerbate this			
Health and safety issues for children playing during construction of any new homes			
Development of site may impact on			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
protected species – lamprey spawning habitat in the River Aire			
<b>SK101: East of Keighley Road and south of Cawder Lane</b>			
Important views over farmland and town setting	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.  Site SK101 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Skipton the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.  The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
Employment zone			
Important canal approach to the town and considered to be outside the town boundary			
Access issues over Horse Close bridge			
Use green infrastructure to mitigate against urbanisation impacts on PROW			
Piecemeal allocation in open countryside with boundaries that make no sense			
Support for site as a housing allocation as it can help to meet the growth identified for Skipton			
Support for site as it can be genuinely integrated into the town without causing harm to it or its surroundings. It is in a sustainable location with good access to commercial and community services and facilities.			
<b>SK114: Land to east of North Parade, Horse Close</b>			
Support for site but need to check archaeological survey/heritage and natural environment conservation issues (Iron Age site below Greatwood Plantation.)	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site (together with SK124) with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<p>Use green infrastructure to mitigate against urbanisation impacts on PROW</p> <p>Support site for as a sustainable location as site is not materially different in use and character to the adjoining housing committed site which has planning permission for residential development and has therefore been deemed to be suitable for development.</p>	<p>Site SK114 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Skipton the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement (combined with site SK0124: Cawder Road Gargarge Site, Horse Close)</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
<b>SK116: Land to east of canal and west of High Laithe Farm, Snaygill</b>			
Piecemeal allocation in open countryside with boundaries that make no sense	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SK116 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the <b>Pool of Sites</b>. A suitable access cannot be achieved to the site as there is no direct connection/frontage to a highway maintainable at the public expense.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Skipton.
Important views over farmland and town setting.			
Employment zone			
Important canal approach to the town – high landscape value			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>SK119: Land south of Whinny Gill Reservoir</b>			
Consider archaeological significance in this area.	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SK119 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the <b>Pool of Sites</b>. The site currently presents an inadequate road access, which is a determining impediment to selection.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Skipton.
Potential flood risk			
High landscape value and outside the town's eastern boundary			
Use green infrastructure to mitigate against urbanisation impacts on PROW			
Support for site. Agent has commissioned a Flood Risk Assessment on this site, which concludes there are no flood risk issues which would prevent the development of this site.			
<b>SK135: Skipton Rock Quarry, Harrogate Road</b>			
Site adjacent to a SINC site (Haw Park) and appropriate buffering and enhancement will be needed.	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Skipton.
Use green infrastructure to mitigate against urbanisation impacts on PROW	<p>SK135 - Although the site performs to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, the site is not deemed suitable to enter the <b>Pool of Sites</b> because the ELR recommends that this site should be considered for employment.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in</p>		
Priority habitat on site (woodland) and next to species rich grassland. Consider retaining/improving habitat.			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
	the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
<b>SK083: Land bounded by A65, White Hills Lane and Raikes Road</b>			
<p>Objection to application (ref 63/2013/13748) approved for housing on 07/10/13. Land should be conserved rather than developed. Important buffer zone between bypass and existing residential area. New housing will be too close to bypass and pollutants. Overdevelopment when considered alongside other existing housing developments in Skipton.</p>	<p>This site was not identified in the pool of sites within the April 2016 draft Local Plan. At that time the site was shown as an existing committed housing site in Skipton.</p> <p>Site SK083 is not suitable to undergo a Sustainability Analysis as the site has planning permission.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Skipton.
<b>SK103: Clay Hall Farm, Broughton Road</b>			
<p>Allocation for housing is supported as site is deliverable: over 1ha of the site is within FZ1; the agricultural land is not large enough for high yields of grazing or arable production; there are no heritage assets on site; there are no ecological designations on site and ecosystems could be enhanced through well-developed landscape strategy; site only 2km away from services in Skipton and 1km away from railway station (with existing footpaths to both)</p>	<p>This site was not identified in the pool of sites within the April 2016 draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Site SK103 is not suitable to undergo a Sustainability Analysis as the site has planning permission.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	No	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Skipton
Site is available in the short term – under			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<p>unified control. No known ownership or other legal constraints</p> <p>Access has been established onto Broughton Road by prior planning approval on eastern part of site</p> <p>Site is suitable – organic, seamless extension of Skipton, with low sensitivity to statutory designations, and use of FZ32 area of site for public space or SUDs</p> <p>Development could compliment setting of canal and open countryside beyond. Development could soften this approach to Skipton which currently has a hard boundary (flyover bypass).</p>			



## April – May 2016 Draft Local Plan

## Site Response Paper by Settlement: SETTLE

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>General</b>			
<p>Question as to whether mass house building in Settle is environmentally or economically appropriate. There is simply no demand for housing in the town on the scale proposed. Appreciate that additional housing needs to be provided within Craven but it should be provided in other areas of the district where it is actually needed. For example Settle has ¼ of the population of Skipton yet the proposal is for a disproportionate number of new homes in Settle. Demand for housing is far greater in the south of the district nearer to the major conurbations. Surely it would make more sense to concentrate the new provision there rather than commit new residents in Settle to long commutes by car given the limited service on the railway? It simply does not make commercial or environmental sense.</p>	<p>The Council's SHMA 2016 identifies a need for 4280 houses to be built in the plan area over the Local Plan period of 2012-2032. This equates to 214 houses per year. The draft Local Plan sets out a draft spatial strategy which identifies Settle as a tier 2 settlement and as a key service centre for the mid sub area, to accommodate 10.5% of the overall housing requirement, i.e. 450 houses over the plan period. This is due to the level of services and facilities currently provided in Settle. The settlement strategy proposes that Skipton, as the principle service centre for the plan area will accommodate 2140 houses over the plan period, or 50% of the total housing requirement, a substantial increase of that allocated to Settle.</p>	No	

<p>It is proposed that development take place in larger units concentrated in the more major towns and villages. Where there is a need for housing in the Settle area is in small pockets in the surrounding villages so that housing is available for future generations. It does not need to be provided in larger units.</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan sets out a draft spatial strategy which identifies Settle as a tier 2 settlement and as a key service centre for the mid sub area, to accommodate 10.5% of the overall housing requirement, i.e. 450 houses over the plan period. This is due to the level of services and facilities currently provided in Settle.</p> <p>Following Sustainability Appraisal and a residential site selection process, housing sites for Settle have been preferred either on smaller town-centre locations or on larger sites that are immediately adjacent to the town's built up area.</p>	No	
<p>If and to the extent that larger numbers of houses are genuinely needed then it must be the case that development on the current industrial sites would be vastly preferable since they are ripe for redevelopment. They are closer to the centre of the town and much more suitable locations for industrial development are available on the bypass at SG083 or SG064. This would remove many commercial vehicle movements from the town and enable the development of a high quality modern industrial area.</p> <p>There are alternative sites for building the relatively small number of additional houses which are actually needed in Settle. Those sites are closer to the centre of the town and would be part of and complement the community.</p>	<p>The industrial areas in Settle, notably Sowarth Industrial Estate, are currently in use by a variety of businesses and services. The Council's Employment Land Review 2016 recommends that the southern and central sections of the industrial estate should be retained and protected for employment use and the northern section of the industrial estate should be considered as a mixed use opportunity site.</p> <p>Following Sustainability Appraisal and a residential site selection process, housing sites for Settle have been preferred in other town centre locations or immediately adjacent to the town's built up area.</p>	No	

For sites close to PROWS, plans have been submitted showing the location of the existing PROW in relation to these sites.	Noted. The proximity of PROWs has been taken into account in the residential site selection process and where preferred sites encompass or are adjacent to a PROW, areas of green infrastructure have been proposed to help retain a sense of openness around the PROW.	Yes	Green infrastructure incorporated into preferred sites where PROWs exist.
<b>SG021: Land to the rear of Penny Green</b>			
150mm trunk gas main running diagonally across the site would make the site uneconomic for development	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017.
Access to Cammock Lane is not available owing to a blind junction caused by the railway bridge crossing Cammock Lane. No logical point of access through SC080.	Site SG021 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Settle the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.		
Too close to the Settle and Carlisle railway conservation area .	The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
<b>SG023: Land south of Settle, between Skipton Road and Railway</b>			
Building on this area south of Settle and Giggleswick would effectively destroy the visual aspect of the entire area. This is a small, relatively remote and very beautiful part of the world whose tranquillity and peace is valued and respected by residents and visitors alike. Any development in this area will urbanise it and turn it into just another town; its unique character will have	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.  Site SG023 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site has numerous negatives, which outnumber the positives for the	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Settle.

gone for ever. The suggested developments would undoubtedly be followed by others which would, in time, finish us off completely.	site, including the site's unsustainable location which is disconnected from the town centre making it difficult to access services and facilities.		
The field SG023 is low lying with a large culvert taking water under the Settle Carlisle Railway and onto Runley Brook. SG023 regularly floods.	The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
This site adjoins the boundary of the Settle-Carlisle Line (Hellifield to Langcliffe) Conservation Area. The loss of this currently undeveloped area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to its significance (Heritage England).			
SG023 is in agricultural use for sheep and cattle with an unusual historic animal underpass between the two fields There is currently a Dales Barn in the field.			
With the adjacent woodland the field attracts a large range of animal life including summer visitors of birds, native birds, deer etc.			
<b>SG025: Land to the south of Ingfield Lane</b>			
Support The site within the Representors control (SG025) is available, suitable and deliverable as a sustainable housing site. The suitability and deliverability of this site has been evidenced by the completion of Phase 1 for	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.  Site SG025 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017.

<p>37 dwellings; and the issuing of planning permission for the delivery of a Flood Meadow to facilitate the development of Phases 2 and 3. A detailed pre-application package of information setting out the detailed proposals for Phases and 3 has been submitted to and considered by the Council and which demonstrates the site is deliverable with no technical constraints.</p>	<p>Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Settle the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<p>Flooding This site, particularly southern end of the site is prone to flooding. On several occasions during last Dec., Jan and February, the southern half of the site was under water, and there were many pools and flows of water on the other parts of the site, even after only moderate rainfall.</p>			
<p>Drainage: Whilst the plan put forward to improve the drainage would help, there would still be problems. Development would increase the amount hard surfaces, increasing the problems of drainage. It is doubtful if the culvert under the railway would cope successfully with this, and the streambed downstream is restricted. The flow of water into the Ribble would increase, making flooding downstream more frequent. Has the Council undertaken an independent feasibility study of the effects a large development would have in terms of flooding?</p>			
<p>This site adjoins the boundary of the Settle-Carlisle Line (Hellifield to Langcliffe) Conservation Area The loss of this currently-</p>			

<p>open area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the heritage assets in its vicinity.</p>			
<p>In addition, this site abuts the curtilage of the Falcon Manor Hotel which is a Grade II Listed Building (Historic England)</p>			
<p>This is a valuable amenity space including frequently used and admired rights of way with impressive landscape views. It is also important to recognise and respect that the fields in this area are part of the medieval settlements of Settle, Anley and Runley.</p>			
<p>Access to the site is poor. The access at the northern end is could take some extra traffic, but not for the flow which would be generated by development of the whole site. The other proposed access to Skipton Road is on a bend by the railway bridge and would be dangerous due to poor sighting. Lorries have to come under the bridge in the middle of the highway. Whilst this could be improved by Traffic Lights, it would produce long delays.</p>			
<p>This proposal is against PO1 PO2 and PO3</p>			
<p>There are wide and elevated views over this site from within the NP (Mitchell Lane and High Hill Lane). We consider there would be significant harm if this site is fully developed. The vista out (particularly from High Hill Lane) is focussed over the gentle pastoral land of the Ribble Valley around Settle and beyond. The view is framed by</p>			

<p>hills/outcrops from the Dales and as such views are channelled in the direction of the allocation. We believe this wide vista over the Ribble Valley towards Pendle Hill is an important part of the enjoyment of the NP in this locality. When viewed from within the Park, the pastoral land is interspersed by pockets of development and other features such as: the railway line, the A65, villages and Settle itself. However, these sit within the landscape rather than dominate it. It is considered that this extensive field sited so close to the NP (which would be viewed along its longest axis) would dominate views from the NP and be significantly detrimental to this vista. There is some development along what appear to be historic routes out of Settle – rural lanes and footpaths, but this appears quite organic and decreasing in density (as well as being part of the character of the wider historic landscape) (Yorkshire Dales National Park)</p>			
<p>Not within reasonable walking distance from the centre of Settle. This would lead to unacceptable traffic movements within Settle adding to congestion and adding to the current issues with the serious lack of parking in the town centre.</p>			
<p>The southernmost ‘pointed’ area of the site shown should be excluded from the development, as it does not have a logical or clear boundary and it projects too far into the countryside and could also provide an</p>			

argument for landowners to seek other adjoining land to be included for development.			
Most towns (Skipton & Kendal) site their employment land on the outskirts of the town. Settle should do this on sites SG064 and SG083, freeing up the existing Sowarth Field area for new housing development.			
<b>SG025: Land to the south of Ingfield Lane; SG027 &amp; SG068: Land to the south of Brockhole View and west of Brockhole Lane</b>			
Development of these sites would fundamentally change the character of Settle as viewed from the surrounding hills.	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Sites SG025, SG027 &amp; SG068 perform satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and pass all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Settle these sites are considered suitable as Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing these sites together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	Sites identified as preferred housing sites with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017.
<b>SG027: South of Ingfield Lane, east of Brockhole View</b>			
All of the land proposed is available for development. The site is bounded to the north by residential development, Brockhole Lane to the east and open fields to the south and west. Public footpaths are located along the western and eastern site boundaries. Residential development to the north is	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SG027 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other</p>	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017.



<p>partially complete with existing commitment to an additional 17 residential dwellings and 11 residential dwellings to the north west. Land to the west of the proposed site is currently being considered as a potential mixed housing and employment land (SG025 within the Site Options for Allocation Plan).</p> <p>The sites are not affected by any statutory designations although the Yorkshire Dales National Park is located to the east. There are no reasons why a suitably designed development would detract from the special character of the National Park</p> <p>There are no listed buildings or heritage assets within or adjacent to the proposed development sites and the development of the sites is unlikely to detract from the wider historical importance of the area.</p>	<p>Pool of Site options in Settle the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<p><b>SG027 &amp; SG068: Land to the south of Brockhole View and west of Brockhole Lane</b></p>			
<p>Indication from the agent/owner that the sites are available for development. There is partially complete residential development to the north and residential development to the north west. Land to the west is currently being considered for a mix of housing and employment uses.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Sites SG027 &amp; SG068 perform satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and pass all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Settle these sites are considered suitable as Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p>	Yes	Sites identified as preferred housing sites with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017.
<p>There are no listed buildings or heritage assets within or adjacent to the sites, are no site specific ecological designations and given the fact that the current use is as agricultural land there is an opportunity to enhance ecological interest of the site</p>	<p>The methodology of reassessing these sites together with the actual assessment is set out in</p>		

<p>through a well-developed landscape strategy.</p>	<p>the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<p>The sites are within Flood Zone 1, which has the lowest risk of flooding.</p>			
<p>Land Form: site are predominantly flat and are free from contamination, buildings and largely clear of trees.</p>			
<p>Designations: There are no site specific land, ecological or historic designations. The YDNP is located to the east of the sites. Development could be designed to ensure the special landscape and scenic beauty could be conserved.</p>			
<p>Location: Development on these sites would offer an opportunity to deliver housing on sites that immediately adjoin the town of Settle.</p>			
<p>Accessibility: existing access point through the new housing development to the north, off Ingfield Lane and is within walking distance to the centre of Settle and existing services.</p>			
<p>Capacity: The site is approx. 3 ha and at a density of 30dph would deliver 90 homes.</p>			
<p>SG027 and SG068 – these sites are highly prominent at close range from Brockhole Lane (which also forms the NP boundary) and from Mitchell Lane and High Hill Lane above Settle (in the NP). Whilst we consider there may be modest capacity for well contained development on SG027 (although it is hard to make out where the site allocation boundary would be) we consider</p>			

<p>that the development of SG068 would have a significant and harmful impact on close and long range views from the National Park, and in particular the character and enjoyment of the green lane. (Yorkshire Dales NP)</p>			
<p><b>SG079: Land to the north of Town Head Way/South of Barrel Sykes</b></p>			
<p><b>Housing Requirement</b> – Draft policy SP4 identifies that Settle will meet 10.5% of the districts’ minimum annual housing requirement per annum that equates to 27 dwellings per annum. Centres such as Settle have an important role in meeting the District’s wider housing needs and this site require allocation in order to deliver housing early within the plan period.</p> <p><b>Site Area</b> – the boundary should be extended in line with the plan included at appendix 1 of the submitted comments, reflecting the full extent of the site available now for delivery of housing in order to make the most efficient use of the available land.</p> <p><b>Suitability of the Site:</b></p> <p><b>Location &amp; Sustainability</b> – Site is well located to Settle town centre (approx. 500m) and all the services and facilities it provides. Residential development on this site would promote sustainable travel patterns by new residents accessing day to day services without the need to travel, supporting the viability of Settle town centre.</p> <p><b>Flood Risk</b> – Site is entirely in flood zone 1.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SG079 passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Settle these sites are considered suitable as Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing these sites together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site identified as preferred housing sites with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017.</p>

<p><b>Availability</b>– The site is available now with no ownership constraints which would create a barrier to early delivery of the site within the plan period and would help to meet the housing requirement for Settle to support its role as a key services centre.</p> <p><b>Access</b> – Proposed that the site can be achieved from Town Head. This access will also provide a direct route for pedestrians and cyclists into the town. There is also potential for the provision of pedestrian links under the railway tunnel, which leads to Barrel Sykes and up to the “Highway”. This could be explored through detail design of any future scheme.</p> <p><b>Consideration of Sustainability Objectives</b> – The SA has identified the site as reaching stage 6, therefore it is suitable for inclusion in the pool of site options. The site specifically scored significantly positively in relation to Objective S04. Therefore there is an opportunity to capitalise on the sites proximity to existing services and facilities in Settle.</p> <p><b>Agricultural Land</b> – Site classified as Grade 4 agricultural land, which is not considered to be the best and most versatile. The loss of existing grazing land is regrettable; the opportunity to deliver much needed housing in a sustainable location outweighs the loss of this grazing land.</p> <p><b>Conservation on the Historic Environment</b> – No listed buildings on the site. Site is within</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>vicinity of Settle-Carlisle Conservation Area and Barrel Sykes (Grade II). Proposed residential development on this site can respond positively to its location and be designed in line with adjacent residential development such as providing back gardens along the railway tract to provide a buffer between housing and railway. The site will continue the historic linear growth pattern of the town adjacent to the railway line while maintaining a close relationship of housing to the town centre. The site would not introduce any new built development within this area which would further detract from the</p> <p><b>Visual Impact &amp; Amenity</b> – Residential development would not introduce any new urbanising elements of development which does not already exist within this area. Due to existing railway bank and topography the site is relatively well screened from public view with exception of adjacent residential development, users of the railway and “highway”. Site has strong linear boundaries along east and west boundary which will help retain development in this area and continue to follow the historic pattern of Settle and not lead to sporadic development within the landscape. A housing scheme can be deliver to provide a satisfactory standard of amenity for future occupants of the site and neighbouring existing residents.</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p><b>Biodiversity</b> – Mitigation and recommendations provided by the Council do not suggest that biodiversity mitigation should be built into this site. Any future application will provide full details of existing habitats and the sites potential to provide a net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p><b>Air Quality &amp; Noise</b> – Site is not located within an Air Quality Management Area. Future Transport Assessment and Air Quality Assessment can fully assess any impact. Due to the size of the site any impacts will not be significant enough to be capable of mitigation. The noise impact of the site in relation to the adjacent railway line will need to be considered. This can be adequately mitigated against following any recommendations within a Noise Assessment.</p>			
<b>SG080: Land to the west of Skipton Road and railway</b>			
<p>This is a raised site, which is particularly visible and is adjacent to the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SG080 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Settle the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017.</p>

	<a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
--	---	--	--

## April – May 2016 Draft Local Plan

## Site Response Paper by Settlement: HIGH BENTHAM

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
Bentham and Settle lack good road connections and should not be a main site for development	<p>The June 2017 draft local plan policy SP4: Strategy and Housing Growth identifies Low and High Bentham &amp; Settle as tier 2 settlements (Key Service Centres). The proportion of housing growth identified for High &amp; Low Bentham is 10.5%, which equates to 23 dwellings per annum. Draft policy SP4 included in the April – May 2016 draft Local Plan set the proportion of housing growth identified for Bentham at 10.2%, which equates to 26 dwellings per annum. There has therefore been a slight increase in the growth planned for High &amp; Low Bentham since April – May 2016.</p> <p>Bentham serves a wide rural hinterland and has the benefit of urban amenities and a rail connection with the potential for development of more frequent train services. Draft policy SP4 distributes growth in larger urban centres including Bentham &amp; Settle.</p>	Yes	A slight increase in growth since the April – May 2016 draft Local Plan.
Lack of off street parking	High Bentham has two areas of off street parking, which are on Council owned land. Proposed future housing growth is concentrated within walking distance of village facilities to avoid the need to bring cars into the centre.	No	



Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
Traffic	An increase in housing numbers in the village will inevitably lead to more traffic. However High Bentham has the potential for improved public transport via the railway which links the village with Skipton and Lancaster. Assessment of potential site allocations has been informed by consultation with NYCC Highways.	No	
Find alternative site for the auction mart on the edge of town.	The auction mart site in High Bentham is identified as an existing employment area on the policies map for Bentham. The Council is involved in on-going discussions relating to the relocation of the auction mart and wider area.	No	
Retain buildings released from public use for new uses	The site of the former High Bentham primary school was identified as a potential housing option in the April – May 2016 draft Local Plan. The same it is proposed as a preferred housing site. Draft local plan policy SP7 sets out development principles for the site including the need for development to conserve heritage assets.	No	
Avoid building on green spaces	The June 2017 identifies proposed Local Green Space Designations via draft policy ENV10; as well as designating existing areas of open space, sport and recreation facilities via INF3. Some preferred housing sites will incorporate new areas of open space within them, such as draft preferred housing site HB011 (former High Bentham primary school) – see draft policy SP7.	Yes	Amendments made to draft policies ENV10, INF3 & SP7 in terms of development principles for preferred housing site sin Bentham.

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>HB003: Bank Head, west of Robin Lane, south of Lakeber Drive</b>			
<p>All in-fill sites, far more preferable than expanding onto adjacent farmland.</p> <p>Site includes existing houses</p> <p>Site is indicated on plan as [proposed] local green space</p> <p>Designated sites: Robert Hall Moor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is close to area, increased access could be an issue but is unlikely to be detrimental. Provision of multifunctional green spaces could help to mitigate this impact.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site HB003 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the <b>Pool of Sites</b>. The site presents an inadequate road access, which is a determining impediment to selection.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for High Bentham.

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>HB011: Primary school, east of Robin Lane, west of Lowcroft, Higher Bentham</b>			
Retain buildings released from public use for new uses	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Bentham the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement. The Council is aware that NYCC are considering the provision of extra care accommodation on this site.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	No	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
Turn site of school into a car park			
Should be protected in case the Extra Care Facility moves forward.			
The suggestion to use HB011 as a green space is a good one			
HB011 should not be 'also local green space' since the general public have never had rights of access to those sites. Such designation would also severely hamper the development potential of the site.			
The local planning authority is currently undertaking an assessment about whether High Bentham should be designated a Conservation Area. This site should not be identified as an Allocation until such time as this evaluation has been completed and the potential impact upon the Conservation Area (if it is eventually designated)			
Designated sites: Robert Hall Moor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is close to area, increased access could be an issue but is unlikely to be detrimental. Provision of multifunctional green spaces could help to mitigate this impact.			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>HB014: Land to east of Lairgill Row on Butts Lane, High Bentham</b>			
An existing car park. It is widely used.	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.  Site HB014 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses, however after a comparison with other Pool of Site options in High Bentham, the site is not considered suitable as one of the <b>Preferred Sites</b> in this settlement. The assessment of this site has concluded that development of the site for housing would have a negative impact in terms of conservation of the historic environment, due to the site's various contributions to the recommended conservation area for High Bentham. In addition, there are concerns regarding surface water flood risk, much of the site is in use as a public car park and the site is bisected by Butts Lane. These constraints on development not only restrict the likely yield of dwellings from the site, but, more importantly, bring into question the site's basic suitability, availability and, therefore, deliverability as a local plan housing site. On current evidence and for those reasons, HB014 is currently not a preferable site for allocation in High Bentham.  The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in	No	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for High and Low Bentham
Cannot build on Lairgill carpark as would destroy aspect of historic terrace (464) Parish Council			
Historic England The local planning authority is currently undertaking an assessment about whether High Bentham should be designated a Conservation Area. This site should not be identified as an Allocation until such time as this evaluation has been completed and the potential impact upon the Conservation Area (if it is eventually designated)			
3.3.1.2 Designated sites: Robert Hall Moor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is close to area; increased access could be an issue but is unlikely to be detrimental. Provision of multifunctional green spaces could help to mitigate this impact.			
Expansion onto surrounding countryside - not necessary.			

	the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
<b>HB022: North of Bigber Farm Higher Bentham</b>			
All fill in sites preferable to expanding into adjacent countryside	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for High and Low Bentham.
Site identified as requiring tongues of green land (green infrastructure) along footpaths	Site HB022 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the <b>Pool of Sites</b> . The site presents an inadequate or uncertain road access and negative heritage impact, which are determining impediments to selection.		
The local planning authority is currently undertaking an assessment about whether High Bentham should be designated a Conservation Area. This site should not be identified as an Allocation until such time as this evaluation has been completed and the potential impact upon the Conservation Area (if it is eventually designated).	The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
Designated sites: Robert Hall Moor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is close to area, increased access could be an issue but is unlikely to be detrimental. Provision of multifunctional green spaces could help to mitigate this impact.			
Designated sites: Robert Hall Moor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is close to area, increased access could be an issue but is unlikely to be detrimental. Provision of multifunctional green spaces could help to mitigate this impact.			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>HB023: North of Low Bentham Road, rear of Furness Drive</b>			
Support – This is an excellent site being in close proximity to the primary school. This site would also be large enough to incorporate some green space for social interaction	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for High and Low Bentham.
Plan key needs amending.	Site HB023 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the <b>Pool of Sites</b> . The site presents surface water		
Expansion onto surrounding countryside - not necessary	flood risk and negative heritage impact, which are determining impediments to selection.		
This area has an annual flooding problem adjacent to Moonsacre	The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
The access beside the BT building is dangerous being just over the brow of a hill. Traffic entering and exiting a new housing estate in the area of the new school is only adding to dissatisfaction with regards to children's safety			
The sewage system is running at capacity and is too expensive to replace			
The local planning authority is currently undertaking an assessment about whether High Bentham should be designated a Conservation Area. This site should not be identified as an Allocation until such time as this evaluation has been completed and the potential impact upon the Conservation Area (if it is eventually designated) Heritage England)			
Designated sites: Robert Hall Moor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is close to			

area, increased access could be an issue but is unlikely to be detrimental. Provision of multifunctional green spaces could help to mitigate this impact.			
Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>HB024: North of Lakeber Drive, High Bentham</b>			
<p>All in-fill sites, far more preferable than expanding onto adjacent farmland</p> <p>Site identified as being suitable for providing tongues of open land alongside footpaths through the sites</p> <p>Designated sites: Robert Hall Moor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is close to area, increased access could be an issue but is unlikely to be detrimental. Provision of multifunctional green spaces could help to mitigate this impact.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site HB024 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Skipton the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>HB025: Robin Lane and east of Butts Lane, High Bentham</b>			
<p>Expansion onto surrounding countryside - not necessary</p> <p>Site identified as being suitable for tongues of open space alongside footpaths across the site</p> <p>Designated sites: Robert Hall Moor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is close to area, increased access could be an issue but is unlikely to be detrimental. Provision of multifunctional green spaces could help to mitigate this impact.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site HB025 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Skipton the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.



Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>HB026: North of Springfield Crescent and east of Butts Lane, High Bentham</b>			
We support the Site Allocation of land within SHLAA No. HB026 -. We seek allocation of this site for new housing development under Policy SP7 (547).	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
A standard density of 30 dwellings per hectare, as suggested in the POSO, is not relevant for this particular site and the number of new homes that can be provided will likely be less than an assumed 77 (30 x 2.577 hectares).	Site HB026 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Skipton the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.		
The site has direct unfettered access directly from Springfield Crescent and is an open undeveloped site immediately adjacent to the rear of existing houses within the settlement.	The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
Designated sites: Robert Hall Moor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is close to area; increased access could be an issue but is unlikely to be detrimental. Provision of multifunctional green spaces could help to mitigate this impact.			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>HB027: Mount Pleasant, High Bentham</b>			
<p>These sites provide a natural infill of housing development within the existing residential area of Mount Pleasant, Lairgill and Springfield.. I therefore feel that your inclusion of these sites into the second draft Local Plan is well considered and will benefit the future Bentham community</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site HB027 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the <b>Pool of Sites</b>. The site presents a negative heritage impact, which is a determining impediment to selection.</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for High and Low Bentham.
<p>The introduction of a mini roundabout to access the development (to County Highways standard) would alleviate the existing and potential accident area at the road restriction on Mount Pleasant, due to speeding vehicles.</p>	<p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<p>It may also have been suggested that the site is liable to flooding, this is not the case, Lairgill Beck is deep fast flowing in flood conditions, and the site is a considerable distance and elevation from the possible flood areas of the River Wenning.</p>			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>HB028: East of Station Road and south-west of Pye Busk, High Bentham</b>			
Site too large. Some of the fields are steep and I feel the character of the landscape should be kept, rather than built on.	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for High and Low Bentham.
Encompasses area earmarked for new park.	Site HB028 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the <b>Pool of Sites</b> . The site presents a negative		
Rest of site too far from current areas of Employment.	heritage impact and negatives for location, access, agriculture and landscape, which are determining impediments to selection.		
The auction mart is part of the heritage of the area and the character of the town. We should do anything possible to support the continuation of the busy and thriving Auction Mart, right in the centre of our community.	The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
I would like to see the development of the Auction to extend its connections within the community to really develop Bentham into a Rural heritage centre, to celebrate farming, traditional crafts and food, to promote the sustainability of the local economy.			
This land comprises several unspoilt habitats. Principally a grazing meadow it also includes mature trees smaller trees some hedgerows and undergrowth as well as a clean and lively beck which crosses the main area. The part sometimes known as the old allotment is rich in biodiversity and birdlife HB028 may be located on or next to a <i>Boloria selene</i> (Small Pearl Bordered			

<p>Fritillary) colony. Investigation is required to determine whether this proposal would affect the colony Site HB028 is adjacent to the SINC site Cowslip Hill. Buffering and enhancement will be necessary.</p>	<p>See response on page above</p>		
<p>Designated sites: Robert Hall Moor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is close to area, increased access could be an issue but is unlikely to be detrimental. Provision of multifunctional green spaces could help to mitigate this impact.</p>			
<p>Agree with greenspace designation. The main meadow could provide an asset which is much needed in Bentham, namely an attractive and easily accessible multi-purpose public space.</p>			
<p>HB028 includes CDC land adjacent to Station Road. There is a proposal for this land to provide new commercial and office space, with additional much needed car parking This area could also include a hotel and leisure area, green area. But no reference is made to this in the plan</p>			
<p>Assessment needed of safe road access to and from the site from the main road.</p>			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<p>It also seems that there is an idea to put a road through from either Mount Pleasant or Pye Busk to connect with Station Road. Surely a much better solution would be to make a connecting road between the back of the Angus Fire complex running across fields behind the new school (HB038 and HB030) (633)</p>	<p>See response on page above</p>		
<p>Has a stream running through them. Tend to carry a lot of water at times of heavy rainfall We recommend that an 8 metre wide strip of land is left clear, adjacent to the watercourse. There should be no structures, fences or trees in this area. Again, this will allow access, essential maintenance and future watercourse improvements to take place. (Environment Agency, )</p>			
<p>Carbon neutral properties built(94). .</p>			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
If the local planning authority concludes that High Bentham should be designated as a Conservation Area, the loss of this currently-open area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area.	See response on page above		
<b>HB030: Land off Duke Street, High Bentham</b>			
All in-fill sites, far more preferable than expanding onto adjacent farmland	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.  Site HB030 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the <b>Pool of Sites</b> . The site presents an inadequate road access and a negative heritage impact, which are determining impediments to selection.  The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for High and Low Bentham.
I believe this site could be developed for housing. It is close to the school and road access would be good. Additional traffic to a housing development would not cause problems in this location			
Part of it in a flood risk area. The field has flooded to some degree (pond to small lake) every year since 1961 on frequent occasions. (538, 239).			
Access could be a problem (538).			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<p>Surely a much better solution would be to make a connecting road between the back of the Angus Fire complex running across fields behind the new school (HB038 and HB030) and accessed from the Low Bentham road. This could also provide an access to the caravan park and the Bentham industrial estate completely relieving the town centre congestion.</p> <p>It would be a blot on the landscape</p> <p>Site identified on map provided by correspondent as being suitable for tongues of green land along footpaths</p> <p>Designated sites: Robert Hall Moor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is close to area, increased access could be an issue but is unlikely to be detrimental. Provision of multifunctional green spaces could help to mitigate this impact.</p>	See response on page above		

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>HB031: Auction Mart and land south of Mount Pleasant, High Bentham</b>			
<p>The auction mart is part of the heritage of the area and the character of the town. We should do anything possible to support the continuation of the busy and thriving Auction Mart, right in the centre of our community.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	Yes	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for High and Low Bentham.</p>
<p>I would like to see the development of the Auction to extend its connections within the community to really develop Bentham into a Rural heritage centre, to celebrate farming, traditional crafts and food, to promote the sustainability of the local economy</p>	<p>Site HB031 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the <b>Pool of Sites</b>. The site presents an inadequate road access, which is a determining impediment to selection.</p>		
<p>Find alternative site for the auction mart on the edge of town</p>	<p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<p>Land comprises several unspoilt habitats. Principally a grazing meadow it also includes mature trees, smaller trees hedgerows, undergrowth as well as a beck crossing the main area. The part sometimes known as the old allotment is rich in biodiversity and birdlife. Site may be located on or next to a <i>Boloria selene</i> (Small Pearl Bordered Fritillary) colony. Investigation is required to determine whether this proposal would affect the colony Site Site is adjacent to the SINC site Cowslip Hill. Buffering and enhancement will be necessary.</p>			



Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<p>This land comprises several unspoilt habitats. Principally a grazing meadow it also includes mature trees smaller trees some hedgerows and undergrowth as well as a clean and lively beck which crosses the main area. The part sometimes known as the old allotment is rich in biodiversity and birdlife HB028 may be located on or next to a <i>Boloria selene</i> (Small Pearl Bordered Fritillary) colony. Investigation is required to determine whether this proposal would affect the colony Site HB028 is adjacent to the SINC site Cowslip Hill. Buffering and enhancement will be necessary.</p>	<p>See response on page above</p>		
<p>Designated sites: Robert Hall Moor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is close to the area, increased access could be an issue but is unlikely to be detrimental. Provision of multifunctional green spaces could help to mitigate this impact.</p>			
<p>Agree with greenspace designation. The main meadow could provide an asset which is much needed in Bentham, namely an attractive and easily accessible multi-purpose public space.</p>			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
HB028 includes CDC land adjacent to Station Road. There is a proposal for this land to provide new commercial and office space, with additional much needed car parking. This area could also include a hotel and leisure area, green area. But no reference is made to this in the plan	See response on page above		
Assessment needed of safe road access to and from the site from the main road			
<b>HB033: Land east of Butts Lane and north of 1-9 Springfield, High Bentham</b>			
I believe this land is a good place for new housing development. It is easy to access and will not add to any congestion in the centre of town, yet it is close enough to give easy access to the shops and other amenities.	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.  Site HB033 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the <b>Pool of Sites</b> . The site presents an inadequate road access and a negative heritage impact, which are determining impediments to selection.  The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for High and Low Bentham.
Expansion onto surrounding countryside - not necessary.			
Site has streams running through them. HB033 streams are culverted. Tend to carry a lot of water at times of heavy rainfall			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<p>The road access to the site (Robin Lane) already has issues with traffic negotiating the narrow sections and junction with the Dales View development. Further traffic and another junction on the opposite side to the current one will only compound this (354)</p>	<p>See response on page above</p>		
<p>HB025, HB033, HB036 – Object – HB033 (and HB025 &amp; HB036) is particularly close to the cemetery; please preserve the peacefulness of this current and future burial space by not building in its vicinity. At the very least, please consider leaving an immediate green space surrounding the cemetery and the streams, from Butts Lane onwards. (270)</p>			
<p>If the local planning authority concludes that High Bentham should be designated as a Conservation Area, the loss of this currently-open area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area. (Historic England)</p>			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>HB038: Land south of Low Bentham Road, High Bentham.</b>			
School built on one side & outline planning permission granted on the other, with good access (464 Parish Council)	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
Development of this site should be dealt with carefully. It is close to the school, which makes it a good place for new housing	Site HB038 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Bentham the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.		
Care should be taken not to develop further in the direction of Low Bentham to avoid a joining of the towns; the two have a slightly different feel/culture and it would be a shame to lose this	The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
Designated sites: Robert Hall Moor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is close to area; increased access could be an issue but is unlikely to be detrimental. Provision of multifunctional green spaces could help to mitigate this impact			
<b>HB044: Land to west of Goodenber Road, High Bentham</b>			
Support – HB052, HB044 and HB030 would provide many years' worth of housing need; please build here rather than scatter new houses on many sites around the town	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
Designated sites: Robert Hall Moor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is close to area, increased access could be an issue but is unlikely to be detrimental. Provision of multifunctional green spaces could help to mitigate this impact.	Site HB044 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Bentham the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.		

Drainage water from the area causes flooding in my property – more houses would make this worse	The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
Goodenber Road would also have more traffic			
I live in Goodenber Road and already have 50+ social houses in close proximity.. More housing would add to the social problems including bad language.. As a result of the recent building of social housing the value of my house has been reduced by £40,000. Other areas of Bentham should receive their share of social housing			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>HB052: Land to north west of Bank Head Farm and south of Ghyllhead Farm, High Bentham</b>			
Site too large – needs reducing in size towards Goodenber (Parish Council)	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
Awful for Bentham!			
Site identified as being suitable for tongues of green land along footpaths through the site			
<p>Site HB052 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Bentham the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>			

## April – May 2016 Draft Local Plan

## Site Response Paper by Settlement: LOW BENTHAM

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan	Changes made to the plan
<b>General</b>			
We estimate that if all the sites included in the pool of potential sites which lead into the Burton Road were to be developed an extra 113 vehicles would need to gain access via Burton Road (calculation based on CDC's figures of 30 dwellings per hectare and 1.5 vehicles per household). (448, 449+)	It was never the intention that all of the sites in the pool of sites presented in the 2 <sup>nd</sup> consultation round would be developed. In fact because of recent permissions and by concentrating development in High Bentham only one preferred site on the Low Bentham Road has been identified as a preferred site generating 18 dwellings.	Yes	Site LB012 identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017.
Why build new houses in a place where there is very little infrastructure or services to support an increase in population?(2) One of the major flaws in the Plan is that it lumps together High Bentham and Low Bentham as though they were one entity, when in fact they are two separate and very different settlements. High Bentham is a small town whereas Low Bentham is a small village with very few facilities - fewer facilities than, for example, Burton in Lonsdale which you categorise as 4a.	The lack of Infrastructure has been noted and preferred sites concentrated in High Bentham. Sites in Low Bentham are proposed for a lower density of development than those in High Bentham due to the lack of facilities	Yes	Only one site, LB012, has been identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017.
Any temptation to 'fill in' any further green spaces with the current built up fabric of Bentham should be resisted (329)	Sites have been allocated in High and Low Bentham following sustainability appraisal and a residential site selection process, which takes account of maintaining a balance between preserving open space within built up areas and avoiding development spreading into open	Yes	An appropriate level of sites, commensurate with the proposed housing requirement for Bentham, have been identified in High and Low Bentham as preferred housing sites with development principles

	countryside.		in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017.
The existing character of the township should be conserved including the retention of buildings released from public use e.g. Original primary school buildings. Main Street and Station (329)	<p>Following sustainability appraisal and the residential site selection process it was concluded that the old High Bentham primary school site should be allocated for housing, but not the primary school in Low Bentham due to inadequate access arrangements.</p> <p>It is not intended to redevelop the train station, nor are there any new allocations of land for housing directly adjacent to the Main Street in High Bentham. One site has been identified in Low Bentham; on the edge of the built up area (LB012), on Low Bentham Road.</p>	Yes	An appropriate level of sites, commensurate with the proposed housing requirement for Bentham, have been identified in High and Low Bentham as preferred housing sites with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017.
Infrastructure issues need to be addressed – inadequate road and pavement and parking provision, inadequate public transport & access to industrial sites, whilst ensuring that drainage and communications and other utilities are adequate. The threats to public services provision, parking & retail provision need always to be kept in mind (329)	The adoption of a Local Plan will make it easier for infrastructure providers to identify future needs. In some cases development can make a contribution to infrastructure costs through S106 agreements.	Yes	Draft policy INF6: Planning Obligations amended and included in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017.
<b>LB007: Corner of Cross Lane and Burton Road</b>			
Support; All in-fill sites, far more preferable than expanding onto adjacent farmland. (244)	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Bentham.
Drainage; There would be drainage problems in such a high rainfall area. It is currently farm land which naturally drains	Site LB007 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the		



the rain water away. Housing would interfere with this and create more drainage issues that might not be dealt with by the existing drains and sewers (2)	site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site presents a negative heritage impact, which is a determining impediment to selection.		
Access; These plots of land are adjacent to Cross Lane and Greenfoot Lane. These are narrow lanes, frequently used by walkers, and an increase in traffic would create a danger to pedestrians. The junctions of Cross Lane with Greenfoot Lane and with Burton Road, are on hills with difficult site lines. An increase in traffic caused by an increase in residential properties could result in road traffic accidents (2)	The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
Heritage; Low Bentham should be designated a Conservation Area. This site should not be identified as an Allocation until such time as this evaluation has been completed and the potential impact upon the Conservation Area (if it is eventually designated) can be evaluated.			
<b>LB008: East of Greenhead Farm, Cross Lane</b>			
Support: All in-fill sites, far more preferable than expanding onto adjacent farmland (244)	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Bentham.
Drainage: There would be drainage problems in such a high rainfall area. It is currently farm land which naturally drains the rain water away. Housing would interfere with this and create more drainage issues that might not be dealt with by the existing drains and sewers (2)	Site LB008 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site presents an inadequate road access and a negative heritage impact, which are determining impediments to selection.		
Access These plots of land are adjacent to			

<p>Cross Lane and Greenfoot Lane. These are narrow lanes frequently used by walkers, (accessing the nearby network of footpaths), and an increase in traffic would create a danger to pedestrians. The junctions of Cross Lane with Greenfoot Lane and with Burton Road, are on hills with difficult site lines. An increase in traffic caused by an increase in residential properties could result in road traffic accidents (2)</p>	<p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<p>Heritage: This site should not be identified as an Allocation until such time as this evaluation has been completed and the potential impact upon the Conservation Area (if it is eventually designated) can be evaluated.</p> <p>If the local planning authority concludes that Low Bentham should be designated as a Conservation Area, the loss of this currently-open area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area</p>			
<b>LB009: South of Greenhead Farm, Cross Lane</b>			
<p>Support; All in-fill sites, far more preferable than expanding onto adjacent farmland. (244)</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Bentham.</p>
<p>Drainage; There would be drainage problems in such a high rainfall area. It is currently farm land which naturally drains the rain water away. Housing would interfere with this and create more drainage</p>	<p>Site LB009 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site presents an inadequate</p>		

<p>issues that might not be dealt with by the existing drains and sewers (2)</p>	<p>road access, which is a determining impediment to selection.</p>		
<p>Access: These plots of land are adjacent to Cross Lane and Greenfoot Lane. These are narrow lanes frequently used by walkers, (accessing the nearby network of footpaths), and an increase in traffic would create a danger to pedestrians. The junctions of Cross Lane with Greenfoot Lane and with Burton Road, are on hills with difficult site lines. An increase in traffic caused by an increase in residential properties could result in road traffic accidents (2)</p>	<p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<p>Rights of WayLB009 have urbanisation impacts on Public Rights of Way (PRoW) (in order of highest impact). Consider use green infrastructure to mitigate (English Nature)</p>			
<p>Heritage; The local planning authority is currently undertaking as assessment about whether Low Bentham should be designated a Conservation Area. This site should not be identified as an Allocation until such time as this evaluation has been completed and the potential impact upon the Conservation Area (if it is eventually designated) can be evaluated.</p> <p>If the local planning authority concludes that Low Bentham should be designated as a Conservation Area, the loss of this currently-open area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area.</p>			

<b>LB012: Wenning View, Low Bentham Road</b>			
<p>Support: All in-fill sites, far more preferable than expanding onto adjacent farmland (244)</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site LB012 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Bentham the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	<p>Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017.</p>
<b>LB013: Low Bentham Primary School and associated land</b>			
<p>Availability: Site purchased by Bentham Town Council as Green Space This space is much needed since there is no other recreational space for public use in Low Bentham. (464 Parish Council, 448, 449 479)</p> <p>Green Space: Support for Local Greenspace Allocation (636)</p> <p>Heritage: The local planning authority is currently undertaking an assessment about whether Low Bentham should be designated a Conservation Area. This site should not be identified as an Allocation until such time as this evaluation has been completed and the potential impact upon the Conservation Area (if it is eventually designated) can be</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site LB013 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site presents an inadequate road access, which is a determining impediment to selection.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Bentham.</p>

evaluated.  If the local planning authority concludes that Low Bentham should be designated as a Conservation Area, the loss of this currently-open area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area.			
<b>LB014: East of Hillside Road</b>			
Quality of Life: We are concerned that building houses on LB014, a site which has been added since the first draft of the Local Plan, will seriously impact on the quality of life of the residents of Low Bentham, particularly those living on Hillside Road (448, 449)	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.  Site LB014 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site presents an inadequate road access and a negative heritage impact, which are determining impediments to selection.	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Bentham.
Extent of Development: The Plan provides insufficient detail to allow meaningful comment. If it were to extend beyond the line of houses on the north of Hillside Road this would have a different (and greater) impact than if it stopped behind 25 Hillside Road.(448, 449)	The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
Loss of Agricultural Lane: Building on LB014 will destroy good agricultural land (448, 449)			
Dark Skies: It will also help to blot out the multitude of stars that you can still see at night as you walk up the path from Burton Road to Hillside Road (448, 449)			

<p>Access; There is also a problem of access from the Burton Road. Access would be from just below a blind bend in a stretch of the road that is already dangerously filled with parked cars, partly an overflow from Hillview Road, which has no parking facilities. Also for most of the Burton Road down to the village there is no footpath, which makes walking dangerous (448,449).</p>			
<p>Expansion into adjacent countryside (244)</p>			
<p>Listed Building; Ellergill House, immediately to the south of this area, is a Grade II Listed Building. Therefore, an evaluation will also need to be undertaken of the potential impact which the development of this site might have upon the significance of this Listed Building (Historic England)</p>			
<p><b>LB015: North of Harley Close</b></p>			
<p>Rights of Way: LB015, have urbanisation impacts on Public Rights of Way (PRoW) (in order of highest impact). Consider use green infrastructure to mitigate (Natural England)</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Bentham.</p>
<p>Heritage; The local planning authority is currently undertaking an assessment about whether Low Bentham should be designated a Conservation Area. This site should not be identified as an Allocation until such time as this evaluation has been completed and the potential impact upon the Conservation Area (if it is eventually designated) can be evaluated.</p>	<p>Site LB015 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site presents a negative heritage impact, which is a determining impediment to selection.  The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a></p>		

<p>If the local planning authority concludes that Low Bentham should be designated as a Conservation Area, the loss of this currently-open area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>document.</p>		
<p><b>LB018: Land between Low Bentham Road and railway line</b></p>			
<p>Support: All in-fill sites, far more preferable than expanding onto adjacent farmland (244)</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site LB018 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. However, the site is relatively large and is in a fairly prominent location on the edge of the settlement, where development may have a greater impact on the wider landscape and where services and facilities are more distant. Land within the site is also of greater agricultural value (grade 3), of some archaeological interest and partly subject to surface water flood risk.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Bentham.</p>
<p><b>LB021: Land between Hillside Road and Ellergill</b></p>			
<p>Quality of Life; We are concerned that building houses on LB014, a site which has been added since the first draft of the Local Plan, will seriously impact on the quality of</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool</p>

<p>life of the residents of Low Bentham, particularly those living on Hillside Road. This is particularly so if both LB021 and LB014, which are on both sides of Hillside Road, were to be developed (448,449)</p>	<p>Site LB021 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site presents an inadequate or uncertain road access and a negative heritage impact, which are determining impediments to selection.</p>		<p>of sites for Bentham.</p>
<p>Access: We have a major concern about access to LB021. If access were to be gained by driving an entrance through numbers 22 and 20 Hillside Road this would go through bungalows which are designed for and occupied by elderly residents, and funnelling cars through these bungalows would produce a great deal of extra noise and pollution which are bound to be deeply disturbing. Quite apart from the sharp turn into the field traffic would first have to pass along Hillside Road, a relatively narrow road that is already choked with parked cars. Indeed it is doubtful whether an emergency vehicle could actually get down Hillside Road even now. So an increase in traffic along Hillside Road would raise very important quality of life and safety issues. There are also problems with Burton Road, where pedestrians already face dangerous conditions, as there is no pavement for most of the hill (448,449).</p>	<p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<p>Green Space: At the moment this field is a wonderful green space, bordered on three sides by tall, mature trees (448,449).</p>			
<p>Loss of Agricultural Lane; This is agricultural</p>			



land, a meadow where sheep graze(448,449).			
Biodiversity: Site sustains our local bio-diversity including bats, owls and the occasional deer (448,449).			
Need: We would question what kind of houses it is proposed to build in the field. If these are private houses at normal commercial prices it has to be said that there is no shortage of such accommodation in Low Bentham. If it is proposed to build low cost social housing for rent, it is clear that Low Bentham is not the best place to build such housing unless there is going to be substantial investment in physical and social infrastructure (448,449).			
Listed Building: The loss of this currently-open area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the Listed Building. In addition, Ellergill House, immediately to the south of this area, is a Grade II Listed Building.  Therefore, an evaluation will also need to be undertaken of the potential impact which the development of this site might have upon the significance of this Listed Building. (448,449, Historic England).			
<b>LB024: Recreation ground adjacent to Burton Road</b>			
Planning Application Submitted (464 Parish Council)	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June
The local planning authority is currently			

<p>undertaking an assessment about whether Low Bentham should be designated a Conservation Area. This site should not be identified as an Allocation until such time as this evaluation has been completed and the potential impact upon the Conservation Area (if it is eventually designated) can be evaluated.</p> <p>If the local planning authority concludes that Low Bentham should be designated as a Conservation Area, the loss of this currently-open area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Site LB024 does not move past a Level 1 acknowledgement, and the site is not suitable to undergo a Sustainability Analysis. The site has planning permission.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		<p>2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Bentham.</p>
---	---	--	---

## April – May 2016 Draft Local Plan

## Site Response Paper by Settlement: GLUSBURN AND CROSSHILLS

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan ( <i>ideas relating to change/site identified or not as a preferred site</i> )
<b>SC003</b>			
<p>Housing should be built on sites SC037 and SC003. We would actively support this due to the benefits that not only Cross Hills residents would get but also those of the wider neighbouring communities. Steeton and Eastburn would also see a reduction in traffic which they are going to need if all the proposed development in the area goes ahead.</p> <p>In support of sites SC037 and 3 this would provide much needed infrastructure which to date has not been forthcoming despite numerous housing developments being constructed in the close locality.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SC003 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites as the site is landlocked and has no access to an adopted highway.</p> <p>The methodology for reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Glusburn and Crosshills.</p>
<b>SC004</b>			
<p>3.3.12.1 Land of least environmental value: SC058, SC059 and SC085 contain priority habitat (see below). SC004 (partial), SC016 (partial) SC037, SC058, SC061 and SC085 are all liable to flooding (Natural England).</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SC004 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis, however it does not</p>	No	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Glusburn and Crosshills.</p>

	<p>pass all four District Level Analyses, this is due to the size of the site, this site would not be able to provide an affordable housing contribution and therefore is not deemed to be as favourable as other sites identified within Crosshills and Glusburn.</p> <p>The methodology for reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<b>SC014</b>			
<p>Waterco have prepared the attached report to inform our representations to the current consultation in the meantime. The key findings of the attached report include that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater than 0.1 hectare of the site is located outside of the extreme 0.1% annual probability flood extent and should therefore be considered as Flood Zone 1.</li> <li>• Mindful of the above, an update to the EA model/flood map is required.</li> <li>• Mitigation measures such as localised land raising could designate additional land within the site as Flood Zone 1 (potentially 100% of the site), without increasing flood risk elsewhere. (558)</li> </ul>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SC014 does not move past Level 1 acknowledgement and the site is not suitable to undergo a Sustainability Analysis as the site does not contain at least 0.1 hectares of land that is at the lowest risk of flooding (Flood Zone 1).</p> <p>The methodology for reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Glusburn and Crosshills.
<b>SC016</b>			
3.3.12.1 Land of least environmental	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local	Yes	Site is not identified as a

value: SC016 (partial) are all liable to flooding English Nature.	Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.		preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Glusburn and Crosshills.
The local planning authority is currently undertaking an assessment about whether Glusburn should be designated a Conservation Area. This site should not be identified as an Allocation until such time as this evaluation has been completed and the potential impact upon the Conservation Area (if it is eventually designated) can be evaluated. (Historic England)	Site SC016 does not perform to an adequate standard within the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites as the site is landlocked by a ransom strip and therefore access cannot be gained.  The methodology for reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
<b>SC034</b>			
The site is elevated and any development would adversely impact on the appearance and character of the village. (243)	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	No	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Glusburn and Crosshills.
It is currently green space and should remain so (243)	Site SC034 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site passes all four of the District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Crosshills and Glusburn, the site is not considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement. Although the site is a positive one for development, there are more preferable brownfield sites within Crosshills and Glusburn.		
The traffic from the site would also add to congestion Old Hall Road and in Crosshills and Glusburn as commuters head for the A629 for Skipton, Keighley stations (243, 284, 320, 254)			
Traffic would impact on the "Clean Air zone" (284)			
We are extremely concerned about flooding and drainage, the potential for it to affect the residents already here could be a real issue that we have never had a problem with. (284, 320)	The methodology for reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process</a>		
Among the wildlife that live in these			

fields (which are green belts) and the lovely views, one of the residents has seen great crested newts which are protected (284, 320, 254	<a href="#">June 2017</a> document.		
The schools are at full capacity (243, 284, 320			
Cross Hills Group Practice is large and patients struggle to get appointments. Airedale Hospital is still having a bed crisis in May (284, 320)			
The local planning authority is currently undertaking an assessment about whether Glusburn should be designated a Conservation Area. This site should not be identified as an Allocation until such time as this evaluation has been completed and the potential impact upon the Conservation Area (if it is eventually designated) can be evaluated. If the local planning authority concludes that Glusburn should be designated as a Conservation Area, the loss of this currently-open area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area.			
To the south of the proposed fields there is the Grade 2 listed building of Glusburn Old Hall, surely this would become compromised by new build houses? (320			
<b>SC037</b>			
Housing should be built on sites SC037. We would actively support this due to the benefits that not only Crosshills residents would get but also those of the wider	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup>

<p>neighbouring communities. Steeton and Eastburn would also see a reduction in traffic which they are going to need if all the proposed development in the area goes ahead. In support of sites SC037 this would provide much needed infrastructure which to date has not been forthcoming despite numerous housing developments being constructed in the close locality (687).</p>	<p>Site SC037 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four of the District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Glusburn and Crosshills the site is considered as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		<p>June 2017.</p>
<p>This site feels like a much more appropriate development – access would be easier to the A629 and this site could therefore support a sustainable increase to the size of Glusburn and Crosshills without having a direct impact on through-traffic in the actual village(s). Closer access to the A629 also means school choice is wider – Steeton, Eastburn, Kildwick and even Silsden are all within easy reach (254)</p>			
<p>Area shown on strategic scale desk-based mapping to potentially include best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land. Due to their scale and location on SC037 and SC052 are of particular concern but without field level ALC surveys it is difficult to assess the impact on BMV agricultural land (English Nature)</p>			
<p>SC004 (partial), SC016 (partial) SC037, SC058, SC061 and SC085 are all liable to flooding(English Nature). .</p>			

<b>SC052</b>			
Inadequate foul drainage leading to flooding of sewage.(345, 978	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SC052 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. SC052 is outweighed by negatives and neutrals compared to positives.</p> <p>The methodology for assessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2027, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Glusburn and Crosshills.
Fields below Baxter Wood flood. .(345, 654, 978)			
Roads and trains overcrowded. .(345, 978			
Baxter Wood is inadequate; narrow and constraints by on street parking.(345, 654, 687, 699, 978			
Access from Cononley Road to Baxter Wood is inadequate. .(345, 654, 687, 699, 978			
Development would increase congestion on Station Road.(345, 654, 687, 699, 978			
Development would lead to loss of public footpaths .(345, 654, 699, 978			
Services in Cross Hills are inadequate.(345, 978.			
Loss of agricultural land .(345, 978			
3.3.12.8 Soils and Agricultural Land: Area shown on strategic scale desk-based mapping to potentially include best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land. Due to their scale and location on SC037 and SC052 are of particular concern but without field level ALC			



surveys it is difficult to assess the impact on BMV agricultural land. However we consider that in the context of Craven, where BMV agricultural land is not widespread we would question whether sites SC037 and SC052 should be assessed as '—' in the Sustainability Appraisal with regards to SA objective 10, unless ALC surveys can be provided that suggest otherwise (English Nature)			
Development would be outside the village boundary .(345, 978			
Development would be visually detrimental .(345, 978			
Existing and proposed development should be adequate for the needs of Crosshills .(345, 978			
Development on greenfield sites is contrary to Government policy .(345, 978			
Loss of area for Public Recreation/Removal of valued habitat (699, 978)			
The proposed development at Site SC052 is in a green wedge. It would almost fill the gap between Cross Hills and Farnhill/Kildwick and would constitute large-scale development beyond the settlement boundary removing the individual character and identity of the settlements (654, 265, 699, 716, 978).			
<b>SC058/SC059/SC060/SC085</b>			
Support: Malsis Ltd Development will restore Listed	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to	Yes and No	Sites SC058, SC059, SC060 are not identified as preferred

Buildings for care use, restoration of Lodge for dwellings, sports facilities for community, around 100 new houses. Houses are essential to allow restoration of listed building and sports use. Unlike other sites proposal provides certainty about jobs, facilities and houses. Application to be submitted 2016 (550)	further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.		housing sites in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor do they remain in the pool of sites for Glusburn and Crosshill.s
Support (243, 664)	Site SC058 does not move past Level 1 acknowledgement and the site is not suitable to undergo a Sustainability Analysis as the site has been combined with SC059, SC060 and SC065 to create SC085.		Site SC085 is identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
Concern over impact of traffic (243, 664)	Site SC059 does not move past Level 1 acknowledgement and the site is not suitable to undergo a Sustainability Analysis as the site has been combined with SC058, SC060 and SC065 to create SC085.		
Concern over impact on infrastructure (664)	Site SC060 does not move past Level 1 acknowledgement and the site is not suitable to undergo a Sustainability Analysis as the site has been combined with SC058, SC059 and SC065 to create SC085.		
	Site SC085 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site passes three of the four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Crosshills and Glusburn, the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.		
	The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
<b>SC061</b>			
Concern about impact on wildlife on the	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local	No	Site is not identified as a

<p>site (177, 238, 234)</p> <p>Site has been flooded in the past (177,238, 234, Natural England)</p> <p>Impact of development on traffic (177, 238)</p> <p>Malsis Hall is a Grade II Listed Building. In order to demonstrate that the allocation of this area is not incompatible with the requirements of the NPPF, as part of the Evidence Base underpinning the Plan there needs to be an assessment of what contribution this currently-undeveloped area makes to those elements which contribute to the significance of this Listed Building and what effect the loss of this site and its subsequent development might have upon those significances (Heritage England)</p>	<p>Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SC061 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis, it also passes all four of the District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Crosshills and Glusburn, the site is not considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement. The site is situated within Flood Zone 3a and has surface water problems to the south, in order to gain access to the site and begin development a number of trees would have to be removed. Therefore this site is not favourable compared to other identified sites within Crosshills and Glusburn.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		<p>preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Glusburn and Crosshills.</p>
<b>SC071</b>			
<p>Access to Cross Hills Road [from Cononley Road] dangerous</p> <p>Access to Baxter Wood unacceptable</p> <p>Increased risk of surface water flooding Baxter Wood</p> <p>Loss of area for recreation</p> <p>Loss of footpath</p> <p>Infill of green wedge between Cross Hills and Cononley</p> <p>Problem of foul water drainage Baxter Wood</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SC071 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four of the District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Crosshills and Glusburn, the site is not considered suitable as one of the Preferred</p>	No	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Glusburn and Crosshills.</p>

<p>Traffic congestion Station Road</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land</p> <p>Development outside village boundary</p> <p>Visual Impact</p> <p>Existing development should be adequate</p>	<p>Sites in this settlement. Although this site is a positive piece of land for development there are other more preferable brownfield sites within Crosshills and Glusburn.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<b>SC081</b>			
<p>This piece of land would extend the confines of the settlement westwards in a linear fashion. It appears as a standalone development, which is clearly outside the settlement. Between the site and the next building (Dog and Gun PH) is a car park and a piece of undeveloped land, further highlighting the visual separation between the Public House and that particular piece of land.(704)</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SC081 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis; however it does not pass all three of the four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Crosshills and Glusburn, the site is not considered suitable as one of the preferred sites in this settlement. This is due to the size of the site; this site would not be able to provide an affordable housing contribution and therefore is not deemed to be as favourable as other sites identified within Crosshills and Glusburn.</p> <p>The methodology for reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	No	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Glusburn and Crosshills.
<p>The case for extending the built area would in any event, achieve very little in terms of making a realistic and substantive contribution to the overall supply of housing in the Borough. It would be more logical to consider the allocation of sites which are more centrally placed in relation to the facilities and services offered by the village. (704)</p>			
<p>Indeed, were this site to be allocated, it could present a realistic precedent to further development on the car park to the Public House, which would serve</p>			

only to artificially extend the edge of the settlement further westwards in an incongruous fashion (704).			
<b>SC083</b>			
The site lies at the very western extremity of the built settlement of Glusburn and comprises open countryside which rises to the South East.	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Glusburn and Crosshills.
<p>Planning application ref 32/204/14668 was refused on appeal on 17 February 2015. The Inspector concluded: “the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the countryside and would represent relatively sporadic and isolated development”. “However, all in all, I conclude that the adverse impact on the countryside would significantly and demonstrably outweigh that benefit in this instance and, taking all aspects of sustainability into account, would not represent sustainable development”</p> <p>It can be inferred that a development for a greater number of dwellings as is now envisaged, would only serve to intensify and consolidate the above identified harm.</p>	<p>Site SC083 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites as the site is subject to a ransom strip.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
The allocation of this site would effectively amount to an incongruous and oddly shaped incursion into the open countryside, introducing in depth development to the housing along Colne Road, where none exists at present and			

<p>appearing notably out of character with the pattern and form of built development at this point.</p>			
<p>There is no footway fronting the southern side of Colne Road in the vicinity of this particular site, rendering it extremely dangerous for pedestrians and those with prams and wheelchairs to attempt to navigate towards the village centre. This matter cannot be addressed because the northern elevations of Bridge End House and Bridge End Cottage directly abut the carriageway of Colne Road rendering it impossible to introduce a footway at this point. This is a further major detractor from the allocation of this site in sustainability terms.</p>			

## April – May 2016 Draft Local Plan

## Site Response Paper by Settlement: INGLETON

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>IN006</b>			
<p>Any encroachment into the Ingleton Conservation Area is unnecessary and should be avoided. The site provides essential car parking, reducing congestion and improving ease of access for residents and tourists.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site IN006 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis; The site passes all four of the District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Ingleton, the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>This site has performed well when assessed against site assessment criteria under the Sustainability Appraisal, and then when compared to other sites included in the pool of sites.</p> <p>The presence of the Ingleton Conservation Area is noted, and the site's potential development</p>	No	<p>Site identified as a preferred site for housing in the June –July 2017 consultation following further site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>

	<p>should be sensitively and appropriately designed with this in mind.</p> <p>The site is owned by Craven District Council, and is viewed as a prime, town centre brownfield site for potential residential development. During a weekday visit to the site in 2016, there was just a singular abandoned vehicle on the site.</p>		
<b>IN010</b>			
<p>Small-scale development of an appropriate scale in this location has the potential to enhance the setting of the conservation area, the viaduct and the street scene as the entry into the village (the National Park boundary runs along the opposite side of the road).</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site IN010 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis; The site passes all four of the District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Ingleton, the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>This site has performed well when assessed against site assessment criteria, and when compared to other sites included in the pool of sites.</p> <p>There is agreement with the site response opposite. Small-scale residential development of an appropriate nature has the potential to improve and enhance the setting of the</p>	No	<p>Site identified as a preferred site for housing in the June – July 2017 consultation following further site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>



	conservation area, the viaduct and the entry into Ingleton from the northwest.		
<b>IN015</b>			
The site has urbanisation impacts on PRow. Consider use of green infrastructure to mitigate.	<p>The points on urbanisation impacts on PRow and the use of green infrastructure are noted.</p> <p>Planning Permission approved (45/2016/17387) for residential development on the site. Hence, site not to be taken forward.</p>	no	Site identified as a preferred site for housing in the June –July 2017 consultation following further site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Site now has planning permission.
<b>IN022</b>			
The site has urbanisation impacts on PRow. Consider use of green infrastructure to mitigate.	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site IN022 does not perform satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site does not have an existing suitable access.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>The points on urbanisation impacts on PRow and the use of green infrastructure are noted. The majority of the site is in FRZ1, but it is recommended that any future development be concentrated on the eastern area of the site as large areas of the western section are in FRZ2. There is a medium to high surface water risk on parts of the site. The site does not have a</p>	No	Site not identified as a preferred site for housing in the June – July 2017 consultation following further site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. The site is not in the pool of sites.

	connection to an adopted highway.		
<b>IN028</b>			
<p>IN028 and IN029 are taken together - close range views into this large site are relatively limited from within the National Park due to the topography of the land and mature tree cover although from certain vantage points it will be seen as a significant enlargement of the village. These views are not considered to be harmful to the setting of the National Park as they would be views down into the village. For similar reasons it is unlikely to affect views into the National Park from southern vantage points to a harmful degree. Any views of development would be seen in the context of the wider village, which is positioned on much lower, relatively level ground compared to the steeply rising hills on the flanks of the National Park above.</p> <p>The site has urbanisation impacts on PRow. Consider use of green infrastructure to mitigate.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site IN028 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site passes all four of the District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Ingleton, the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>This site has performed well when assessed against site assessment criteria, and when compared to other sites included in the pool of sites.</p> <p>The comments on the views into the site from within the National Park are noted. It is recommended that only a portion of this site be utilised, an area of land in the northeast of the site, bordering existing residential development. The northwest of the site has built heritage elements which warrant protection, and the remainder of the site to the south has biodiversity and open countryside elements where it is not desirable to locate residential</p>	No	Site identified as a preferred site for housing in the June – July 2017 consultation following further site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

	development under this Local Plan.  The points on urbanisation impacts on PRow and the use of green infrastructure are noted.		
<b>IN029</b>			
<p>INO28 and INO29 are taken together - close range views into this large site are relatively limited from within the National Park due to the topography of the land and mature tree cover although from certain vantage points it will be seen as a significant enlargement of the village. These views are not considered to be harmful to the setting of the National Park as they would be views down into the village. For similar reasons it is unlikely to affect views into the National Park from southern vantage points to a harmful degree. Any views of development would be seen in the context of the wider village, which is positioned on much lower, relatively level ground compared to the steeply rising hills on the flanks of the National Park above.</p> <p>The site contains priority habitat woodland - consider retaining/improving any woodland on this site.</p> <p>The site has urbanisation impacts on PRow. Consider use of green infrastructure to mitigate.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site INO29 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site passes all four of the District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Ingleton, the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>This site has performed well when assessed against site assessment criteria, and when compared to other sites included in the pool of sites.</p> <p>The comments on the views into the site from within the National Park are noted. It is recommended that only a portion of this site be utilised for residential development, namely a central-west portion, adjacent to existing residential development.</p> <p>It is not desirable to locate residential</p>	No	Site identified as a preferred site for housing in the June – July 2017 consultation following further site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

	<p>development on the remainder of this site as the site contains large amounts of open countryside, and also some woodland habitat which should be retained.</p> <p>The point raised regarding the site having potential urbanisation impacts on the PRoW is noted, and this is further reason why the large majority of the site should not be developed under the Local Plan proposals.</p>		
<b>IN049</b>			
<p>The site is shown as 'also local green space' but this should not be so since the general public have never had rights of access to the site. Such designation would also severely hamper the development potential of the site (which is relatively small).</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site IN049 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site passes all four of the District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Ingleton, the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>This site has performed well when assessed against site assessment criteria, and when compared to other sites included in the pool of sites.</p> <p>The site is no longer shown as a site for local</p>	Yes	<p>Site identified as a preferred site for housing in the June – July 2017 consultation following further site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>

	green space. The site is a village centre site which has good potential for residential development.		
<b>IN050</b>			
The site has urbanisation impacts on PRoW. Consider use of green infrastructure to mitigate.	The point regarding potential urbanisation impacts on the PRoW is noted.	No	Site not identified as a preferred site for housing in the June – July 2017 consultation following further site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<b>General</b>			
With a potential of 450 houses, albeit phased in, I would like to see an assessment/plan for the development of additional facilities to support these extra households e.g. school, doctors, and shops. Provision of green space/corridor for wildlife and community enjoyment. Carbon neutral properties built.	Consultation with infrastructure providers is ongoing throughout preparation of the Local Plan to ensure that representatives of the key services such as health and education are aware of the growth planned in Craven over the next plan period. The aim of this process is to ensure that the Local Plan and the delivery and longer term management plans of such providers is aligned.		

## April – May 2016 Draft Local Plan

## Site Response Paper by Settlement: GARGRAVE

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>GA004</b>			
In fill sites which lessen impact on the village.	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site GA004 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis; The site passes all four of the District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Rathmell, the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>This site has performed well when assessed against site assessment criteria, and then when compared to other sites included in the pool of sites.</p> <p>Agreement – this is an infill, brownfield site with potential residential development which would lessen the impact on the village in comparison</p>	No	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017.
Currently Neville House Brownfield Site – Chosen site for Neighbourhood Plan & supported by the village.			
These would be natural extensions of the existing more recent housing and are outside the conservation area. There is an existing road for access and are not in sight from many existing houses			
Achieved 108 on site assessment score on page 31 of Gargrave Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (November 2015). I support the reuse of brownfield site with minimal impact on infrastructure and character of village.			
GA004 (site of NYCC Home for the Elderly) Neville House, Neville Crescent 19 Houses proposed. The number of houses on this site should be reduced and perhaps homes suitable for the elderly should be considered.			
Even excluding 50% of GA017 (which –			

<p>according to the 1999 plan -- appears to be a flood risk) these sites [GA004, GA017, GA031] would provide about 4 Ha which is sufficient for 120 homes. These are in addition to the 29 already allocated at G2/4 on the NDP.</p>	<p>with some other available sites.</p> <p>Acknowledgement that this site is a chosen residential site under the draft Gargrave Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
<p>Object Why do these spaces need to be filled in? Spaces are what they are space without space there is no freedom to move to escape all these things that are vitally important</p>	<p>North Yorkshire County Council has stated to the Planning Policy team that they are currently looking at a replacement site for Extra Care units in Gargrave. This is a brownfield site in the village centre and an appropriate density is expected to take advantage of the sustainable modes of travel which this site can encourage.</p>		
<p>If sensitive considerate development took place I would support this site.</p> <p>Low density would be supported.</p>	<p>It is not appropriate to comment on combinations of sites outside of those proposed in the draft Local Plan, and the possible number of houses they may contain.</p>		
<p>The Neville House site is a valuable asset to the community and should not be redeveloped. The green open space is vital to maintaining the character of the village.</p>	<p>Regarding the comment on spaces, site GA004 is not an empty space, but has a current care home for the elderly. North Yorkshire County Council have expressed their intention to move on from this site, and accommodate Extra Care units elsewhere in Gargrave.</p> <p>Sensitive development of this site in terms of design is encouraged. A residential density appropriate to a brownfield site in the village centre is recommended.</p> <p>As stated, North Yorkshire County Council has expressed their intention to move on from this</p>		

	site, and accommodate Extra Care units elsewhere in Gargrave.		
<b>GA005</b>			
Building on this site would create new dwellings very close to existing dwellings.	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site GA005 does not perform satisfactorily in the Sustainability Appraisal, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. Potential for undesirable cumulative effects if all of the site developed, in terms of increasing traffic onto the already busy narrow roads of Church Lane and Pennine Way. This is a built area of Gargrave with its own urban characteristics within the Conservation Area. Access from Church Street is unacceptable due to no visibility to the north.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>Agreement – the site is largely surrounded by a dense concentration of existing dwellings.</p>	No	Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017. The site is not in the pool of sites for Gargrave.
Negative impact of building new properties within the conservation area. Increased traffic would cause blockages on Church Street and prevent traffic from crossing the bridge.	The potential impact on the conservation area is noted, as is the likely increased pressure on Church Street. This is already a quite busy intersection, from site visit inspection.		
Any building on this site would spoil the	Agreement – it is not thought desirable to change		



<p>scenic views, also this site gives a break between Church Street, Mill Lane. A real green field site in the centre of the village surrounded by properties.</p>	<p>this greenfield area to residential development under the Local Plan's Preferred Sites.</p>		
<p>The site is one of the two remaining "home crofts" in the ancient part of the village a conservation area. It should be preserved for the character of the village. It also has poor access for housing etc.</p>	<p>The point on the site being one of the two remaining 'home crofts' in this part of the village is noted. Agreement that residential development here is not appropriate in this part of the village, which has a largely separate character to the rest of Gargrave.</p>		
<p>All these sites are parkland and open green space which contributes to a rural feel in Gargrave. These sites also run alongside the canal which is already experiencing too much housing development. The canal attracts holiday makers and is a source of income. Why would people come if it was a built up residential area with cheap houses overlooking the canal. Again, stupid choice.</p>	<p>The site is not immediately adjacent to the canal. The open green space which this site contains is valuable in the context of the local built environment.</p>		
<p>Damages environment, inadequate road and infrastructure. Aesthetically damaging by the canal Disrupts beauty of canal side by creating "urban" environment Adjacent to Pennine Way Route Adjacent to National Park Cycle Way Favoured countryside walk Additional traffic and site development would be damaging to the village Chew Lane is an area of sheet flood. Additional concrete and hard surface run off would exacerbate the situation Infrastructure not sustainable for such</p>	<p>The additional traffic which would be generated by development of the site may be excessive for an already busy Church Lane.</p>		

disproportionate development			
Good Access.	Potential accesses may be formed.		
All the above sites are outside the “settlement boundary” as shown on the plan issued by Gargrave PC and should not be approved for further residential or commercial use. The village of Gargrave is unsuitable for further large scale development as the infrastructure is already over capacity.	The ‘settlement boundary’ referred to in the plan issued by Gargrave Parish Council is not something which the Craven Local Plan is required to adhere to when choosing the most appropriate residential sites for Gargrave. Development of this site could not represent ‘large scale development’ due to its size.		
Sites on outskirts of village where development has already started, so impact is lessened.	There is no residential development on this site.		
Object Strongly Development alongside the canal would change the whole nature of the village. Once development started it would be difficult to contain. We saw much flooding in this area in the winter which may become more common.	The references to development alongside the canal are noted, although this site is not located immediately adjacent to the canal.		
Traffic joining A65 from Church Street is already heavy and at peak times traffic is tailing back the length of the bridge on Church Street increased traffic would make this narrow bridge a danger for both walkers and drivers alike.	It was noticed during a site visit in 2016 that traffic was already reasonably heavy along Church Lane.		
Access problems. Flood Issues. Again I object most strongly to the urbanisation of this village. Gargrave Parish Council have spent 3 years in a democratic process to try and get the best possible plan for the village. Is CDC now going to override this democratic process? Maybe a legal	The Craven draft Local Plan is in agreement with Gargrave’s draft Neighbourhood Plan regarding GA004 and GA031, two sites chosen for residential development by both plans. This site is not to be chosen for such development.		

<p>challenge couple be implemented.</p>			
<p>The occasional grazing was discontinued in 2012 following damage to surrounding fences and tree hedge planting on the croft itself. In all practical terms the croft is now an extension of the gardens to Bell House and The Hollies and should be recognized as such in the new Plan.</p> <p>4. Conclusions – Designation of the land as LGS will create more problems of uses and maintenance. We would suggest that the site is well-protected by its status within the Conservation Area and will object strongly to any suggestion to increase the level of protection to Local Green Space.</p>	<p>The references to previous uses and maintenance are noted. There is no intention to put forward this site as a Preferred Site.</p>		
<p>The site is generally given positive support apart from 2 issues:</p> <p>SO9: Flood risk - 95% in Zone 1, never been affected by flooding in living memory. No formal flood risk assessment has been carried out by any practical inspection demonstrates little risk – the site is 2 to 3m higher than the Riverside properties to the north and well above the formal Greens flanking the River Aire (which do flood regularly).</p> <p>S12: Heritage Assets/ Archaeological Interest – both limited in scope. The site is mainly surrounded by the backs of properties all partially screened by fencing and hedges and adjoins The Hollies (grade II) and the Church Yard. The archaeological interest relates to human remains</p>	<p>The observations on Flood Risk and Heritage Assets are both noted.</p>		

<p>discovered when the Vicarage was built in the 1950's; this was on a limited area and since then no further remains have been discovered.</p> <p>A formal Archaeological Report submitted following investigation as part of appl.ref 30/2013/13571, the Vicarage Extension – copy available if required.</p> <p>Summary of Issues and Recommendations – P12 – Support/Comment: Highways: development of the site has always been anticipated in 2 sections, the western end accessed from Church Street (with the added advantage of being able to improve the access to Riverside) and the eastern end from Church Lane.</p> <p>The problem with Church Lane is not one of volume (a traffic survey was included with appl.ref. 30/2014/14091 and is available if required). Problems arise when having to pass the occasional heavy farm vehicle; an additional refuge was provided at the rebuilt site entrance in October 2013, much closer to where the HGV's come into view which has eased the problem considerably.</p> <p>Mitigation and Recommendations – P12 – Support: Measures 5a &amp; 5b are accepted. It is also suggested that measure 6, very good accessibility to key services and public transport to be included.</p> <p>Summary &amp; Conclusions</p> <p>1. Introduction – We are</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>generally in support of the overall objectives, methodology etc as set out in the Craven Local Plan consultation documents (draft 5/4/16).</p> <p>Our principle concerns relate to Gargrave and in particular to site GA005, partly owned by Mrs Anne Clark and the possibility of this being designated as 'Local Green Space' (LGS).</p> <p>2. Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan – Prepared by the Parish Council and distributed for consultation in autumn 2015. This document introduced the proposal for several open areas within the Village boundary to become LGS and had many shortcomings including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- References to sites were inconsistent and confusing</li> <li>- Sections of previous consultation documents which did not agree with the objectives had been omitted</li> <li>- Incorrect assumptions has been drawn from some of the analysis</li> </ul> <p>Representations objecting to the LGS proposals were made in December 2015; a copy is attached.</p> <p>3. Current Position – Site GA005 was originally the 'home croft' attached to Church Gate Farm which ceased farming in the 1960's. From then and up to approx. 1985 the land was used as a domestic croft connected to The Hollies. Over the last 25-</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>30 years the land has been effectively disused, occasionally grazed – ‘mobile grass cutters’ as a favour by a local farmer. The occasional grazing was discontinued in 2012 following damage to surrounding fences and tree hedge planting on the croft itself. In all practical terms the croft is now an extension of the gardens to Bell House and The Hollies and should be recognized as such in the new Plan.</p> <p>4. Conclusions – Designation of the land as LGS will create more problems of uses and maintenance. We would suggest that the site is well-protected by its status within the Conservation Area and will object strongly to any suggestion to increase the level of protection to Local Green Space.</p>			
<p>Object Church Lane is not suitable to accept increased levels of cars. This green space is the only one of its kind in the middle of the village. The whole ambience of Church Street/ Church lane would be affected.</p>			
<p>GA005 P24 of “Gargrave Pool of site options with potential for residential or mixed use – Object: This site is one of the two remaining “home crofts” in the ancient part of the village - a conservation area. It should be preserved for the character of the village. It also has poor access for housing use.</p>			
<p>Strong concerns re 1) Infrastructure - surrounding drainage / risk of surface water flooding 2) Roads - congestion: road already</p>			

<p>busy (Church Street) with local, commuter, agricultural; cyclists and horse riders 3)                  Access to site - present access was I understand not officially agreed to / several accesses to houses near present access / risk of accident 4) Aesthetically unsympathetic in heart of "heritage" type housing / damaging ambience of Gargrave to locals and visitors alike. Strongly support designation as Green Space.</p>			
<p>Near church idyllic spot beautiful village surrounded by Grade II Listed Buildings. Lovely walks part of cycle network. Pennine way. Please do not spoil the village Take heed of the GPC Plan</p>			
<p>3.3.11.3 Rights of Way: GA005, GA014 and especially GA28, GA30 could have a landscape impact on the Pennine Way. Although GA023, GA029 and GA031 aren't next to the Pennine Way, there could be a landscape impact from these allocations. GA017 and GA031 could have an urbanisation impact on other PRoWs. Consider use green infrastructure to mitigate.</p>			
<p>Destroy areas that have always been "green spaces". Part of the attraction of the village. Reasons for coming. Do not go against the GPC plan. Do not be party to destruction of a beautiful village and go against the wishes of the people.</p>			
<p>Neighbourhood Plan – GA005 – Support –</p>			

<p>We agree with the neighbourhood plan and green spaces. As the site GA005 is classed as a croft and heritage site and planning permission on it has already been refused. We hope this continues.</p>			
<p>Conservation Area – the site is a narrow strip sandwiched between the formal Village Greens and the Church Yard, formal green spaces which do make a ‘strong’ contribution to the CA. The site at best can be described as making ‘some’ contribution.</p>			
<p>This has already been thrown out on Appeal! Keep as Local Green Space please.</p>			
<p>I’m shocked and surprised to see this site as mixed potential housing/green space. I have recently exchanged contracts on half this site and am due to complete in the not too distant future. The full site does not have the capacity to both be for residential use and green space given its limited size. Surrounded by a number of listed buildings, the beautiful vista in provides from the path from the south to the north of the village and the vital role it plays in retaining the village character, would mean development would erode one of the core pieces of land giving the village it’s character. In addition, I was paid a visit by the owner of the other half of the site. There were a number of concerning messages about the wish to develop the land to make significant financial gain. However, this would not be in the near term until the overage the church</p>			



<p>had on the land had expired and the individual could reap maximum financial gain.</p> <p>Most concerning was the rather worrying boast that he was in contact with members of the craven planning team and that those planners did not want the green spaces of Gargrave identified to be designated as green space. This worried me greatly that the consultation is pre-judged and that there may be influence in order to achieve an individual's financial gain. I have a record of the conversation and a number of documents he left with me should this need to be investigated. This and the potential for it to affect my current purchase and lose money would cause me to need to consider my options should the decision be made which does not reflect the best use of space.</p>			
<p>Open Space – states that the site 'is not to be designated as Local Green Space' (our major concern); the 'Outcome' concluding section indicates that 'the site is presently identified as a potential Local Green Space designation.</p> <p>The statements are obviously in direct contradiction. And we feel it is worthwhile revisiting the original LGS Methodology for Assessing Sites.</p> <p>Test 1 – No existing Planning Consents. Designated 'Agricultural' in the 1999 Plan. The land was last in agricultural use in the 1960's; originally the home croft to Church</p>			

<p>Gate Farm, later taken over by Church Close Farm. For the last 50 years the croft has been used in connection with The Hollies (domestic paddock and occasional grazing), sections have been sold off for residential uses (the Vicarage, Bell House, Fletchers Barn); corners have been trimmed to improve access to Riverside and Goffa Mill and the land encroached into by Riverside boundary hedges.</p> <p>The land area is now approximately 60% of the original croft – see Site Plan OS4 attached.</p> <p>Test 2 – Proximity to the community they serve.</p> <p>The site is within easy walking distance of the Village Centre, the Railway Station and other amenities. Whilst this fulfils the LGS criteria, it also makes it an ideal site for a limited number of small retirement homes which many local people drew attention to in response to the Parish Council’s October 2015 public consultation.</p> <p>Test 3 – Local in character / not extensive.</p> <p>The croft is the remains of an agricultural field, original area 0.48 hectares (1.19 acres), now reduced to 0.30 hectares (0.74 acres).</p> <p>Test 4 – Can the site be shown to be ‘special’ ?</p> <p>Beauty : Generally accepted criteria for assessing the quality of an ‘Open Space’ within a town or village would include the</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>following –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- use / functional role within the built-up area</li> <li>- spatial characteristics (important gaps or spaces)</li> <li>- providing a setting for LB's or other important features</li> <li>- providing a setting for other frontage buildings</li> <li>- trees and other natural features</li> <li>- views, either of features within the village or hills beyond</li> </ul> <p>The Croft is a very ordinary piece of grassland surrounded by the backs of houses partially hidden by miscellaneous walls, hedgerows and fences in various states of repair; the site provides for none of the amenities listed.</p> <p>Historic Significance : Not relevant</p> <p>Recreational Value : The croft is private land with no public access.</p> <p>Tranquility : Not relevant</p> <p>Richness of Wildlife : Not relevant.</p> <p>Other Reason : There is an element of nimbyism especially objections from the Riverside neighbours to any form of development. The site is well protected by its Conservation Area status and ignoring any residential development, the site could be used to improve local deficiencies, improving the access to Riverside, providing rear access to the Church Street properties (currently parking on the road) and possibly</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>parking for the Church which would presumably be prevented by LGS designation.</p> <p>If designated, can the LGS be sustained beyond the Local / Neighbourhood Plan periods : Maintenance of the Eastern section of the croft currently costs between 2 &amp; £3,000p/a. When the Parish Council put forward their proposals for LGS sites in October 2015, they were asked if they would be taking over the maintenance of these community assets – the answer was 'NO'.</p> <p>Whilst we will continue to maintain the Church Lane section for the time being, it is unlikely to be undertaken by future owners - the Church street section is now owned by parties living outside the Village. When such sites are not connected to farmland on-going maintenance is likely to become a major problem; the sites will become valueless and are likely to degenerate into 'Urban Wastelands'.</p>			
<p>GA005 - object to possibly being designated Local Green Space.</p>			
<p><b>GA009</b></p>			
<p>Accessibility for the site referred to as GA009 is totally unsafe with regard to traffic movements and speed flow. I have been dealing with the Police for some time on this matter, so far without success.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site GA009 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan of June 2017.</p>

<p>They have provided a graph showing the excess speed of vehicles passing both of the proposed access points - these being in a 30MPH restriction without control or monitoring on any regular basis. This road is totally unsafe for current residents.</p>	<p>Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Settle the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement. This site should not be completely developed over its whole land area due to the current FRZ3 zone in the southern part of the site, adjacent to the canal. This is Grade 3 agricultural land which is of importance. Potential for community recreational use adjacent to the canal to the southern boundary. It must be noted that North Yorkshire County Council are looking at the potential for Extra Care units on the site.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<p>The building of houses in the eastern section of the proposed site in incompatible with the surrounding area. The units would be out of the current line and contrary to the local landscape. The centre access section between the 2 sites renders the parcel of land to the south of the line unusable for current agricultural activities.</p>			
<p>The only means of access to this part of Eshton Road, Gargrave is via two listed bridges one to the west of the site and the other to the east. The amount of increased traffic will have a detrimental effect on these bridges together with an increased level of accident potential. The bridge on the east of the site access suffers from chronic congestion currently; the building of units on this scale will create an unacceptable gain in congestion and is therefore not compatible with current road safety requirements.</p>			
<p>This land is not a proposed housing site in the Gargrave Neighbourhood Development Plan. Generally it has poor accessibility to services. Has identified flood risk issues. Some policy constraints; it is identified as</p>			

<p>Special Landscape Area in the adopted Development Plan. It does not relate well to the village and the open land in the southern part of the site is important to the rural setting of Gargrave and to views of the National Park from the village and key amenity corridors, notably the Leeds and Liverpool Canal. There would also be a significant increase in traffic on Eshton Road and its listed canal bridge. The village has identified sites sufficient for the needs of the village in its Neighbourhood Development plan and this should be the development option going forward.</p>			
<p>Use the Gargrave NP sites. These are sustainable and fulfill Gargrave's strategic housing requirement, therefore no need to allocate this site. Clause 185 of the NPPF says not to duplicate the process.</p> <p>The site has flooding risks as identified by the EA. As there are other sites, as identified in the Gargrave NP, which are at lower risk of flooding and more sustainable. GA009 fails when treating flooding sequentially. By using the low flood risk area only the risk of flooding on the other areas increases. The Local Plan accepts this by requiring SUDS and flood risk assessment. This is not treating flooding sequentially and risks indiscriminate planning applications from other sites which flood, particularly the cricket pitch site.</p>			

<p>By including this site in the LDP Craven are resetting the acceptable sustainability score in the Gargrave NP. This increases the risk of indiscriminate planning applications for sites not included in the Gargrave NP, which have the same or higher scores.</p>			
<p>So far as GA009 is concerned we object on the following grounds: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed development will be visually intrusive when viewed from Yorkshire Dales National Park, the boundary of which is very near, and also visually intrusive from the Leeds-Liverpool canal.</li> <li>2. Access is from Eshton Road where it may not be possible to achieve satisfactory sight lines. We have seen the results of a survey made by the police earlier this year, the highest speed was almost twice the limit on Eshton Road, which is 30 m.p.h. Substantial vehicular traffic will be created by the proposed development, to the detriment of road safety.</li> <li>3. We are seriously worried about flooding. Our property has been flooded twice and just avoided it on Boxing Day 2015. The proposed development will inevitably have substantial areas of hard surfacing thus potentially increasing the flood risk.</li> <li>4. The proposed development will be an intrusion into open countryside and will destroy the open aspect of the fields to the</li> </ol>			

<p>rear of the properties on Eshton Road originally constructed by the West Riding to serve as small holdings, and will be detrimental to the character of the area.</p> <p>5. The proposed development will increase vehicular traffic on Raybridge Lane which is already very busy (often being by vehicles unsuited to a narrow Dales road) and subject to drivers travelling at an unsuitably high speed. There is no footpath along Raybridge Lane which is also used by many pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. The risk of accidents and injury to anyone walking or riding along Raybridge Lane will be increased because of the extra traffic. Immediately on our boundary (along Raybridge Lane is the narrow, steep and blind bridge over the canal, already the scene of many and frequent accidents.</p> <p>Yours faithfully CJ Varley IJ Varley</p>			
<p>Other – The southern part of the area adjacent to the LL canal should, as shown, not be developed. This to preserve the character and aspect of the canal.</p>			
<p>Other – This area next to the canal should not be developed.</p>			
<p>Part of site floods but remainder would be an excellent location for extra care provision. Do not support for housing though numbers sufficient in GA004 &amp; GA031 would result in over development of the village.</p>			



<p>I wish to object to the inclusion in the list of Preferred Sites for Housing of GA009 (land off Esthon Road) on the basis that, in consultation with North Yorkshire County Council, the Neighbourhood Planning Group has identified another site on Marton Road which is more suitable for the care home provision sought by North Yorkshire.</p>			
<p><b>Access</b>          The accessibility for the site referred to as GA009 is totally unsafe with regard to traffic movements and speed flow. I have been dealing with the Police for some time on this matter, so far without success. They have provided a graph showing the excess speed of vehicles passing both of the proposed access points - these being in a 30MPH restriction without control or monitoring on any regular basis. This road is totally unsafe for current residents.</p> <p><b>Eastern Aspect</b>          The building of houses in the eastern section of the proposed site is incompatible with the surrounding area. The units would be out of the current line and contrary to the local landscape. The centre access section between the 2 sites renders the parcel of land to the south of the line unusable for current agricultural activities.</p> <p><b>Sewerage</b></p>			

<p>The sewerage system on Eshton road - North of the canal was constructed in the mid 1950's.</p> <p>It was designed to accommodate 6 pairs of semi-detached, smallholding houses. The method of moving this sewerage over or under the canal, will be of a size to accommodate the requirements at the time. It will not accommodate 50 new dwellings.</p> <p>Infrastructure</p> <p>There are no places left in the local school for additional children.</p> <p>The doctor's surgery cannot currently cope with the demand for appointments.</p> <p>There are no shops other than a co-operative store.</p> <p>There is an inefficient and unreliable public transport system to other towns, trains that do not always stop or return, the bus system looks to be a temporary measure to fill the gap left by the original company going out of business.</p> <p>There are no facilities to buy fuel for cars that have to be used on a general basis.</p>			
<b>GA009 &amp; GA022</b>			
<p>Added adverse effect on canal users. Proposals will change the nature of Gargrave as an attractive tourist village with the economic drawbacks this would entail.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>GA009 has been discussed above.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017. The site remains in the pool of sites.</p>

	<p>Site GA022 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site passes all four of the District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Gargrave, the site is not considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement. This is a prominent site on the settlement's northwestern edge and sensitive design would be required. It is also among the closest sites to the National Park and it is a site that is not required at this time given the other options available.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p>		
<b>GA009, GA017, GA022, GA027, GA028, GA029, GA030, GA031, GA032</b>			
<p>All of the above sites are outside the "settlement boundary" as shown on the plan issued by Gargrave PC and should not be approved for further residential or commercial use. The village of Gargrave is unsuitable for further large scale development as the infrastructure is already over capacity.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing these sites together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p> <p>Whether SHLAA sites are inside or outside the aforementioned 'settlement boundary' does not restrict the choosing of sites by the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>GA009 has been previously discussed.</p>	No	<p>GA009: Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan of June 2017.</p> <p>GA017: Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan of June 2017. The site remains in the pool.</p> <p>GA022: Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan</p>

	<p><b>GA017</b>  Site GA017 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. However, after a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Gargrave, the site is not considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement at this time. The majority of the site is in FRZ1, but areas of FRZ3 exist on the northern portion of the site, with high risk of surface water flooding in this area. A sub-division of the site would be necessary to allow only a portion of this site for dwellings for reasons of flood risk. A sub-division is also necessary in order to reduce the impact of increased traffic on Church Lane, and allow a setback from the creamery on the site's western boundary. The existing lanes to the north and southwest of the site's boundaries have the potential to be upgraded to accommodate vehicles.</p> <p>GA022 has been previously discussed.</p> <p><b>GA027</b>  Site GA027 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. However, after a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Gargrave, the site is not considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement at this time. The site performs well regarding having a low flooding risk, and may be suitable for some small-</p>		<p>of June 2017. The site remains in the pool.</p> <p>GA027: Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan of June 2017. The site remains in the pool.</p> <p>GA028: Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan of June 2017. The site remains in the pool.</p> <p>GA029: Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan of June 2017. The site remains in the pool.</p> <p>GA030: Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan of June 2017. The site remains in the pool.</p> <p>GA031: Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan of June 2017.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>scale residential development. Any development would need to be sensitive to existing surrounding dwellings. Access is available onto Eshton Road, but is considered difficult as there is poor visibility to the south.</p> <p><b>GA028</b>          Site GA028 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. However, after a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Gargrave, the site is not considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement at this time. All of the site is in FRZ1, but has a medium to high surface water flooding risk on its northern boundary. Possibility for the site to be assessed for Local Green Space to occupy part of the site, considering the adjacent Leeds-Liverpool canal. This is a site within the Conservation Area, and also development here would represent a fresh precedent in terms of residential development north of the canal in this area of Gargrave. There is enough frontage at the site to make visibility acceptable (Mark House Lane). If access was made off Chew Lane, a bridge may be required.</p> <p><b>GA029</b>          Site GA028 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. However, after a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Gargrave, the site is not considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement at this time.</p>		<p><b>GA032:</b> Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan of June 2017. The site remains in the pool.</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>Medium to high surface water flooding risk in the northeast area of the site, but majority of site in FRZ1. This is a site within the Conservation Area, and also development here would represent a fresh precedent in terms of residential development north of the canal in this area of Gargrave. Possibility for the site to be assessed for Local Green Space to occupy part of the site, considering the adjacent Leeds-Liverpool canal. There is an existing stream in the northeast area with rough grassland which has biodiversity value, and should be protected from any development - this area coincides with the area of high surface water flood risk. Visibility for access is considered acceptable.</p> <p>GA030          Site GA028 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. However, after a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Gargrave, the site is not considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement at this time. A prominent site which, if developed in full, has the capacity to have a significant impact on the town given the site's relatively large size. The majority of the site is in FRZ1, but medium to high surface water risks exist on various localised areas of the site. Development here may be dependent on the sites GA028 and GA029 being allocated for development. Visibility is acceptable off Mark House Lane.</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>Site GA031 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Gargrave the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>GA032 Site GA032 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. However, after a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Gargrave, the site is not considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement at this time. The site performs well regarding having a low flooding risk, and may be suitable for some small-scale residential development. Any development would need to be sensitive to existing surrounding dwellings. Access is available onto Eshton Road, but access may be considered difficult as there would seem to be poor visibility to the south.</p>		
<b>GA009, GA022, GA027, GA032</b>			
<p>If these sites were developed a large green corridor should be preserved to the north of the canal. [Swans often congregate on these fields].</p>	<p>The point of preserving a large green corridor to the north of the canal is noted.</p> <p>GA009, GA022, GA027 and GA032 are all discussed in the previous section.</p>		
<p>- Eshton Rd – Ray Bridge are all Country Roads. They have a better chance of road</p>			

widening - & new sewer constructions. But the village is a traffic hasing now.			
Sites on outskirts of village where development has already started, so impact is lessened.			
These sites were not shown on the GPC plan. They have much to commend them for the following reasons: More access for traffic onto Eshton Road and Ray Bridge Lane. New appropriate drainage and sewer systems can be constructed It is not objected to by GPC			
Well outside village boundary well into rural green space.			
Too large an area of development for houses although could offer employment potential for a small site.			
As a whole this area far too big for development. Infrastructure of village definitely would not support development of that size.			
This is also a lovely aspect. Taking away our green fields is terrible. We love our village!			
against these developments: Massive intrusion into the field network on this side of the village outside village boundary.			
Too many houses for the infrastructure to support school, doctors, drains, water supply etc. also flooding.			
Development on these sites would again spoil yet more views of the countryside and peaceful walks along the canal tow path.			



<b>GA009, GA027, GA022, GA032, GA029, GA028, GA030</b>			
<p>These sites would generate traffic (additional) on to either Eshton Road or Ray Bridge Lane or West Street/Mark House Lane, none of which are suitable for extra local traffic.</p> <p>Eshton Road is 24ft at full width, with restricted width (due to residents parking) of 18ft. The bridge on Eshton Road is 18ft wide. These widths do not allow two vehicles to pass.</p> <p>The excess traffic would create a safety hazard for children going to the playground.</p>	<p>GA009, GA027, GA022, GA032, GA029, GA028, and GA030 are all discussed previously.</p>		
<b>GA010</b>			
<p>These sites are included in the Gargrave NP and have been identified through a thorough quantitative assessment process and have been consulted on extensively already.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site GA010 does not perform satisfactorily in the Sustainability Appraisal, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. There is no existing access to the site, either from the site's northern boundary (existing dwellings) or the site's southern boundary (large expanse of agricultural land).</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017. It is not in the pool of sites for Gargrave.</p>

<b>GA028, GA029 &amp; GA030</b>			
All these sites have very serious issues with road capacity & access with narrow & limited village bridges. All these sites unnecessarily extend the village boundaries.	GA028, GA029 and GA030 are previously discussed above.		
All these sites are an inappropriate and unnecessary extension of the village boundaries.			
These sites are identified as LGS in Gargrave's NP using the methodology requested by Ruth Parker for CDC. These sites should be included in the Local Plan as LGS as the Local Plan is progressed following this consultation on preferred sites for housing.			
Whilst not preferred these sites should be removed from the SHLAA. They should be LGS as in the Gargrave NP.			
<p>Sites GA028 and GA029 offer a more sustainable location, close to the village centre. These being larger sites which can add betterment to the village in terms of providing open space and community facilities.</p> <p>Objection to GA028 and GA029 being in the Conservation Area: Sites GA028 and GA029 should be removed from the Conservation Area boundary. This land has no buildings on it there is no public access. It has no place within the Conservation Area which is at the</p>			

<p>other side of the canal. It does not affect views or any aspect of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>It should have the same status as other land on the periphery of the village.</p> <p>The normal Planning Procedures and Acts will govern how this land is used and the designation as a Conservation Area is inaccurate, misleading and not within the guidance.</p>			
<b>GA014</b>			
<p><b>Object</b> Would spoil view of village and church from Marton Road</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site GA014 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. However, after a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Gargrave, the site is not considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement at this time. Sensitive design of any future residential development would be required due to the site's location in the Conservation Area, and its proximity to the church to the southwest. The site has the potential to contribute positively to the existing built character of this part of Gargrave.</p>		<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017. It remains in the pool of sites for Gargrave.</p>
<p>Near church idyllic spot beautiful village surrounded by Grade II Listed Buildings. Lovely walks part of cucle network. Pennine way. Please do not spoil the village Take heed of the GPC Plan</p>			
<p>3.3.11.3 Rights of Way: GA005, GA014 and</p>			

<p>especially GA28, GA30 could have a landscape impact on the Pennine Way. Although GA023, GA029 and GA031 aren't next to the Pennine Way, there could be a landscape impact from these allocations. GA017 and GA031 could have an urbanisation impact on other PRowS. Consider use green infrastructure to mitigate.</p>			
<p>Object These are two green areas [with GA023] which need to be preserved and are shown as such on the GPC plan and your local green designation plan.</p>			
<p>Object Both these locations provide an openness to the village providing good natural views and openness to an already crowded part of the village. A crowded part that is alleviated by having these beautiful green spaces.</p>			
<p>Road access to both GA014 &amp; GA023 is of a higher standard to that of any of the other proposed sites within Gargrave, both leading out onto Marton Road / Church Lane which in turn have access to the High Street or commuters can turn left towards Broughton in order to meet the A59. Neither of these sites are known to have flooded in recent history unlike many of those proposed (or GA030, GA029 &amp; GA028 which regularly flood). Neither of these sites are on the areas very popular with</p>			

walkers / biker riders / horse riders and therefore will not impact on pedestrian safety or tourism in the village nor are they in areas of outstanding beauty within the village. Both areas have been developed slightly over the past couple of decades with new houses on Marton Road and Church Croft estate.			
Road access - lack of footpaths - width of road.			
Negative impact of building new properties within the conservation area. Site is at the narrowest part of Marton Road. Unacceptable traffic levels & significant safety risk.			
Again significant local green space Transport/Access			
This site (and GA023) was identified as Green Space in the Gargrave LP. This now appears to be reversed in the CDC plan and I am most concerned that this has happened. 1. The approach to the village via the Pennine Way, traversed by many thousands over the years, over the ancient drumlins towards the church and pub is the most beautiful approach to Gargrave which should be protected. 2. Approach to the site via the corner at the Masons Arms from Marton Road will be a real issue given the current traffic problems.			
Destroy areas that have always been "green spaces". Part of the attraction of the village.			

Reasons for coming. Do not go against the GPC plan. Do not be party to destruction of a beautiful village and go against the wishes of the people.			
Suitable for extra burial ground? Or keep as green space.			
For obvious reasons, well documented elsewhere, these 3 sites for development would destroy Gargrave as a visitor attraction and damage the environment.			
<b>GA031</b>			
Neighbourhood Plan Chosen Site Popular with the village.	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.  Site GA031 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Gargrave the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.  The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.	No	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan of June 2017.
These sites are included in the Gargrave NP and have been identified through a thorough quantitative assessment process and have been consulted on extensively already.			

## April – May 2016 Draft Local Plan

## Site Response Paper by Settlement: BURTON IN LONSDALE

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<p>The village needs to ensure that it adopts a housing policy which allows it to maintain facilities by having the required number of houses and hence population in the village.</p> <p>Developments are not proportionate to present number of households</p> <p>Development likely to be too rapid due to allocation of two large sites in a small village</p>	<p>Agreed. The June 2017 draft local plan policy SP4: Strategy and Housing Growth identifies Burton In Lonsdale as a tier 4a settlement (village with basic services). The proportion of housing growth identified for Burton is 0.4%, which equates to 1 dwelling per annum. The proposed housing allocation in Burton would yield 15 dwellings. Draft policy SP4 included in the April – May 2016 draft Local Plan set the proportion of housing growth identified for Burton at 1.2%, which equates to 3 dwellings per annum. The level of housing growth planned for Burton is therefore reduced to reflect an overall reduced Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAN) and housing requirement for Craven.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Proportion of development in Burton reduced to reflect adjusted OAN and housing requirement for Craven.</p>
<p>Inadequate infrastructure in the village.</p>	<p>The perception of a lack of infrastructure noted. Burton in Lonsdale is identified as a tier 4a settlement (village with basic services). The proposed growth will help support the maintenance and potential enhancement of infrastructure provision.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Additional of impact of additional cars.</p>	<p>Assessment of potential site allocations has been informed by consultation with NYCC Highways. The site preferred for housing allocation is considered suitable in highway terms and is within walking distance of the village centre.</p>	<p>No</p>	

<b>Main issues from consultation</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Change required to the local plan (yes/no)</b>	<b>Changes made to the plan</b>
Concern about over supply of second homes and too few affordable homes	Draft local plan policy H2: Affordable Housing sets out how affordable housing will be provided. The draft Local Plan does not include policy to influence the purchase of new homes for second homes. Control of second homes within the existing housing stock falls outside the scope of the planning system.	Yes	Draft Local Plan Policy H2: Affordable Housing has been amended.
<b>BU001 - West of Ireby Road, Burton in Lonsdale.</b>			



Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<p>In principle, this may be seen to be the more appropriate area of the two proposed, as it is adjacent to (relatively) new housing; the visual impact might be less than that on the BU013 site (147)</p> <p><u>Location</u></p> <p>We note BU001 is outside the current (Local Plan 1999) development limit and the designated Conservation Area. These limits were designated to protect the existing environment (both built and natural) from inappropriate development. This has ensured Burton in Lonsdale has retained its special character. (147).</p> <p><u>Scale/Density</u></p> <p>The full site BU01 would be attractive to a medium scale builder and indeed could accommodate over 100 properties if the full site at a proposed Craven average density of 50/hectare was used. It would be helpful if the proposed area for use and the density was outlined (507)</p> <p><u>Traffic/access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ireby Road is narrow, and has no pedestrian footways beyond the junction with the A687.</li> <li>• At the junction with the A687 it is a single lane.</li> <li>• Any increase in traffic from the new houses will have to go through the</li> </ul>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site BU001 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. There is unacceptable access due to poor visibility and there are no footway links into the village.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Burton.</p>

<b>Main issues from consultation</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Change required to the local plan (yes/no)</b>	<b>Changes made to the plan</b>
<b>BU008 - Land between Ireby Road and Mill Wood, Burton in Lonsdale</b>			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<p>We feel that the development of BU008 would enhance the development of BU001 (628).</p> <p><u>Access</u></p> <p>Ireby road, single track with passing places, the south exit onto the A687 is dangerous. (3723). (628)</p> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <p>BU008 is at the wrong end of the village to access main roads. Any increase in traffic from the new houses will have to go through the centre of the village, making worse an already severe problem with traffic. (373).</p> <p><u>Topography;</u></p> <p>BU008 is on a steep bank (628)</p> <p>Impact on Listed Buildings (628)</p> <p><u>Agricultural land</u></p> <p>BU008 are greenfield sites, Grade 3 agricultural land, there are brownfield sites which would better fulfil the planning criteria.</p>	<p>This site was not identified in the pool of sites within the April 2016 draft Local Plan.</p> <p>When assessed in preparation of the June 2017 Pre-publication Draft Local Plan site BU008 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis. The site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The access road serving the site is unsuitable for serving a development of this scale (NYCC Highways).</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017, nor is it included does in the pool of sites for Burton in Lonsdale.</p>

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>BU009 - Land to the east of Burton Hill, Burton in Lonsdale.</b>			
<p>BU009 - We find it difficult to understand that BU008 is not being considered when the same supposed difficulties apply to BU0013 off Brookland. BU009 is situated next to the Village Recreation Field which is within the village. Keep these two sites BU008 and BU009 within the Local Development Plan (628)</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>The site is not suitable to undergo a Sustainability Analysis as the site is not located within, adjoining or adjacent to the village of Burton. The site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	No	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017, nor is it included does in the pool of sites for Burton in Lonsdale.</p>
<b>BU012 - Richard Thornton's CE Primary School, Burton in Lonsdale</b>			
<p>Objection to exclusion of this site :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access is better than BU001 and BU013</li> <li>• The site is already developed</li> <li>• Failure to allocate the site could lead to deterioration of the Listed Buildings (Parish Council,27, 251 147, 535)</li> </ul>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site BU012 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site passes all four of the District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other site options in Burton in Lonsdale, the site is considered suitable as a Preferred Site in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a></p>	No	<p>Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan of June 2017.</p>

<b>Main issues from consultation</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Change required to the local plan (yes/no)</b>	<b>Changes made to the plan</b>
	document.		
<b>BU013 - Land to the east of Brooklands, Burton in Lonsdale</b>			

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<p>Support:</p> <p>Danial Thwaites confirm that they own the land and it is available for development (624)</p> <p>The site is not affected by any statutory designations.</p> <p>The site benefits from an existing access point off Brookland. Initial feedback from the Highways Officer is that there would be no objection to this on the grounds of traffic generation</p> <p>Development would be an opportunity to create a new area of open space/walkway along the line of the stream.</p> <p>It is much closer to the village centre than BU01 and more suitable than BU01. (507)</p> <p><u>Objections:</u></p> <p>The original 1986 planning application (5/15/77) for 14 detached houses was refused at appeal. The original objections included unsuitable access road, restricted visibility at the exit to Burton Hill, river bank erosion, concerns about extra waste water production, and unneighbourly development. Little has changed since that time (147).</p> <p><u>Flood Risk:</u></p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site BU013 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites as it has no direct access onto the adopted road network.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Burton in Lonsdale.</p>



## April – May 2016 Draft Local Plan

## Site Response Paper by Settlement: BRADLEY

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<p><u>Implications for the Neighbourhood Plan</u> Bradley Parish Council has spent considerable time and expense undertaking a Neighbourhood Plan and have recently undergone a public consultation exercise of the draft plan. It has identified sites that may be allocated, based on earlier consultations of the CDC Local Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan has provided Development Briefs for 3 sites that would deliver sufficient housing for Bradley's needs over the next plan period. However, the latest CDC SA assessments dismiss two of the three sites in the Neighbourhood Plan and propose a further 4 sites for inclusion in the Pool of Sites. It is disturbing that CDC officers have not been able to work more closely with the Neighbourhood Plan group. This renders much of the good work done on the Neighbourhood Plan abortive and will result in additional costs and delay in its production/adoption (540).</p>	<p>Paragraph 184 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that ; “Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. To facilitate this, local planning authorities should set out clearly their strategic policies for the area and ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. Neighbourhood plans should reflect these policies and neighbourhoods should plan positively to support them” The draft Neighbourhood Plan was published for consultation at roughly the same time as the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft of the Local Plan and has been taken into account in selecting preferred sites. However 2 of the sites put forward in the Neighbourhood Plan are not acceptable given impact on Conservation Area, existing access and flooding issues. BR016 has been accepted as a preferred site. Additional discussion has taken place between the Neighbourhood Plan Group and Officers.</p>	Yes	Draft Neighbourhood Plan site BR016 identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017.



<b>BR002: Holly Tree House and land to the rear</b>			
Support in preference to BR016. Houses already behind Skipton Rd adjacent to this site and permission for some the other side so it would infill. Would not be as visible as development of BR016 (630)	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Bradley.
Access: The Bradley neighbourhood planning group considered that this site should only be developed if a joint access was made with BR001. The present access to the site BR002 is on Skipton road almost directly opposite the main entrance to the Primary School. There is a genuine cause for concern at any increased lateral traffic movements into Skipton road at this point. (255, 505, 505, 646)	Site BR002 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites as it has no direct connection/frontage to a highway maintainable at the public expense.		
Amenity: Building on this site would dominate the view both into and out of the village, detracting from its current natural beauty (255)	The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		

<b>BR004: East of Skipton Road adjacent to Middle Beck</b>			
<p>Support Seems a good site. A safe way in could be via the Methodist Church car park (moving the car park beside/behind the church) (630)</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site BR004 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites as visibility to the right, from the access point is restricted by the existing building, therefore an access up to NYCC standards would not be able to be formed. The site is also located within Flood Zone 2 and 3 areas to the north west and plays a strong contribution to the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Bradley.
<b>BR005: South of Lidget Road</b>			
<p>Support: Seems a good site for development. There is no public access to it and it is not even visible from most of Skipton Road with ground level/bank. Building has happened on 2 sides already (630)</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site BR005 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. However, after a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Bradley, the site is not considered suitable as</p>	No	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Bradley.
<p>Flood Risk: I also have concerns regarding possible flooding. Without this grassy area acting as a sponge, more of the housing downstream" would have been damaged more than it was. (549, 561)"</p>			

	<p>one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement as it is an open greenfield site in the middle of the village which makes a strong contribution to the Conservation Area. Residential development of this site may be inappropriate in the context of Bradley's current housing requirements.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<b>BR006: Land of West Ings Lane</b>			
I believe that this will have minimal impact on the overall appearance and feel of the village.(549, 630,561)	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Bradley.
The BR006 site lies within the village conservation area, maintains the integrity of the set aside view of the old mill as you enter the village from the main road (630,637)	Site BR006 does not move past a Level 1 acknowledgement in the residential site selection process, and the site is not suitable to undergo a Sustainability Analysis as the site has an overall site size less than 0.1 hectares, and/or cannot accommodate five or more dwellings.		
<p>It is a flood risk area (630,637). ID Civils produced a flood risk appraisal for the landowner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no historical record of fluvial flooding.</li> <li>• Flooding may be possible from north of the site to the south parallel to Ings Lane</li> <li>• Falls across the site are relatively steep and do not form a flood plain</li> </ul>	<p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		

<p>If a corridor of land adjacent to Ings Lane was left open the site could be developed</p> <p>Access: I object to any proposal to build an access road across the front face of the Mill as this would:</p> <p>(a) destroy the unimpeded view of the Mill for all villagers and visitors as they enter the village from the main road,</p> <p>(b) obstruct the view for Mill residents in the 10 flats on the south-west side, particularly for ground floor residents, and</p> <p>(c) likely create annoying permanent night-time street light pollution for residents on the south-west side. (478, 630,637)</p>			
<b>BR007: South west of Matthew Lane</b>			
<p>Support: The site will provide an opportunity to create recreational space to the south west of the site, adjacent to the existing cricket ground which would include access to the canal bank</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Bradley.</p>
<p>Support Access: The road is as wide as or wider than Skipton Road by site BR016 and Skipton Road has loads more traffic. Visibility is good and access off Matthew Lane has been used for development before. (505, 540, 630).</p>	<p>Site BR007 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites as the site does not have enough frontage available to create a safe access to NYCC standards, the site also provides a strong contribution to the character and appearance of the area.</p>		

<p>Report prepared by Sanderson Associates Highway Consultants which confirms that a suitable access is achievable</p>	<p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<p>Object: Access would presumably be via Matthew Lane. This is narrow and confined by walls which make pedestrian access hazardous (549, 561).</p>			
<p><b>BR008: Land at College Farm</b></p>			
<p>Support: Even with narrow access a small no of houses could be built (630).</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site BR008 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites as it has no direct connection/frontage to a highway maintainable at the public expense.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Bradley.</p>

<b>BR011: Land to east of College Road</b>				
Site good but should use all to infill between existing houses (630)	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site BR011 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites as the site does not have enough frontage available to create a safe access to NYCC standards. The site also provides a strong contribution to the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes		Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Bradley.
This site was previously refused planning permission on the grounds of not preserving or enhancing the character of Bradley's conservation area. At appeal (1991) the Inspector rejected the application				
The development of this site would cause substantial harm to the setting of College House, a Grade II listed former farmhouse. Divorcing this former farmhouse from the agricultural land which it once served would prevent the historical significance of the building from being understood. (151, 221, 255, 409, 412, 488, 540, 542, 645, 869)				
Development will exacerbate traffic problems on College Road. It is as narrow as four metres in width and has no footway on either side. It now serves as access to around thirty 30 dwellings. (151, 210, 221, 255, 273, 409, 412, 488, 540, 645, 869)				
An evaluation will also need to be undertaken of the potential impact which the development of this site might have upon the significance of this Listed Building (Heritage England)				
The proposed site appears to pay no regard to this landscape character and would result in a modern, regimented housing estate type layout bolted onto the end of the village. Development would "tower" over this area of Bradley and the character and				

<p>appearance of this conservation area would be lost forever. (409)</p>			
<p>Problems with drainage of surface water on College Road from the fields at higher levels which finds its way onto farm tracks beyond College Crescent and eventually onto College Road. The flow then continues downhill where it causes problems in the low point of the village. Any development in the fields above College Road would only exacerbate the existing problems (151, 255, 273, 869</p>			
<p>3.3.3.1 Rights of Way: BR011, have urbanisation impacts on PRoW. Consider use green infrastructure to mitigate (English Nature).</p>			
<p>The trees in the ghyll have significant amenity value as they are clearly visible in medium to distant views into the village and they support wildlife such as bats and owls which are protected under the Habitats Directive (2010).( 255, 540, 542, 869)</p>			

<p>The accompanying plan shows the whole of the site put forward for allocation which totals some 0.663 Ha. At an average density of 30 dph this would yield some 19 dwellings but it is not clear what CDCs recommendation of restricting development to the western part of the site would have on the scale of development possible (540, 542).</p>			
<p>Access to the site would result in the loss of a 2m high stone wall in the Conservation Area. This wall forms an important sense of enclosure marking the divide between the developed part of the village and the agricultural land beyond.( 255, 542)</p>			
<p>Noise - There would be a significant increase in noise generated by the increases in vehicular movements (365).</p>			
<p>If this site was to be developed then houses would have to be of a type and design appropriate to the site and its surroundings. Surely affordable housing, by definition, would not be appropriate on the site (412)</p>			
<b>BR012: Land to west of Aire Valley Drive</b>			
<p>Support: support the developing this site, particularly the W (sloping) section. You can get access by the canal and at the top corner of Aire Valley Drive. Alternatively demolishing a unit in Aire Valley Drive could give access – given the number of houses possible it would pay a developer to do this. Like site BR007 traffic from development here could be encouraged to use Ings Lane</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site BR012 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. However, after a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Bradley, the site is not considered suitable as one of the Preferred</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Bradley.</p>



<p>and reduce pressure on Skipton Rd. There would be less impact visually to village as a whole by developing here (630).</p>	<p>Sites in this settlement as other sites in Bradley perform better when the site assessment process is applied. Residential development of this site would represent a significant extension to the village which may be inappropriate in the context of Bradley's current housing requirements.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<p><b>BR013: Land south west of Crag Lane</b></p>			
<p>Support (630)</p> <p>Access Crag Lane is a narrow winding hill with no clear view of oncoming traffic from either direction, and no passing places,. In winter the road becomes icy from water runoff from the fields. When the A629 is closed, Crag Lane is used as a diversion. Lack of passing places results in gridlock. The Bradley neighbourhood development plan has already discounted this site. [Objectives 2.3]</p> <p>Access at any point to and from this site will be dangerous (301, 488, 505,645, Bradleys Both PC)</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land (301, 542)</p> <p>Development of this site does nothing to protect and enhance the open countryside and wider landscape character (SO14) (301).</p> <p>This site lies in the Low Bradley</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site BR013 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. However, after a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Bradley, the site is not considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement as the site makes a strong contribution to the character of the Conservation Area and other sites in Bradley perform better when the site assessment process is applied. Residential development of this site may be inappropriate in the context of Bradley's current housing requirements.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a></p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Bradley</p>

Conservation Area. The loss of this currently undeveloped area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to its significance. (Heritage England)	document.		
<b>BR014: Land south of Silsden Road</b>			
Support (630)	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site BR014 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites as the site does not have enough frontage available to create a safe access to NYCC standards and the site provides a strong contribution to the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Bradley.
BR014 has access problems Silsden Road climbs steeply out of the village. It is narrow without passing places, set between high sided banking. Part way up there is a blind double bend. There have been accidents here. It is a road which needs great care to drive along (262, 505, 645)			
Rights of Way: BR011, BR014 and BR016 all have urbanisation impacts on PRoW. Consider use green infrastructure to mitigate			
Agricultural use: A positive score cannot be justified for this when it involves developing a field currently used for agriculture and when other similar sites (BR013, BR012) are considered to have a negative effect (540,542, 540, 640)			
Drainage. During the storm events at the end of 2015 the site deposited large volumes of water downward towards the village and this resulted in overtopping of the boundary wall with Silsden Road. Any development of the site would therefore potentially exacerbate the flood risk to properties lower down in the village (262, 505, 542)			

<p>This site lies in the Low Bradley Conservation Area. The loss of this currently undeveloped area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to its significance. (531)</p>			
<p><b>BR016: Land to the west of Gilders and Langholme, Skipton Road</b></p>			
<p>Support: This would seem to accommodate the required number of houses for Bradley and would appear to have the least effect on surrounding properties This site is located in a position which affords direct access to the A629 and the A 6131 at Snaygill. It is convenient for the Primary School, Bus Stop, Village Shop and open fields to the rear. Traffic approaching from Ings Lane can reach the development via Aire Valley Drive or Heath Crescent. Thus not adding to the through Village congestion. Access to the site can be positioned advantageously on a straight section of Skipton Road. The provision of a pedestrian footpath in Skipton Road along the front and side of the site would be essential. (229, 322, 549, 505, 645,561)</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.  Site BR016 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Settle the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.  The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017.</p>
<p>The build would result in the loss of views which could adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. (255,630,674, 629)</p>			
<p>There would be increased traffic on an</p>			

<p>already busy, inadequate Skipton Road. Access and egress at the site would be dangerous We feel that any increase in traffic down Skipton Road towards the A6131 is fraught with danger. (229, 255, 262, 629, 630,674)</p>			
<p>Site BR016 is well use by dog walkers and hikers. This site also contains the only public footpath with access to High Bradley and the hills. There is no reference to this footpath being kept for the public to use 3.3.3.1 Rights of Way: BR011, BR014 and BR016 all have urbanisation impacts on PRoW. Consider use green infrastructure to mitigate (255,630,674, 629).</p>			
<p>As site BR016 is on a steep slope, we feel that there is potentially a massive water runoff risk for the residents who live below. By replacing a vast proportion of green land with concrete on (262, 629, 630, 674)</p>			
<p>The site (BR016) does not afford adequate privacy for the occupants of the houses adjacent and surrounding (629).</p>			
<p>A barn on site BR016 which is frequented by a pair of owls would need to be removed. We appreciate barn owls are not yet a protected species, however the population has declined by over 70%* since 1932 (up until the last known estimate in 1997). This is a direct result of invasive building and the removal of their habitat (629, 630, 674).</p>			
<p>There is a beautiful large, mature tree on</p>			

<p>what would be the perimeter of site BR016. We live in hope that if building was to go ahead, every effort would be made to save this from felling (629)</p>			
<p>Site is Grade 3 Agricultural Land (630, 674)</p>			
<p>Houses on this side of Skipton Rd are large and on large sites. Development of this site would be out of character, size, density and would move the building line up the hill (630).</p>			
<p>We also feel that properties on site BR016 once built would not fall into the 'affordable' category and therefore would not align with Craven Council's current housing strategy (629).</p>			

## April – May 2016 Draft Local Plan

## Site Response Paper by Settlement: RATHMELL

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>RA001</b>			
<p>We note this could be viewed as infill however, the loss of Grade 3 or Best &amp; Most Versatile Land outweighs the benefits and the site should be removed.</p> <p>There is a very large and important barn on the roadside and that must not be compromised by unsympathetic development or demolition/modern rebuild. A watching brief on the whole designated area is suggested.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site RA001 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis; The site passes all four of the District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Rathmell, the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>This site has performed well when assessed against site assessment criteria under the Sustainability Appraisal, and then when compared to other sites included in the pool of sites.</p>	No	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017.

	<p>It is viewed that this site is indeed of the better infill options available in the SHLAA sites in Rathmell. As the site is relatively large, and given the relatively low housing numbers required in Rathmell, only a portion of the site is likely to be required for housing.</p> <p>The presence of the barn has been noted.</p>		
<b>RA003</b>			
<p>The loss of Grade 3 or Best &amp; Most Versatile Land outweighs the benefits and the site should be removed.</p> <p>On behalf of our client Francmanis Properties we would like to further promote a site in Rathmell in relation to the consultation on the Draft Local Plan and Pool of Sites that are considered suitable for development. We set out below a description of the site followed by a breakdown of the opportunities and constraints associated with it. We also look at the current site assessment and how the site is deliverable in the short term. Site Description Francmanis Properties own approximately 1 ha of agricultural land on the north-eastern edge of Rathmell, labelled RA003 within the 'Pool of Site Options'. All of the land proposed is available for development. The site is bounded to the east and west by residential development, Hesley Lane to the south and open fields to the north. A public footpath runs in a north/south direction through the</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>RA003 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. It is however not selected as a Preferred Site on this occasion when compared with other available sites.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>The presence on this site of Grade 3 agricultural land has been noted.</p> <p>The points raised by Francmanis Properties in their submission have been noted, and it is acknowledged that there is validity and reason in many of the points raised. For example, we acknowledge the existing access point to the site off Hesley Lane, and also that the site is not</p>	Yes	Site not identified as a preferred site for housing in the June – July 2017 consultation following further site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

<p>proposed development site and a second footpath is located to the north (running in an east/west orientation). The eastern portion of the proposed site RA003 is currently under consideration by Craven District Council for the erection for three dwellings (ref: 59/2015/15703). This demonstrates the deliverability of the site and the intentions of the client to bring forward residential development on the site as soon as possible. The site is not affected by any statutory designations. There are a number of listed buildings within Rathmell, in particular along Main Street to the east. There are no reasons why the sensitive development of the site would detract from the special character and interest of these buildings due to the distance of these properties from the proposed development site and the screening they are afforded by intervening properties. There are no site specific ecological designations, and as the site is in agricultural use, there is the potential to enhance the ecological interest of the site through a well-developed landscape strategy. As depicted in the Flood Map below, the site falls within Flood Zone 1 as designated by the Environment Agency and is therefore considered to be at lowest risk of flooding.</p> <p>Site Opportunities</p>	<p>affected by any statutory designations. We also note the point raised about the requirement about the need to try to increase student numbers in Rathmell primary school with new housing in the village. However, given the relatively low requirement for housing in Rathmell under the Local Plan, there are deemed to be more appropriate sites elsewhere in Rathmell to meet the housing requirement at this time. It is thought that development of this site would represent quite a large expansion of housing into open countryside compared with some other available sites, which are deemed to represent more appropriate options for infill development in Rathmell at this time.</p>		
--	---	--	--



<p>There are a number of opportunities associated with the site and these are set out below:</p> <p><b>Land Form:</b> The site is predominately flat with the land rising to the west. It is free from contamination, buildings and largely clear of trees. Being free from physical constraints makes it a clearly developable site which can contribute to housing supply.</p> <p><b>Designations:</b> There are no site specific land, ecological or historic designations. There are a number of listed buildings within Rathmell although the presence of these would not prevent the sites development.</p> <p><b>Location:</b> The site appears as a 'gap' of undeveloped land between the main built form of the village, along Main Street and the cluster of dwellings that include Rathmell Primary School to the west. It is noted that this 'gap' is not planned and has developed through the sporadic development of the village. There is no planning reason why this gap should not be diminished through site sensitive and well-designed development. The sites development would provide the opportunity to deliver housing on land that adjoins the village, forming a link between the two areas that make up the settlement.</p> <p><b>Accessibility:</b> The site benefits from an existing access point off Hesley Lane.</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>The site is within walking distance of the centre of the village. It is a one-minute walk away from the War Memorial Bus Stop. Rathmell is served by the No. 11 Bus Service, which runs between Tosside &amp; Settle and Horton in Ribblesdale. There are three services a day, Monday to Saturday, in both directions. As mentioned, Rathmell Church of England Primary School is to the west of the application site, around a two-minute walk away. The Primary School is currently undersubscribed with 30 pupils out of a possible 55 enrolled at the time of writing. The school therefore is operating at 45% below capacity, compared to the national average of 10.8% below capacity (Source: School Capacity 2012, Department for Education). The school roll could decrease if the population of Rathmell continues to age. Providing additional housing in the village will help support the school and strengthen its links with the local community. In addition, at a time of paucity of public funding, the low school roll could put the school's future into jeopardy. This site is being proposed by an experienced local housing</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>developer. Along with the existing application site, it is reasoned that the proposed site is highly likely to be built out in the short term should it be designated for housing. It will therefore provide a positive impact upon the future of the local school by providing new family housing in the short term, providing a boost to the school roll.</p> <p>Should the site be brought forward for development it may be possible to offer a walkway along the entire Hesley Lane frontage in order to facilitate pedestrian links between the village centre and the School, benefitting the community by way of safer access.</p> <p>Capacity: The site measures approximately 1 hectare and at a density of 30 dwellings per hectare would be capable of delivering in the region of up to 30 homes. This level of housing provision would enable a mix of unit type and tenure and would make a useful contribution to the districts housing land supply. Deliverability of the Site</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) offers an outline of the requirements for sites to be considered deliverable. Footnote 11 of the Framework stipulates,          “To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable.”</p> <p>As has been demonstrated within this site promotion letter, land to the north of Hesley Lane, Rathmell (RA003) is available now and can be delivered in the immediate short term by an experienced local house builder. The site is situated in an ideal location in proximity of established residential areas, and it is considered that its development will contribute to increasing the vitality and viability of the community through the provision of affordable housing and supporting the local school. The site is therefore considered suitable for development. There are no constraints to the site, which makes it achievable. The deliverability of the site is further demonstrated by the planning application currently being considered by Craven District Council on the eastern portion of the proposed development site (ref: 59/2015/15703). The fact that this application has been submitted demonstrates the desire of the client that this site be delivered for housing development. As a result, the site can be considered deliverable and there are no reasons why it should not be</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>put forward as a 'Preferred Option' in the emerging Craven Local Plan. Sustainability Appraisal Following the council's 'Site Allocation Methodology' the site has passed through 'Stage 6' which recommends potential preferred sites. A summary advises that: 'The majority of the site is in FRZ1, and the site has a low to high risk from surface water flooding in some parts of the site. A prominent site which would need to respect village design patterns. This is Grade 3 agricultural land. This is quite an open site and a significant loss of open countryside would occur with full development of this site, which may be inappropriate in the context of Rathmell's current housing requirements.' The subsequent Sustainability Appraisal for the site has identified a couple of 'Mitigation and Recommendations' at site RA003 as follows:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Code 5b <input type="checkbox"/> Ground work assessment will be required as part of the on-site works to investigate areas thought to be of archaeological significance. A Council recommendation may include sub-division of the site to protect these specific areas within the site's overall area;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Code 9 <input type="checkbox"/> The site is viewed as being in a prominent location, and hence visual character with regards to housing density, building heights and dwelling design to be considered for this sites potential</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>development. Prominent locations can include sites situated adjacent to a key entrance to a town or village, or sites on raised ground in comparison to surrounding residential and employment development.</p> <p>It is accepted that the site location is prominent and as such development would have to follow village design patterns. It should be noted that prominence does not equate to harm. Many of the District's most valued buildings may be considered prominent. The site is 'open' in nature, however it is situated between two areas of residential development. The loss of 1ha of countryside is not considered significant to the nature of the wider area, given the great distances between settlements within Craven. In light of this, the client would be prepared to accept an allocation of a smaller part of the site. Such an allocation could include the provision of a strategic open space to meet the need of the village.</p> <p>At site RA003 an appropriate ground work assessment can be commissioned by our client in order to address any initial concerns in relation to the potential archaeological significance of the site, following allocation. As has been established in previous representations, there are no site specific land, ecology or landscape</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>designations, and whilst there are a number of Listed Buildings within Rathmell, their presence would not prevent the development of the site.</p> <p>Comparison with Alternative Sites. We note that four other sites are being considered as housing sites within Rathmell namely:  RA001 Hollins Croft;  RA004 Land to south west of Gooselands;  RA005 Land to the north of Fairways, Hesley Lane; and  RA006 Land to the north of Beauty House, Main Street.</p> <p>We consider the Francmanis Properties' site to have the best location when compared to the other four options.</p> <p>Sites RA004 and RA005 are considered to be 'back land' development sites which could offer limited contribution to housing supply. There would also be minimal affordable housing associated with such small developments.</p> <p>Site RA001 includes what is considered to be a barn building within its landholding. The surrounding field forms the setting of this building and should be considered a more prominent open space.</p> <p>Development of the proposed land would also impact upon a number of residential properties that abut the site, far more than would be impacted through the development of the land north of Hesley</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>Lane. It is also unlikely that any development of RA001 would be able to include provision of a footpath linking the main village to the school due to the presence of a number of residential dwellings along the southern flank of Hesley Lane. Site RA006 to the southeast of Rathmell has an existing business on part of the site. The development of this land for residential dwellings would prejudice against the future of this business and its contribution to the village. The site is also adjacent to the Grade II Listed Beauty Farmhouse. Any development would have the potential to detract from the special character and interest of this property by virtue of proximity.</p> <p>Conclusion: The proposed development site comprises agricultural land that will be relatively easy to develop and our client Francmanis Properties has confirmed that it is available in the short term. This is emphasised as the client currently has a planning application being considered by Craven. It benefits from an existing access that has the capacity to support residential development. It has an excellent location within walking distance of the village and the services it has to offer. Given the above, it is considered that the proposed site represents excellent options</p>			
--	--	--	--



<p>for delivering new, high quality housing in Rathmell on a site that can be genuinely integrated into the village without causing harm to it or its surroundings. As a result, the site can be considered deliverable and there is no reason why it should not be put forward as a Preferred Option within the emerging Craven Local Plan.</p>			
<p>This site is ideally positioned for the development of Rathmell village. It is a very convenient location for families with children of Primary School age and this development would help with its sustainability. Mains utility connections are within easy reach. There are 6 metal manhole covers in the field close to Hesley Lane giving easy access to the main drains. The site does not flood. There have been issues with the road flooding but this was because of poor drainage maintenance on the opposite side of the road. This site drains well and would easily support development.</p> <p>Comments have been made stating that any development would spoil open views. There is actually a new barn to the north of the site which dominates views from Hesley Lane. There is scope to develop the site without significantly affecting the views.</p>			
<p><b>RA004</b></p>			

<p>Proximity and relation to village indicate that these sites should be viewed as preferable. The Wigglesworth - Settle road which runs through the village is a busy and dangerous road, and school children walking to Rathmell Primary School will be put at risk. Rathmell village could utilise the nucleus of available facilities (the Reading Rooms and Primary School) as a central hub for the community rather than extending the village as a ribbon development along the main road.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>RA003 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>This site has performed well when assessed against site assessment criteria, and when compared to other sites included in the pool of sites.</p> <p>This site is viewed as the best opportunity for largely enclosed, infill development from the site options available in Rathmell. The site is bordered to the north and east by existing housing development, and the site has two existing accesses. The site does not have a frontage onto Main Street. Any proposed development in Rathmell will have at least some residents who will utilise the road referred to in the submission opposite.</p>	No	Site identified as a preferred site for housing in the June – July 2017 consultation following further site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<b>RA005</b>			
<p>Proximity and relation to village indicate that these sites should be viewed as preferable.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	Yes	Site not identified as a preferred site for housing in the June – July 2017 consultation following further

	<p>RA003 does not perform satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed suitable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site does not have a suitable access road at present.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>It is noted that this site is relatively close to the centre of the village. However, the existing track leading to the site from the Main Street would require an upgrade to North Yorkshire County Council standards prior to any development taking place. At present, the access is not to the required standard.</p>		site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<b>RA006</b>			
<p>Suitable for residential development. Good accesses can be formed and the site is adjacent to existing village development.</p> <p>No requirement for this site due to village housing requirement, would extend the village settlement, site highly visible from the surrounding landscape towards Long Preston, Settle and the Yorkshire Dales National Park, A65 and Settle Carlisle Railway area.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan of April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>RA003 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p>	Yes	Site not identified as a preferred site for housing in the June – July 2017 consultation following further site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Given its edge of village position, we would			

<p>suggest an archaeological watching brief on those parts that have not been built on before.</p>	<p>The possibility of a suitable access being formed for residential development is noted, and how the site is adjacent to existing village development.</p>		
<p>Given its edge of village position, we would suggest an archaeological watching brief on those parts that have not been built on before.</p>	<p>The possibility for the site to extend the village settlement to the southwest, if all of the site were to be developed for housing, is noted. The potential design of homes would influence visibility of the site from elsewhere.</p> <p>The request for an archaeological watching brief is noted.</p> <p>The site has an existing use with horses being kept on the site in a shed at the time of visit in 2016. The site is hence thought to be available for residential development in the medium to long term. There are other available sites in Rathmell which are available in the short term and are thought to be more preferable for development for the purposes of this Local Plan. Full development of this site would represent an extension of the village to the southwest along Main Street, which can be avoided by utilising other available sites at this time.</p>		

## April – May 2016 Draft Local Plan

## Site Response Paper by Settlement: CONONLEY

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan ( <i>ideas relating to change/site identified or not as a preferred site</i> )
<b>CN006: Station Works, north of Cononley Lane, Cononley.</b>			
Development of this site for quantity proposed in the current proposal represents overdevelopment together with extant permissions (x2).	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site identified as a preferred housing site with development principles in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.
Concerns regarding vehicles and congestion which should be addressed to avoid negative impacts on parking on main road. Land End junction needs consideration. No garage units are proposed to save space and cost.	Site CN006 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. After a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Skipton the site is considered suitable as one of the Preferred Sites in this settlement.		
Site has easy access to A629, no need when travelling to Skipton or Keighley to travel through the village. Residents would not have to negotiate railway crossing.	The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
Cross Hills Road dangerous for pedestrians as no footway.			
Cadelisa proposal to build new car park on land not owned by them, question over deliverability of this.			
New employment space of 15,000 sq. ft. fraction of that currently available, albeit existing is underused as it is not of high quality. Argued by agent that employment space needed to be reduced for viability			

<p>purposes.</p>			
<p>Site is brownfield and should therefore be given priority.</p>			
<p>Green fields at rear of site should not be developed.</p>			
<p>Site has been preferred by majority of village for many years.</p>			
<p>Retain the site as the only site for housing or mixed use in Local Plan.</p>			
<p>Potential capacity to be 65 (may be less if mixed use) but reduce to 50 if committed site for 15 houses off Meadow Lane is confirmed.</p>			
<p>As per Cononley Neighbourhood Plan, Council would like to see as the only preferred site in Local Plan.</p>			
<p>Agent representation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major brownfield site.</li> <li>• Positive pre-application response from Council.</li> <li>• Welcome inclusion in pool of sites.</li> <li>• Only brownfield site in village, rare opportunity.</li> <li>• Location near to railway station and short walk from village facilities adds to sustainability.</li> <li>• Largest brownfield site in plan area, in accordance with para 111 of NPPF – effective use of land by re-using previously developed land.</li> <li>• Site should only be allocated for housing and not employment, with</li> </ul>			

<p>any employment being treated as windfall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mill building only lends itself to apartments use in terms of market housing – potential for significant contribution towards housing. Recommended 110 dwellings for allocation at a density of 50 dwellings per hectare.</li> <li>• Intention to submit planning application for 96 dwellings with some employment use.</li> </ul>			
<p>CN005, CN014, CN015 (extant permissions) and CN006 should be included.</p>			
<p>CN006 will put great strain on existing sewerage and other services including schools.</p>			
<p><b>CN009 - Land south east of Crag View, CN011 - Land to west of Skipton Road and CN019 - Land at junction of Cross Hills Road and railway,:</b></p>			
<p>As there will be oversupply with existing permissions and CN006, sites CN009, CN011 and CN019 should not be included (x3).</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Sites CN009, CN011 &amp; CN019 perform satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses, however after a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Cononley, these sites are not considered suitable as <b>Preferred Sites</b> in this settlement. This is due to the allocation of CN006 which will cover the housing need for the area and therefore no further sites will need to be allocated for housing within Cononley.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Sites CN009, CN011 &amp; CN019 are not identified as preferred housing sites in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. These sites therefore remain in the pool of sites for Skipton.</p>

	The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
<b>CN009: Land south east of Crag View</b>			
Two previous applications refused and appeal dismissed. The inspector dismissed the appeal on grounds of impacts on the conservation area (x2), ribbon development erode wider countryside setting and openness (x2), clearly visible from surrounding countryside and significant harm to the built and historic environment. Reduced application for 4 houses also refused.	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.  Site CN009 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses, however after a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Cononley, the site is not considered suitable as one of the <b>Preferred Sites</b> in this settlement. This is due to the allocation of CN006 which will cover the housing need for the area and therefore no further sites will need to be allocated for housing within Cononley.  The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.	No	Sites CN009 is not identified as preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Skipton.
Not required as CN006 fulfils need.			
<b>CN011: Land to west of Skipton Road</b>			
Site is an agricultural field in a conservation area. Prominent location.	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	No	Sites CN011 is not identified as preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Skipton.
Not required as CN006 fulfils need.			
Would create additional traffic and parking congestion on Skipton Road.	Site CN011 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses, however after a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Cononley, the site is		



	<p>not considered suitable as one of the <b>Preferred Sites</b> in this settlement. This is due to the allocation of CN006 which will cover the housing need for the area and therefore no further sites will need to be allocated for housing within Cononley.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<b>CN019: Land at junction of Cross Hills Road and railway</b>			
Site is opposite CN009 which got refused; same issues here but also flood risk (x2).	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site CN019 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses, however after a comparison with other Pool of Site options in Cononley, the site is not considered suitable as one of the <b>Preferred Sites</b> in this settlement. This is due to the allocation of CN006 which will cover the housing need for the area and therefore no further sites will need to be allocated for housing within Cononley.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	No	Sites CN019 is not identified as preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Skipton.
Site in conservation area.			
Site not in Neighbourhood Plan.			
<p>Site should be included as suitable, available and deliverable.</p> <p>Cononley has good transport links/walkable to services and site would make a meaningful contribution.</p> <p>Site can be developed outside area of flood risk.</p> <p>Site can be accessed safely, provide enhanced pedestrian links and footpath.</p> <p>Can be developed without harming ecology.</p> <p>Site can provide useable area of public open space.</p> <p>Comments on SA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is greenfield but recognised greenfield sites needed within Craven.</li> </ul>			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Heritage appraisal has been undertaken as part of planning application (21/2016/16681) concludes site's development would have less than significant impact on conservation area.</li><li>• All sites will have an impact on air, noise and light quality.</li><li>• No mineral implications.</li></ul>			
---	--	--	--

## April – May 2016 Draft Local Plan

## Site Response Paper by Settlement: CARLETON

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan (ideas relating to change/site identified or not as a preferred site)
<b>CA004</b>			
Consider using green infrastructure in order to mitigate any impacts on the PROW.	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Settle.
There is an opportunity to link the ancient woodland in the south east to the woodland in the south west.	Site CA004 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed suitable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site has a couple of negatives however; it has a double negative in regards to Highways. Highway comments concluded that the site does not include a sufficient frontage to enable an access of acceptable standards to be formed on to the public highway.		
Green infrastructure in proposals CA004, CA005, CA012, CA015 and CA016 could help the area become more permeable to woodland species.	The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
<b>CA006</b>			
This site meets the tests of deliverability and is suitable for development.	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	No	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June

	<p>Site CA006 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis, and passes all four of the District Level Analyses. However due to the planning permissions granted since 2012, there are no housing requirements in the area and therefore further assessment of the site is not required as no sites will be allocated. The site has a couple of negatives but does have two double negatives in regards to Highways and Historic Conservation.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Carleton.
<b>CA012</b>			
Required inclusion of the full land area – not part.	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site CA012 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed as sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. Highways comments concluded that the site does not include a sufficient frontage to enable an access of acceptable standards to be formed on to the public highway. The site also provided a strong contribution to the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a></p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Carleton.

	document.		
--	-----------	--	--

## April – May 2016 Draft Local Plan

## Site Response Paper by Settlement: COWLING

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>CW001: Off Wainmans Close, rear of Bannister Walk,</b>			
<p>In April 2012, Bannister Wood to the North was designated as Ancient Woodland by Natural England. The pressures that a 92 build development nearby would put on the rich biodiversity of this woodland would be unacceptable.</p> <p>CW001 does bring settlement substantially closer to this woodland. Provision of multifunctional green spaces could help to mitigate any impacts.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site CW001 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis, and passes three of the four District Level Analyses, however there is uncertainty as to whether there would be a significant effect on the South Pennines SPA &amp; SAC. Due to planning permissions granted since 2012, there are no housing requirements in the area and therefore further assessment of the site is not required as no sites will be allocated for housing in Cowling.</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Cowling.
<p>The site is outside the built-up area and would have acknowledged access problems - Lane Ends Lane is narrow and already has a collision history and a dangerous junction to the North, while the A6068 at this point has a history of poor driving.</p>	<p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<p>Moreover, Lane Ends Lane is bordered to the West by an Important Hedgerow (possessing at least 4 characteristics), lacking any designation to protect it.</p>			
<p>This land is adjacent to Lane Ends Lane. Development here would extend housing beyond the current limit. The site is close to</p>			

woodland. There are also issues with access onto the main Keighley-Colne Road from lane Ends lane.			
Priority Habitat: Proposals not directly on priority habitat but upstream of priority river habitat, consider impact of water quality from any proposal (particularly CW001).			
3.3.8.4 Rights of Way: CW001, has urbanisation impacts on PRow. Consider use green infrastructure to mitigate.			
<b>CW003: East of Dick Lane</b>			
This site is east of Dick Lane. A development of 3 bungalows is currently underway. The development of the site resulted in destruction of ancient hedgerow and was only passed by the planning inspectorate.	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site CW003 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis, and passes three of the four District Level Analyses, however due to planning permissions granted since 2012, there are no housing requirements in the area and therefore further assessment of the site is not required as no sites will be allocated for housing in Cowling.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Cowling.

<b>CW004: South of Colne Road, east of Wellbeck House</b>			
<p>This site is the preferred location for development within the village. The site is low grade agricultural land and access is directly on to the main Keighley Road. At 2.934 acres the site would allow construction of more than the allocation of housing.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Cowling.</p>
<p>This is one of the sites whose impact upon the heritage assets in its vicinity (should it be developed) is currently being evaluated following Historic England's objections to the last iteration of the Local Plan. This site should not be allocated until the results of that work are finished.</p> <p>The loss of this currently-open area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the heritage assets in its vicinity.</p>	<p>Site CW004 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis, and passes three of the four District Level Analyses, however there is uncertainty as to whether there would be a significant effect on the South Pennines SPA &amp; SAC. Due to planning permissions granted since 2012, there are no housing requirements in the area and therefore further assessment of the site is not required as no sites will be allocated for housing in Cowling.</p>		
<p>Rights of Way: CW001, CW004, CW005, CW006, CW008, CA011 all have urbanisation impacts on PRow. Consider use green infrastructure to mitigate.</p>	<p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<b>CW005: Former sewerage works and adjoining land at Woodside Farm,</b>			
<p>This site composes a former sewage works and adjacent land. The area provides an open semi-wooded amenity. However, limited development close to the main Keighley Road would cause limited impact on the area.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Cowling.</p>
<p>3.3.8.4 Rights of Way: CW001, CW004, CW005, CW006, CW008, CA011 all have</p>	<p>Site CW005 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis, and passes three of the four District Level Analyses, however there is uncertainty as to whether there would be a</p>		



<p>urbanisation impacts on PRoW. Consider use green infrastructure to mitigate.</p>	<p>significant effect on the South Pennines SPA &amp; SAC. Due to planning permissions granted since 2012, there are no housing requirements in the area and therefore further assessment of the site is not required as no sites will be allocated for housing in Cowling.</p>		
<p>Designated sites: The South Pennine Moors Phase 2 Special Protection Area (SPA), South Pennine Moors Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and South Pennine Moors SSSI is close to area, increased access could impact on these sites. Careful allocation of sites and provision of multifunctional green spaces could help to mitigate this impact but this concern will need to be carefully considered in the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment.</p>	<p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<p>This site lies within the Cowling Conservation Area. This is one of the sites whose impact upon the heritage assets in its vicinity (should it be developed) is currently being evaluated following Historic England's objections to the last iteration of the Local Plan. This site should not be allocated until the results of that work are finished.</p> <p>The loss of this currently-open area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the heritage assets in its vicinity.</p>			
<p><b>CW006: Between Collinge Road and Cow Lane</b></p>			
<p>This site would suit small scale development of houses in keeping with the surrounding areas i.e. two storey or bungalow housing. The only issues are access to the site, which</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains</p>

<p>would be on to Collinge Road.</p>	<p>Site CW006 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis, and passes three of the four District Level Analyses, however due to planning permissions granted since 2012, there are no housing requirements in the area and therefore further assessment of the site is not required as no sites will be allocated for housing in Cowling.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		<p>in the pool of sites for Cowling.</p>
<p>Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lingcrag Gardens is a cul-de-sac which is already at full capacity for vehicles and parking has always been an issue.</li> <li>• Lingcrag Gardens he always been a safe environment for children and an increase in traffic will make the street more hazardous.</li> <li>• Similarly with access from Collinge Road, a popular place for children with a play area makes additional vehicular access a hazard to an already full street.</li> </ul>			
<p>Rights of Way: CW001, CW004, CW005, CW006, CW008, CA011 all have urbanisation impacts on PRoW. Consider use green infrastructure to mitigate</p>			
<p>Land drainage - any building on this land could worsen the already apparent land drainage issues at the rear of the properties on Lingcrag Gardens .</p>			
<p>This is one of the sites whose impact upon the heritage assets in its vicinity (should it be developed) is currently being evaluated following Historic England’s objections to the last iteration of the Local Plan. This site should not be allocated until the results of that work are finished.</p>			
<p>The property we have bought has a plot of land attached to it that has been put</p>			

<p>forward by the previous owners as a potential development site, however the previous owners have sold part of that land to use along with the property (address: Heather Bank, Lingcrag Gardens, Cowling). We write to formally inform you that the site originally submitted (CW006) is no longer available for development, as we have no interest in developing our part of it for housing.</p>			
<p><b>CW008: West of Fold Lane, east of Carr Mill</b></p>			
<p>Whilst this site was ranked second, the Parish Council feels that there are significant issues with how the site would be accessed and increased traffic up Fold Lane, which is unsuitable for increased volumes of traffic.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Cowling.</p>
<p>This is one of the sites whose impact upon the heritage assets in its vicinity (should it be developed) is currently being evaluated following Historic England's objections to the last iteration of the Local Plan. This site should not be allocated until the results of that work are finished.</p>	<p>Site CW008 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis, and passes three of the four District Level Analyses, however there is uncertainty as to whether there would be a significant effect on the South Pennines SPA &amp; SAC. Due to planning permissions granted since 2012, there are no housing requirements in the area and therefore further assessment of the site is not required as no sites will be allocated for housing in Cowling.</p>		
<p>Rights of Way CW008 has urbanisation impacts on PRoW. Consider use green infrastructure to mitigate</p>	<p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		

<b>CW011: South of Acre Meadow and Laycock Fields</b>			
<p>Support for allocation of this site, as it is available, suitable and deliverable as a sustainable housing site. The site is well related to existing services and recreational opportunities and has no flood risk or known highway safety issues. Issues relating to the proximity of SPA and SAC to be investigated further.</p> <p>An extension to site CW011 has been submitted to include the small parcel of land located to the west of site CW011.</p> <p>The whole of the site now proposed as a housing allocation was assessed in the SHLAA 2013 and classed as a deliverable housing site that passed the Part 1 Checks.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site CW011 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis, and passes two of the four District Level Analyses, however there is uncertainty as to whether there would be a significant effect on the South Pennines SPA &amp; SAC. Due to planning permissions granted since 2012, there are no housing requirements in the area and therefore further assessment of the site is not required as no sites will be allocated for housing in Cowling.</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Cowling.
<p>Part of this site has already received consent.</p> <p>However, it is felt that further development of the site would extend the boundary of the village beyond the extent of the former mill/ garage sites and would blur the green boundary around the village.</p>	<p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<p>Rights of Way: CW011 all have urbanisation impacts on PRow. Consider use green infrastructure to mitigate.</p>			

**April – May 2016 Draft Local Plan**  
**Site Response Paper by Settlement: EMBSAY**

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan <i>(ideas relating to change/site identified or not as a preferred site)</i>
<b>EM001</b>			
Review the assessment of this site as it should be included in the Local Plan.	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.  Site EM001 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis, the site also passes all four District Level Analyses; however the site is not considered as a Preferred Site due to no more sites being required in Embsay due to the amount of previous allocations and planning permissions since 2012.  The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.	No	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017. The site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Skipton.
Mitigation and Recommendation - Factor 2 is required (Flood Risk Assessment) and with regard to the Sustainability Appraisal SO9 should be PINK (-) and SO8 should be MAROON (--).			
A number of recent planning applications submitted for housing on this site. YDNPA has objected to at least one proposal based on harm to the Conservation Area, and a designated heritage asset. Agree that there are parts of the site worthy of designation as open greenspace. Pre-app advice was given that identified 'the site in conjunction with the adjoining field makes an important contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. However, there is scope for development which maintains an element of openness and respects the distinctive character of the CA.'			
Part of the site is available, suitable and deliverable as a sustainable housing site. The whole site was originally included in the Council's SHLAA 2012 given site reference EM001. The site was then assessed in the published document 'Craven Local Plan Draft 22/9/14 - Sites Preferred and Not Preferred for Consultation' as Site Reference EM001: and assessed as a site not preferred for consultation but one which would have 'potential significant positive impacts' under the Preliminary Sustainability Check. It is notable that the document selects site EM016			

<p>as a preferred site for consultation despite the Preliminary Sustainability Check identifying that EM016 (Shire Lane) would have 'potential minor positive impacts'.</p> <p>An indicative layout is included with this Representation which illustrates just one potential scheme within the western part of the site with an approximate capacity of 9 dwellings. The proposed site is contiguous with the extent of the western field and measures approximately 0.2 hectares. The Representor will make further representations in due course to provide evidence on the deliverability of the site.</p>			
<p>Support for Greenspace. Planning permission rejected a number of times for road traffic issues. Greenspace will ensure no increase in housing density on a site that is within the Embsay Conversation area and both adjacent to and visible from the National park</p>			
<p>This site is an integral part of the Embsay Conservation Area, which is characterised by the village's internal meadows. There are three key meadow areas fulfilling this characteristic, the others are both sought to be protected by designation as Green Space in the draft Plan and this one should be too. Other heritage impact relates to the site's proximity to the War Memorial. Heritage England has objected to the planning applications for development on this site, two of which have previously been refused by Craven District Council in a rare display of backbone. Highway access to the site is poor and potentially dangerous. No need for housing in Embsay with Eastby other than permitted site at Shires Lane.</p>			
<p>The exit from Laurel Croft does not meet highways safety requirements hence development on this site has already been rejected.</p>			
<p>The judgement in connection with the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives does not recognise that 3 recent planning applications (ref nos. 26/2014/14631, 26/2014/15324 and 26/2015/16037)) for this site have all been refused on the grounds of unsatisfactory visibility issues at the junction from Laurel Croft into Main Street. The most recent decision is now under appeal to the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>Recent planning decisions have also recognised the importance of this</p>			

<p>parcel of land in connection with the heritage asset of Embsay Conservation Area and the close proximity of the Grade 2 Listed War Memorial. The site has historic importance in relation to the early development of the village and its agricultural roots. There are surface drainage issues, which cause the northeast corner of the site to flood and in extreme conditions surface run off flows from the site to the southwest and affects neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The site access also has existing problems of anti-social parking, as recognised in Draft Policy INF4 paragraph c</p> <p>Also, with reference to Mitigation and Recommendation, Factor 2 is required (Flood Risk Assessment) and with regard to the Sustainability Appraisal SO9 should be PINK (-) and SO8 should be MAROON (--)</p>			
<p>Two applications and one appeal have been refused and dismissed on this site because of the conservation, road access, impact on character and appearance of the local area. Heritage England and the National Park (YDNP) and Highways objected strongly as did CPRE. A second appeal is currently being considered.</p> <p>Stages 2-5: The site is in the Conservation Area. Possible access from the site is difficult as West Lane is a narrow road with a hazardous bend adjacent to the site.</p> <p>The Planning Authority state that EM001 is:</p> <p>Stage 6 (Pass): The majority of the site is in FRZ1 and the surface water risk is low. The site is partly in the Conservation Area. The western portion of the site may be utilised for residential development as it has an existing access (Laurel Croft), but the laneway dividing the site and the eastern portion may be left as open green space due to its strong landscape character.</p> <p>There is a lack of consistency in the approach to passing sites illustrated by EM001 and EM002</p> <p>This fails to recognise the access problems, infrastructure, proximity to</p>			

<p>the village halls and local school (ie properties here would overlook children at play) and the importance (endorsed by the Planning Inspectorate) of the conservation area. The Parish Council have objected to applications on this site illustrating that they view the land as an important part of the character and appearance of the Embsay village and Conservation area.</p>			
<b>EM002</b>			
<p>Support for Greenspace. Unsuitable for development as traffic access is poor whichever route is taken. Site is within Conservation area and visible from National Park.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Embsay.</p>
<p>Part of the site within the Representors ownership is available, suitable and deliverable as a sustainable housing site. The whole site was originally included in the Council's SHLAA 2012 as an available, suitable and deliverable as a sustainable housing site (given site reference EM002). The site was then assessed in the published document 'Craven Local Plan Draft 22/9/14 - Sites Preferred and Not Preferred for Consultation' as Site Reference EM002: and assessed as a site not preferred for consultation but one which would have 'potential significant positive impacts' under the Preliminary Sustainability Check. It is notable that the document selects site EM016 as a preferred site for consultation despite the Preliminary Sustainability Check identifying that EM016 (Shire Lane) would have 'potential minor positive impacts'. The suitability and deliverability of part of Site EM002 for housing development should therefore be re-assessed and considered for inclusion in the Plan. An indicative layout is included with this Representation which illustrates just one potential scheme within the western part of the site with an approximate capacity of 20 dwellings. The proposed site is contiguous with the extent of the western field and measures approximately 0.5 hectares. The Representor will make further</p>	<p>Site EM002 does not move past a Level 1 acknowledgement and the site is not suitable to undergo a Sustainability Analysis.  The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		



<p>representations in due course to provide evidence on the deliverability of the site.</p>			
<p>Whilst Para 76 of the NPPF provides for the ability for local communities to identify ‘green areas’ of particular importance to them for special protection, Para 77 goes on to make it clear that the Local Green Space (LGS) designation “will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space”.</p> <p>In other words, the NPPF provides for an ‘exceptional approach’ to the use of the LGS designation where amongst other criteria the green space in question is “demonstrably special.”</p> <p>The NPPF therefore makes it clear that the selection of sites as LGS requires an evidenced based approach to their identification and selection. The draft Local Plan, however, takes a dangerously unbalanced and un-evidenced approach to the designation of LGS because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> There is a significant volume of sites illustrated on the draft Proposals Map as potential LGS designations following only a partial assessment against four very basic criteria.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> In relation to those criteria of Policy ENV10 (a to d) there are no parameters provided to undertake an objective assessment of the role and function of the LGS.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The criteria are also unclear; what is meant by ‘local character’ (criterion c) and how is ‘reasonably close’ defined (criterion d).</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The Policy itself also fails to define what the essential characteristics of the LGS should be, other than one “which the local community identifies as important to them and which should be provided special protection.”</li> </ul> <p>In other words, the current version of the Local Plan has selected a significant volume of potential LGS sites that have been put forward by either individuals or community groups without completing or publishing for consultation the detailed evidence base to quantify the exceptional value of those LGS sites, and without consulting the landowners of those sites. In effect, the approach has provided a ‘NIMBY’s’ charter/tool’ to stifle the development potential of sites located within settlements which otherwise might provide opportunities for sustainable growth.</p>			

<p>Sites have been included that have no public access or recreational/amenity function.</p> <p>The Local Plan therefore needs to accurately define what a LGS should be, clearly set out the exceptional circumstances on which a LGS will be identified, and then undertake and publish for consultation the detailed evidence which justifies the identification of each proposed LGS designation.</p> <p>Part 2 of Policy ENV10 sets out that any development proposals on sites that are identified as LGS will be refused permission unless there are two specific exceptional circumstances (criteria a and b). These two criteria/circumstances are extremely limited and do not reflect the intention/policy of the NPPF. Paragraph 78 of the NPPF states “Local policy for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts”. The draft Local Plan Policy ENV10 attempts to be significantly more restrictive than the Green Belt policy in the NPPF – in effect creating a ‘planning status’ as the most restrictive planning policy designation in the English planning system.</p> <p>The NPPF itself clearly provides for a wider flexibility on the interpretation of ‘exceptional circumstances’. The Council’s Policy effectively serves to prevent any development of any kind within LGS which does not conform with Paragraph 78 of the NPPF, making the proposed Policy unsound. The Policy therefore needs to be re-written to ensure the approach in ENV10 is consistent with the Government’s policy for Green Belts.</p> <p>The landowner is not supportive of the Local Greenspace designation of this site.</p> <p>The site is an extensive tract of land comprising approximately 1.5 hectares which is completely disproportionate to the size of the village and cannot therefore be regarded as ‘local’ in scale.</p> <p>The site is not publicly accessible.</p> <p>The site provides no formal recreation function.</p> <p>The site provides no informal amenity open space function.</p> <p>The site provides no special ecological habitat</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>The site is not 'demonstrably special' and the Council has not provided any evidence to quantify 'exceptional circumstances' that warrant the designation of the site as LGS.</p> <p>In addition, part of the site is available, suitable and deliverable as a sustainable housing site and its designation as LGS would therefore conflict with other objectives of the Local Plan to provide sustainable development in sustainable locations.</p>			
<p>We act on behalf of Mr R Eastwood and Mrs H Byford, owners of land located to the west side of West Lane in Embsay. The land in question is provisionally identified in the consultation draft Local Plan as a proposed Local Green Space (LGS) given reference no 6 on the map extract for Embsay with Eastby. It has also been referred to by the Council as Site Reference EM002 in iterations of its SHLAA and associated Local Plan evidence base.</p> <p>Please find attached a Representation on behalf of the owners of this land, completed on the Council's form, and articulating objections to the identification of this land as LGS; and also promoting a small part of it as an available, suitable and deliverable housing site.</p> <p>The part of the site that is considered available, suitable and deliverable housing site is contiguous with the extent of the western field and measures approximately 0.5 hectares. The indicative plan below shows one iteration of how the site could be laid out to deliver approximately 20 dwellings. This indicative shows how seven additional parking spaces could be included within the housing plan for the use of tenants occupying cottages on Pasture Road.</p>			
<b>EM005</b>			
<p>Site already rejected for planning. Significant and regular flood risk (as 26th Dec 2015)</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site EM005 does not move past a</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> April 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Embsay.</p>
<p>EM002 (West Lane) and EM005 (Skipton Road) – Both of these sites suffer major limitations, which deny the practicable feasibility of development</p>			

	<p>Level 1 acknowledgement and the site is not suitable to undergo a Sustainability Analysis as the site does not contain at least 0.1 hectares of land that is at the lowest risk of flooding.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<b>EM006</b>			
Poor access, the site is prone to flood risk (inundated in December 2015 Floods); Noise impact adjacent operational Steam Railway. No need for housing in Embsay with Eastby other than permitted site at Shires Lane.	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site EM006 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis, the site also passes all four of the District Level Analyses, however due to the amount of previous allocations and planning permissions since 2012 no more housing is needed within Embsay, therefore no sites will be allocated as housing sites.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in</p>	No	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Embsay.
The exit from this site is onto a narrow section of main road and has no visibility to the east and is thus very hazardous.			
Junction at road from Station to through road is dangerous. Vehicles travelling from Embsay have limited visibility of junction. Cyclists on national cycle route descend hill at speed.			
The site suffers a major drawback due to the lack of adequate visibility on egress into East Lane. This has been acknowledged as dangerous by NYCC Highways, because of the hidden entrance and exit. If this could be improved (albeit involving possible compulsory purchase powers and not insignificant engineering works), this site would be a prime location for residential development, with no other known adverse factors being evident.			
In addition, with regard to the Sustainability Appraisal SO9 should be GREY and SO8 should be MAROON (--)			
In addition, with regard to the Sustainability Appraisal SO9 should be GREY and SO8 should be MAROON (--)			
3.3.10.3 Priority Habitat: EM006 and EM010 are close to woodland			

<p>priority habitat but are unlikely to be on priority habitat - consider retaining/ improving any woodland on these sites.</p>	<p>the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<b>EM010</b>			
<p>EM010 Land to the south of Kirk Lane, Eastby; 0.985 ha.  Stage 6 (Pass): A potential site for residential development, but it is quite isolated from the village centre of Embsay. Some issues of medium to high risk of surface water flooding, which would need investigation.  This site is part of determined attempt to develop which is not in the best interest of the local people and the local area.  EM010 should be removed from the draft plan.  EM010 and EM012 English Heritage, when commenting on application 26/2014/14881 stated:  'Eastby and Embsay are two separate historic rural settlements, each with their own conservation areas. We consider that reducing the gap between these two rural settlements would harm the setting of the Embsay and Eastby conservation areas, eroding the distinction between them and eroding the perception of their having a rural setting. It is our view that the proposal fails to protect the setting of the Embsay and Eastby conservation areas or of the Grade II listed heritage assets on Kirk Lane (Church of St Mary the Virgin and Embsay Kirk) It fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of these conservation areas and fails to safeguard elements that make a positive contribution to the setting of these heritage assets''. Any development</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site EM010 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site has numerous negatives, which outnumber the positives for the site.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the same pool of sites for Embsay.</p>

<p>on EM012 &amp; 010 would have an adverse impact on the setting of the Yorkshire Dales National Park, listed Heritage assets and the existing road network used by numerous cyclists and tourists. The area is much used by cyclists and walkers en route to the historic Bolton Abbey. The road is not suited to increased vehicles. The footpath running through the site is an historic link from Eastby to the Church. for full details as to the unsuitability of this site see CPRE response to application 26/2014/14881 32 houses application withdrawn Parish Council, CPRE and approximately 300 local residents objected to building on this site. We note that the Parish Council of the Embsay with Eastby area recommend the removal of EM 010 and EM 012 Local Green Space The area EM012 (EM010) is we believe the subject of a Local Green Space Designation application. This we believe, in view of the quality, setting and location of the landscape in question should be endorsed and supported by CPRE. The level</p>			
<p>EMO10 and EMO12- Land to the south of Kirk Lane, Eastby and Land between Embsay and Eastby. I feel very strongly that this land and adjacent EMO12 should not be included as potential sites for development in the Craven local plan.</p> <p>1) It is a beautiful area, next to the Yorkshire Dales National park land. I value its tranquillity and love walking across the footpath near EMO10. Also watching the antics of the cows that often graze in field off the footpath. Even though I have lived in the village 33 years it still give me a lot pleasure. I walk it at least once a week. I wish it was more often, but as I work that is not possible.</p>			

<p>These two areas also provide a beautiful back drop to St Mary the Virgin Embsay with Eastby Church, a grade 2 listed building They should be kept as agricultural land and designated as a local green space.</p> <p>2) Both areas have a great historic significance due to its location opposite Embsay Kirk which was the site of Embsay Priory. This Augustinian Priory was found by Cecile De Romille in 1120. Even though the Priory moved to Bolton ( Bolton Priory in about 1154/55) a chapel was kept at Embsay Priory until the dissolution of the monasteries in 1538. The land of EMO10 and EMO12 has evidence of medieval ridge and furrow in the fields and would have been farmed by the priory. The priory had granges (farms) in Embsay and Eastby. EMO12 this area was also part of the ancient village green and is where a 3 day fair with a royal charter was held during the medieval period. The priory received fees from this fair. Also these two areas have not been archaeologically surveyed either by geophysics or excavation, who knows what these techniques might reveal.</p> <p>3) Environmental diversity; these two areas of land are very rich in fauna and flora. Watching Hares at play in the fields or Lapwings protecting young is a great delight. The hedgerows are a haven for insects, moths and birds.</p> <p>4) Flooding; these fields provide a soak way for water coming off the moor, covering them with housing and concrete will make the situation worse, with faster run off and more water flooding Embsay Main Street. Embsay was flooded on Boxing Day 2015 including Kirk Lane, church carpark and parts of main street, due to the sheer volume of water coming off the moor. This is not an unusual occurrence and not a one in a 100 years event.</p> <p>I would be grateful if the preferred site EMO10, Kirk Lane, Embsay, could</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>be considered for removal from the Pool of site options with potential for residential or mixed use, for the reasons referred to above in EM12 as well as those outlined regarding Local Green Space referred to in point 1, as its boundaries fall within the boundaries of EM012 and all the above points apply.</p>			
<p>3.3.10.3 Priority Habitat: EM006 and EM010 are close to woodland priority habitat but are unlikely to be on priority habitat - consider retaining/ improving any woodland on these sites. 3.3.10.4 Rights of Way: EM012 and EM010 have urbanisation impacts on PRow (in order of highest impact). Consider use green infrastructure to mitigate.</p>			
<p>Delete. Reasons: Site is in an exposed landscape setting. Location is unsustainable, being distant from services and public transport access. No need for housing in Embsay with Easby other than permitted site at Shires Lane. Development of the site would contribute to the reduction in separation of villages of Eastby and Embsay.</p>			
<p>EM010 (Land to the south of Kirk Lane) – Development of this site would lead to an unwarranted increase of the ‘ribbon development’ nature currently existing to the north side of Kirk Lane and which prevailed in the inter-and immediate post war periods and is now considered unacceptable under planning principles. There are also potential limitations due to the proximity of a high-pressure gas main. This area has been the subject of a planning application for 32 houses in July 2014 (ref 26/2014/14881) against which there was a wealth of public objection and the application was subsequently withdrawn. The suggested site adjoins the boundary of the Yorkshire Dales National Park, the designation of which has been made on the basis of the high value of the natural landscape. Immediately adjacent urbanisation would significantly detract from this designation. The site is adjacent to Embsay Kirk – (see earlier comments relating to Open Green Spaces) where there is a strong historic and heritage connection. The “summary of issues” indicates a medium to high risk of surface</p>			



water flooding. This does not apply and Mitigation Factor 2 should be REMOVED, whilst SO12 should be PINK (-)			
This formed part of a larger site for development under application ref. 26/2014/14881, which the YDNPA objected to (see EM012 below). However, following the refusal/withdrawal? Of this application we thought there may be scope for minor development that would not harm the NP along the Kirk Lane frontage, providing that views are maintained – i.e, a well landscaped cluster rather than a continuous frontage.			
The “summary of issues” indicates a medium to high risk of surface water flooding. This does not apply and Mitigation Factor 2 should be REMOVED, whilst SO12 should be PINK (-)			
<b>EM010 and EM012</b>			
These sites should not be excluded from the Local Plan as they both performed well during the summer 2013 consultation.	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Embsay.
Potential exists to the south of EM012 and the north of EM010.			
The planning application proposals have been revised and reduced in scale to take account of environmental evaluation and comments received during the 2013 consultation.			
Full and up to date Sustainability Appraisal, which assesses the policies and sites against a full and clear set of criteria, is required. Discounting of these sites has occurred within this full Sustainability Appraisal.			
Further sites will need to be identified in a number of the second tier growth settlements and these sites are well placed to make such a contribution.			
Policy SP11 – Strategy for tier 4A and 4B villages with basic services and bisected villages with basic services We support the inclusion of SHLAA sites EM010 and EM012 within the pool of potential residential development sites. However we agree with the Council’s initial conclusion that EM012 is a large site and that it is inappropriate to consider the full development of this land area. We generally agree with the council that there are issues of biodiversity, landscape and green infrastructure to be addressed. The project team			
	Site EM012 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site		

<p>commissioned by KCS Development Ltd have examined these issues and other potential impacts in some detail. As a result two discrete net residential development cells have been identified at the southern and northern ends of the EM012 land holding. The southern cell constitutes a logical extension to the settlement form of Embsay and is assessed as having a development capacity of circa 25 dwellings. The northern cell fits within the subsidiary SHLAA site EM010 and is assessed as having a development capacity of circa 15 dwellings. Development of the cell will be in an essentially linear format reflecting the pattern of existing housing to the north of Kirk Lane and in the smaller village of Eastby to the east of the cell.</p> <p>These sites are deliverable, currently available and in suitable locations relative to the existing settlement pattern of Embsay and Eastby.</p> <p>Pool of Site Options with potential for residential or mixed use and sustainability appraisal:</p> <p>Based on our detailed work to date, as summarised in paragraph 2.20 above, we support the inclusion of two discrete residential allocations as outlined on the plan at Appendix 1. These proposed allocations represent developments which are deliverable, sustainable and appropriate in scale and have a good fit with the existing settlement form. Detailed assessment has been undertaken of the impacts of this level of development on heritage assets, landscape character and visual amenity.</p> <p>The Council has assessed the full land coverage of SHLAA site EM012 and EM010 in their Sustainability Assessment. The Council’s summary of issues and recommendations for site EM012 states:</p> <p>“A potential site for residential development, but it is a very large site which may be inappropriate for full development given the relatively low housing requirements for Embsay. Some issues of medium to high risk of surface water flooding areas scattered throughout the site. A listed building is close to the site to the west. A gas pipeline runs through the site. The national border is adjacent.”</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal also provides recommends on avoidance,</p>	<p>has numerous negatives, which outnumber the positives for the site.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>mitigation and opportunity measures for each site. Sites EM010 and EM012 highlight the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Flood Risk Assessment;</li> <li>Consider impact on Conservation Area and Heritage Assets;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Ground work assessment to investigate archaeological significance; and,</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Prominent location- visual character in relation to housing density, building heights and dwelling design to be considered.</li> </ul> <p>KCS Development has continued to engage a team of technical consultants including flood risk, landscape, highways, design, heritage and archaeological expertise. Further technical work is currently underway and we reserve the right to provide future technical updates to the Council when appropriate.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>In summary therefore the development team employed by KCS Development Ltd have undertaken a significant amount of technical work to refine the development proposals within the wider land holding, as defined in SHLAA site EM012. The smaller development cells now put forward as residential allocations will make a significant contribution to the enhanced housing requirement for this fourth tier settlement. These proposals are the result of considering all relevant constraints and opportunities and they achieve a planning balance and macro design solution which will constitute a positive outcome.</p> <p>We welcome the opportunity to comment on this informal consultation of the Craven Local Plan Second Draft and look forward to being kept informed of future consultation exercises and the publication of further evidence base documents and draft SPD's.</p>			
<p>Object to housing designation. Planning application already rejected. Large parts of site unsafe for construction due to major gas pipe. Access and Egress to site unsafe; road system to and through Embsay and Eastby unsafe for increased quantities of vehicles. Significant heritage asset. Adjacent to 18thC mansion built on site of 12thC monastic site. Remains of 14thC field system with revetted banks. Likely site of Embsay</p>			

<p>Fair in 12-14thC. Adjacent to National Park. Neutral to negative Sustainability Appraisal Objective</p> <p>Support for Green space. Designate entire area as Green space. Maintains agrarian nature of Embsay and Eastby. Provides separation between two separate communities. Retains ancient environment (14thC banks with hedges) and remains of ancient green way in NE corner</p>			
<b>EM012</b>			
<p>Delete. Reasons: Site is in an exposed landscape setting. Location is unsustainable, being distant from services and public transport access. No need for housing in Embsay with Eastby other than permitted site at Shires Lane. Development of the site would contribute to the substantial reduction in separation of villages of Eastby and Embsay. Surface water and foul drainage infrastructure constraints add to the unsuitability of the land for development</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	Yes	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Embsay.</p>
<p>The field opposite the church in Kirk Lane (EM012) is, to my mind, vital, in maintaining the character of the two separate, but linked, villages. The whole feel to this oldest and most historic part of our parish would be changed completely by the construction of modern houses. A development would, I think, be a 'blot on the landscape', and out of place in this particularly sensitive environment, spoiling the beauty and tranquillity of this area around the church. One gets a powerful sense of walking from one village to the other along the footpath which runs through this open field. This seems to me to be very important to conserve and preserve. It's at the heart of the villages' history. Once gone, there would be no bringing it back.</p>	<p>Site EM012 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site has numerous negatives which outnumber the positives for the site.</p>		
<p>I would be grateful if the preferred site EM012, Kirk Lane, Embsay, could be considered for removal from the Pool of site options with potential for residential or mixed use for the reasons referred to above in point 1, as well as those outlined below:</p> <p>I note in your sustainability assessment that you assessed the site to</p>	<p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		

<p>have achieved Stage 6 (Pass), although you accurately state that 'it is a very large site, which may be inappropriate for full development, given the relatively low housing requirements for Embsay. Some issues of medium to high risk of surface water flooding areas scattered throughout the site. A listed building is close to the site to the west. A gas pipeline runs through the site. The National Park border is adjacent.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I believe the number of 'required' houses in Embsay will be achieved following the successful application (26/2014/15224) for an additional 12 dwellings on the site to the western end of Shires Lane (26/2014/14518) and any recent 'windfall' plots.</li> <li>• On the Evening of Christmas day 25.12.15 this year, surface water flooding down Kirk Lane was so severe that it resulted in part of the carriage way lifting and a 2 metre deep 'sink' hole appearing around the man hole cover of the drain, which necessitated temporary road closure and significant repair works by North Yorkshire highways, indicating the flood risk is high now and would only be increased with further building. • There are, I believe, 2 listed buildings nearby, (Church of St Mary the Virgin and Embsay Kirk). Regarding the Sustainability Assessment undertaken SO15. Promote innovative design which enhances the visual character of Craven's towns and villages. EM012 has been judged positive, offering noticeable improvement (light green) Whilst I accept well designed buildings can, in the right place, enhance an area, I feel that any building on such an open, unspoilt, scenic and rural green site could never enhance its visual character. I respectfully request that this is re-assessed to Negative, showing dis-improvement (pink). SO19. Minimise waste production and increase recycling rates in Craven EM012 has been judged positive, offering noticeable improvement (light green) Building of any kind on this site must bring with it increased waste</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--

<p>production, which could, of course be properly and responsibly managed. As recycling rates are based on a percentage value eg per household/person, the rate would stay the same, not be increased. Therefore the impact would be at best neutral here, which should be reflected in the assessment. (0-grey)</p> <p>SO20.Safeguard minerals, resources and other natural material assets and ensure the safe management of hazard risk of former mining activity where new development is proposed.</p> <p>I believe this relates generally to not building on future potential assets and surveys have indicated it could be assessed as light green. I suggest on this basis alone it should be assessed as neutral, but when the fact that a high pressure gas pipeline bisects the site, the safe management of hazard risk should make it significantly negative (maroon).</p>			
<p>EM012 (Land between Embsay and Eastby) – This is an extensive site, the development of which would materially change the nature of the parish by joining 2 physically separate communities and also significantly change the local landscape. There are also many of the disadvantages stated previously within the comments relating to EM010 above.</p> <p>Additional problems arise with surface water run off from surcharging watercourses in the southern section of the area.</p> <p>The Parish Church of St Mary’s, standing adjacent to the western boundary of the site, is a Grade 2 listed building, consecrated in 1853, furthering the heritage value of the neighbouring land.</p> <p>Recommendation Factor 3 should also be applied – biodiversity</p> <p>SO12 should, therefore, be PINK (-) and SO 14 should be MAROON (++)</p>			
<p>Land at Eastby (EM012)</p> <p>CST owns part of a much larger site EM012 (as identified on the attached plan by the red line).</p> <p>The comments in relation to the site within the document are:          “Stage 6 (Pass): A potential site for residential development, but it is a very large site which may be inappropriate for full development given the relatively low housing requirements for Embsay. Some issues of</p>			

<p>medium to high risk of surface water flooding areas scattered throughout the site. A listed building is close to the site to the west. A gas pipeline runs through the site. The national park border is adjacent.”</p> <p>CST accepts that the full site EM012 as shown would be unsuitable for development. CST requires that the land it owns is not considered in conjunction with a much larger area of land with and is considered separately. Shown hatched on the attached plan is an area of land to the northern part of the site which is considered particularly suitable for residential development. This area of land could accommodate around two new houses and in its depth would replicate houses to the east and their curtilages.</p> <p>CST considers that it is appropriate for the LPA to allocate a development site within Eastby as a distinct but related settlement to Embsay and considers that the northern section of the land it owns provides the opportunity to do this.</p>			
<p>Recommendation Factor 3 should also be applied – biodiversity SO12 should, therefore, be PINK (-) and SO 14 should be MAROON (++)</p>			
<p>YDNPA objected to the development of this site in August 2014 (ref. 26/2014/14881) on the grounds of harmful impact on the character of Eastby village, impact on the Conservation Areas of Embsay and Eastby, landscape Impact and Impact on Listed Buildings (Embsay Kirk and St Mary’s Church). All these grounds relate to the principle of developing this site.</p>			
<p>EMO10 and EMO12- Land to the south of Kirk Lane, Eastby and Land between Embsay and Eastby.</p> <p>I feel very strongly that this land and adjacent EMO12 should not be included as potential sites for development in the Craven local plan.</p>			

<p>1) It is a beautiful area, next to the Yorkshire Dales National park land. I value its tranquillity and love walking across the footpath near EMO10. Also watching the antics of the cows that often graze in field off the footpath. Even though I have lived in the village 33 years it still give me a lot pleasure. I walk it at least once a week. I wish it was more often, but as I work that is not possible.</p> <p>These two areas also provide a beautiful back drop to St Mary the Virgin Embsay with Eastby Church, a grade 2 listed building</p> <p>They should be kept as agricultural land and designated as a local green space.</p> <p>2) Both areas have a great historic significance due to its location opposite Embsay Kirk which was the site of Embsay Priory. This Augustinian Priory was found by Cecile De Romille in 1120. Even though the Priory moved to Bolton ( Bolton Priory in about 1154/55) a chapel was kept at Embsay Priory until the dissolution of the monasteries in 1538. The land of EMO10 and EMO12 has evidence of medieval ridge and furrow in the fields and would have been farmed by the priory. The priory had granges (farms) in Embsay and Eastby.</p> <p>EMO12 this area was also part of the ancient village green and is where a 3 day fair with a royal charter was held during the medieval period. The priory received fees from this fair.</p> <p>Also these two areas have not been archaeologically surveyed either by geophysics or excavation, who knows what these techniques might reveal.</p> <p>3) Environmental diversity; these two areas of land are very rich in fauna and flora. Watching Hares at play in the fields or Lapwings protecting young is a great delight. The hedgerows are a haven for insects, moths and birds.</p> <p>4) Flooding; these fields provide a soak way for water coming off the moor, covering them with housing and concrete will make the situation</p>			
--	--	--	--



<p>worse, with faster run off and more water flooding Emsay Main Street. Emsay was flooded on Boxing Day 2015 including Kirk Lane, church carpark and parts of main street, due to the sheer volume of water coming off the moor. This is not an unusual occurrence and not a one in a 100 years event.</p>			
<p>M012; Land between Emsay and Eastby; 12.252 ha.                  Stage 6 (Pass): A potential site for residential development, but it is a very large site which may be inappropriate for full development given the relatively low housing requirements for Emsay. Some issues of medium to high risk of surface water flooding areas scattered throughout the site. A listed building is close to the site to the west. A gas pipeline runs through the site. The national park border is adjacent. As with the inclusion of EM001, there is a great deal of local opposition to this i.e. the Parish Council and local residents. An application to build 32 houses 26/2014/14881 was refused by the Local Authority in 2014. Any development on EM012 &amp; 010 would have an adverse impact on the setting of the Yorkshire Dales National Park, listed Heritage assets and the existing road network used by numerous cyclists and tourists. The area is much used by cyclists and walkers en route to the historic Bolton Abbey. The road is not suited to increased vehicles. The footpath running through the site is an historic link from Eastby to the Church. for full details as to the unsuitability of this site see CPRE response to application 26/2014/14881 32 houses application withdrawn Parish Council, CPRE and approximately</p>			

<p>300 local residents objected to building on this site.</p> <p>We note that the Parish Council of the Embsay with Eastby area recommend the removal of EM 010 and EM 012 Local Green Space</p> <p>The area EM012 (EM010) is we believe the subject of a Local Green Space Designation application. This we believe, in view of the quality, setting and location of the landscape in question should be endorsed and supported by CPRE. The level Development on EM012 was objected to by the Yorkshire Dales National Park, The local Parish Council, CPRE and numerous local residents. The site is indicative of traditional ridge and furrows, sits next to the Yorkshire Dales National Park and development on this site would have an adverse impact on Heritage Assets and the two conservation areas of Embsay and also the Eastby conservation area. It should be noted that a high pressure gas pipeline runs through the middle of the site.</p> <p>This large site provides 3b grazing land which should be protected. Any development of this important space will degrade the setting of the local area, the character and landscape of the local area and the setting of the Yorkshire Dales National Park.</p> <p>We are informed that the Parish Council and local residents have strongly objected to the inclusion of this site and that some residents, whilst sending their objections to the site relating to the local plan via electronic response to CDC 'were not received' and</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>therefore have not had their comments included. See also comments following EM10 which apply to both EM12 &amp; EM010. EM010 and EM012 English Heritage, when commenting on application 26/2014/14881 stated:          'Eastby and Embsay are two separate historic rural settlements, each with their own conservation areas. We consider that reducing the gap between these two rural settlements would harm the setting of the Embsay and Eastby conservation areas, eroding the distinction between them and eroding the perception of their having a rural setting. It is our view that the proposal fails to protect the setting of the Embsay and Eastby conservation areas or of the Grade II listed heritage assets on Kirk Lane (Church of St Mary the Virgin and Embsay Kirk) It fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of these conservation areas and fails to safeguard elements that make a positive contribution to the setting of these heritage assets''.          EM012 should be removed from the draft plan.</p>			
<p>Should be designated as a Local Green Space, it is within 300m of the community it serves and doesn't have existing planning permission. The site failed to pass the test relating to it being considered an extensive tract of land. Seems to be inconsistency here regarding what an extensive tract of land actually is.          The field in question, if considered only in relation to Embsay, could be considered to be near its boundary. However, when considering the villages of Embsay with Eastby, the field is in the middle of the unique settlement, has clearly defined edges with houses to all four sides and the size of the area clearly relates to the community that it serves. i.e. Embsay with Eastby, which is a single Parish. The field is bisected by the</p>			

<p>pubic footpath which joins Embsay with Eastby .Furthermore when one 'Consider(s) how large the site is in comparison to other fields; groups of fields; areas of land in the vicinity etc?</p> <p>It could certainly not be considered an extensive tract of land compared with surrounding areas and is in fact clearly more local in scale.</p> <p>I can appreciate how a misunderstanding could arise from a desktop assessment alone, but if a person was standing in the south east corner of the site facing northwest, they would see edges on all sides, clearly defined by roads, houses, farm buildings and church or stonewall field boundaries, all within 300meters of the community.</p> <p>If the person then turned through 180 degrees to face south east, their view would be uninterrupted over an extensive tract of land towards Ilkley. I contend there is a marked and significant distinction between the two.</p> <p>This open green field sits directly between the conservation areas of Embsay and Eastby and is greatly valued by the residents of both settlements, as well as the wider Craven community and visitors to it, many of whom pass through the green field space when walking through the site from Embsay car park to Eastby and on to Bolton Abbey and the Yorkshire Dales beyond. They appreciate its stunning natural beauty, with views of the Yorkshire Dales National park and Embsay Crag to the north, meandering becks passing through it. This Green Space provides a vital village amenity, with a public footpath crossing it, and is regularly used, proving a recreational opportunity within comfortable walking distance of residents' homes.</p> <p>The site is of proven historic significance. When recently consulted on a subsequently withdrawn planning application, (Application No 26/2014/14881) English Heritage commented that</p> <p>'Eastby and Embsay are two separate historic rural settlements, each with their own conservation areas. The proposal site consists of open grass fields which visually separate the two small settlements of Eastby and Embsay and which contribute strongly to their rural setting. The</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>proposal site contains the remains of a medieval field system'. We consider that reducing the gap between these two rural settlements would harm the setting of the Embsay and Eastby conservation areas, eroding the distinction between them and eroding the perception of their having a rural setting. It is our view that the proposal fails to protect the setting of the Embsay and Eastby conservation areas or of the Grade II listed heritage assets on Kirk Lane (Church of St Mary the Virgin and Embsay Kirk). It fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of these conservation areas and fails to safeguard elements that make a positive contribution to the setting of these heritage assets'. In addition a recently discovered carved stone gatepost has been identified within the site.</p> <p>The tranquillity offered by this site will be lost forever, if is not designated as a LGS. It provides a quiet space for people to enjoy and undisturbed habitats for wildlife from resident and migrating birds to hares and deer. The hedgerows and streams contained within the green space, provide shelter and habitats for insects and smaller mammals. The Parish Council of Embsay with Eastby also support the designation of EM12 as a Local Green Space, having submitted their own application. I also feel designation as a LGS has the support of the majority of residents of Embsay with Eastby, as reflected in the number of objections made when a planning application (Application No 26/2014/14881) was made, but subsequently withdrawn, just before decision.</p> <p>I would respectfully request that these views are considered, before coming to a final decision on the designation of this highly valued Local Green Space, which, I believe, should be protected and retained in its present form for the enjoyment and benefit of future generations to come.</p>			
<p><b>EM013</b></p>			
<p>Reduce the number of houses to a small spacious cul-de-sac</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site was not identified as</p>

<p>development at the end of the field nearest the cricket field and water pumping station.</p>	<p>Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site EM013 was not identified as a preferred site to enter the Pool of Sites within the Draft Local Plan 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016.</p> <p>The methodology for reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		<p>a preferred site to enter the Pool of Sites within the Draft Local Plan 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016. This site therefore remains out of the pool of sites for Embsay.</p>
<p>Any new houses on this site should be extensively screened to rescue their impact on both Low Lane and Shires Lane.</p>			
<p>Development of this site would represent urban sprawl and would be highly visible from anyone approaching the village along Low Lane from Halton East.</p>			
<p>This site should not be used as the village should be kept rural.</p>			
<p>There is enough development in the outline planning approval for the other site on Shires Lane.</p>			
<p>This site would have less impact on traffic and highway safety within the middle of Embsay when compared to other options considered, has relatively easy access to the limited public transport, it is outside of the Conservation Area and would have little impact on the historic core of the village. The site is of a sufficient size to provide new homes and an area of open space to complement the nearby sports facilities.</p>			
<p>Consider for designation as a Local Green Space as its designation has been, supported by the Parish Council, via an application in December 2015. It is within 300m of the community. It does not currently have planning permission. It is bounded and edged by road, dry stone field walls and is not an extensive tract of land for reasons similar to those outlined above. It is valued by residents and visitors, including many recreational cyclists and walkers, for providing uninterrupted views of beautiful open countryside and provides a safe and secluded habitat for a rich variety of wildlife. For many years it has been the home of the Embsay show, a vital aspect of traditional Craven village life.</p>			
<p>SO15. Promote innovative design which enhances the visual character of Craven's towns and villages.</p> <p>EM013 has been judged positive, offering noticeable improvement (light green)</p> <p>Whilst I accept well designed buildings can, in the right place, enhance an area, I feel that any building on such an open, unspoilt, scenic and rural green site could never enhance its visual character. I respectfully</p>			

<p>request that this is re-assessed to Negative, showing dis-improvement (pink).</p> <p>SO19. Minimise waste production and increase recycling rates in Craven EM013 has been judged positive, offering noticeable improvement (light green)</p> <p>Building of any kind on this site must bring with it increased waste production, which could, of course be properly and responsibly managed. As recycling rates are based on a percentage value eg per household/person, the rate would stay the same, not be increased. Therefore the impact would be at best neutral here, which should be reflected in the assessment. (0-grey)</p> <p>SO20.Safeguard minerals, resources and other natural material assets and ensure the safe management of hazard risk of former mining activity where new development is proposed.</p> <p>I believe this relates generally to not building on future potential assets and surveys have indicated it could be assessed as light green. I suggest on this basis alone it should be assessed as neutral (grey), as it does not offer any noticeable improvement to the current open green space.</p>			
<p>Planning permission has been granted for the development of housing on land south of Shires Lane to the extent that the full development of this site will breach the level of housing appropriate to the settlement of Embsay with Eastby for the Plan period as established by the position of Embsay within the draft Local Plan settlement hierarchy. The land subject to planning permission south of Shires Lane should be the only housing site allocated at Embsay for the above reason and for the reasons explained below relating to the unacceptability of the other site options identified in the consultations document. The identification for the housing allocation south of Shires Lane should be amended to include the northern part of that site as Green Space. This Green Space designation should run from the southern boundary of the residential property at the north west corner of the site eastwards, parallel to Shires Lane, to the site's boundary with Embsay Cricket Club.</p>			
<p>No consideration has been given to the fact that part of the site is at high</p>			

<p>risk of flooding.</p> <p>The site is a deliverable option for development when considered against the requirements of NPPF paragraph 47 footnote 11. Footnote 11 states that “To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable...”</p> <p>In this regard the site is available for development having been promoted recently for development via a planning application (26/2015/15886). The application is further being promoted via the appeal process.</p> <p>The site is suitable for development as it continues a pattern of non-agricultural uses along Shires Lane, including the cricket pitch and land to the west of the cricket pitch which has recently been granted consent for residential development (applications 26/2014/15224 and 26/2014/14518), as shown on the consultation plan for the village. As is clear from the consultation plan the site does not extend as far south as the consented site to the west of the cricket pitch. It is bounded to two sides by public highway and to one side by the cricket pitch. There are existing mature trees along part of the southern boundary of the site, which can be reinforced through development. To the south of the site are a railway line and quarry workings of significant size and the development of the site is not therefore considered to cause harm to an open countryside setting of Embsay.</p> <p>The site is achievable as there are no legal or technical barriers to the site’s development as demonstrated by the determination of a recent application on the site, which found no such barriers.</p>			
---	--	--	--



<p>The refusal of the application on landscape grounds, which are considered unsubstantiated and not based upon the advice of any qualified landscape professional, is currently being appealed. CST SUPPORTS the allocation of this site in the Craven Local Plan. The site is considered to be better suited to a major scale development than other sites identified in the plan. CST SUPPORTS the conclusion of Craven District Council, in its assessment of the site, that: "Stage 6 (Pass): Suitable for residential development. It is close to the village centre and it seems to have no significant obstacles to development."</p>			
<p>Of the published pool of options this is a site with a low level of material drawbacks to development. It is currently under appeal, against refusal of an application for 39 houses (ref no. 26/2015/15886), on the basis that the development of the site would be a 'disruptive finger' into open countryside. There are also significant surface water problems. S08 should be PINK (--) and SO14 should be PINK (-) Recommendation Factor 2 should also be APPLIED</p>			
<p>Building on this site would cause flooding problems at Bow bridge and has already been rejected.</p>			
<p>The field on the corner of Shires Lane and Low Lane (EM013) is also important in establishing the character of Embsay as it is entered from the east. It is a most attractive approach which would certainly be compromised by a housing development. The number of cars using the Halton East road, the shortest link to the A59, would significantly increase I fear, and therefore be much more hazardous for walkers, such as myself, and runners, who very much enjoy using it. Kempley Pond is just on the bend, opposite the field in question, and one April morning I counted 16 species of birds in half an hour in that vicinity. Any development would, I am convinced, be highly detrimental to the wildlife of the area.</p>			
<p>Outline planning permission rejected by Craven. Significant flood/water</p>			

<p>flow issues (as 26th Dec 2015). Unsuitable for housing density as proposed elsewhere in plan as on the edge of current village development. Nearby site has been approved for recommended number of houses within Emsay and Eastby. Support for Greenspace. Site maintains agrarian nature of Emsay on entry from Low Lane. Site is on the edge of village. Greenbottom Beck provides significant opportunity for enhancing environment and wildlife diversity within site and to adjacent fields.</p>			
<p>Development of this site would result in residential development on both sides of Shires Lane, which would provide a residential feel to the area.</p>			
<p>Development of this site would prevent access to the adjoining fields across the site.</p>			
<p><b>Sites: EM013 and EM016</b></p>			
<p>Development of these sites would remove much of the open aspects from the village cricket ground and allotments.</p>	<p>Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>EM013 and EM016 were not identified as a preferred site to enter the Pool of Sites within the Draft Craven Local Plan 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016. These sites therefore remain out of the pool of sites for Emsay.</p>
<p>Support for the Local Plan for Emsay/Eastby as the preferred sites have been sympathetically chosen to provide the least impact in terms of traffic, wildlife and impact on the fabric of the villages.</p>	<p>Sites EM013 and EM016 were not identified as a preferred site to enter the Pool of Sites within the Draft Craven Local Plan 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016.</p> <p>The methodology for reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		

<b>EM014</b>			
<p>Object to housing or any development. Hazardous road junction precludes anything but existing use. Significant heritage asset within Eastby Hall. Surrounding fields, boundaries etc are pre-15thC in origin, and, in all likelihood, older.</p>	<p>Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site EM014 was not identified as a preferred site to enter the Pool of Sites within the Draft Craven Local Plan 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016.</p> <p>The methodology for reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	No	<p>Site was not identified as a preferred site to enter the Pool of Sites within the Draft Craven Local Plan 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016. These sites therefore remain out of the pool of sites for Embsay.</p>
<b>EM015</b>			
<p>Relatively small site and is considered acceptable, but only within the existing footprint of the current buildings. It should be noted that this site was adversely affected by flooding in 1979 and 1982 due to exceptional storm water runoff from the adjacent land to the north of Barden Road.</p> <p>SO9 should be PINK (-) and Mitigation Recommendation Factor 2 is REQUIRED</p>	<p>Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site EM015 was not identified as a preferred site to enter the Pool of Sites within the Draft Craven Local Plan 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016.</p>	No	<p>Site was not identified as a preferred site to enter the Pool of Sites within the Draft Craven Local Plan 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016. These sites therefore remain out of the pool of sites for Embsay.</p>
<p>This would appear to be prominent back land development. It would be particularly visible on the approach from the east, as land levels begin to dip away. This area is also the oldest part of the village with the most character to conserve.</p>	<p>The methodology for reassessing this site together</p>		

<p>The site extends into open countryside to the south of Eastby. Development of this land would fail to reflect the established pattern of development of the village, which is linear along either side of the road. Location is unsustainable, being distant from services and public transport access. No need for housing in Embsay with Eastby other than permitted site at Shires Lane</p>	<p>with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<b>EM016</b>			
<p>This site has been approved with more than the recommended allocation of houses as specified within earlier versions of local plan. The permission for 48 houses consumes the 3 houses per year over the 15 year life of the local plan.</p>	<p>The methodology for reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	No	<p>Site was not identified as a preferred site to enter the Pool of Sites within the Draft Craven Local Plan 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016. This site therefore remains out of the pool of sites for Embsay.</p>
<p>Development of an extension to site EM016 would not result in a discordant development and would be seen as a logical infill between the football field and allotment area.</p>			
<b>General Comments :</b>			
<p>Water supply - Local mains reinforcement may be required. Waste water – The increase in foul flows can be accommodated in the sewer network and there are not issues with the receiving waste water treatment works. (Yorkshire Water comment)</p>	<p>Due to the amount of previous allocations and planning permissions since 2012 no more housing is needed within Embsay, therefore no sites will be allocated within Embsay as preferred housing sites.</p>	No	<p>No change required as there are to be no sites allocated for housing within Embsay.</p>
<p>Support the approach that there is no new development proposed in and around Eastby. Eastby is little more than a hamlet and has no services and facilities.</p>	<p>Due to the amount of previous allocations and planning permissions since 2012 no more housing is needed within Embsay, therefore no sites will be allocated within Embsay as preferred housing sites.</p>	No	<p>No change required as there are to be no sites allocated for housing within</p>

			Embsay.
Support the lack of any proposed new development in the existing gap between Embsay and Eastby. They are two distinct settlements with their own identity. Their physical separation is vital to their identities and characters and must be maintained. Any infill between the two villages is strongly opposed as this would destroy the balance of the two distinct villages.	Due to the amount of previous allocations and planning permissions since 2012 no more housing is needed within Embsay, therefore no sites will be allocated within Embsay as preferred housing sites.	No	No change required as there are to be no sites allocated for housing within Embsay.
Support the lack of proposed allocations for new housing on the existing open spaces within Embsay. These areas of land contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and also provide an historical reference to the earlier 'Dales village'. The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to have regard to the desirability of maintaining the existing character and appearance. Safe and convenient access to these areas of open space within the village would also be difficult to achieve.	Due to the amount of previous allocations and planning permissions since 2012 no more housing is needed within Embsay, therefore no sites will be allocated within Embsay as preferred housing sites.	No	No change required as there are to be no sites allocated for housing within Embsay.
As there have been continuing delays in producing a Craven Local Plan, to the detriment of the parish, there is a pressing need for the district council to finalise the completion of the Local Plan as quickly as possible.	Comments noted.	No	No changes required to the plan as comments relate to timescales of the delivery of the New Local Plan.

## April – May 2016 Draft Local Plan

## Site Response Paper by Settlement: KILDWICK AND FARNHILL

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>General Comments:</b>			
<p>Objection to Kildwick and Farnhill being grouped together. The villages are separate and have their own identities and should not be grouped together. Kildwick is a third the size of Farnhill, has its own Parish Council, together with sensitive heritage assets. Kildwick should be treated the same as other small parishes e.g., Bolton Abbey.</p>	<p>There are no preferred housing sites to be allocated in either Kildwick or Farnhill in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, due to a decrease in the overall level of housing need required across the plan area. The proportion of development in Kildwick and Farnhill has been reduced to reflect the adjusted OAN and housing requirement in Craven.</p>	Yes	<p>There are no preferred housing sites to be allocated in either Kildwick or Farnhill in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017.</p>
<p>Kildwick is a small village with approx. 45 houses. The new plan proposes 72 possible houses built over 3 sites, thus increasing Kildwick massively and totally changing its character. Farnhill is a much larger village, which has only been allocated 27 new homes on one development.</p>			
<b>KL002: Recreation ground south of Priest Bank Road</b>			
<p>Site is subject to flooding. It flooded from the overflowing river and canal last winter. It should not have passed to stage 3. PO8 states that the plan must address and mitigate flood risk.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	Yes	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Kildwick.</p>
<p>Incorrect description of site location</p>	<p>Site KL002 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site presents an inadequate road access, is partly located in flood risk zone 3b</p>		
<p>This site has access constraints. The following two options are suggested: 1) Through the recreation ground,</p>			

<p>however this would reduce the extent of the recreation ground.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2) Through private land at Lion Croft Yard, which is unacceptable to the owners &amp; residents of this privately owned yard.</li> <li>3) Through farmland alongside the River Aire, however this farmland floods.</li> </ol>	<p>and the site, as an existing area of open space the site makes a significant contribution to the character and appearance of Kildwick Conservation Area. These are determining impediments to selection of this site.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<p>The roads in Kildwick and Farnhill are appropriate to the current character of both villages and are not suited to an increase in volume of traffic. Priest Bank Road is narrow and, in part, has no pavements; Kirkgate is single track with limited visibility when approaching from Kildwick. Development of this site would exacerbate these existing road capacity issues, including resulting an extra traffic burden on the medieval stone bridge (SAM) into the village. Entry to the village is congested daily at the roundabout.</p>			
<p>The historic heritage of Kildwick needs conserving, development would damage the historic setting of the village Conservation Area.</p>			
<p>The aesthetics of Kildwick will be spoiled by any new development as it will hide the older part of the village from view.</p>			
<p>The amount of development proposed will be more new houses than there is in the historic village. There is no bus route, no shops and the school is at capacity. The</p>			

<p>proposed development would put strain on an already struggling infrastructure. This site should not have passed stage 2 of the site assessment process.</p>			
<p>The conservation area was not shown on the preferred sites map. This was pointed out during the Local Plan Surgery in April 2016.</p>			
<p>The site has no previous planning history and is used for farm animals. Planning was refused for a residential property.</p>			
<p>Sustainability Appraisal process:  SO1 should be N (pink) result as building houses in Kildwick will only increase traffic on the narrow village roads.  SO3 – Development will not aide equality and diversity as it will put more strain on the village amenities and access.  SO4 – should not be a positive result as building houses in Kildwick will not enhance access to essential facilities. There are no shops that will benefit from extra housing and the school is at capacity.  SO5 – should not be a positive result as there is no need to address highway safety at the moment and only if traffic in the village increased due to additional houses, would there be any need for these measure.  SO6 - should be N (pink) result as building affordable houses in keeping with the local character is a contradiction and locating affordable housing in a village with limited facilities is not sustainable.</p>			



<p>SO7 – should be a NN (maroon) result as the school is already at maximum capacity.</p> <p>SO8 – should be a N (Pink) result as there is no public transport services in Kildwick. The low bridge on Main St between Kildwick and Farnhill and canal bridge with a weight restriction mean there is no way of introducing a bus service in the future. The site has access constraints.</p> <p>SO9 – should have been a NN (maroon) result as the site floods.</p> <p>SO10 – should be a negative result as is a field for agriculture and wildlife, including sheep, cows, horses and swans.</p> <p>SO12 - should have been a NN (maroon) result as developing this site will impact on the character of the conservation area and historic village. This site is an important greenspace and essential flood plain, viewed across the valley and from the A629.</p> <p>SO13 – should have been a negative result as there are numerous wildlife species (including bats) that frequently migrate back to this area.</p> <p>SO14 - should have been a NN (maroon) result as development of this site would have a negative effect on local wildlife and local landscapes.</p> <p>SO15 – should have a N result (Pink) as innovative design will have a detrimental effect on the character of historic Kildwick.</p> <p>SO16 should have been a NN (maroon) result as residents are reliant on the car</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>which increases carbon emissions and maximises impact on climate change. Building 30 or more houses will not improve air, noise or light pollution.</p> <p>SO17 – Due to climate change there is already a more regular occurrence of flooding, building on this site would increase that risk.</p> <p>SO18 - should have been a NN (maroon) result as the Aire Valley Trunk Sewer has capacity issues.</p> <p>SO19 – should not have been given a positive result as more houses will increase waste production not minimise it.</p> <p>SO20 – should not be a positive result as the site floods and forms part of the floodplain.</p>			
<p>KLOO2 should be designated as green space rather than KLOO3.</p>			
<p>KL002 is designated as “Special Landscape Area and “Green Wedge” in the 1999 Craven Local Plan.</p>			
<p><b>KL003: Adjacent to the Old Smithy, Skipton Road</b></p>			
<p>Why has this site been designated as green space and ruled out for housing development. It has potential for access from the Main Road and the partially closed Old Skipton Rd. It would have least visible impact on the character of the village.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site KL003 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. However, the site is not considered as a Preferred Site because no more sites are required in Kildwick due to the amount of previous allocations and planning permissions since 2012.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Kildwick.</p>
<p>Sustainability Appraisal: SO8 – assumed access would be over Kildwick Bridge and off Skipton Road. Skipton Rd is only accessible from the bridge and Main St. Opening the road to the west</p>			

<p>at the A629 would further exacerbate the non-local traffic use of the narrow and busy Priest Bank Rd. The bridge suffered minor damage in the recent floods. SO9 – The beck runs down here to the River Aire. Development may increase flood risk to nearby properties.</p>	<p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<p>This site is bordered by a very important tree screen that protects the village from traffic noise and pollution.</p>			
<p>Development of this site would mean traffic crossing the dangerous junction with Main Rd to Farnhill where accidents regularly occur.</p>			
<p>The historic heritage of Kildwick needs conserving, development would damage the historic setting of the village Conservation Area.</p>			
<p>Support for this site as it is not subject to flooding and has access from a wide and quiet road.</p>			
<p><b>KL004: Land north west of Priest Bank Road</b></p>			
<p>Priest Bank Road is narrow and, in part, has no pavements. Development of this site would exacerbate these existing road capacity issues.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Kildwick.</p>
<p>The canal bridge is a constraint to development as it is narrow (only wide enough for 1 car), regularly open, especially in the summer months, which creates a serious bottle neck. These issues has an impact on the capacity of this road to serve development on this site (approx. 25</p>	<p>Site KL004 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. However, the site is not considered as a Preferred Site because no more sites are required in Kildwick due to the amount of previous allocations and planning permissions since 2012.</p>		

<p>dwelling)</p> <p>There are issues relating to landscape character/green infrastructure, conservation heritage and road capacity issues.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal:  SO8 – should be a minor negative/major negative result as canal bridge is a constraint to development of site KL004 in terms of access to development traffic, refuse vehicles etc.  SO12 &amp; SO14 – should be a minor negative/major negative as this site positively contributes to the setting of the many heritage assets. The remains of a Medieval field pattern has been identified on this site.</p> <p>This is an incredibly important site in the very heart of the village containing important grazing land and surrounded by important listed assets, including the grade I St Andrews Church and Grade II* Kildwick Hall. Development of this site would damage the historic setting of the village Conservation Area. As such this is the least preferred site.</p> <p>The Leeds Liverpool canal runs to the south of this site, which is well used by tourists who come to enjoy the unspoilt beauty.</p>	<p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<p><b>KL002: Recreation ground south of Priest Bank Road; KL003: Adjacent to the Old Smithy, Skipton Road. KL004: Land north west of Priest Bank Road</b></p>			
<p>Kildwick is a settlement of less than 200 people (2011 census), whose housing stock is increasing within the development limit as</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	<p>Yes and No</p>	<p>Site KL002 is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan;</p>

<p>identified in the 1999 Craven Local Plan. Development of these sites would double the number of people in the village, which would have a significant negative impact on the character of the village and on existing infrastructure, as well as contributing to higher flood risk.</p>	<p>Site KL002 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site presents an inadequate road access, is partly located in flood risk zone 3b and the site, as an existing area of open space the site makes a significant contribution to the character and appearance of Kildwick Conservation Area. These are determining impediments to selection of this site.</p>		<p>14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Kildwick.</p>
<p>Development would put additional pressure on existing services (South Craven School, Health Centre) in Crosshills, which will be overwhelmed.</p>			<p>Sites KL003 and KL004 are not identified as preferred housing sites in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. These sites therefore remain in the pool of sites for Kildwick.</p>
<p>These sites are within 5 mins walk to the bus stop providing services to Keighley and Skipton. The frequency of bus services during the week is good, however the service is less frequent at the weekends and bank holidays. There is no service running through the village. If this existing bus service declines this will increase reliance on the private car.</p>	<p>Site KL003 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. However, the site is not considered as a Preferred Site because no more sites are required in Kildwick due to the amount of previous allocations and planning permissions since 2012.</p> <p>Site KL004 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. However, the site is not considered as a Preferred Site because no more sites are required in Kildwick due to the amount of previous allocations and planning permissions since 2012.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		

<b>KL005: Land to the east of Croft House Farm, Kildwick Grange</b>			
Support for this site as it would not result in more traffic onto Kildwick Bridge and congested roundabout, and it would not have a negative impact on the centre of Kildwick village.	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Kildwick.
SO12 – KA002,3 & 4 has been assessed as having no/low effect, however KL005 is assessed as having a double negative result. There are more heritage assets in close proximity to KL002,3 & 4 than KL005 (list and details of these assets provided). KL005 is less obtrusive than other sites in Kildwick and Farnhill and its historical significance is also less than sites KL002,3, & 4.	Site KL005 does not move past a Level 1 acknowledgement, and the site is not suitable to undergo a Sustainability Analysis as the site is judged to be located at an inappropriate distance from the built up area of Kildwick, which is a settlement in the Spatial Strategy.  The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		
<b>FA002</b>			
Development of this site would mean that traffic would not have to go through the village and join the congested roundabout.	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Farnhill.
Support for development of this site as it would have minimal visual impact and of all the sites (in the pool) it has the best road access being beside the A629.	Site FA002 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site has numerous negatives, which outnumber the positives for the site.  The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.		



## April – May 2016 Draft Local Plan

## Site Response Paper by Settlement: GIGGLESWICK

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>SG004 - South of Church Street, east of Tams Street</b>			
<p>There are enough spaces offered for housing (2.372 hectares within the village) without using this one. This site lies within the Giggleswick Conservation Area. There needs to be an assessment of what contribution this currently-undeveloped area makes to those elements which contribute to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and what effect the loss of this site and its subsequent development might have upon the designated area.</p> <p>The loss of this currently-open area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area. Impact on conservation area, Glebe Field integral. The field is part of the character of the old village that earned conservation status and is described within the Conservation Area appraisal as 'integral to this more open 'character zone.'</p>	<p>The points raised are noted.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SG004 does not perform satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites; the site does not have an acceptable access.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	No	Site SG004 is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Giggleswick.



<p>Forms green link from village to play ground and sports field. Used for recreation.</p> <p>Traffic safety, busy at school times potential hazard for children. Narrow access unsuitable. Highways authority previously raised objection. Safety of pupils put at risk by further development.</p> <p>Would harm view of centre from public footpath at side of beck.</p> <p>Submitted despite overwhelming local opposition.</p> <p>Important green space.</p> <p>Potential impact on ecology.</p> <p>Should be reclassified as constrained.</p> <p>Reduce rainfall absorption. Only one main watercourse to take rain out of village.</p> <p>Further development would place at risk existing as well as new properties.</p> <p>Impact on local road and services infrastructure.</p> <p>Most trips to buy services are by car. Very limited services in the village.</p> <p>To gain access to the Fellings (field used by residents as open space, little amenity space in village) access is across Glebe Field. Any development on Glebe Field would have safety implication for pupils accessing Fellings.</p>			
--	--	--	--

<b>SG004 South of Church Street, east of Tems Street; SG011 - Castleberg Hospital, Raines Road.</b>			
<p>Number of green spaces suggested for development is worrying. Essential for mental and physical health and wellbeing for green fields to be retained. Some of the sites are prone to flooding. Building on yet more open spaces would add to strain and increase potential for flooding in the area. Flooding and traffic issues Glebe field. Castleberg is much used and necessary facility. All previous arguments against loss are valid. The two sites (SG004 and SG011) are very close to each other adding to traffic problems.</p>	<p>The points raised are noted.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SG004 does not perform satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites; the site does not have an acceptable access.</p> <p>Site SG011 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site is deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites (with mitigation measures and recommendations). However, the amount of growth directed towards Giggleswick in the plan means that it is not allocated any Preferred Sites under the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes and No	<p>Site SG004 is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Giggleswick.</p> <p>Site SG011 is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Giggleswick.</p>
<b>SG004 - South of Church Street, east of Tems Street; SG085 - Land to the west of Raines Road; SG086 - Land to the east of Raines Road</b>			

<p>Giggleswick can easily fill quota with designated sites. If 3 new sites accepted and SG083 used for housing, could mean 259 houses, leading to increase in population.</p>	<p>The points raised are noted.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SG004 does not perform satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites; the site does not have an acceptable access.</p> <p>Sites SG085 and SG086 perform satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and pass all four District Level Analyses. The sites are deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. They can potentially be a Preferred Site, but Giggleswick is not to be allocated any Preferred Sites under the draft Local Plan.</p>	<p>Yes and No</p>	<p>Site SG004 is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Giggleswick.</p> <p>Sites SG085 and SG086 are not identified as preferred housing sites in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. These sites therefore remain in the pool of sites for Giggleswick.</p>
<p>No reason why 1b mitigating circumstances on SG083. Not within, adjoining or adjacent and therefore should have dropped out at stage 1.</p> <p>Suffers from same flooding problems as SG084 which was dropped for flooding. SG083 and SG084 should be marked pale red on Sustainability Appraisal in relation to access to services. Inconsistencies in SA between two sites.</p> <p>Sustainability Objectives SO9, SO12, SO13, SO15, SO16, SO17 and SO19 and SO20 dubious in relation to SG083.</p>	<p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<p><b>SG006: Site reference number not found in SHLAA or Pool of Sites</b></p>			

<p>Development would be ribbon development and far in excess of the quota. Giggleswick is classed as a 4b tier settlement with minimal development prescribed. Development would be a threat to wildlife, encroach on best and most fertile agricultural land, would likely to cause flooding in the around the site and create increase in traffic and danger at the roundabout along Station Rd.</p>	<p>Site reference number SG006 does not appear in the Council's SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) or the Pool of Sites for the draft Local Plan (April-May 2016). It is unclear which site these responses are referring to.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p><b>SG010 - Between Raines Road and Tems Street</b></p>			
<p>Support, minuses impact on YDNP.</p>	<p>The points raised are noted.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SG010 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site is deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites (with mitigation measures and recommendations). However, the amount of growth directed towards Giggleswick in the plan means that it is not allocated any Preferred Sites under the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document. .</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Giggleswick.</p>
<p><b>SG010 - Between Raines Road and Tems Street ; SG062 - Between Morrison House and Raines Court, Raines Road.</b></p>			
<p>Both sites should remain as green spaces as</p>	<p>The points raised are noted.</p>	<p>Yes and No</p>	<p>Site SG010 is not identified as a</p>

local visual amenity.	<p>Notwithstanding this, the pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SG010 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site is deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites (with mitigation measures and recommendations). However, the amount of growth directed towards Giggleswick in the plan means that it is not allocated any Preferred Sites under the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Site SG062 does not perform satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites; access is considered unacceptable as there is insufficient frontage.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document. ..</p>		<p>preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Giggleswick.</p> <p>Site SG062 is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Giggleswick.</p>
<b>SG011 - Castleberg Hospital, Raines Road</b>			
Castleberg Hospital vital resources and valued amenity for north Craven, fought hard to keep open. Important for ageing population. Help reduce 'bed blocking.'	<p>The points raised are noted.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	No	Site SG011 is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Giggleswick.

	<p>Site SG011 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site is deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites (with mitigation measures and recommendations). However, the amount of growth directed towards Giggleswick in the plan means that it is not allocated any Preferred Sites under the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<b>SG014 - Land adjacent to Lord's Close and Sandholme Close</b>			
<p>Sports field used heavily during summer and winter months. Convenient for local children to play football in early evenings. Sports pitches act as a natural soakaway. Further development would compromise existing and future properties. Ribble is located only 200m away. Access is a major safety concern. Narrow bridge access to A65.</p>	<p>The points raised are noted.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SG014 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site is deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites (with mitigation measures and recommendations). However, the amount of growth directed towards Giggleswick in the plan means that it is not allocated any Preferred Sites under the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a></p>	No	<p>Site SG014 is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Giggleswick.</p>

	document.		
<b>SG083 - Land at the corner of the A65 and Brackenber Lane</b>			
<p>Impact on tourism. Giggleswick does not have the feel of other surrounding more urban towns and villages. Giggleswick attractive, relaxing and well positioned. Building would influence over decision where to stay.</p> <p>Strange choice for industrial/residential for gateway to one of prettiest villages in Yorkshire.</p> <p>Environment Agency identify site as being at high risk of flooding from surface water. Development no matter what mitigation would increase run off, and thus flood risk on properties further down Swaw Beck. Residents properties have flooded recently. Until drainage issues resolved any further development would increase issues of flood risk. Would be the start of more building on River Ribble flood plain. Brackenber Lane underwater for first time floods December 2015.</p> <p>Unspoilt approach along A65 would be spoilt. Similar light industrial development at Ingleton, compromises aesthetic appeal and gives poor first impression. Industry would reduce appeal. Two of the three peaks visible along Raines Road.</p> <p>Dangerous junction, fatality in last five years. Would lead to more traffic turning at junction. Would open way for infilling whole</p>	<p>The points raised are noted.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SG083 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site is deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites (with mitigation measures and recommendations). However, the amount of growth directed towards Giggleswick in the plan means that it is not allocated any Preferred Sites under the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	No	<p>Site SG083 is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Giggleswick.</p>

<p>area between Raines Road and A65. All HGV traffic would need to go down Raines Road. SG083 would impact on setting of Settle and Giggleswick and spoil open countryside. Site is very significant for breeding and nesting of Curlews. UK PAP priority.</p> <p>SG083 is a dark sky area. Objective SO16 (light pollution) on Sustainability Appraisal should be marked negative.</p> <p>SG083 would require car use for access to Settle.</p> <p>Giggleswick not an area of unemployment. Unclear why there is a need for new industry.</p> <p>Development of the site for light industrial would kill the golden goose (tourism). The area is a gem.</p> <p>If site included most likely use a hotel or retail both of which could impact local business.</p> <p>Site located well outside existing built up area causing large increase in car journeys. Craven Landscape Appraisal 2002 – states importance of conserving undeveloped nature of floodplain landscape. Consider opportunities for provision of riverside walks to increase enjoyment of flood plain landscape.</p> <p>There are empty industrial buildings in Settle, no more currently needed. If needed over time other less high profile sites more suitable.</p> <p>Loss of grade 3 agricultural land.</p>			
---	--	--	--



<p>There is not the demand in Settle/Giggleswick for employment land (take up has been low).  Number of SA outcomes are incorrect, SO4, SO9, SO12, SO13, SO15, SO16, SO17, SO19/20.  Would be many years before natural landscaping would mitigate impact.  Would result in higher crime.  Development would be adjacent Dales cycleway.  Impact on water quality.  Need has not been shown.  Inconsistency between SG083 and SG084.  New sites suggested in place of SG083 for industrial development. East of the railway line and B6480. Site is large, drainable, invisible along A65. Not overlooked by houses. Noise from the site would be screened.  Relocating industrial development out of Sowarth to site would free Saworth for housing, close to shops, school and entertainment.</p>			
<p><b>SG083 - Land at the corner of the A65 and Brackenber Lane; SG064 - Land south of Runley Bridge Farm and west of B6480; SG067 - Land to south east of Runley Bridge Farm, B6480</b></p>			
<p>Ideal for commercial or housing stock.  Safe road access  Not adversely affect appearance of towns for visitors or citizens.  If industrial property in Settle town centre, relocated to these sites would enable housing in centre of Settle.</p>	<p>The points raised are noted.   Notwithstanding this, the pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	<p>Yes and No</p>	<p>Site SG083 is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Giggleswick.</p>

<p>If housing was permitted on these sites would not be further from the town than in other towns including Skipton.</p>	<p>Site SG083 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site is deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites (with mitigation measures and recommendations). However, the amount of growth directed towards Giggleswick in the plan means that it is not allocated any Preferred Sites under the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Sites SG064 and SG067 do not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and are not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites as they is located a considerable distance from the town centre and ease of access to services and facilities is limited.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		<p>Sites SG064 and SG067 are not identified as preferred housing sites in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor do they remain in the pool of sites for Giggleswick.</p>
<b>SG085 - Land to the west of Raines Road; SG083 - Land at the corner of the A65 and Brackenber Lane; SG008 - Land east of Bankwell Road.</b>			
<p>Risk of surface water flooding Increased risk of flooding locally. Industrial units at odds with landscape. Impact on residents and tourists enjoyment. Impact on flora and fauna. Increase in pollution. Increase in traffic. Encroaches on best and most versatile agricultural land. Threat to curlew population. Station Road traffic too speedy. Traffic appears around the bend without reducing</p>	<p>The points raised are noted.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SG008 does not perform satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites; the site does not have an acceptable access.</p>	<p>Yes and No</p>	<p>Site SG008 is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Giggleswick.</p> <p>Sites SG083 and SG085 are not identified as preferred housing sites in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. These sites therefore remain in the pool of sites for Giggleswick.</p>

<p>speed. No pedestrian refuge on Station Road.</p>	<p>Site SG083 and SG085 perform satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. These sites are deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites (with mitigation measures and recommendations). However, the amount of growth directed towards Giggleswick in the plan means that it is not allocated any Preferred Sites under the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
---	--	--	--

<b>SG085 – Land to the west of Raines Road</b>			
<p>Object, application refused after local objections.</p> <p>Recently refused, on the grounds of the site relating more to open countryside than to the built up area. Would form a visual incursion into the countryside and introduce an unsatisfactory linear built form of development along two prominent road frontages to the detriment of the character and appearance of the landscape and countryside setting to the village.</p> <p>Development of the site against NPPF para 17 (recognising the intrinsic character of the countryside) and 56 (making places better for people).</p> <p>Site inappropriate for all the same reasons that apply to SG086.</p> <p>In excess of designated quota.</p> <p>Encroaches on to best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>The site could be sub divided to overcome archaeological constraints. Ground work assessment can be undertaken.</p> <p>Visual mitigation could include high quality design.</p> <p>Site is available now and can be delivered in the immediate short term.</p> <p>Would spoil the unity of the settlement.</p>	<p>The points raised are noted.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SG085 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. The site is deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. It can potentially be a Preferred Site, but Giggleswick is not to be allocated any Preferred Sites under the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	No	<p>Site SG085 is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Giggleswick.</p>

<b>SG086 - Land to the east of Raines Road.</b>			
<p>Would be in excess of quota for Giggleswick. Ribbon development. Encroaches on best and most versatile agricultural land. Threat to wildlife and in particular Curlews. Development likely to cause flooding. Increase in traffic and danger to cyclists at the roundabout of Station Road.</p>	<p>The points raised are noted.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SG086 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis and passes all four District Level Analyses. The site is deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. It can potentially be a Preferred Site, but Giggleswick is not to be allocated any Preferred Sites under the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	No	<p>Site SG086 is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Giggleswick.</p>
<b>SG088 - Land to the south of Station Road</b>			
<p>Surface water flood risk. Increase in severe flooding further down Ribble valley. Blot on the landscape. Drop in spontaneous visitors to the area. Noise pollution. Increase in traffic. Harm to biodiversity – Curlews.</p>	<p>The points raised are noted.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4th April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SG088 does not perform satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis. The site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites; the site has large areas of Flood Zone 3 in evidence.</p>	No	<p>Site SG088 is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14th June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Giggleswick.</p>

	<p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
--	--	--	--

## April-May 2016 Draft Local Plan

## Site Response Paper by Settlement: HELLIFIELD

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>HE001</b>			
<p>The site is next to a playing area. Southern end is playing field. Traffic would increase the potential for accidents. Station Road is part owned by the residents. Access is frequently difficult due to traffic from railway and housing and parking on either side of the road. Further development would be harmful to the amenity of the residents. The northern end falls into the Settle-Carlisle conservation area and the site is on the border of the Yorkshire Dales National Park. Site is within 500 metres of recorded Great Crested Newts and is a known area for badger foraging. Development would impact adversely on the setting of Hellifield Railway Station (grade II listed). Further development would exacerbate existing drainage problem. The site contains very old trees (horse chestnut, sycamore, ash etc.) and a natural habitat for wildlife.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the draft local plan, April 2016, has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site HE001 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. There is an inadequate access to the site.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>Residential development can make a very good contribution to improving the appearance of this prominent site near to the rail station. There is a small part of the site to the north within the Settle-Carlisle Railway Conservation Area. Station Road servicing the site is currently a private road, and a change to public ownership would be necessary. The quality of this service road would also need to be improved.</p>	No	<p>Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017. It is not in the pool of sites for Hellifield.</p>

<b>HE004</b>			
<p>The site has been identified by the Environment Agency as being almost entirely Flood Zone 3.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the draft local plan, April 2016, has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site HE004 does perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites - if only part of it would be utilised due to significant areas of flood risk.</p> <p>The site is not required as there are no sites to be listed as Preferred Sites in Hellifield, as housing numbers have been met.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>The EA have designated areas throughout the size in FRZ2 and FRZ3, but sufficient land (greater than 0.1 ha) is available in total, and a small residential development area may be accommodated. There is certainly attractive amenity area to create open green space on parts of the site affected by flood risk.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017. It is in the pool of sites for Hellifield.</p>
<b>HE005</b>			
<p>This site would be classed as brownfield and infill. No reason to exclude this site.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the draft local plan, April 2016, has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>HE005 does not perform to an adequate standard</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017. It is not in the pool of sites for Hellifield.</p>



	<p>in the Sustainability Appraisal, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site does not contain at least 0.1 hectares of land in FRZ1.</p> <p>The site is not required as there are no sites to be listed as Preferred Sites in Hellifield, as housing numbers have been met.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>We recognise that this site would be classed as brownfield and infill.</p>		
<b>HE006</b>			
No reason to exclude this site. Extant planning available. 100% brownfield site.	There appears to be no site HE006.	No	There appears to be no site HE006.
<b>HE007</b>			
<p>100% greenfield and agricultural land. Cannot be viewed as in fill. Adjacent to oldest part of village. Hellifield House, Rook Cottage and St Aidan's Church are grade II listed buildings. Negative impact on heritage. Planning permission granted for houses on the Hellifield House site and further development would be unacceptable. There is no vehicular or pedestrian access to the site and no apparent way to provide them.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the draft local plan, April 2016, has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site HE007 does perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites.</p> <p>The site is not required as there are no sites to be listed as Preferred Sites in Hellifield, as housing numbers have been met.</p>	No	<p>Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017. It is in the pool of sites for Hellifield.</p>

	<p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>The majority of the size is in FLRZ1, and there is a low to medium risk of surface water flooding in some parts on the site. The site can offer residential development close to the town centre and its services. Approved planning applications in the north and northeast (42/2009/10088, 42/2011/11691 &amp; 42/2015/16308) have slightly reduced the original site area.</p>		
<b>HE009</b>			
<p>Within 500m of a SSSI. Open countryside. 100% agricultural fields. Provides agricultural setting for traditional farm buildings at Beck House. Provides a green buffer between industrial premises of Townson Tractors and residential areas. This and other developments would make significant inroads into the belt separating Hellifield from Long Preston. Overseen from the Yorkshire Dales National Park. Access via unadopted road, which is used by heavy agricultural vehicles and equipment. Its junction with A65 is poor and unsafe. Flood risk. Land under numerous ownerships. Subject of a refused application, an appeal and concurrent new application. 30-40 objections lodged against the most recent application.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the draft local plan, April 2016, has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site HE009 does perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites.</p> <p>The site is not required as there are no sites to be listed as Preferred Sites in Hellifield, as housing numbers have been met.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>The site has already a good access road in place. The majority of the site is in FRZ1 and there is a low risk of surface water flooding within the site.</p>	No	<p>Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017. It is in the pool of sites for Hellifield.</p>

<b>HE011</b>			
<p>Access onto the A65 hazardous. Trees on the site. Multi ownership of the land. 100% agricultural greenfield. However, the impact on the village itself would be less than other proposed sites.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the draft local plan, April 2016, has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site HE011 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites.</p> <p>The site is not required as there are no sites to be listed as Preferred Sites in Hellifield, as housing numbers have been met.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>Any potential access from this site would likely create quite hazardous conditions as the road adjacent to the site meets the A65 and Thornview Road at an often busy junction, which is already poorly respected by many motorists as witnessed on a site visit.</p>	No	<p>Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017. It is not in the pool of sites for Hellifield.</p>
<b>HE012</b>			
<p>This tiny site would only be the access for Site HE004. Would not be required if HE004 is rejected.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the draft local plan, April 2016, has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site HE012 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites.</p>	Yes	<p>Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017. It is not in the pool of sites for Hellifield.</p>

	<p>The site is not required as there are no sites to be listed as Preferred Sites in Hellifield, as housing numbers have been met.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>The site is below 0.1 hectares in size and is not capable of accommodating at least 5 dwellings.</p>		
<b>HE013</b>			
<p>Open countryside. The site would dramatically alter the entrance to the village and impact adversely on the heritage asset [St. Aidan's Church, grade II listed], which forms the first building one sees on arrival in the village. The site provides significant overcapacity and should be considered for removal or reduction. The A65 down a steep hill into the village is notoriously dangerous. The adverse Airton Road junction multiplies the hazard. Any proposed access point for the site would need to be examined for safety.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the draft local plan, April 2016, has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site HE013 does perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites.</p> <p>The site is not required as there are no sites to be listed as Preferred Sites in Hellifield, as housing numbers have been met.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a>.</p> <p>Sub-division of this site would be necessary to accommodate residential development, with a setback of the development from the church to the western site boundary. The site is on a</p>	No	<p>Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017. It is in the pool of sites for Hellifield.</p>

	prominent location adjacent to the A65 approaching the town from the east.		
<p><b>HE001, HE007, HE009, HE013</b></p> <p>Object. The Parish Council questions the Local Planning Authority's (LPA) housing supply formula, compared to the overcapacity proposed in the suggested sites for housing.</p> <p>The LPA propose a housing supply for Hellifield of 2 units per annum, over the 15 year plan period, thus 30 units in total. However, the sites proposed would provide for a housing supply overcapacity: HE001, HE007, HE009 and HE013 contain a proposed total of 189 units to meet a supply requirement of 30.</p> <p>This represents a very substantial overcapacity.</p> <p>Hellifield has seen housing units in the village increase by over 56% in a 15 year period. This has had a dramatic impact on every aspect of village life and time is still needed for this greatly increased new population to be properly integrated into the village. The Parish Council argue that Hellifield has already had more than its "fair share" of housing supply in Craven, this represents a material consideration when determining housing provision in the future.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the draft local plan, April 2016, has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Sites HE001, HE007, HE009 and HE013 have been discussed in the paragraphs above.</p> <p>We take into consideration the comments raised. The sites are not required as there are no sites to be listed as Preferred Sites in Hellifield, because housing numbers have been met under the Local Plan requirements.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a></p>	No	<p>HE001: Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017. It is not in the pool of sites for Hellifield.</p> <p>HE007: Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017. It is in the pool of sites for Hellifield.</p> <p>HE009: Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017. It is in the pool of sites for Hellifield.</p> <p>HE013: Site not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan, June 2017. It is in the pool of sites for Hellifield.</p>

<p>The impact of this vastly increased housing supply has resulted in serious parking pressure at the railway station, increased traffic flows through the village – especially at peak travelling times, including traffic exiting and entering the new estate. There is no argument to justify further housing overcapacity within the village, or at its open countryside borders.</p>			
---	--	--	--

## April – May 2016 Draft Local Plan

## Site Response Paper by Settlement: SUTTON

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan ( <i>ideas relating to change/site identified or not as a preferred site</i> )
<b>SC040: Land south of Sutton Lane</b>			
<p>Comment made in response to planning application number 66/2016/16745: development of the site would destroy Sutton's individuality by removing the natural gap between Eastburn and Sutton. This is a prominent sloping site, which if developed would have a damaging effect on the character of Sutton. There has been enough housing development recently in Sutton. Sutton Lane is over used, has poor street lighting and has no pavement causing danger to pedestrians. Additional traffic from development of this site would compound an already dangerous lane. The increase traffic, which would result from this development, could threaten the 66 bus service, which already has difficulty getting through the village. Such problems have already resulted in rerouting of the service away from Cononley.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SC040 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site has a couple of negatives, with one major negative relating to the gap between Sutton and Eastburn. Developing this piece of land would constitute large scale development beyond the settlement boundary which would be harmful to the landscape character of the area and its approach to Sutton.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Sutton.
SC040 site is shown as being 3.486 ha in area, however the current application 66/2016/16745 only relates to 0.55ha of the			

<p>site with the rest being left as green wedge/green field due to the steep topography of the site. If SC040 is identified as a preferred site the smaller area of 0.55ha should only be allocated.</p>			
<p>Is unclear why SC040 should have been put forward as a potential site given Sutton Parish Council's comments. It appears to have been based on the Craven Local Plan Community Engagement events in summer 2013 where 34 comments were made in relation to this site; 4 favourable, 1 adverse and 29 made no comments in favour or against. If we had known that a few comments would be viewed as "support" we would most certainly have objected to the site. The 2014, 2015 and 2016 planning applications proposing residential development on this site have attracted significant numbers of objections and it is hoped that these would carry more weight than the support provided on post it notes at the 2014 Local Plan consultation events. The only people preferring this site are land owners and potential developers, not the people of Sutton.</p>			
<p>Saved Local Plan policy ENV1 applies to this site. Inclusion of the site in the Local Plan does nothing to protect the character/quality of the open countryside, doesn't benefit the rural economy, would devastate landscape character, isn't needed for agricultural/forestry and cannot be</p>			



<p>classed as “small scale”. If allocated for housing it would be same size as the Silent Night and Greenroyd Mill brownfield developments. The community are absolutely against development of this site for housing.</p>			
<p>This site should have not passed stage 2 of the site assessment given the surface water flood risk that exists (evidenced during the Boxing day 2015 floods), the proximity of the site to existing heritage assets and site topography. Stage 3 talks about the sites setting and ground conditions and stage 5 talks about research and recording on any previous comments on the suitability of the site that may have been made during previous consultations, which have clearly not been considered otherwise the site would not still be considered for allocation. In stages 2-5 of the sustainability appraisal this site (together with others) has 4 out of the 6 existing constraints. Why is it still being considered as a preferred site? When assessed against sustainability objectives SO1 – SO20 the site has a negative result in terms of SO10, SO11, SO12, SO14 &amp; SO16.</p>			
<p>Whilst site lies outside Flood Risk areas the steep topography of the site will exacerbate existing run off problems. Properties on Garden Place (opposite) and Ravenstone Gardens have experienced flooding in the past. This greenfield site is essential for</p>			

<p>absorption of run off from the hill sides.</p>			
<p>Development of SC040 would impact on wildlife, including bats, endangered hedgehogs, badgers, kestrels, owls and herons. Development of it would not meet aims of NPPF relating to protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains where possible.</p>			
<p>SC040 was included in the "Special Landscape Area" (1999 adopted Craven Local Plan). Whilst this designation no longer exists, the site is special to those that live and visit the area and the wildlife that inhabit it.</p>			
<p>Residential development on the site would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the local landscape by eroding the existing gap between Sutton and Eastburn and allowing the two villages and counties to merge. CDCs Landscape Appraisal (Oct 2002) identifies this area of open countryside as type 10 "Pasture with Wooded Gills and Woodland", which should be conserved/reinforced, NOT destroyed. The 1986 and 2016 appeal decisions gave the steep topography and harm to landscape character resulting from development in the reasons for the appeal decisions.</p>			
<p>NPPF is clear that to achieve sustainable development, the economic, social and environmental roles of the planning system</p>			

<p>are mutually dependant. Paragraph 7 emphasises the need to protect and enhance the natural and built environment, para 17 includes the need to take account of the different roles and character of different areas and para 61 states that decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural and built environment. Building on the rising slopes of green fields does nothing to integrate development with the natural environment,</p>			
<p>The opposing gable ends of Wilson and Harker Street serve as a “gateway” to the village and the orientation of Dixon Street provides views into this part of the village and of the countryside beyond it. Development of this site would alter this existing pleasing relationship between the edge of the village and countryside beyond.</p>			
<p>Identification of the following existing infrastructure constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Craven School and two primary Sutton schools are at capacity.</li> <li>• Health centre is over committed and Airedale Hospital is over run. CDC Sustainability Appraisal 2013 states that “demand on healthcare is set to increase due to a growing population and an increasing elderly population”.</li> <li>• The Aire valley trunk sewer is</li> </ul>			

<p>overstretched (as identified in Sutton Parish Council’s 2012 Parish Plan. Yorkshire Water comments relating to the recent planning application – “the local public sewer network does not have capacity to accept any surface water”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There have not been improvements made to the road network over the last 15 years. They are generally narrow and unsuited to the increase traffic burden. Reference to 2009 CDC report that refers to no more development being undertaken in Sutton unless infrastructure improvements were made. Section 4 of the NPPF promotes sustainable transport choices and reducing travel by car. Development of SC040 would not promote reduction in travel by car; it would increase it commuting by car to West Yorkshire.</li> </ul>			
<p>Development should be focused on the brownfield sites of Leeds and Bradford and leave green fields alone. This site should be preserved for future generations to enjoy and not destroyed.</p>			
<p>Sutton does not need executive style homes that local people cannot afford to buy.</p>			
<p><b>SC043: West of Holme Lane and north of Holme Beck</b></p>			
<p>Based on the availability of detailed work to date in relation to the previous 2013 appeal</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication</p>

<p>we support the inclusion of residential allocation on this site as it would be deliverable, sustainable and appropriate in scale to the existing settlement form. Whilst dismissing the appeal, the Inspector did refer to the proposed development not affecting the setting of the Conservation Area, subject to appropriate conditions would not adversely affect highway or pedestrian safety nor would it have an adverse effect in terms of flood risk, drainage and sewerage. The Council's Sustainability Assessment recommended that the site is included in the pool of sites with the extent of development restricted by flood risk and the need to retain trees on the river bank. The Sustainability Appraisal identifies mitigation measures relating to flood risk, landscape/biodiversity impact, ground work assessment and design.</p>	<p>assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SC043 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site has numerous negative which outweigh the positives for the site, including flood risk and the existence of green wedge designation.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		<p>Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Sutton.</p>
<p>Support for this site as it would be natural infilling between existing residential areas.</p>			
<p><b>SC044: West and north of Hazel Grove Road, south of Holme Beck</b></p>			
<p>Support for allocation of this site as it would be natural infill between the existing residential area.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SC044 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site has numerous negatives which outnumber the positives for the site, including the fact that the site would erode</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Sutton.</p>

	<p>the green wedge separating Sutton from Glusburn &amp; Crosshills. This site has therefore been recommended for green wedge designation.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<b>SC048: Gott Hill Farm, east of Ellers Rd</b>			
Development of this site would lead to excessive traffic volumes on surrounding roads. NYCC Highways have also raised issues about access to this site.	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SC048 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis; however it does not pass all four of the District Level Analyses, as there is uncertainty as to whether there would be a significant effect on the South Pennines SPA &amp; SAC. However, due to planning permissions granted since in 2012 in Sutton, there are no housing requirements in the area, therefore no sites will be allocated for housing in Sutton.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	No	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Sutton.
Development would be contrary to SA objectives SO8 AND SO14.			
Development would result in loss of privacy to existing surrounding residents, a greater risk of flooding and negative impact on biodiversity.			
<b>SC040, SC043 &amp; SC044</b>			
Although these sites are relevantly small individually, cumulatively they may lead to a significant loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Sites SC040, SC043 and SC044 are not identified as preferred housing sites in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017,

<p>It is important to leave some green spaces between buildings so that Sutton retains its rural atmosphere. SC044 is used daily by local people walking through the village. Planning permission has already been refused on SC043 so it should be included in the Local Plan. It is a vital space needed to retain the rural feel.</p>	<p>Site SC040 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. Proposed development here would compromise the gap between Sutton and Eastburn and would constitute large scale development beyond the settlement boundary which would be harmful to the landscape character of the area and the approach to Sutton.</p> <p>Site SC043 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site has numerous negatives, including flood risk and the existence of green wedge designation, which outnumber the positives for the site.</p> <p>Site SC044 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site would erode the green wedge separating Sutton from Glusburn &amp; Crosshills. The site is recommended for green wedge designation.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		<p>nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Sutton.</p>
<p><b>SC047, SC044, SC043, SC045 and SC080</b></p>			
<p>Rights of way: SC047, SC044, SC043, SC045 and SC080 all have urbanisation impacts on</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site</p>	<p>Yes and No</p>	<p>Sites SC047 and SC080 are not identified as preferred housing sites</p>

<p>PROW (roughly in order of highest impact). Consider use of green infrastructure to mitigate. (NYCC)</p>	<p>assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SC047 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis; however it does not pass all three of the District Level Analyses. There is uncertainty as to whether there would be a significant effect on the South Pennines SPA &amp; SAC. Furthermore, due to planning permissions granted since 2012 in Sutton there are no housing requirements in the area and therefore no sites will be allocated for housing in Sutton.</p> <p>Site SC044 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site would erode the green wedge separating Sutton from Glusburn &amp; Crosshills. This site is recommended for green wedge designation.</p> <p>Site SC043 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site has numerous negatives, including flood risk and the existence of the green wedge designation, which outnumber the positives for the site.</p> <p>Site SC045 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site has the majority of its area under Flood Zone Risk 2 and 3, which is a</p>		<p>in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. The sites therefore remain in the pool of sites for Sutton.</p> <p>Sites SC044, SC043, SC045 are not identified as preferred housing sites in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Sutton.</p>
--	--	--	---



	<p>determining impediment to selection.</p> <p>Site SC080 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis, however it does not pass all four District Level Analysis. The site is not likely to deliver affordable housing. Due to planning permissions granted since 2012 in Sutton in Craven, there are no housing requirements in the area and therefore no sites will be allocated for housing in Sutton.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<b><i>SC025: Land and premises, south of Bridge Road</i></b>			
Support for allocation of this site	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SC025 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site is an active employment use and should remain as such until informed otherwise by site owners.</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Sutton.
<b><i>SC030: Works and land at Low Fold, Manor Way</i></b>			
Support for allocation of this site	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool

	<p>Site SC030 does not move past a Level 1 acknowledgement and the site is not suitable to undergo a Sustainability Analysis. The site has planning permission.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		of sites for Sutton.
<b>SC047: The Acres</b>			
<p>The Acres is single track lane, which cannot be widened due to ownership constraints. As such access to the fields above the existing houses cannot be achieved. We therefore ask that site SC047 is removed from the pool of sites.</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SC047 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis; however it does not pass all four of the District Level Analyses. There is uncertainty as to whether there would be a significant effect on the South Pennines SPA &amp; SAC. However due to planning permissions granted since 2012 in Sutton, there are no housing requirements in the area and therefore no sites will be allocated for housing.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	No	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Sutton.</p>
<b>SC048: Gott Hill Farm, east of Eilers Road</b>			
<p>Greenroyd Drive/Harper Grove is already congested with traffic and the new development will only increase congestion. Eilers already used as a "rat-run". Will</p>	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p>	No	<p>Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in</p>

<p>exacerbate traffic problems further in the village. Highways have raised concerns about access to this site. This is against sustainability objectives SO8.</p>	<p>Site SC048 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis; however it does not pass all four of the District Level Analyses. There is uncertainty as to whether there would be a significant effect on the South Pennines SPA &amp; SAC. However, due to the planning permissions granted since 2012 in Sutton, there are no housing requirements in the area and therefore no sites will be allocated for housing.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		<p>the pool of sites for Sutton.</p>
<p>Removal of local green space would destroy important green space, views and important ecological habitat for wildlife. A previous planning application (66/2015/15358) was rejected on these grounds last year. Building here contrary to SO14.</p>			
<p>The village has only limited resources.(e.g. schools and medical services). The proposed new development will only add increased pressure on these resources.</p>			
<p>The site is within 2km of an SPA. It has trees present along south and south west of site. Pressure on the Local Biodiversity site of Ancient Woodland in Sutton Clough should not be overlooked.</p>			
<p>Ellers floods and has run-off water issues. The sewerage system is at full capacity. SUDS not suitable to site geography.</p>			
<p>SC048 also has greater road capacity issues because there is potential for a higher number of dwellings on the land. Development should be confined to the western part of the site to avoid intrusion into open countryside. An unacceptably large site on rising land, visible from the Aire Valley (and even further afield to the North-East?). Its 70 houses, facing North, could be enhanced by planting.</p>			

<b>SC075: Salt Pie Farm</b>			
Development should only be allowed if the Ravenstone Gardens access is improved into a proper metalled road. Sutton Lane and Main Street are not equipped to deal with extra traffic, which could threaten the 66 bus service which already has difficulty getting through the village. This site should be identified as having road capacity/access issues.	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SC075 does not perform to an adequate standard in the Sustainability Analysis, and the site is not deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites. The site has a number of neutrals but it also has one major double negative. The site is landlocked as there are no links to the adopted highway.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Sutton.
Development should not be permitted on this greenfield site with agricultural vale, as there are brownfield sites available (Yeadon House site)			
Site falls outside the existing development limit for Sutton and development would expand the village towards Eastburn. The landowner has made previous unsuccessful planning applications on the site, which establishes that building on this site would not result in a sustainable form of development.			
Issues relating to drainage and flooding. Concentrating over the fields will make this situation worse.			
Support for allocation of this site.			
<b>SC076:</b>			
Support for allocation of this site.	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SC076 does not move past a Level 1 acknowledgement, the site has an overall site size</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Sutton.

	<p>of 0.1 hectares, and/or cannot accommodate five or more dwellings. Therefore the site is not suitable to undergo a Sustainability Analysis.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<b>SC080: Rear of Bay Horse Pub</b>			
Comment of "No objection" provided for this site.	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SC080 performs satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis; however the site does not pass all four Macro Level Analysis. The site is not likely to deliver affordable housing, however due planning permissions granted since 2012 in Sutton in Craven, there are no housing requirements in the area and therefore there will be no sites allocated for housing in Sutton.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>	No	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017. This site therefore remains in the pool of sites for Sutton.
Access - Ellers Road already used as a "Rat Run". Road capacity issues identified			
Sewerage system is at full capacity			
<b>SC084:</b>			
The Yeadon House site is available for development, which would be preferable to development of a greenfield site. It has been excluded based on flood risk, however the site is not in proximity to the beck. Is the issue drains that are at capacity?	<p>The pool of sites identified in the Draft Local Plan; 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 has been subject to further site assessment and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Site SC084 does not move past a Level 1 acknowledgement as the site contains less than</p>	Yes	Site is not identified as a preferred housing site in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14 <sup>th</sup> June 2017, nor does it remain in the pool of sites for Sutton.

	<p>0.1hectares in Flood Risk Zone 1 and is therefore not suitable to undergo Sustainability Analysis.</p> <p>The methodology of reassessing this site together with the actual assessment is set out in the <a href="#">Residential Site Selection Process June 2017</a> document.</p>		
<b>General Issues</b>			
<p>Concerns about the ability of local communities to access local services, including schools, hospitals, GP surgery and public transport. Increased housing means more demand for supermarkets leading to local independent shops loosing trade and risk closing.</p>	<p>There are no preferred housing sites to be allocated in Sutton in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017, due to planning permissions granted since 2012 in Sutton in Craven, there are no housing requirements in the area and therefore there will be no sites allocated for housing.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>There are no preferred housing sites to be allocated in Sutton in the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan; 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017.</p>

## April-May 2016 Draft Local Plan

## Site Response Paper by Settlement: Langcliffe

Main issues from consultation	Response	Change required to the local plan (yes/no)	Changes made to the plan
<b>LA004</b>			
<p>This site is a suitable site in Settle which should be considered as an allocation.</p> <p><b>Housing Requirement</b> – Draft policy SP4 identifies that Settle will meet 10.5% of the districts’ minimum annual housing requirement per annum that equates to 27 dwellings per annum. Centres such as Settle have an important role in meeting the District’s wider housing needs and this site require allocation in order to deliver housing early within the plan period.</p> <p><b>Site allocations methodology</b> – The submission sets out an assessment (prepared by the agent) of the site against the four criteria set out in stage 1 of the Council’s Site Allocations Methodology. This assessment concludes that the site meets all four criteria included in stage 1.</p> <p><b>Suitability of the site</b> – The site is available now with no ownership constraints which would create a barrier to early delivery of the site within the plan period.</p> <p>The site performs positively against criteria set out in stage 2 of the Site Allocations Methodology.</p> <p>The site is approx. 750m for the centre of Settle,</p>	<p>Site LA004 is located within Langcliffe Parish.</p> <p>Langcliffe is not a settlement included in the draft settlement hierarchy as set out at table 6 on page 44 and draft policy SP4: Spatial Strategy and Housing Growth of the Pre Publication Draft Local Plan June 2017.</p> <p>As such the draft Local Plan does not proposed any housing allocations within Langcliffe parish.</p>	No	<p>Site does not move past Level 1 acknowledgement, and the site is not suitable to undergo a Sustainability Analysis as the site is in a settlement not designated in the Spatial Strategy.</p>

<p>which would promote sustainable travel patterns by new residents accessing day to day services without the need to travel, supporting the viability of Settle town centre.</p> <p>Sowarth Field employment area is easily accessed by pedestrians from the site.</p> <p><b>Alternative Site Area</b> – the Council may wish to consider the allocation of the southern part of the site as an alternative to allocation of the entire site.</p>			
<p><b>Consideration of Sustainability Objectives:</b></p> <p><b>Agricultural Land</b> – Site is currently used for agricultural purposes and is identified as Grade 4 agricultural land. The loss of existing grazing land is regrettable; the opportunity to deliver much needed housing in a sustainable location outweighs the loss of this grazing land.</p> <p><b>Conservation on the Historic Environment</b> – No listed buildings on the site. Site is located adjacent to the Settle-Carlisle Conservation Area. Careful siting and design of development will ensure that any impact on the CA will be reduced. Key view of Barrel Sykes (Grade II) will be considered and if necessary incorporated into the overall scheme design. The site will continue the historic linear growth pattern of the town adjacent to the railway line while maintaining a close relationship of housing to the town centre. The site would not introduce any new built development within this area which would further detract from the importance of the Settle-Carlisle Railway CA.</p> <p><b>Visual Impact &amp; Amenity</b> – Site slopes gently towards bank of railway line to the east. Through</p>			



<p>careful design, views from Langcliffe Rd towards the YDNP can be retained and protected. Residential development would not introduce any newly urbanising element within the area given the adjacent Watershed Mill and existing residential development to the south. Site is adjacent to existing residential development located off Barrel Sykes. The access road into existing housing development provides an existing buffer between the site and existing properties, providing satisfactory standard of residential amenity for existing residents.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity</b> – any future application will provide full details of existing habitats and the sites potential to provide a net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p><b>Air Quality &amp; Noise</b> – Site is not located within an Air Quality Management Area. Future Transport Assessment and Air Quality Assessment can fully assess any impact. The noise impact of the site in relation to the adjacent railway line will need to be considered. This can be adequately mitigated against following any recommendations within a Noise Assessment.</p>			
--	--	--	--