

Craven Local Plan (Draft 22/9/14) Consultation Policy 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 section 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

Section 1: Introduction

Section 2: Context

Section 3: Strategy

Vision

Objectives

Spatial Strategy

Sustainable Development

Neighbourhood Planning

Section 4: Environment

Section 5: Housing

Section 6: Economy

Section 7: Infrastructure, Services & Facilities

Section 8: Local Plan Map

Bradley

Burton

Carleton

Cononley

Embsay

Gargrave

Giggleswick

Glusburn

Hellifield

High Bentham

Ingleton

Low Bentham

Rathmell

Settle

Skipton

Sutton

General

Consultation

Introduction (Section 1) Response Paper

Section 1: Introduction			
Aim: To provide a concise and easy-to-read introduction that explains the background, purpose, production and components of the local plan.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More detail is required on the Duty to Co-operate to show how cross-boundary issues and engagement have affected plan preparation. A background paper would be helpful. 	Agreed. This should be resolved as work on the draft plan progresses.	Yes	<i>[Prepare a Duty to Co-operate statement to support the plan and refine the introduction to reflect the statement.]</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction is clear, reasonably concise and sets out the background to the requirement to produce the plan. 	Noted	No	

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Context (Section 2) Response Paper

Section 2: Context			
Aim: To provide some context for Craven, its people and places in 2014 and to identify key issues and challenges facing the area. (More detailed facts and figures will be contained in supporting Sustainability Appraisal documents.)			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sentence “Skipton is the largest settlement in Craven with a population of 14,677, equivalent to 32% of the District total. The neighbouring settlements of Cross Hills and Glusburn provide services for South Craven” reads as though Crosshills and Glusburn are the major providers of services to South Craven. This sentence should be amended to read “Skipton is the largest settlement and the major service centre in Craven with a population of 14,677, equivalent to 32% of the District total. The neighbouring settlements of Cross Hills and Glusburn also provide services for South Craven...” 	Noted. This aspect of the context section will be revised and improved as work on the draft local plan progresses.	Yes	See new paragraphs on settlements (2.18 onwards) within the revised context section.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg. 12: There should be a comment that the area has good access for cycling with the National Cycle Network passing though Clapham and Ingleton and within about 1km of Bentham. 	Noted. This aspect of the context section will be revised and improved as work on the draft local plan progresses.	Yes	See new paragraph 2.31 of the revised context section.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg. 14: It should include a comment that there are lots of cycling opportunities in 	Noted. This aspect of the context section will be revised and improved as work on the draft	Yes	See new paragraph 2.31 of the revised context section.

<p>the area, including two National Cycle Network routes crossing in Giggleswick</p>	<p>local plan progresses.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg. 16: It should include a comment that compared to the rest of the region, access to the National Cycle Network is poor but that there are still several opportunities to join the NCN in South Craven, at Gargrave and Embsay. 	<p>Noted. This aspect of the context section will be revised and improved as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new paragraph 2.31 of the revised context section.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft Plan states that Craven has extensive rail network coverage. Disagree. Rail links from Skipton to Leeds and Bradford are excellent. However trying to travel in any other direction the rail links from Skipton are either very poor (i.e. north of Skipton – to Settle and Carlisle) or non-existent. There is no rail link from Craven to several nearby large towns in East Lancashire (despite the fact Colne, Nelson etc are only twelve miles away). Need a rail link connecting Skipton and Settle with Clitheroe. Need to re-open Skipton to Colne line. Improved transport and economic links to Lancashire are essential for businesses in Skipton to thrive. Also need improved road and rail links to central Manchester, and in particular fast rail links to Manchester Airport. The route from Skipton to the M65 is also difficult and needs addressing. These would be highly advantageous for many Craven businesses. In particular it would give Skipton access to national/international conference and 	<p>Noted. This aspect of the context section will be revised and improved as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new paragraph 2.14 onwards within the revised context section.</p>

exhibitions in central Manchester, and a good range of international flights from the Airport.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add annotation to Map 2 – North Sub Area - to show the link / influence with South Lakeland to the north (e.g. Kendal and Kirkby Lonsdale). Reflect this addition in accompanying paragraph. 	Noted. The context map will improve as work on the draft local plan progresses.	Yes	A new/revised context map is to be prepared – see paragraph 2.2 and footnote 3 of the new/revised context section.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context section should be broadened to include national strategic factors and those of the wider northern region (such as impact on Craven of future development of Leeds, Bradford, Manchester; impact on HS2; analysis of IT infrastructure such as superfast broadband and 4G; impact on rise in tourism in future). Plan needs to analyse these factors and assess the risks and opportunities they might present to avoid appearing too inward looking. 	Noted. The context section will be revised and, whilst it may not be possible to cover all of these specific issues in detail, the main point about being more outward looking will be taken on-board.	Yes	See new/revised context section.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend seventh paragraph of Context section as, apart from providing little more than a few figures about the Plan area, there is little to describe what elements make Craven particularly distinctive or, more importantly, what contribution they make to the quality of life and economy of the Plan area (which is found elsewhere in the plan). The 2013 edition of “Heritage Counts” has the following figures for that part of Craven which lies outside the National Park:- Listed Buildings – 888; Scheduled Monuments – 31. (English Heritage comment) 	Noted. This aspect of the context section will be revised and improved as work on the draft local plan progresses.	Yes	See new paragraphs on natural and built environment (2.24 onwards) and key issues (2.40) within the revised context section.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2 – Key Issues, An outstanding local environment, add the following to the end of this Section:- “There is a need for the Plan to reconcile the community’s need for development with the protection of its natural and historic assets”. The plan needs to reconcile meeting its assessed development needs with the appropriate protection of its outstanding environment. In the case of Craven’s historic environment, without evidence to the contrary, it seems likely that a number of the areas that are being proposed as potential development sites would result in harm to the significance of the District’s heritage assets. The resolution of this potential conflict is a Key Issue which the plan will need to tackle and, as such, should be referred to within this section. (English Heritage comment) 	<p>Noted. This aspect of the context section will be revised and improved as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new paragraphs on natural and built environment (2.24 onwards) and key issues (2.40) within the revised context section.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given that the brevity of the portrait of the District’s heritage assets on Page 7, one might have expected some amplification within the detailed descriptions of the Sub-Areas. However, this Section contains virtually nothing about the historic environment of this part of the plan area. For example: 	<p>Noted. This aspect of the context section will be revised and improved as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new paragraphs on natural and built environment (2.24 onwards) within the revised context section.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The historic communication routes between Yorkshire and Lancashire are a key feature of the Northern Sub-area. Castle Hill in Burton in Lonsdale (which is a fine example of a motte and bailey castle) 	<p>Noted. This aspect of the context section will be revised and improved as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new paragraphs on natural and built environment (2.24 onwards) within the revised context section.</p>

emphasises the importance of this route.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Mid Sub-area: Buildings and structures associated with Settle-Carlisle Railway; The attractive Historic Market Town of Settle notable for the survival of its many 17th and 18th century buildings, its steep lanes and narrow 'ginnels'. 	Noted. This aspect of the context section will be revised and improved as work on the draft local plan progresses.	Yes	See new paragraphs on natural and built environment (2.24 onwards) within the revised context section.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the South Sub-area: The historic Market Town of Skipton with its medieval castle and church, its textile mills, chimneys and terraced housing; Buildings, bridges, locks and other and structures associated with the Leeds- Liverpool Canal and Thanet Canal; Evidence of prehistoric settlement and concentrations of carved rock on the Moors to the south-east of Skipton; 18th and early 19th century spinning mills, found along watercourses along with locally-distinctive housing designed to accommodate hand looms; Local settlement pattern based on linear settlements along the valley floors. This includes textile mills surrounded by stone terraces of housing on the hillsides and mill chimneys that are often prominent in the landscape; The Waterwheel at Dale End Mills is the largest of its kind; Historic Parks and Gardens - Broughton Hall (is considered to be the best surviving example of work by William Andrews Nesfield); Gledstone Hall (features a planting scheme by Gertrude Jekyll). (English Heritage comment) 	Noted. This aspect of the context section will be revised and improved as work on the draft local plan progresses.	Yes	See new paragraphs on natural and built environment (2.24 onwards) within the revised context section.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council should set out the reasons for identifying Sutton-in-Craven as an area for development by sharing which sites in Skipton they have already considered and dismissed and on what grounds. 	<p>Changes to be made to the spatial strategy section and justification for the approach to the distribution of housing growth. The distribution of housing growth between settlements will continue to be determined and justified prior to the consideration of alternative sites. Site assessments will consider sites in Sutton against other sites in Sutton (not Skipton) unless there is insufficient developable / available land at the village.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised context and strategy sections, site assessments and sustainability appraisal.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sentence “it is apparent that the local housing market is inaccessible for many households” should be amended to read “it is apparent that, as is the case nationally, the local housing market is inaccessible for many households”. This would show that the problem is not unique to South Craven. 	<p>Noted. This aspect of the context section will be revised and improved as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new paragraphs on housing (2.36 onwards) and key issues (2.40) within the revised context section.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support expressed for the Context section: This section is clear and succinct, giving an excellent appreciation of the issues to be addressed in the Local Plan. 	<p>Noted. Revisions to the context section will aim to reinforce these good points.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map 1 shows the local authorities with which Craven shares a common boundary, but does not highlight that Lancashire County Council, North Yorkshire County Council and the National Park Authority are also considered to be ‘neighbouring authorities’. It would be beneficial to list all neighbouring authorities within the opening paragraphs of the Context. 	<p>Noted. The context section has been revised and the context map will improve as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See paragraph 2.2 of the new/revised context section and a new/revised context map is to be prepared.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal to construct a bypass between Colne and Foulridge is identified 	<p>Noted. This aspect of the context section will be revised and improved as work on the draft</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See paragraph 2.15 of the new/revised and context section and</p>

<p>in the East Lancashire Highways and Transport Masterplan (Lancashire County Council, 2014), with construction work due to commence in 2020/21 (Page 53). The delivery of the by-pass is a priority for the Lancashire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and is recognised in the LEP Delivery Plan. This proposal is supported in Policy ENV4 of the Pendle Core Strategy (Pre-Submission Report) (Pendle Council, 2014), as is the potential re-instatement of the former Colne to Skipton railway line. Improved connectivity between the two boroughs will help to improve cross-boundary access to housing and employment opportunities and this should be recognised (and supported) in the Craven Local Plan.</p>	<p>local plan progresses.</p>		<p>the new/revised strategy section, including part d) of policy SP2.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sentence “These good transport links make commuting to and from the south sub area easy, however there are localised transport infrastructure pressures around Crosshills and” should be amended to read “These good transport links make commuting to and from the south sub area possible, however there are major localised transport infrastructure pressures around Crosshills and”. The sentence, read in its original form, overstates the effectiveness of the transport links. 	<p>Noted. This aspect of the context section will be revised and improved as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new paragraphs on transport links (2.3 onwards) and key issues (2.40) within the revised context section.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan needs to provide a map of Craven detailing all conservation areas, landscape, biodiversity and heritage designations. 	<p>Noted and to be reflected in a local plan policies map and a revised context section containing new maps.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new paragraphs on natural and built environment (2.24 onwards) and draft policies map. Fully detailed</p>

<p>Include all designations on individual inset maps to highlight relationship to proposed development. Protection of these assets is imperative to maintain Craven's "unique and outstanding local environment".</p>			<p>inset maps to follow.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Context Section: Housing & Income – Bentham does have a high level of affordable housing need, but not for 1 and 2 bed properties following the development of Bargh's Meadow (not shown on maps). The real need in High Bentham is for 3 and 4 bed properties to accommodate the growing families already living in the new 1 and 2 bed properties. 	<p>Noted. This part of the context section is likely to change as work on the draft local plan progresses, in order to provide a more strategic overview of the plan area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new paragraphs on housing (2.36 onwards) within the revised context section.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Context Section: Health – the services provided at Castleberg are so limited it is hardly worth a mention. Residents in Bentham use RLI and Westmorland General in Kendal. 	<p>Noted. This aspect of the context section is likely to change as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised context section. Reference to Castleberg Hospital has been removed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft plan needs to be reconsidered with a view to recognising that Clapham looks south rather than west. Clapham would therefore be better allocated to the Mid Sub-area alongside Settle (rather than the North Sub-area). Transport links between Clapham and Bentham and Lancaster are poor and inadequate. There is no direct bus service between Clapham and these centres, the roads are narrow winding and dangerous and the rail services are inconveniently timed. Road and rail transport links between Clapham and Settle, Skipton and Airedale Hospital 	<p>Noted. The context relating to Clapham will be revised and improved as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new paragraphs on settlements (2.18 onwards) within the revised context section.</p>

are far better, safer and are more heavily used by local residents.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local plan should be redrafted to recognise Clapham as a principal gateway to the Forest of Bowland (via the road to Slaidburn), a gateway with an enormous but largely ignored potential for exploitation for leisure and leisure employment. Indeed, half of Clapham parish is in the AONB, the boundary of which runs through the parish along the A65. The road from Clapham to Slaidburn runs through spectacular moorland scenery over Bowland Knotts, through Gisburn Forest to Stocks Reservoir and Slaidburn and thence to Tatham, Tosside, Chatburn etc. The area is popular with photographers, birdwatchers, cyclists and walkers. 	Noted. This aspect of the context section will be revised and improved as work on the draft local plan progresses.	Yes	See new paragraph 2.26 within the revised context section.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Context section describes GP practices in mid and south sub area as being Bradford District CCG, they're actually Airedale Wharfedale Craven CCG. 	Noted. This aspect of the context section is likely to change as work on the draft local plan progresses.	Yes	See new/revised context section. Reference to CCGs has been removed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan mentions the Kildwick Level Crossing but proposes no action. A relief road and bridge in Cross Hills would ease traffic flow and could run from the junction east of the industrial estate, bridging the Aire and meeting the Aire Valley road in a roundabout. 	Actions are in the policies, strategy and preferred development site sections of the emerging local plan. The context section outlines the situation at the start of the period covered by the local plan.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan makes no mention of the lack of a station at Cross Hills. A station serving a population of 10,000 would reduce traffic. 	This matter is concerned with forward planning and opportunities for growth rather than the existing Craven context. To be addressed in	No	

<p>There were 2 former stations in Cross Hills; one of the sites could be used.</p>	<p>strategy and policy sections of future versions of the plan.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg. 7: The list of designations lacks information on the number of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI's) found in the district. These should be included in the final paragraph of this section. 	<p>Noted. This aspect of the context section will be revised and improved.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new paragraphs on natural environment (especially 2.30) within the revised context section, plus policy ENV4 and the policies map.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broughton Hall Estate welcomes the reference to Broughton in the context of Tourism. The Estate has a significant role in drawing in visitors (as day visitors and stay visitors) to Craven and its importance must be noted in the context of the future potential; Broughton also play a significant role in raising the regional and national profile of Craven in the extensive filming (advertisements, mainstream films) that takes place across the estate and as a consequence of the success of the Business Park. The early Local Plan reference to Broughton and tourism is not followed through in subsequent policy concerning the Estate (SP15) or at Section 6, Economy and the Tourism policy. Recommendation: it is recommended that SP15 broadens its reference to also include the sustainable growth of the existing tourism offer at the Broughton Hall Estate. 	<p>Noted. This part of the context section is likely to change as work on the draft local plan progresses, in order to provide a more strategic overview of the plan area. Also, new/revised policies SP2 (formerly SP15), EC2 and EC4 address the point raised.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised context section and policies SP2, EC2 and EC4.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England welcome the strong and positive emphasis regarding the districts landscape and environmental assets running through the Context, Vision, 	<p>Noted. Revisions to the context section will aim to reinforce these good points.</p>	<p>No</p>	

Objectives and Spatial Strategy chapters.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Context fails to acknowledge linkages with Pennine Lancashire and/or the Central Lancashire City Region. Good transport links between Pendle and Craven are needed if there is to be mutually beneficial growth. Whilst the section on 'Links with areas outside Craven' (Page 15) specifically mentions the A682 as a conduit into Pendle, the corresponding section in the South Sub Area (Page 17) fails to mention the A56 or the A6068, which are arguably more important traffic arteries from Skipton and Cross Hills/Cowling respectively. 	<p>Noted. This aspect of the context section will be revised and improved.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new paragraphs on sub-regional/economic context and transport links (2.3 onwards) within the revised context section.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan states the South sub area is the primary area for growth yet there is a very sizeable business area (Crosshills Business Park) not included. 	<p>Noted. This part of the context section is likely to change as work on the draft local plan progresses, in order to provide a more strategic overview of the plan area. Relevant changes are also likely to be made in the economy policies and inset maps.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised context section, policy EC2 and related inset map for Glusburn & Cross Hills.</p>

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Strategy (Section 3) Response Paper

Vision			
<p>The Vision for the draft Local Plan sets out how the Council would like to see the plan area look by the end of the plan period. Overarching themes of the Vision include steady, sustainable growth to provide adequate housing and employment opportunities, well connected communities across the district, and equal access to services for all. These aspirations are tempered by a strong commitment to protect and enhance the high quality landscape and treasured environmental assets that make the plan area so special.</p>			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Change Made to Plan [ideas relating to change]
<p>Anomaly between prioritization of brownfield land in the Vision and the reality in the rest of the Plan that most new development will be on greenfield land</p>	<p>The Vision in its current form does not specifically prioritise the use of brownfield land, rather it aims to situate new homes on both “previously developed land and on the fringes of market towns and villages” (i.e. greenfield land). However the Vision could be reworded to clarify the fact.</p> <p>There is a need for greenfield development because the amount of brownfield land currently available for re-development is insufficient to meet the objectively assessed housing need for the district.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See second paragraph of revised Vision.</p>
<p>The Vision needs to acknowledge the level of new infrastructure needed to support number of new homes proposed.</p>	<p>Whilst it would be useful to acknowledge that infrastructure will be provided to support planned development, the Vision is not the place to set out the actual levels or types of new infrastructure required across the sub areas. The Vision could however make reference to the need for infrastructure to support the planned level of development.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See introductory paragraphs of the revised Vision, which highlight access to services and facilities.</p>

<p>The Vision should endorse the need for good, off road cycle infrastructure to enable active travel and reduce carbon travel in the district.</p>	<p>Off road cycle ways would be an example of the types of infrastructure that plan can promote through policy, rather than specifically in the Vision. As stated above the Vision could acknowledge the need for infrastructure to support planned development, with detail set out in appropriate policies.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>There is no mention of the adverse impacts of quarry lorry traffic on Settle and its residents.</p>	<p>Whilst a comment was received stating that the transfer of quarry traffic from road to rail should be included as an aim in order to improve the environment in Settle for residents and visitors, this is beyond the remit of the Local Plan as it would be an issue for the quarry owners, North Yorkshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan, Network Rail and the local highway authority to consider.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>The Vision for the plan area up to 2030 and the spatial strategy's sub-area approach to development and the wider growth aspirations in the North Craven area are supported.</p>	<p>This aspect will be carried forward into the next version of the draft local plan.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Support for Vision in terms of its intention to preserve the natural and historic environment in Craven and highlighting how attractive the area is; although various minor word changes are recommended to strengthen these aspirations. (Historic England)</p>	<p>Whilst this comment is in support of the current draft Local Plan approach, minor word changes could be made to strengthen the Vision's aspirations to preserve the natural and historic environment in Craven.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See revised Vision, which includes improvements on the lines suggested.</p>
<p>Plan should maximise the potential of buildings and structures associated with the area's textile industry not only to help meet the housing and employment needs of the area but also help to retain the local distinctiveness of Craven. (Historic England)</p>	<p>The Context of the draft Local Plan acknowledges that the legacy of buildings and structures associated with the area's textile industry are a distinctive feature of many settlements across the District. Many 19th century mills have, in fact been successfully converted to alternative uses: Bradley</p>	<p>No</p>	

	<p>Mill, Carleton Mill and Belle Vue Mills in Skipton are all good examples of buildings that have been sensitively redeveloped. The retention of mill chimneys and the re-use of reclaimed materials have contributed to the successful redevelopment of these important buildings in the district.</p> <p>In terms of the draft Local Plan we would seek to redevelop existing mills (brownfield sites) and retain their features as they contribute to the distinctive character of the area. For example, the Cononley Mill site is currently preferred as a future mixed use conversion. Development principles, including the need to retain important mill features, will be set out for each of the preferred sites in future drafts of the plan.</p> <p>The Vision and other policies in the Plan (such as SP5: Heritage and SP6: Good Design) work towards preserving the distinctive and historic features of the plan area such as mill buildings.</p>		
<p>Concern about the lack of detail within the Vision. Vision should include footnotes which reference the relevant low level documents.</p>	<p>The Vision is a strategic and aspirational view of the future. More detail will be added to support the Vision as the plan progresses. Footnotes may or may not be included as necessary. The Vision's ideas are carried through into the rest of the plan, both in policies and supporting text, and relevant low level documents are acknowledged in footnotes where appropriate.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Addition to paragraph 1 to include: "more opportunities for access to arts, heritage, sport, active recreation and play which support a healthy lifestyle"</p>	<p>The Vision would benefit from reference to the importance of access to the arts, heritage, sport, active recreation and play.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See revised Vision, which highlights culture, heritage and active healthy lifestyles.</p>

<p>Addition to paragraph 2 to include text which ensures that new homes will not only respect an area's distinctive character and heritage but will also "enhance the quality" of these areas.</p>	<p>In addition to the existing wording which encourages new development to 'respect' an area's distinctive character and heritage, the Vision would benefit from taking account of the importance of also 'enhancing the quality' of these areas.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See introductory paragraphs of the revised Vision, which set out how the quality of the area will be enhanced.</p>
<p>The Vision should indicate the possibility of business development in cooperation with Bradford area.</p>	<p>The Vision should be amended to include reference to the need to plan across local authority boundaries and to ensure a truly joined up approach to future growth for the area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See revised paragraphs on the south area, which highlight the Leeds City Region economic partnership (which includes Bradford).</p>
<p>The Vision will not be achieved without first addressing the issue of the District's ageing population through active measures to retain and attract families and the economically active to the District</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority will be taking account of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the objectively assessed need set out in this document which looks at both demographic change and market and economic growth in the area. This will help us to review the policies in the plan to ensure the Vision is supported. The issues of balancing out the older sections of the community, families and the labour forces could be drawn out further in the Vision.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See the revised Vision which highlights the local economy, community life, all age groups, families and older people. These issues are set out in the Context and carried through into the strategy and policies of the plan.</p>
<p>The Plan is not clear about how heritage assets are to be protected. General disconnect between the aims of the Vision regarding heritage, and actions or commitments in the body of the Plan. Language used is non-committal, e.g. the use of "should", not "must".</p>	<p>How the plan proposes to protect heritage assets will be clarified in the review of policy SP5: Heritage. Evidence from a new heritage study will support a review of draft policy and site allocations. Connections between the body of the plan and the Vision will be strengthened by improvements in policy and in the allocations process, rather than in the Vision itself.</p> <p>NB. The language in the plan is not necessarily 'non-committal', rather it is flexible to allow for different circumstances. The term 'should' is encouraging and positive and allows for a balanced judgement to be made.</p>	<p>No</p>	

<p>The South sub area section of the Vision should be split into two new sub areas – one centred on Skipton and one centred on Glusburn/Crosshills to avoid an uneven distribution of population in comparison to the North and Mid sub areas, and to avoid a basic lack of infrastructure provision in the South Craven villages, as it could be weighted towards Skipton should the south sub area remain in its current form.</p>	<p>Settlements are grouped into areas to reflect their shared spatial characteristics, as in relationships with each other and cross-boundary influences. Settlements in the southern area share relationships with West Yorkshire and East Lancashire. Issues of distribution and weighting raised in this comment are dealt with in the strategy section of the plan.</p>	<p>No</p>	
--	---	-----------	--

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Strategy (Section3) Response Paper

Objectives			
The 22/9/14 draft Local Plan identifies a total of nine overarching objectives. The objectives stem from the critical issues identified within the context of the Local Plan and are a means for action in achieving the Local Plan vision. Together the objectives seek to achieve sustainable development within Craven.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PO2, Landscape character and setting – Objective should be included re the enhancement of landscape character and setting of protected landscapes (either as new objective or as part of PO2) 	Noted. This would be an improvement.	Yes	See new/revised objective PO3.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PO6, Entertainment and recreation – Suggested wording amendment re entertainment opportunities ‘high quality local environment, the tourism economy and recreation/entertainment opportunities.’ 	Noted. Culture would be a better term to use in the objective.	Yes	See new/revised objective PO7.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PO8, Renewable energy suggested wording amendment re renewable energy - ‘Encourage renewable forms of energy particularly on a microgeneration scale, and design out’ 	The Council considers all forms of renewable energy to be important in tackling climate change including microgeneration. However, careful consideration must be given to the appropriate location of renewable energy particularly in Craven which has high landscape sensitivity.	Yes	New/revised objective PO8 refers to ‘renewable forms of energy where appropriate’.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PO1 – general thrust supported 	Noted. This point will be addressed in	Yes	See new/revised objectives

<p>but objective should provide greater emphasis on protection of safeguarding the character and landscape setting of the district's towns and villages – suggested wording “... That make best use of available resources, safeguard the character and landscape setting of Craven's settlements, nurture high-quality environment...’</p>	<p>improvements to the first two objectives.</p>		<p>PO1, PO2 and PO3.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PO2, landscape character - Suggested amendment to objective, ‘Conserve and enhance the high-quality local environment and reinforce the distinctive character of Craven's towns, villages and landscapes including its open spaces ...etc.’ 	<p>Noted. The objective will be amended on the lines suggested.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised objectives PO2 and PO3.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PO10 (new objective), sustainable transport – there is currently no specific objective for supporting walking, cycling and sustainable transport modes for non-motorised users. Suggested new objective declaring firm commitment to pursue and encourage people out of cars and to walk or cycle whenever possible and practical. <p>Additionally a commitment should be made to build</p>	<p>The Council considers that opportunities where available should be sought which encourage walking, cycling and other sustainable transport modes.</p> <p>However, recognition should be given to Craven's rural character which means that movements between settlements to access services often requires travel over larger distances. Nevertheless, within rural areas sustainable travel is still possible through innovative means and it is</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised objective PO1.</p>

<p>infrastructure within developments which positively caters for walkers, cyclists and non-motorised vehicles.</p>	<p>considered that the Local Plan has a role in supporting such opportunities. This will be achieved through policy but objective PO1 will be strengthened.</p> <p>New development will be distributed taking account of the sustainability of individual settlements as identified in a settlement hierarchy. This is likely to result in the majority of development being distributed to Skipton, as this is the settlement with the most services, thereby reducing the need for travel and maximising opportunities for walking and cycling.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objective currently on 'infrastructure improvements' – suggestion for new objective which declares an aspiration to achieve infrastructure improvements by a combination of engaging with other authorities and pooling S106/CIL contributions. 	<p>Noted. An objective relating to the provision of infrastructure would be beneficial. However, specific mention of s106, CIL or duty to co-operate may not be necessary or appropriate.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised objective PO1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PO5, community services and facilities - Possible tie in with infrastructure improvements – (alternative to above) 	<p>Noted, but the provision of infrastructure will be addressed in improvements to objective PO1 instead.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PO1-PO9 - Parish Council is in agreement with objectives 	<p>Noted. Some refinements and improvements are likely to be made.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives general - It would be helpful in aiding understanding 	<p>Noted. This is a good point and an aspect of the draft local plan that will</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The explanation of linkages between context, key issues,</p>

<p>of how different aspects of the plan fit together by identifying which policies are related to individual objectives, either through a simple table or action plan.</p>	<p>improve as work progresses.</p>		<p>objectives and strategy has improved, but work needs to continue on fully explaining how the draft plan fits together.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives general -the plan has good objectives but the strategies to achieve the stated aims are too weak to be effective (policies SP4, SP5, SP6, SP8 and SP10). The language used is wooly. Tighten the language of the policies so that they enforce the stated aims. 	<p>Noted, but some refinements and improvements are likely to be made to the draft objectives. (NB. Regarding policies, terms like 'encourage', 'support', 'wherever possible' etc. have been used in order to avoid a position that makes the plan undeliverable. 'Must' or 'will require' may not be appropriate to every case and in some cases the local plan may have a legitimate supporting role. Policies are being reviewed individually.)</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Infrastructure - There is no objective regarding green infrastructure, permeable development, focus on increasing walking and cycling. This should be incorporated within the plan objectives. 	<p>Noted. This point will be addressed in improvements to the first two objectives.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised objectives PO1 and PO2.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PO8 – Noise/congestion, The objective currently omits the issue of reducing noise and congestion. Suggested amendment 'reduce 	<p>It is not considered appropriate to seek to reduce noise within objective PO8. Instead the Council will seek to ensure that existing and future land uses are compatible with each other thereby limiting the impact of noise</p>	<p>No</p>	

<p>carbon emissions, waste and water use, noise and congestion from current and future local development.'</p>	<p>on people and the environment. Noise may be temporary, for example during development, or may be reasonable in industrial areas. Furthermore noise levels are suitably managed through controls outside of the Planning System.</p> <p>With regards to congestion – the plan will seek to ensure that development is located sustainably reducing the need for travel where possible.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PO4, housing choice - Suggested wording amendment 'tenure, price and locationtaking into account the needs of young people and low income groups.' 	<p>Whilst meeting the needs of young people and those on low incomes is considered important within Craven, meeting the needs of all demographic groups such as older people and those with a disability are of equal importance. Relevant policies on housing within the Local Plan will set means for implementing this.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport/connectivity - Additional objective connectivity (transport and/or broadband) within and outwith Craven 	<p>Noted. This point will be partly addressed in improvements to objective PO1. Further improvements will be made in related policy.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised objective PO1 and policy INF5.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective needs to be included to define how the Council intends to positively address and reverse the underlying issue of the fundamental imbalance in the age profile of the District's population. 	<p>Noted. The objectives overall seek to address the needs of all people including Craven's ageing population. Within the context of the Local Plan consideration is given to a locally ageing population. Local housing needs are addressed in policy and identified in objectives Po3 and PO4.</p>	<p>No</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PO1 – Bradley – Comment made that Bradley has limited service provision and increased development would place further pressures on the village 	<p>Comment noted – It is recognised that at present Bradley has the facilities of a Service Village within the settlement hierarchy – the level of development distributed to the village takes account of existing services, proximity to Skipton etc. However, it is also important to recognise that new development is important in supporting village services and infrastructure.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vision and objectives generally welcomed (including PO3, PO4, PO6) - exception over priority given to previously developed land – contrary to para 111 of the NPPF. Paragraph 2 of the vision should be amended to reflect this 	<p>The comment about PO3, PO4 and PO6 is noted. The comment relating to the vision is addressed in the separate vision response paper.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimising the volume of HGV quarry traffic through Craven will positively contribute to meeting the Craven Plan objectives PO2 (Conserve and enhance the high quality local environment) and PO5 (Enhance the vitality of market towns and larger village centres). 	<p>Noted. Whilst this may be the case, the Local Plan has a limited role in being able to minimise existing patterns of HGV movements.</p>	<p>No</p>	

*These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Strategy Response Paper

Policy SP1: Spatial Strategy and Sub-Area Growth (replaced by draft policy SP4: Spatial Strategy and Housing Growth)			
Aim of the Policy: To identify the most appropriate locations for development within each of three local plan sub-areas, to provide a rationale for distributing new development across the plan area and to establish a framework for change that achieves the vision, aims and objectives of the plan.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
We welcome the recognition of the contribution that the historic environment makes to the attractiveness of the Market Towns as places to live and work. We also support the intention that the spatial strategy looks to build on the existing and individual roles of these places rather than fundamentally alter their role which could threaten their individual character and identity.	Noted	No	
Include a commitment to maintain the separate identities of the South Craven villages.	Noted	Yes	See part e) of new/revised policy ENV1: Countryside and Landscape
Need to define ‘small’, ‘medium’ and ‘large’ in the following context (pg. 24): “it looks to accommodate new development primarily through a pattern of small and medium/large sized sites”.	Noted. The text is intended to be descriptive.	Yes	Size of sites is now clearer and more specific – see new/revised policies SP1 and SP5 to SP11.
Omit the following sentence from pg. 24: “The need for some Greenfield development sites would also help to avoid areas with flooding problems”. Surely brownfield sites, by virtue of the fact that they were originally	Noted, although this is an incomplete quote. The full sentence makes a broader point. Wording will change and improve as work progresses.	Yes	<i>[Improve wording used in supporting text]</i>

developed when land availability was greater, will be sites which are not on flood plains?			
Add an additional sentence which justifies this statement (pg. 24): “Generally, Greenfield sites provide a greater opportunity to secure funding for supporting infrastructure and affordable housing provision”	This is a general point about development viability. Wording will change and improve as work progresses.	Yes	<i>[Improve wording used in supporting text]</i>
Amend the following statement: “Whilst the redevelopment of Brownfield sites will be prioritised and supported, the limited availability of Brownfield land, together with the small size of many sites, means that each of the market towns and the identified villages will need to expand beyond their current built up areas. Greenfield land will be required to accommodate new housing and employment over the Plan Period” to read “The redevelopment of Brownfield sites will be prioritised and supported”. The current paragraph contains too many statements which could be used by developers as justification for building on inappropriate sites.	The statements are truthful and make an important point about the spatial strategy.	No	
Sutton is not suitable for more development, the housing figures are wrong. Sutton has had more than average (i.e. Greenroyd Mill – properties still available in the mill). People living in Sutton would like it to remain a pleasant village, not become part of a conurbation. The village has reached saturation point and the services, schools,	The spatial strategy is being revised, although not necessarily in response to these broad and sweeping assertions.	Yes	Sutton has been identified as a “Village with Basic Services” and placed in Tier 4a of the settlement hierarchy – see new/revised policy SP4.

surgeries, roads are not coping with the population level as it stands now. The population of Sutton is not increasing. Shift the proposed housing northwards.			
The infrastructure in Cross Hills, Glusburn and Sutton cannot support further development.	The spatial strategy is being revised, although not necessarily in response to this broad assertion.	Yes	None of these settlements appear above Tier 3 in the hierarchy - see new/revised policy SP4.
The penultimate paragraph on pg. 24 regarding 'carbon storage' needs some explanation. Explain or give an example.	Carbon storage is thought to be an understandable term. Terrestrial or biological carbon sequestration are alternatives, but thought to be less understandable. A simple internet search of the term provides plenty of explanatory material.	No	
The vision for the plan area up to 2030 and the spatial strategy's sub-area approach to development and the wider growth aspirations in the Ingleton / Bentham area are supported.	Noted	No	
Pg. 22: This page fails to note that Craven has very poor transport links with East Lancashire. The main A56 road across from Skipton to Colne is incredibly poor for a major A road, especially one that links Skipton to the nearest major motorway.	Noted. Improvements will be supported.	Yes	See part d) of new/revised policy SP2.
Pg. 23: There is plenty of brownfield land to develop in East Lancashire that would alleviate this housing problem in Craven.	This is a broad and sweeping assertion, which is not supported by evidence contained in the Strategic Housing market Assessment (SHMA).	No	
Pg. 23: In the longer term the proposed economic and population growth might provide an important opportunity to provide additional major infrastructure projects. This is, after all, a long term plan.	Noted. These would be supported in principle.	Yes	See part d) of new/revised policy SP2.
Pg. 24: There is a need for infrastructure	Noted. This would be supported in principle.	Yes	See part d) of new/revised policy

investment to aid businesses in this area and therefore help to drive economic growth.			SP2.
Reduce the number of houses planned for Rathmell by factoring the amount of planning permission already granted meaning 20 new homes plus the 10 granted would give you the 30 but would still mean an approx. 80 per cent increase.	Noted. Completions since 2012 and extant planning permissions will be factored in for all settlements.	Yes	See new/revised policy SP1.
Need to stop the policy of greenfield site development as it is non-sustainable. Address the problem - not the symptoms of the problem. Put policies in place to limit overpopulation. It would be a good start to limit any development to brownfield sites. Further degrading greenfield sites (sometimes green belt sites) and encouraging urban sprawl is not a solution.	These are broad and sweeping statements that lack clear credibility and appear to run contrary to the NPPF.	No	
Pg. 23: Clarity of wording. Most of the available housing land within the plan area is greenfield, but there is also some brownfield land and additional brownfield land may become available in the form of 'windfall site's. It appears from these words that only brownfield sites may be windfall sites? Page 48 implies that windfall sites can be greenfield. Could assurances be given in the document that the plan be reviewed and updated at say 5 year intervals extending the development period by a further 5 years.? In addition, if then by chance a 'community limit' is met by windfalls, could it state that it possible the 'approval' for an initially agreed site can be removed from the plan?	Noted. Wording will improve as work on the draft local plan progresses. Explanation of the plan-monitor-manage approach to local plan reviews will be included.	Yes	<i>[Improve wording used in supporting text]</i>

<p>In terms of spatial distribution of housing, there are various sub-regional housing market areas within the Craven district. Each of these distinct areas will have its own requirement for housing and this should be reflected in the spatial distribution of housing supply within the local plan. This decision should be based on the findings of the evidence base and should not be a politically-driven spatial strategy to build a disproportionate amount of housing in areas where people do not wish to (and will not) live. If the spatial distribution does not reflect the need/demand as shown by the evidence base, housing will not be delivered and the plan will not be implemented.</p>	<p>Noted. The second draft of the local plan will be based on up-to-date evidence from the 2015 SHMA.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>New/revised policies SP1 and SP4 are based on evidence from the 2015 SHMA.</p>
<p>SP1 (Spatial Strategy and Sub-Area Growth) sets out how Craven's future development requirements will be distributed and accommodated in line with the spatial strategy and based upon a hierarchy of sub-areas. The policy states that outside identified settlements, development will be restricted to that which fulfils a set of criteria. General support is expressed of the council's overall approach to direct development to major and key centres, and support is expressed for the concept that growth should be distributed to key settlements with established facilities, services and infrastructure (in accordance with the promotion of sustainable development running through the</p>	<p>Noted. The housing requirement, settlement hierarchy and distribution strategy will be revised as work on the evidence base and draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policies SP1 and SP4.</p>

<p>Framework), however, this should not preclude development in lower order, sustainable settlements, which could also help to sustain existing facilities and services. Indeed, the level of growth directed to each settlement should be reviewed in light of meeting a higher housing requirement in the district. This policy is amended to be worded more positively, so that it is line with the requirement of the Framework (paragraphs 14, 157 and 182) to positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of the area.</p>			
<p>Support expressed for the identification of the 'South Sub-Area' as the 'Primary Area for Growth', and the identification of Skipton as the 'Primary Focus for Growth' within the 'South Sub-Area'. Support also expressed for the identification of Skipton on the Key Diagram as a 'Strategic Area for housing and employment growth'.</p>	<p>Noted. This approach will continue in the next draft.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Support expressed for the overall Spatial Strategy for the District. It is clearly a sustainable strategy to direct the majority of new housing and employment development in the Borough to the three market towns in the District (Skipton, Settle and Bentham) with Skipton in particular being the focus for most new development because of its larger size, greater accessibility and the wider 'service' function that it provides to the whole of the District. The acknowledgment that, in response even to the limited stated</p>	<p>Noted. This approach will continue in the next draft.</p>	<p>No</p>	

<p>objectives of the Plan, that Market Towns such as Skipton will need to expand beyond their current built up areas to accommodate the new development that is needed to meet projected development requirements over the Plan period, and that this will necessarily involve the release of greenfield land, is also welcomed.</p>			
<p>Some confusion is expressed about the following statement on pg. 24: “An important element of this spatial strategy is that it looks to accommodate new development primarily through a pattern of small and medium/large sized sites spread within and around each of the market towns and the identified villages as opposed to relying on the delivery of one or more major strategic sites’ or major urban extensions capable of accommodating a significant proportion of Craven’s development requirements in a limited number of locations. If Craven was to be dependent on major strategic site or major urban extensions to deliver the development requirements identified in this Plan, it is considered that there would be risks to the delivery of the Plan if it were to rely on such a pattern of development. Strategic sites will demand significant investment in infrastructure to ensure that they can be delivered.” This statement appears to conflict with the identification of Skipton on the Key Diagram as a ‘Strategic Area for</p>	<p>Noted. These parts of the initial draft plan will improve and become clearer as work on the second draft progresses. Changes are likely to be on the lines suggested.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policies SP2, SP4 and SP5.</p>

<p>Housing and Employment Growth.” and Draft Policy SP17 Strategic Employment Site. Support expressed for the identification of its land south of Skipton as a Strategic Employment Site under Policy SP17 and also as a large scale housing site under Policy SP11/SP12 (sites SK049 and SK051) (see separate representations) and as a result consider that the Council’s statement on page 24 needs to be amended to reflect the particular circumstances in Skipton where such large scale ‘strategic allocations’ are appropriate and deliverable. It is also considered that the Plan would benefit from an explicit Strategic Land use Allocation for the South Skipton Area covered by Policy SP17 and Housing sites SK049/SK051 that explicitly promotes a balanced mix of both employment and residential uses in this location. The Council is aware that, because of high infrastructure costs associated with this site, the delivery of employment uses on this site needs to be ‘enabled’ though the delivery of higher value residential development. In such circumstances a site specific allocation would give greater certainty to delivery and incorporate greater guidance about the mix and type of use and delivery mechanisms.</p>			
<p>Strategy (pgs. 22-25) – could be strengthened by including references to cross-boundary implications, where appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted. As a general point, this is true, but no specific implications are mentioned. Any cross-boundary matters that are relevant to the plan will be addressed.</p>	<p>Unclear</p>	<p><i>[Include references to any relevant cross-boundary matters]</i></p>

<p>There should be a greater focus in this section (pg. 24) on how the positioning of a development can affect its environmental impact. It should be mentioned that positioning of developments can minimise detrimental impacts on biodiversity and protected species through the avoidance of protected areas such as SINC's and ancient woodland, as well as through locating areas with high opportunity to increase connectivity and biodiversity. This can then be used to determine how developments can help to achieve this through avoidance, mitigation or compensation. Avoidance of areas that are of importance for flood mitigation, including both downstream flood zones and upland catchment areas to reduce the rate of runoff should also be included in this section.</p>	<p>Noted. These points would help to explain aspects of the spatial strategy and site selection/allocation process.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><i>[Include these points in the supporting text of new/revised Section 4: Strategic Policies and Spatial Strategy]</i></p>
<p>In order to provide plan-led certainty for Bolton Abbey over the plan period Chatsworth Estate request that the following three changes are made to the emerging Craven District Local Plan: The amendment of the Plan's Spatial Strategy to include Bolton Abbey as an 'Identified Village' and 'Secondary Focus for Growth' in the South Sub-Area, for the reasons outlined in this response. An allocation of the 3.5 ha site shown on the attached site plan in the Local Plan. An allocation would be predicated upon the sensitive and sustainable development of</p>	<p>These points are noted. The draft local plan's approach to Bolton Abbey should be reviewed.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policies SP1, SP2, SP4 and SP11, which include refinements to the strategy for Bolton Abbey.</p>

<p>the site being brought forward by a comprehensive Masterplan that is delivered in consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>Policy references to the above site being brought forward through a sensitive heritage and landscape based Masterplan.</p> <p>Chatsworth Settlement Trustees wishes to see the following policy references included within the Local Plan: - A policy reference to be provided as a footnote to policy 'SP1: Spatial Strategy and Sub-Area Growth' and linked to the inclusion of Bolton Abbey as both an 'identified village', stating: "Mixed use development of a commensurate scale to be brought forward on the single allocated site at Bolton Abbey via a sensitive heritage and landscape based Masterplan."</p> <p>The National Park Authority has acknowledged Bolton Abbey's key role as a Service Village and included it in its settlement hierarchy as a suitable place for new development. However, given that the village straddles the National Park boundary there is a clear acknowledgement by Chatsworth Settlement Trustees that new build development of the type require in the village should be directed outside of the National Park. It is considered that the amendment of the Yorkshire Dales National Park Local Plan provides a clear rationale for Craven District Council to acknowledge the reassessment of National Park Officers, based on the information presented to them</p>			
--	--	--	--

and the formal change in the plan's settlement hierarchy when revisiting the role of Bolton Abbey, as a cross-boundary settlement, in the Council's Local Plan.			
Hellifield has seen astronomical growth over the last 20 years and now needs a period of integration for the old and new parts of the village. Hellifield Parish Council agree that there are benefits to being classed as a secondary village in the draft Local Plan, as it allows them to be involved in the allocation of a site for development, rather than having to accept windfall development on an ad hoc basis. However, they take the view that the development of 30 houses in Hellifield should be phased for the latter part of the plan period (nothing for the first 5 years of the local plan) to allow for the necessary integration.	Noted. However, phasing of this type (which is not related to the timing of infrastructure delivery) is unlikely to be justifiable. The plan is required to provide an upfront supply of deliverable sites and to adopt a plan-monitor-manage approach to ensure delivery is achieved. Imposing a delay on delivery, of the type suggested, is likely to be considered inappropriate.	No	
Pg. 24, 2nd paragraph. The statement about CLIL threat to affordable housing is not clear without some explanation. Provide further explanation.	Noted. These parts of the initial draft plan will improve and become clearer as work on the second draft progresses. Changes are likely to be on the lines suggested.	Yes	<i>[Improve wording used in supporting text]</i>
Growth in Clapham-cum-Newby: Clapham is in the Plan's Northern Sub-Area and is an "identified village". On both counts it is therefore seen as an area for "secondary growth". The nature of "secondary growth" is not made clear but this designation rings alarm bells in Clapham. The Draft notes that Clapham has experiences higher than average (about 25%) housebuilding in the period 1991-2011 (p46) and the recent	Noted. The spatial strategy, settlement hierarchy and housing distribution will be refined as work on the draft plan progresses. Housing completions since 2012 and extant planning permissions will be factored into the housing figures.	Yes	See new/revised policies SP1, SP4 and SP11.

<p>Dalesview development would add an estimated further 25% to the local village population in a short period, with the inevitable increased pressure on local school and other services. The Draft Plan notes that a further 2 houses are expected to be built in the years up to 2030 (p.46) but it is not clear whether these are expected to be in addition to the Dalesview development or whether that development has not been taken into consideration. Slow, gradual, organic growth should be stated within the Plan as a firm policy objective in respect of all upland Dales villages where the Dales vernacular is predominant, including Clapham and Newby. In addition the consent for the Dalesview development should be reconsidered and reduced in scale when the consent comes up for renewal and/or full consent.</p>			
<p>There seems to be a tactic admission that development on greenfield sites would be acceptable in some circumstances (pp.24-25). At the same time it is recognised that the countryside is also important (p.25). It would help if the Plan specified more clearly the criteria for developing on greenfield sites, together with an order of priority for the consideration of these criteria. Building on greenfield sites should take place only in the most exceptional circumstances of overwhelming need.</p>	<p>The draft plan seeks to achieve sustainable development, which will involve balancing economic, environmental and social objectives. In this context, the plan's success will rely on the development of greenfield sites. This will be made clearer as work on the draft plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The new/revised Section 4: Strategic Policies and Spatial Strategy is specific about the need for greenfield development and the allocation of greenfield sites.</p>
<p>Spatial Strategy - 'Exceptions to the Development Plan' (pg. 25). 'Windfall</p>	<p>Whilst these points are overstated and appear to run contrary to the NPPF, the draft local</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policies SP1, H1 and H2.</p>

<p>housing' (pg. 48): The spatial strategy as drafted in relation to development exceptions and windfall housing effectively give "carte blanche" to potential developers. This makes a mockery of the purpose of the entire Plan, which seeks to set out where development should and shouldn't be focussed. Failing to do this will risk achieving the vision, objectives, strategy and plan outlined in the draft Plan. This section needs to be re-drafted to make it clear that exceptions to the development plan should be limited to small developments, giving an example of developments of one or two dwellings.</p>	<p>plan's approach to the matters raised will be reviewed and refined as work progresses. This should allay the concerns expressed.</p>		
<p>Spatial strategy – 'transport and other infrastructure' (pg. 23-24): It focuses on new highway capacity and roads, and fails to recognise the already existing pressures on services such as schools, primary healthcare facilities, and heavy traffic at peak commuter times e.g. through Crosshills. The infrastructure section on p23-24 should be strengthened to address these issues. The Plan will have to change to achieve the Vision set out in the draft plan, and so any future development should serve to address these issues.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policy SP12 and INF1.</p>
<p>Public transport in Bentham does not provide a realistic alternative to the car. Those working outside of the town are unlikely to be able to use public transport to travel to work. There is no direct bus to</p>	<p>Noted. The issue of public transport and car dependence in Bentham (and elsewhere in the plan area) will continue to be acknowledged in the draft local plan.</p>	<p>No</p>	

Skipton or Kendal, the bus service to Lancaster offers poor opportunities to return home after work and the train schedule is limited.			
Natural England welcome the reference to ecosystem services in the Spatial Strategy in line with para 109 of the NPPF and the principles of the 2011 Environment White Paper The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature.	Noted.	No	
SP1 should be worded more positively. In particular the section ‘In all other villages, hamlets and in the open countryside’ indicates that development will be restricted to that complying with the relevant criteria. Such a policy wording is considered contrary to the NPPF which seeks a positive framework for meeting the needs of the area (paragraphs 14, 157 and 182). It is therefore recommended that the policy wording be amended to: ‘In all other villages, hamlets and in the open countryside development will be supported which...’	More positive wording will be used.	Yes	See new/revised policy SP4 – wording with respect to Tier 5 settlements and open countryside is now more positive.

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Strategy Response Paper

Policy SP2: Sustainable Development (replaced by draft policy SD1: The Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)			
Aim of the Policy: At the heart of Craven’s local plan strategy is a desire to deliver sustainable growth. This draft policy aims to reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within the NPPF.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
Definition of “sustainable development” should be clearer.	Noted.	Yes	See new/revised policy SD1.
Code for Sustainable Homes level 5 or 6 or Passivhaus Standard should be used.	The Code for sustainable Homes has now been withdrawn. Building Regulations includes former Code up to level 4. Passivhaus Standard can be achieved outside the planning system.	No	
Land should be made available for self-builders who usually build to higher standards.	Noted. Para 50 of the NPPF states that in order to deliver a wide choice of homes, Local Planning Authorities should plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic and market trends and the needs of different groups in the community including those wishing to build their own homes.	Yes	<i>[Require provision of self-build plots on suitable allocated sites and specify requirement in the site commentary.]</i>
Greater detail needed on employment, infrastructure and landscape within this draft policy.	This draft policy is an overarching one, which will apply to any development proposal in order to meet the plan’s aim of achieving sustainable development. Proposals will also be assessed against other relevant policies, which depending on the detail of the proposal may include employment, infrastructure and landscape policies.	No	

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Strategy Response Paper

Policy SP 3: Neighbourhood Planning (policy removed and replaced by supporting text)			
Aim of the Policy: To encourage, guide and support Parishes to prepare and adopt Neighbourhood Plans where appropriate.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CDC has a duty of positive engagement and proactivity in the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. 	Agree. Draft policy SP3 aims to encourage the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans with guidance and support from CDC.	No	The next draft LP does not include a policy on Neighbourhood Plans as it repeats national guidance. Instead Neighbourhood Plans will be referred to in a section of the plan. This role of CDC should be included in this section.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where Neighbourhood Plans are in preparation, CDC should only consult on the strategic policy/sites in its Local Plan and leave the non-strategic policy/sites to Neighbourhood Plans. 	Noted. Sites identified in the Local Plan to meet the OAN are strategic as they show how the plan can meet the strategy. Draft Neighbourhood Plans and the identification of sites within them will inform subsequent drafts of the Local Plan e.g., as in Gargrave.	Yes	The next draft LP does not include a policy on Neighbourhood Plans as it repeats national guidance. Instead Neighbourhood Plans will be referred to in a section of the plan. This role of CDC should be included in this section. Draft NPs and sites identified within them may inform subsequent drafts of the LP in terms of site allocations.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern exists that Parishes require specialist expertise to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan. 	Agree. LPAs have a legal duty to advise or assist those producing NPs in the area. Funding is also available to help parishes in preparing NPs.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The list of proposals that can be included in Neighbourhood Plans should include 	Noted	Yes	The next draft LP does not include a policy on Neighbourhood Plans as it

the identification of local green infrastructure projects and protection of wildlife sites/corridors			repeats national guidance. Instead Neighbourhood Plans will be referred to in a section of the plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reference is made to the Community Infrastructure Levy in the draft plan. A reference should be made to the Community Infrastructure Levy in this section of the plan. 	Noted. The explanation to draft policy SP21; Sustainable Buildings, Infrastructure & Planning Obligations does state that the Council will consider the introduction of CIL in consultation with developers, infrastructure providers etc.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Last bullet point should be amended to read “community projects for arts, heritage, sport, recreation, tourism and biodiversity”. 	Noted.	Yes	The next draft LP does not include a policy on Neighbourhood Plans as it repeats national guidance. Instead Neighbourhood Plans will be referred to in a section of the plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for this part of the plan as the importance of Neighbourhood Planning is recognised. 	Noted.	No	Neighbourhood Plans will be referred to in a section of the plan.

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Environment Response Paper

Policy SP4: Countryside and Landscape (replaced by draft policy ENV1: Countryside and Landscape)			
Aim of the Policy: The policy is intended to seek protection of the landscape and countryside through a criteria based policy which actively seeks to retain features of importance and ensure that in drawing up and determining proposals for new development full use is made of landscape character appraisals.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement re “maintaining gaps between settlements in order to preserve their separate identities,” is a very valid point. 	<p>Comment endorsing policy approach to maintain gaps between settlements in order to preserve their separate identities is noted.</p>	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape appraisals should be used in determining development proposals. Welcomes use of North Yorkshire and York Landscape Character Assessments as tool for managing landscape change. Suggested amendment ‘in drawing up and determining the appropriateness of proposals for new development.’ (Landscape Character para. 1 line 9) 	<p>Comment noted and agreed that landscape appraisals are also an important tool to help determine the appropriateness of proposals for new development.</p>	Yes	<p>See new policy ENV1, Cou“Landscape Character” as suggested.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated landscapes – reference to Registered Historic Parks and Gardens amend to read “There are also two 	<p>Comment noted and agreed that reference to Craven’s two historic parks and gardens which are designated historic landscapes should be included in the explanatory text on Designated</p>	Yes	<p>Include new paragraph at the end of the explanatory text on “Designated Landscapes” to read ‘Craven also has two Registered Historic Parks and Gardens (Broughton Hall and</p>

<p>Registered Historic Parks and Gardens within the Plan area. Proposals affecting these two designated landscapes are dealt with under Policy SP5.”</p>	<p>Landscapes.</p>		<p>Gledstone Hall). These are designated under the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England. Proposals which affect these designated landscapes and heritage assets will be considered under policy SP5 (Heritage).”</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy SP4 – Restoration of degraded landscapes (second bullet point), Amend second bullet point to read ‘-in ways which help to achieve biodiversity and heritage objectives.’ 	<p>Comment noted and agreed that heritage should be an important consideration when seeking to secure the restoration of degraded landscapes, alongside biodiversity.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Amend the second bullet point of Policy SP4 to read “ as suggested.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference should be made to the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 where a duty of regard is enshrined. • A positive commitment towards implementing the Rights of Way Improvement Plan will bring enormous social benefits such as reducing obesity, improved general health etc. • As a Section 94 body under the CROW Act 2000 the council should actively engage with Local Access Forums in the Yorkshire Dales National Park and at county level. 	<p>Noted. The Council has a duty of regard under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 reference will be made to this.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes, add reference to Local Access Forums ‘As part of its legal duty of regard under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 the Council makes a positive commitment to actively engage with Local Access Forums of the Yorkshire Dales National Park and the North Yorkshire Local Access Forum.’</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy SP4 – Fields with footpaths should not include development in them therefore excluded from allocation. The maintenance of these fields would remain the responsibility of landowners. 	<p>The council considers the protection of public rights of way important. Generally the Council will seek to avoid building on fields with footpaths running through them. However, this may not always be possible given the need for development within Craven. Furthermore such an approach may result in opportunities being missed particularly where benefits could be achieved such as an improvement in the quantity and quality of open space.</p> <p>The Council does not intend that development would result in a loss of footpaths or their amenity value.</p> <p>Housing allocations where footpaths exist will need to make provision for their appropriate protection through site development principles including the provision of areas of open space.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy SP4 AONB's – Better recognition for the statutory duty for local authorities relating to AONB's 'to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the landscape.' 	<p>The council understands its role in working with the Forest of Bowland AONB partnership to ensure the continued protection of the natural beauty of this designated landscape alongside achieving other aims.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Amend sentence 'The Council has a legal duty¹ to work with the AONB and national park management bodies in the achievement of their aims.' To read '...in the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the Forest of Bowland AONB and Yorkshire Dales National Park. The</p>

			Council will also work with these bodies in achieving their other aims.'
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include reference to Forest of Bowland AONB Landscape Character Assessment 	Include reference to the FoB AONB Landscape Character Assessment 2009 (page 32)	Yes	Yes, include reference to existing Landscape Character Appraisals at the time of adoption (Landscape Character, paragraph 1, line 8) (Craven Landscape Character Appraisal 2002 and Forest of Bowland Landscape Character Assessment 2009).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest of Bowland special qualities 'including its heather moorland, blanket bog and rare birds and is also important for its upland hay meadows, ancient semi-natural woodlands and tranquillity.' 	The Council understands these are the important special qualities of the Forest of Bowland and it would be appropriate to include these under this section.	Yes	Change as suggested.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AONB is supportive with the Council's proposals to develop policies relating to 'dark skies' for Craven and accords with actions in the AONB management Plan 2014-2019. 	Noted.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated landscapes – amendment to text 'AONB's and National Parks are national landscape designations afforded the highest protection for their landscape and scenic quality.' 	This change is a minor amendment to the text but accurately reflects the weight afforded to these landscape designations in accordance with national policy.	Yes	Insert as suggested at beginning of first paragraph, delete second paragraph.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on overall environment section pages 32-44. Absence of intent in language used with no specific references to responsibility for implementation i.e. restoration or protection. CDC needs to appoint qualified and proactive Environmental/Conservation Officer. Too much emphasis on protected designated landscapes not enough attention to wider/intervening non-designated land. 	<p>Council recruitment is a matter outside of the Local Plan. However, in preparing policies consultation has been held with various bodies and where required with external consultants.</p> <p>Responsibility with regards implementation lies with developers. There are also other plans and programmes outside of the Local Plan that are concerned with the implementation of countryside and landscape improvements.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Insert reference to the role of Landscape Character Appraisal in determining planning applications.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dark skies – terms for intent are vague. Maps identifying lighting zones should be identified. * 	<p>The Council does not believe it is the place of the Local Plan to provide such level of detail on dark skies. Instead it sets a general policy framework to support their promotion within the AONB.</p> <p>In other areas obtrusive lighting will be avoided in order to minimise light pollution.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Changes to be made to dark skies, as not appropriate in all locations.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 33 SP4 ‘add preserve existing footpaths and rights of way.’ 	<p>It is considered that promoting access to the countryside through the protection of footpaths and rights of way is important. Therefore further recognition of this can be given.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Insert reference to protection of footpaths and rights of way.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 33 – Policy should include support for farmers and landowners who wish to 		<p>Yes</p>	<p>Insert reference at policy SP4 bullet 5, ‘Encouraging and supporting farmers and landowners who already practice</p>

<p>encourage biodiversity and a sustainable wildlife rich environment through farming.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy should also include details to achieve this. 			<p>or wish to adopt, sustainable countryside and landscape management; improvements to biodiversity and encouraging a wildlife rich environment; and who wish to increase understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of Craven's farming heritage.'</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for fourth bullet point 	Noted	No	

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Environment Response Paper

Policy SP5: Heritage (replaced by draft policy ENV2: Heritage)			
Aim of the Policy: To ensure the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment within Craven, by recognising that heritage assets have special value, help to create local identity, are irreplaceable and must be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan should include a map or listing of conservation areas and heritage assets. The term 'heritage asset' should be defined to include aspects of the built environment which are not currently statutorily protected but are nonetheless of significance in the social, economic and historic context of Skipton i.e. many overlooked aspects of the town's industrial past and associated architecture. Tourism is vital to Skipton and attention must be given to the surviving 18th to 20th century elements of its industrial development in addition to the ancient core. 	<p>Agree. These points will be addressed as work on the draft local plan and policies map progresses.</p> <p>NB. It may not be practical to show all listed buildings on the main policies map (covering the entire plan area), but it should be possible to show them on settlement inset maps.</p>	Yes	<p>Symbols identifying the location of conservation areas, monuments and parks and gardens have been included on the main policies map. Conservation area boundaries are shown on inset maps.</p> <p><i>[Show listed buildings on inset maps?]</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archaeological surveys should form part of planning approval wherever there is the likelihood of the archaeological record being obliterated by development. This should be included in planning policy. 	<p>Agree. This is covered in the draft policy, but could be made clearer or more explicit.</p>	Yes	<p>See changes made in response to English Heritage recommendations below.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English Heritage suggests re-wording of supporting text for the policy with regards to referencing the correct regulations which govern each type of heritage asset. They also suggest that even though not all designated heritage assets are protected by law the supporting text should point out that these non-designated heritage assets make a very important contribution to the distinct identity of the various parts of the plan area. Wording of 	<p>Agree</p>	Yes	<p>See changes made in response to English Heritage recommendations below.</p>

<p>supporting text should use similar terminology to that used in the NPPF and make use of the advice set out in the NPPG.</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Neighbourhood Plans are only one way in which non-designated heritage assets might be identified. It may be the case that, over the lifetime of the Plan, either the Council or other local amenity groups develop a programme to identify those assets which are important to the character of the local area. It is also important to make it clear that, in the absence of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is the Local Plan which will be used to provide a framework for the management of change to these assets (English Heritage comment). 	<p>Agree. The draft policy should be revised accordingly. NB. There's a possibility that non-designated heritage assets may be added to inset maps once they've been identified – see related point above.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See changes made in response to English Heritage recommendations below.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Policy is extremely generic providing no indication of whether there are any aspects of Craven's historic environment which are of especial importance to the distinct identity of the District (and thus, which ought to warrant particular attention). Neither does it provide any spatial dimension. Indeed, as drafted, the Policy is so general it could apply to virtually any authority in the Country (English Heritage comment). 	<p>Agree. The draft policy should be revised to address these points.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See changes made in response to English Heritage recommendations below.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Once this plan is adopted, Policy SP5 will be the only one against which proposals affecting the historic environment will be assessed. In the NPPF there is an expectation that, with a compliant plan in place, there will be no need for those using it to have to look again at the NPPF in making decisions on development proposals. However, with the Policy as currently drafted, it is clear that, in determining many proposals affecting Craven's historic environment, reference will, despite an adopted plan being in place, still need to be made back to the NPPF. As a result, it does not really accord with the plan-led approach being advocated within the NPPF and is particularly 	<p>This insight is helpful and provides some useful guidance. In seeking to avoid repetition of the NPPF, the draft policy is clearly lacking in several respects and needs to be revised. The points raised should be taken on-board.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See changes made in response to English Heritage recommendations below.</p>

concerning, in the case of those areas where the NPPF provides very little specific guidance (such as the approach which will be taken to applications affecting non-designated archaeological remains). (English Heritage comment)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is little difference in the approach proposed for applications affecting designated heritage assets to those affecting non-designated heritage assets. (English Heritage comment) 	Noted. Differentiation between designated and non-designated heritage assets can be introduced.	Yes	See changes made in response to English Heritage recommendations below.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage states that Policy SP5 does not comply with the following requirements of the NPPF:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is not clear how the presumption in favour of sustainable development (in terms of the management of the historic environment) will be applied locally [NPPF Paragraph 15]. ○ It does not provide certainty about how applications on planning proposals will be determined [NPPF Paragraph 17]. ○ It does not provide clear policies on what will or will not be permitted or provide a clear indication of how a decision-maker should react to a proposal [NPPF Paragraph 154]. 	Noted. These points need to be addressed in the next draft of the policy.	Yes	See changes made in response to English Heritage recommendations below.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a result of the above comments English Heritage have suggested the following re-wording of the supporting text for SP4: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Heritage, second Paragraph, line 4 - amend the final sentence to read:- “The NPPF makes it clear that great weight should be given to the conservation of these assets when considering development proposals” 2. Heritage, second Paragraph, bullet-points - Amend accordingly 3. Heritage, third Paragraph, line 1 amend to read:- “However, the designated heritage assets represent only 	Agree. The recommendations are helpful.	Yes	The recommended wording has been used in the revised policy and supporting text.

<p>a fraction of the heritage resource of the District. Indeed, it is the wealth of non-designated elements which help to give Craven's towns, villages and countryside their distinct identity. These non-designated heritage assets are a vital part of the social and cultural identity of the District helping to provide distinctiveness, meaning and quality to the places in which its communities live, providing a sense of continuity and a source of identity and are valued by local people as part of the familiar and cherished local scene. Many non- designated ... etc"</p> <p>4. Heritage, fourth Paragraph, line 1 delete the first sentence and replace with:- "This plan needs to maintain and manage change to these heritage assets in a way which sustains and, where appropriate, enhances their significance. This can be achieved ... etc"</p> <p>5. Heritage, delete fifth Paragraph and replace with:- "In order to sustain the long-term future of a heritage asset, it may be necessary for it to be put to a use for which it was not originally designed. This can help reduce the threat of neglect and decay and the number of assets being identified as being at risk. However, this should always be to the optimum viable use for that asset (i.e. the one that will cause least harm to its significance)"</p> <p>6. Heritage, sixth Paragraph delete all but the final sentence and replace with:- "Any harm to or loss of a heritage asset - through destruction, alteration or development within its setting – will require clear and convincing justification. Proposals which would result in harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset will be weighed against the public benefits of that proposal. Where substantial harm or total loss is likely to occur, it would have to be demonstrated that the harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits. Where</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>any heritage assets or parts of heritage assets are likely to be lost, the assets should be properly surveyed and recorded beforehand.”</p> <p>7. Heritage, seventh Paragraph, line 1 insert the following before the first sentence:- “Local communities and amenity groups have an important role to play in helping to identify those non-designated heritage assets in their area which they consider important to the character of their area. The impact of a development upon such assets will be taken into account in determining the appropriateness of any proposals”.</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage have suggested the deletion of existing draft Policy SP5, to be replaced with:- “Craven’s historic environment will be conserved and, where appropriate, enhanced and its potential to contribute towards the economic regeneration, tourism and education of the area fully exploited. This will be achieved through:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Paying particular attention to the conservation of those elements which contribute most to the District’s distinctive character and sense of place. These include:- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The legacy of mills, chimneys, and terraced housing associated with the textile industry 2. The buildings and structures associated with Settle-Carlisle Railway 3. The buildings, bridges, locks and other structures associated with the Leeds-Liverpool Canal and Thanet Canal 4. The historic market towns of Skipton and Settle ○ Ensuring that proposals affecting a designated heritage asset (or an archaeological site of national importance) conserve those elements which contribute to its significance. Harm to such elements will be permitted only 	<p>Agree. The recommended policy wording is helpful.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The recommended wording has been used in the revised policy and supporting text.</p>

<p>where this is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Substantial harm or total loss to the significance of a designated heritage asset (or an archaeological site of national importance) will be permitted only in exceptional circumstances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Supporting proposals that would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a Conservation Area, especially those elements which have been identified in a Conservation Area Appraisal as making a positive contribution to its significance ○ Ensuring that proposals affecting an archaeological site of less than national importance conserve those elements which contribute to its significance in line with the importance of the remains. In those cases where development affecting such sites is acceptable in principle, mitigation of damage will be ensured through preservation of the remains in situ as a preferred solution. When in situ preservation is not justified, the developer will be required to make adequate provision for excavation and recording before or during development. ○ Supporting proposals which conserve Craven's non-designated heritage assets. Developments which would remove, harm or undermine the significance of such assets, or their contribution to the character of a place will only be permitted where the benefits of the development would outweigh the harm. ○ Supporting proposals which will help to secure a sustainable future for the Craven's heritage assets, especially those identified as being at greatest risk of loss or decay." 			
--	--	--	--

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Environment Response Paper

Policy SP6: Good Design (replaced by draft policy ENV3: Good Design)			
Aim of the Policy: The policy intends to promote good quality design in Craven. The Council places high value on good design in creating sustainable places that are inclusive for all.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water efficiency – Unites Utilities wishes to highlight the importance of incorporating water efficiency measures as part of the design process for all new development. <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Suggested wording amendment - additional bullet point to SP6 to read 'The design of new development should incorporate water efficiency measures. New development should maximise the use of permeable surfaces and the most sustainable form of drainage, and should</p>	<p>Noted. The Council considers water efficiency to be an important element of sustainable design. The Council does not intend to introduce optional water efficiency standards over and above Building Regulations. However, developers are still encouraged to implement water efficiency measures within new development including the use of permeable paving. The policy will be amended to include wording on water efficiency.</p>	Yes	Amend as suggested.

<p>encourage water efficiency measures including water saving and recycling measures to minimise water usage.'</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimising water usage - the sustainability (11th) bullet point of SP6 should refer to reducing water usage as well as energy. 	<p>Noted. As above water efficiency is an important part of sustainable design. The amendment does not set specific standards for water efficiency but seeks to reduce water usage. This is considered compliant with changes made as part of the Government's Ministerial Statement on 25th March 2015 (Planning update March 2015).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Amend 11th bullet point of SP6 to read '...', so that development takes the opportunity to reduce energy and water use and carbon emissions...'</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wildlife – additional bullet point of SP6 to ensure that residents have access to wildlife for health & wellbeing benefits. New bullet point should be inserted to include access to high quality natural environments and wildlife rich greens spaces. 	<p>Noted. Building for Life 12 (3rd edition January 2015) recognises the importance of wildlife within design. As the plan progresses links between design, biodiversity and health and wellbeing policies will be fleshed out and drawn together.</p>	<p>Yes,</p>	<p>Add a new bullet point 'the Council will support design proposals which promote enhanced access to a high quality natural environment and wildlife rich green spaces.'</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking – point refers specifically to Bentham – Better access required for the town, B6480/Station Road bottleneck needs 	<p>Noted. This is not proposed at present and is currently over and above the infrastructure requirements of the plan. However, with the strategy being reviewed this will be considered further.</p> <p>Problems with parking including anti-social parking have been identified</p>	<p>No</p>	

<p>addressing. Access to main A roads should be improved. Antisocial parking is a real problem, too many properties do not have access off street parking, future developments in Bentham should not be allowed with off street parking.</p>	<p>in a number of settlements and is not limited to Bentham. When considering development principles for allocation sites potential solutions for on street parking will be considered.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dark Skies - Consideration of tranquillity, light and darkness supported 	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Term 'pastiche' – unclear what is meant by the term but should be omitted if means designs shouldn't be traditional in local stone and slate should be omitted. 	<p>The term pastiche means a poor and degraded imitation of an original style. The Council seeks to promote designs that complements the local vernacular, including building materials scale and architectural features etc. but does not support designs which seek to effectively copy architectural styles. The 3rd bullet point of Policy SP6 states what the Council would support the use of locally sourced materials.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater emphasis needs to be made to ensure the value of arts and creative arts is taken into account as it is often misunderstood. Developers should contribute a percentage for creative art and arts development to meet the needs of the community 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Paragraph 70 of the NPPF states that planning policies should deliver social, recreational and cultural facilities (including cultural buildings) by planning positively; guarding against unnecessary loss; ensuring that established facilities are able to develop and modernise; and taking an integrated approach to housing, economic uses and community facilities. Further work will be carried out on meeting the NPPF requirements and relevant draft local plan policies will be refined.</p> <p>(NB. A percent for art scheme would need to be justified and evidenced, and subjected to viability testing and consultation with stakeholders.)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policies INF1, INF2 and INF3.</p>

<p>i.e. Bolton 5% goes to the arts.</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments made that more emphasis needs to be made on the importance of new development connecting with natural green spaces and the protection of public rights of way. Where it is not possible to avoid building in fields with footpaths, the footpaths should be moved to another field. • A suggested amendment to add following words to bullet point 7 of SP6, ‘.. and other areas of public realm with links to the existing public rights of way network.’ 	<p>The Council recognises the value of Craven’s towns and villages with important links to natural green spaces.</p> <p>A new bullet point is being inserted relating to access to high quality natural environments (see earlier point).</p> <p>Policy SP8 relates to Green Infrastructure including natural green spaces and footpaths. When applications for new development are submitted decisions will be made taking account of all relevant planning policies within the Local Plan. The potential for integrating footpaths into open areas of the site will be considered.</p> <p>With regards the suggested worded amendment, it is agreed that this change could be made to bullet point 7. Connectivity including streets but also to public rights of way is important for health and well-being according with Building for Life 12.</p> <p>Wherever possible development principles will incorporate green spaces with footpaths on site. If not possible the re-routing of footpaths potentially through diversions will be identified. The importance of preserving an open experience is important. A range of potential solutions exist to avoid urbanisation effects.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>As earlier point insert bullet point re access to high quality natural environments.</p> <p>Amend bullet point 7 as suggested ‘.. and other areas of public realm with links to the existing public rights of way network.’</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy supported – policy will help to ensure that development proposals safeguard, and help to reinforce the distinctive character of the settlements and landscapes of the plan area. 	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Art and design in the public realm- suggested amendment page 36 definition of public realm 'Art and design in the public realm can in addition add to a sense of place and local distinctiveness.' 	<p>Agreed</p> <p>The Council values the role of art and design in the public realm and this is considered a good addition to the justification.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Amend as suggested</p>
--	---	------------	---------------------------

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Environment Response Paper

Policy SP7: Biodiversity (replaced by draft policy ENV4: Biodiversity)			
Aim of the Policy : To achieve a net gain in the biodiversity of a site wherever possible upon development of a site.			
Main issues from consultation*	Response	Change required to local plan (Yes/No)	Change made to plan
Net gain of biodiversity verses viability	<p>Objections were based on the notion that net gain, either off or on site, should be commensurate with the size of the site. Developers of small sites may find that increasing the biodiversity of a site is unviable, taking into account other financial pressures developers may encounter.</p> <p>The policy needs to be fleshed out to reassure people that policy requirements, especially for smaller sites, are not going to undermine viability.</p>	Yes	<p>On strategic sites the draft plans enthusiastically pursues significant net gains in biodiversity and enshrines requirements in the allocations themselves. On other sites, the draft plan adopts a “no significant harm” approach and encourage/require beneficial biodiversity measures (in landscaping, SuDS etc) to make a reasonable and proportionate contribute towards biodiversity.</p>
Strengthen wording of policy to ensure that in all cases there is a net gain in biodiversity and an enhancement to ecological networks.	Comments received during the consultation in support of the draft policy advocate strengthening the wording, for example by deleting the phrase ‘where ever possible’ and indicating that ‘in all cases a net gain should be achieved’.	No	

	<p>The NPPF sets out that policy on biodiversity should attempt to achieve a net gain wherever possible and policy in the draft plan should be in line with this. It should be noted however that the draft plan will not be allocating sites high in biodiversity, where potential losses would be significant. Allocations will be on managed agricultural land or brownfield sites, both of which are often not very high in biodiversity value. In addition policies in the plan will encourage the creation of green space on allocated sites, as well as landscaping schemes and private gardens, all of which can improve the biodiversity in an area. The plan will also designate local green space sites. These are protected sites where local communities can increase biodiversity through planting/ponds etc. As such the biodiversity of an area can be increased via a variety of projects, both on allocated and unallocated land.</p>		
<p>Weighting loss of biodiversity against other planning issues (i.e. housing need).</p>	<p>Comments were received regarding the need for the loss of biodiversity to be weighed against other issues such as housing need. It was suggested that biodiversity loss should not be the sole means for refusal of permission, especially if the loss is minor. The Local Planning Authority agrees with this notion, which is backed up by the NPPF which specifies that loss of biodiversity should only result in a refusal if it is a significant loss. Such loss will be judged on a case by case basis as some schemes can still be considered sustainable even if they result in a minor loss to biodiversity.</p> <p>The policy needs to be fleshed out to reassure that policy requirements are not going to undermine other planning issues.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Policy amended to indicate that only a significant loss in biodiversity will result in a refusal of planning permission.</p> <p>Achieving a net gain should not undermine other planning issues.</p>

<p>Mapping of ecological networks and designated and non-designated biodiversity sites.</p>	<p>Various comments pointed out the need to identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them, and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation. Such mapping will aid developers in understanding where they could achieve net gains in biodiversity to existing networks in order to improve the overall biodiversity of Craven.</p> <p>The local authority agrees that this point should be emphasised in policy and encourages developer contributions to enhance and improve these important biodiversity connections. The accompanying Policies Map for the Local Plan will display all internationally, nationally and locally designated sites in the plan area. Explanatory text to the policy will also direct developers to sub-regional and local projects in the plan area (including the Craven Biodiversity Action Plan 2008) that aim to conserve and enhance ecological networks, with the purpose of encouraging development which strengthens and creates linkages throughout the district. Local Green Spaces, once designated will also be mapped on the Policies Map, providing further protection for ecological networks in the plan area. Designated and non-designated sites will be backed up with criteria in local plan policies to ensure full protection and enhancement.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Although not complete at the time of consultation, the forthcoming policies map will include all designated ecological sites and networks, which will be backed up by criteria in the policy to ensure full protection. Explanatory text to the policy encourages developers to consider non-designated sites across the plan area, and refers to various sub-regional and local projects, to ensure improvements and connections are made where possible.</p>
<p>Biodiversity offsetting mechanisms.</p>	<p>The suggestion was made that the policy should encourage 'biodiversity off-setting' mechanisms where off-site mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Biodiversity offsetting mechanisms may not be appropriate for the size of sites that are proposed in</p>

	<p>Biodiversity offsets are conservation activities that are designed to give biodiversity benefits to compensate for losses - ensuring that when a development damages nature (and this damage cannot be avoided) new, bigger or better nature sites will be created. They are different from other types of ecological compensation as they need to show measurable outcomes that are sustained over time. This approach may not be appropriate for the Craven plan area, where the majority of development sites are fairly small-scale, or if they are larger, they may not be rich in biodiversity (i.e. managed farmland). Developers of such sites may not find it financially viable to create extensive nature sites off site, nor be able to monitor whether or not measurable outcomes of increased biodiversity have been sustained over time. As such draft policy SP7 will not be encouraging developers to utilise biodiversity offsetting mechanism, rather it will encourage a simple net gain in biodiversity either on or off site.</p>		<p>the plan, or those achieved through windfall development, all of which are often too small to make biodiversity offsetting viable.</p>
<p>Encouraging the use of brownfield sites to preserve biodiversity elsewhere.</p>	<p>Comments reflected that growth in housing, business and other land-uses will have a serious, negative impact on biodiversity, unless growth is on brownfield sites</p> <p>Encouraging brownfield development is beneficial for many reasons, not just to preserve biodiversity. However the plan will seek to ensure that where greenfield sites (and brownfield) are developed there will not be a significant loss of biodiversity. This may be the case in any event as not all allocated greenfield sites are rich in biodiversity i.e. managed agricultural fields.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Brownfield development is encouraged throughout the plan for a variety of reasons, including the preservation of biodiversity.</p>

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Environment Response Paper

Policy SP8: Green Infrastructure (replaced by draft policy ENV5: Green Infrastructure)			
Aim of the Policy: To protect, improve and increase the green infrastructure network, looking to all developments to make a reasonable contribution, wherever possible.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
<p>The local plan should specifically mention Aireville Park (including a Master Plan) and its importance to the town as a green amenity.</p> <p>Aireville Park is an important multifunctional green infrastructure hub not only to existing and new residents across the whole of Skipton, but it also provides a destination site for residents in outlying rural locations and even visiting tourists. Its location is also of strategic importance with close links to the train station, the Leeds-Liverpool canal green infrastructure corridor, Stepping Stones II project, Gawflat Meadow and Craven Swimming Pool and Leisure Centre. This combination creates a potential to enhance Skipton's "honey pot" status within Craven District to invest in and enhance the biodiversity, heritage, formal and informal recreation, cultural, sporting and leisure offer of the Park as a destination within Skipton for residents and visitors alike.</p>	<p>As noted, there is currently no mention of Aireville Park in the plan. As the plan area's main public park, Aireville Park could be mentioned in supporting text to SP8, and in the Context section of the plan, in its capacity both as an important visitor destination and an important multifunctional green infrastructure hub. Aireville Park will be embedded within the strategy for the overall growth for Skipton and the green infrastructure network.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Context section and the supportive text of the Green Infrastructure policy have been amended to include mention of Aireville Park both as a visitor destination and as an important green infrastructure corridor through Skipton.</p> <p>Aireville Park will also feature on the policies inset map for Skipton as a major Green Infrastructure asset or 'hub' which supports strategic areas for change in Skipton.</p>
<p>The plan needs a robust up to date assessment of future sporting needs;</p>	<p>It was suggested that a specific chapter be introduced into the Local Plan to deal with the</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The next draft Local Plan will contain a policy specifically relating to</p>

<p>allocation of land to meet this identified future need and a means of providing this, such as scheme for the community infrastructure levy.</p>	<p>need for new formal playing pitch provision in Skipton. The suggestion indicated that specific locations should be identified for the provision of new formal playing pitches as part of proposed development allocations so that the delivery of the pitches is directly linked to increased demand arising from new development proposals.</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority is currently carrying out a Playing Pitches, Built Facilities and Open Space Assessment which will contain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a playing pitch strategy setting out the existing and future needs of rugby union, football, cricket, bowls and tennis; • an assessment of built facilities including swimming pools and sports halls; and • an assessment of open space <p>This Assessment will highlight where there may be deficiencies or surpluses in the quality and quantity of existing playing pitches, built facilities and open space, and of required suggest where new pitches/facilities/open space could be sited.</p> <p>The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) could potentially provide a funding route for these facilities should the Local Authority decide to proceed with introducing a CIL charge (undecided to date). Other funding routes could arise, i.e. funding from specific</p>		<p>sports, built facilities and open space provision. This will be informed by the assessment currently being carried out and clearly set out the Council's standards and requirements in terms of improvement of existing and provision of new facilities and sites.</p> <p>CHECK THIS WORDING WITH RUTH</p>
--	--	--	--

	development schemes.		
Green spaces which impact positively on the health and wellbeing of a community should be designated for preservation.	<p>Various representations were made on the designation of specific green spaces and the protection of local walks and footpaths, Raikes Road Burial Ground and the Skipton Wilderness.</p> <p>As part of the preparation for the next draft of the local plan the local planning authority has drawn up a methodology for the designation of Local Green Space, based of guidance in the NPPG (National Planning Policy Guidance). This methodology will form the basis of a 'call for sites' that may be suitable for designation as Local Green Space. Sites submitted will be assessed in line with national guidance and suitable sites will form part of the next round of consultation for the draft local plan, with the aim of having an adopted local plan which proactively protects designated green space across the plan area.</p>	Yes	Once agreed, a list of sites designated as local green space will be included in the plan, and mapped on the plan's accompanying Policies Map.
Flexibility needed in the plan where there is a surplus of green infrastructure in the local area. In such cases compensatory provision is unnecessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.	Agree. The comment seems to apply to sports facilities. The wording of the policy needs to be reviewed to ensure clarity on when/where compensatory measures for such assets will form part of a development proposal (either on or off site). However, even if the quantitative assessment of sports facilities in an area proves to be sufficient there may be a requirement to upgrade the quality of them.	Yes	The Green Infrastructure policy has been amended to ensure compensatory measures (or upgrades to sports facilities – new Sport policy) for GI either on or off site.
The local plan provides protection and effective management of the parts of the green infrastructure network which are	Noted. This comment is in support of the current draft Local Plan approach	No	

<p>designated heritage assets, or which contribute to the setting of historic buildings and structures; and in doing so aids in the delivery of the plan's Objectives for its historic environment.</p>			
<p>The word "footpaths" should be replaced by "public rights of way" as this latter description covers higher rights of access such as horse riding or cycling and National Trails. Where possible the plan should aim to improve connectivity between these rights of way.</p>	<p>Whilst the Local Planning Authority acknowledges that the term Public Right of Way could be added to the list of features that make up green infrastructure (although it should be noted that this is not an exhaustive list), the term 'footpath' should remain in the list. Not all footpaths are Public Rights of Way, but most provide a valuable addition to the green infrastructure network in an area.</p> <p>Reference could be made in the supporting text to National Trails (such as the Pennine Way and Pennine Bridleway which run through Craven) and the importance of improving connectivity with these trails. In addition strategic sites could look to improve connectivity between PROWs and trails/footpaths. This would be set out in the Development Principles for strategic allocated sites.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The supportive has been text amended to include reference to Public Rights of Way and National Trails.</p>
<p>The plan should support better off-road cycle paths.</p>	<p>Cycleways help to achieve alternative sustainable transport choices and increase the tourist potential of the area as a destination for cyclers. Whilst cycle-paths are listed in the supporting text of SP8 as being assets to the green infrastructure network, more detail could be added to highlight the value of existing and new cycle paths in the area as a way of increasing sustainability and tourist potential</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The supportive text to the policy has been amended and now sets out how improvements planned for the canal towpath can help to achieve easier, more sustainable passage from existing and planned housing to the town centre and beyond.</p> <p>The supportive text to the policy also</p>

	<p>(i.e. outside of the scope of the Local Plan, there are works planned for the upgrade to the canal towpath between Bradley and Gargrave which will enable cyclists to use this route with greater ease). Permeability is also advocated through the draft Good Design policy.</p> <p>The plan can encourage the provision of sustainable forms of transport such as cycleways as part of new strategic development sites and promote connections to existing routes, however large scale improvements to the cycle network in the plan area (either along existing roadsides or on other routes) are outside the remit of the Local Plan.</p>		sets out that development proposals which are near or on existing cycle routes should be encouraged to protect and/or enhance them.
Query as to who would be responsible for the maintenance of 'strategic open space' that is identified on various preferred sites.	<p>The Local Planning Authority would expect the landowner to be responsible for the strategic open space that will form part of larger development sites, unless agreement is made otherwise with the Local Authority or another interested part (i.e. Town/Parish Council, Local Interest Group).</p> <p>Policy already sets out that the developer would be required to ensure agreed mechanisms are in place for longer term management and maintenance of the green infrastructure assets on site.</p>	No	
International, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity as well as the wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them should be mapped to	Future drafts of the local plan will include a Policies Map which will include international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity as well as the	Yes	A list of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity will be included in the plan, and these will

<p>support the delivery of this policy. This should include a cross boundary approach to deliver landscape scale ecological networks (Natural England comment).</p>	<p>wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them in order to support the delivery of policies SP7 and SP8. Development principles on strategic sites will have a part to play in joining up corridors and enhancing routes and the biodiversity on site.</p> <p>In terms of working with neighbouring authorities to deliver cross boundary landscape scale ecological networks, SP8 already advocates joint working “beyond the plan area, which promote(s) district, sub-regional or regional green infrastructure corridors and projects.” This approach will be closely adhered to as part of the statutory duty placed upon the Council to cooperate with neighbouring authorities in the planning process.</p>		<p>be mapped on the plan’s accompanying Policies Map.</p> <p>Corridors/stepping stones information already mapped (Yorkshire and Humber GI Mapping Project)</p>
<p>The AONB is supportive of the Council’s policy to make links between green infrastructure and the Forest of Bowland AONB, in particular strategic link routes from urban/village centres into the AONB.</p>	<p>Noted. This comment is in support of the current draft Local Plan approach</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Local Plan lacks positive policies for formally dealing with temporary sporting events</p> <p>Policy SP8 should recognise other sports that take place in the district, and not just the sport facilities that serve the local community, but those sports that also serve visitors to the district (i.e. equestrian activities, motorsport, cycling, running, canoeing and climbing events).</p>	<p>Following an update to the Assessment of Playing Pitches, Built Facilities and Open Space (see comment above) the next draft of the local plan will set out a new policy regarding sport and recreation which could be supportive of temporary sporting events that encourage tourism in the plan area.</p> <p>As temporary sporting events often benefit from permitted development rights there is</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>New policy on Sport and Recreation will recognise other sports that take place in the district, in addition to the sport facilities that serve the local community (i.e. temporary sporting events).</p> <p>Existing supportive text to Green Infrastructure refers to the importance of maintaining and</p>

(Sport England comment)	<p>little scope for policy to monitor them. However the plan can be proactive in its approach to the ongoing maintenance and enhancement of the area's green infrastructure network to complement or aid such events, both through visual impact for tourists and through the provision and maintenance of adequate green space.</p>		<p>enhancing the GI network as a way of encouraging the continuance of economic boosting activities (i.e. temporary sporting events).</p> <p>Links to Tourism policy</p>
<p>Genuine contact needed between urban areas and the surrounding countryside via rural tongues of land entering the built up areas. Boundaries should be drawn as naturally as possible, rather than providing a rigid containment within straight lines of fences, walls and tarmac. Natural features such as trees, ponds and wildflowers should also be included. Not sufficient to include a narrow strip of footpath as only green space on site. Preferable if development reached slightly further out into farmland rather than infilling an equivalent area which penetrates into the town.</p>	<p>SP8 currently advocates local patterns of growth that avoid town cramming and concentric urban sprawl which pushes green space and countryside further away from where people live.</p> <p>Sites should be interspersed and intersected with rural land as a way of integrating new development with the surrounding countryside. SP8 and the plan's site allocation process will ensure that open space is achieved on larger strategic development sites via green corridors, areas of planting, ponds, wildflower meadows etc, all of which will help to soften the impact of development. Footpaths that currently run through development sites will be either incorporated into the green space on site or, if this is not possible, diverted around the site. There is a need to preserve the amenity value of existing footpaths, using a range of solutions to preserve the user's experience and avoid their urbanisation.</p> <p>The development principles on strategic sites will ensure that green infrastructure through</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The policy has been designed to ensure preservation of the amenity value of existing footpaths that run through development sites. Development principles will ensure this as well.</p>

	the site is strategically connected to GI routes beyond the sites' boundaries. Combined they will enhance the strategic growth of GI assets across the district.		
<p>The plan should have a policy which requires new developments to incorporate green walls, roofs and soft borders as a way of significantly improving the environmental performance of buildings. Green walls and roofs can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the quantity of surface water run-off and the risk of flooding • Improve the quality of surface water run-off • Improve air-quality and reduce urban heat island effect • Improve biodiversity • Create higher visual qualities 	<p>Whilst the plan will not require new development to incorporate green walls, roofs and soft borders it will support them as one of many methods of improving the green infrastructure network in the plan area. It is acknowledged that these features provide additional green space in an area, thereby assisting biodiversity connectivity, however this is also true of many other methods, i.e. the provision of open space. They could be referred to in the supporting text of the Green Infrastructure policy and then backed up by the existing bullet point in the policy which states that "...development will enhance existing or create new green infrastructure and secure its long term management and maintenance"</p> <p>Green walls and roofs and soft border would also be advocated through the sustainable building standards set out by Government.</p> <p>The plan's Flood Risk policy (and supporting text) also makes reference to the use of natural drainage systems (SuDS), as one of many ways of reducing and improving the quality of surface water run-off.</p>	Yes	The supportive text to the Green Infrastructure policy has been amended to make reference to green roofs/walls.

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Environment Response Paper

Policy SP9: Flood Risk, Water Resources and Land & Air Quality (replaced by draft policies ENV6: Flood Risk; ENV7: Land and Air Quality; ENV8: Water etc.)			
Aim of the Policy: In its current form the policy is four-fold and covers issues surrounding flood risk, water resources, land and air quality. The aim is to reduce flood risk associated with development works, management and maintain sustainable water resources, and protect and enhance land and air quality as part of any development.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
<p><u>Flood Risk:</u> United Utilities recommends that Policy SP9 is split into at least two separate policies, one of which should be dedicated to flood risk management alone. The wording of the flood risk section of Policy SP9, should be revised to include text within the body of the policy, to deal specifically with surface water management.</p>	<p>The Flood Risk policy should be worded to deal specifically with surface water management, together with other aspects of flood risk management (see Environment Agency comments below).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Flood Risk section of the 22/9/14 version of SP9 will be separated out from the rest of the policy and become a stand-alone policy.</p> <p>Suggestions from United Utilities to deal specifically with surface water management will be set out in an appendix to the Flood Risk policy as follows: “Surface water should be discharged in the following order of priority:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An adequate soakaway or some other form of infiltration system. 2. An attenuated discharge to watercourse. 3. An attenuated discharge to public surface water sewer. 4. An attenuated discharge to public combined sewer. <p>Applicants wishing to discharge to public sewer will need to submit clear evidence demonstrating why alternative options are not available. Approved development</p>

			<p>proposals will be expected to be supplemented by appropriate maintenance and management regimes for surface water drainage schemes. On large sites it may be necessary to ensure the drainage proposals are part of a wider, holistic strategy which coordinates the approach to drainage between phases, between developers, and over a number of years of construction.”</p> <p>Policy wording regarding the above will state that “development will minimise the risk of surface water flooding by ensuring adequate provision for foul and surface water disposal in advance of occupation”.</p> <p>With regards to greenfield sites and mimicking current natural discharge solution from a site, the Flood Risk policy will encourage SuDS where possible, and other aesthetical and ecological solutions to safeguarding waterways (appropriate permeable soft and hard landscaping can aid in reducing surface water discharge). The policy will also set out that surface water discharge on previously developed land will be managed at the source, and not transferred. It will state that “every option should be investigated before discharging surface water into a public sewerage network”.</p>
<p><u>Flood Risk</u>: Need to ensure that development does not increase flood risk by</p>	<p>Policy will ensure that development does not increase flood risk on greenfield sites</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>An appendix to the Flood Risk policy will set out the following requirements:</p>

<p>ensuring that surface water run-off rates for greenfield sites are not increased. This could involve restricting new development on greenfield sites to the existing run-off rate from a lower order storm event, e.g. a 1 in 1 year storm. Development on brownfield sites should offer a 30% reduction in surface water run-off.</p> <p>Also need to seek a betterment from developers to help mitigate future flood risk. This could be achieved by providing attenuation storage up to and including a 1 in 100 year storm event, plus an appropriate allowance for climate change.</p> <p>(Environment Agency comment) (United Utilities also commented on seeking a betterment from developers on mitigating against flood risk)</p>	<p>by ensuring the existing run-off rate is at least mimicked. Policy will also ensure that development on brownfield sites offer a 30% reduction in surface water run-off.</p> <p>Policy will set out standards of attenuation storage for brownfield and greenfield sites as a way of seeking betterment from developers to help mitigate against future flood risk.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should not increase flood risk on greenfield sites. Surface water run-off rates for greenfield sites should be restricted to the existing run-off rate from a lower order storm event, e.g. a 1 in 1 year storm. • Development on brownfield sites should offer a 30% reduction in surface water run-off. <p>The Flood Risk policy will also seek betterment from developers by encouraging the following standards of attenuation storage for brownfield and greenfield sites to give greater strength to planning conditions. The following will be set out in an appendix to the policy:</p> <p>“Sufficient attenuation and long term storage should be provided to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. Any design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system, can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into a watercourse.”</p> <p>Policy wording on attenuation and long term storage will be as follows:</p>
---	--	--	---

			“Development will maximise opportunities to help reduce the causes and impacts of flooding by ensuring adequate sufficient attenuation and long term storage is provided to accommodate storm water on site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into a watercourse (as per standards set out by the Environment Agency, see Appendix XX).”
<u>Flood Risk:</u> There needs to be an addition to the second point in the “Flood risk” section that requires developers to monitor the outflow from the drainage system to ensure that there are no pollutants entering waterways or groundwater.	Current guidance from NYCC (as the lead local flood authority for North Yorkshire), based on current planning regulations, specifies that all new surface water drainage for major applications should be directed to SuDS, unless they are demonstrated to be inappropriate. Less clear is the duty of developers to ensure that no pollutants enter waterways or groundwater in the long term. <i>(Meeting arranged with NYCC to discuss)</i>	Yes	<i>Advice needed from NYCC as local flood authority with regards to monitoring the outflow from the drainage system to ensure no pollutants enter waterways or groundwater.</i>
<u>Flood Risk:</u> SP9 requires that developments minimise, inter alia, surface water flood risk by incorporating SuDS. Agree with the objective of this policy; however, there are circumstances when the use of SuDS is not feasible or appropriate. As such, this policy should incorporate flexibility to use other means of flood prevention and water management.	Agree. As stated above, current guidance from NYCC (as the lead local flood authority for North Yorkshire), specifies that all new surface water drainage should be directed to SuDS, unless they are demonstrated to be inappropriate. Policy could be reworded to allow developments the use of other means of flood prevention and water management where SuDS are not appropriate.	Yes	The Flood Risk policy has been amended to reflect a wider variety of flood prevention and water management methods, where SuDS are not possible.
<u>Flood Risk:</u> Policy SP9 should require new development to avoid areas with potential	The plan is not currently proposing growth in areas with potential to increase flood	No	Land allocations will aim to avoid areas with potential to increase flood resilience. The

<p>to increase flood resilience and improve the water retention capacity of these areas.</p>	<p>resilience (i.e. upland areas) and this can be drawn out in policy. Land management practises, outside the scope of the local plan, are necessary to achieve flood resilience in these areas.</p> <p>Policy will support development which would improve the water retention capacity of areas that have potential for improving flood resilience.</p>		<p>Flood Risk policy makes reference to this by stating that “Development will avoid areas with the potential to increase flood resilience, and seek to enhance as far as possible the natural capacity of soils, vegetation, river floodplains, wetland and upland habitats to reduce flood risk.”</p>
<p><u>Water resources:</u> In order to differentiate, the Environment Agency suggests splitting this section into the following three sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Water resources - Water quality - Groundwater and contaminated land <p>Water resources: Given the capacity issues with sewerage infrastructure in areas such as in the Aire Valley, new development may be dependent upon upgrading and enlarging the existing sewerage infrastructure. Need to look at the Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy (CAMS) licensing documents. These provide an overview of water abstraction availability at a catchment scale, and information on how abstraction licensing is managed.</p> <p>Water quality: The plan does not refer to new developments meeting the Water Framework Directive’s (WFD) requirements. In England and Wales, WFD compliance is</p>	<p>In terms of water resources although the plan acknowledges that new development may be dependent upon upgrading and enlarging the existing sewerage infrastructure, this approach could be further advocated in the supporting text to the policy by reference to CAMS and the availability of water abstraction at a catchment scale.</p> <p>In terms of water quality the policy could ensure the WFD objective to safeguard water resources and protect and improve water quality is clearly stated.</p> <p>In terms of groundwater the plan could protect the SPZs in the plan area to ensure ground water drinking supplies are free from risk of contamination as a result of development.</p> <p>With respect to contaminated land, the onus would be on the owner of a site to</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Water Resources, Water Quality and Groundwater sections of the 22/9/14 version of SP9 will be separated out from the rest of the policy and become a stand-alone policy.</p> <p>Supporting text to the Water Resources, Water Quality and Groundwater policy will refer to CAMS and the water abstraction availability at a catchment scale.</p> <p>Water Resources, Water Quality and Groundwater policy now states that “Development will not lead to pollution of controlled waters in line with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (see Appendix XX).” Appendix to policy sets out the following WFD standards:</p> <p>“Any development shall ensure that it does not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cause a deterioration of water quality to a lower WFD status class:

<p>achieved through meeting the relevant River Basin Management Plans' (RBMP) requirements. Specifically, the Humber river basin management plan requires the restoration and enhancement of water bodies to prevent deterioration and promote recovery of water bodies. As such, any development shall ensure that it does not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cause a deterioration of water quality to a lower WFD status class; - Cause deterioration or prevent the recovery of a protected area as required by WFD. <p>Instead, development should safeguard water resources and protect and improve water quality with an overall aim of getting water bodies to 'good' status as defined by the WFD. The plan should ensure this WFD objective is clearly stated.</p> <p>Groundwater and contaminated land: In order to protect surface and groundwater from potentially polluting development and activity, the plan should follow the approach advocated in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in ensuring land is suitable for the intended use. Support is expressed for the approach of reusing previously developed land and encouraging the restoration of contaminated land, however preliminary site investigations should be undertaken for development proposals prior to permission being granted.</p>	<p>undertake site investigations prior to gaining planning permission or to having it allocated for development. SP9 could set out criteria to ensure that contaminated land should require remediation prior to development.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cause deterioration or prevent the recovery of a protected area as required by WFD <p>Instead, development should safeguard water resources and protect and improve water quality with an overall aim of getting water bodies to 'good' status as defined by the WFD".</p> <p>The Groundwater part of the part policy makes reference to the protection of SPZs in conjunction with potential nearby development.</p> <p>The Land Quality section of this policy has been reworded ensure the <u>remediation</u> of contaminated land prior to development.</p>
---	---	--	---

<p>Sources of groundwater supply within and adjacent to the district should be protected using identified Source Protection Zones (SPZ) (i.e. areas close to drinking water sources where the risk associated with groundwater contamination is greatest). As there are a limited number of SPZs within the plan area, it is unlikely many developments will intersect with an SPZ. Nevertheless, where this occurs, the developer will be expected to follow SPZ guidance. (Environment Agency comment)</p>			
<p><u>Water Resources:</u> Policy SP9 states that development will reduce the need for water consumption, wherever possible, by incorporating water efficiency measures into the design. However policy should be revised to align with current guidance (recently published Housing Standards Review) which states that water management is to become part of the Buildings Regulations.</p>	<p>The recently published Housing Standards Review confirms that water management is to become part of Building Regulations, and that where councils wish to impose further, optional requirements, these must be based on solid evidence. The Council does not propose to carry out studies to evidence the need to water efficiency savings above those required by the current Building Regulations.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Water Resources, Water Quality and Groundwater policy has been amended and the <u>requirement</u> to reduce water consumption by incorporating water efficiency measures into the design has been removed. This is now under the remit of Building Regulations.</p> <p>Housing standards are improving all the time, water efficiency being of part of these standards. The policy will <u>encourage</u> this approach and the standards set out in Building Regulations by stating that “Development will encourage the incorporation of water conservation into its design, to maximise opportunities to collect and re-use water on-site.”</p>
<p><u>Land Quality:</u> The Local Plan should give appropriate weight to the roles performed by the area’s soils. These should be valued as</p>	<p>Soil is covered in Sustainability Appraisal; therefore any impacts from development on the plan area’s soils will be recognised</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Land and Air Quality sections of the 22/9/14 version of SP9 will be separated out from the rest of the policy and become a</p>

<p>a finite multifunctional resource which underpin our well-being and prosperity. (Natural England comment)</p>	<p>through this process. Policy will also reflect need to avoid agricultural land (grade 3) where possible, unless the needs for and benefit of development justifies the scale and nature of the loss.</p>		<p>stand-alone policy. The Land Quality section of the policy will specify that “Development will avoid the plan area’s best agricultural land (grade 3) wherever possible, unless the need for and benefit of development justifies the scale and nature of the loss”.</p>
<p><u>Land Quality:</u> The policy advocates the prioritisation of previously developed land. This is contrary to paragraph 111 of the NPPF which seeks to encourage its re-use, not prioritise its use. Instead, the overriding objective is to meet housing needs, whether on brownfield or greenfield land. Unless CDC is able to produce clear and robust evidence that the supply of brownfield land is readily deliverable, the approach to the use of brownfield land in Policy SP9 should be revised.</p> <p>Opposing view advocates that plan should have a brownfield first approach whereby greenfield sites would be replaced as and when new brownfield sites become available.</p>	<p>Policy wording could be amended to indicate that the re-use of previously developed land will be supported rather than prioritised. This approach would be consistent with approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>The issue of preferring brownfield over greenfield to be drawn out in the Strategy sections of the plan. Greenfield sites will be allocated in the absence of sufficient brownfield land being made available. Unallocated brownfield sites that come forward in the plan period could have a knock on effect on the rolling 5 year land supply, potentially moving allocated greenfield sites further back in the plan period.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Land Quality policy has been reworded to ‘support’ re-use of brownfield land rather than ‘prioritise’, in line with NPPF.</p> <p>The issue of preferring brownfield over greenfield to be drawn out in the Strategy sections of the plan.</p>
<p><u>Land Quality:</u> Policy should be more prescriptive and read ‘Development will avoid the plan area’s best agricultural land (grade 3)’.</p>	<p>To have no development on grade 3 agricultural land would be an ideal situation but may not be a practical possibility. Some sites on grade 3 agricultural land may be more suitable and sustainable than other grade 4 or 5 land in the area. The policy will specify that</p>	<p>No</p>	

	<p>“Development will avoid the plan area’s best agricultural land (grade 3) wherever possible, unless the need for and benefit of development justifies the scale and nature of the loss”.</p>		
<p><u>Land Quality:</u> Given the significant legacy of past mining activity within Craven and in particular the correlation between the presence of legacy and the focus for development in the Ingleton/Bentham area and the Skipton area, The Coal Authority considers that the Local Plan should incorporate a reference to the range of potential public safety issues relating to the legacy of coal mining within the Craven area.</p>	<p>The supporting text to SP9 could include reference to potential hazards relating to the coal mining legacy in the area. These include: collapse of shallow mine workings; collapse of mine entries; gas emissions from coal mines; transmission of gases into adjacent properties; coal mining subsidence; and water emissions from coal mine workings, all of which may either currently exist, be caused as a result of development, or occur at some time in the future.</p> <p>The policy could have criteria requiring new development proposals to take account of any risks associated with former coal mining activities and, where necessary, incorporate suitable remediation measures to address them.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The supporting text to the Land Quality policy has been amended to make reference to the range of potential public safety issues relating to the legacy of coal mining within the Craven area, as suggested by the Coal Authority:</p> <p>“As the mining legacy in Craven is a sizable and locally distinctive issue, unstable land is an important factor that requires consideration as part of any development proposal, and land remediation schemes may be necessary to ensure that the land is remediated to a standard which provides a safe environment for occupants and users. Due consideration should also be afforded to the prior extraction of any remnant shallow coal as part of any mitigation strategy, in line with the requirements of the NPPF. Prior extraction of remnant shallow coal can prove to be a more economically viable method of site remediation than grout filling of voids.”</p> <p>The Land Quality section of the policy has been amended to take account of the risk and the potential remediation measures needed upon the redevelopment of land associated with former coal mining activities.</p>

			<p>The policy now includes the Coal Authority's suggested wording (underlined): <u>"Land Quality and Unstable Land: Growth in Craven will help to safeguard and improve land quality in the following ways:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development will avoid the plan areas' best agricultural land (grade 3) wherever possible-exceptions may be made where the need for and benefit of development justifies the scale and nature of the loss; • The re-use of previously developed (brownfield) land of low environmental value will be preferred and prioritised; • The <u>remediation</u> of contaminated <u>and unstable</u> land will be encouraged and supported, taking into account what may be necessary, possible, safe and viable."
<p><u>Land Quality:</u> In identifying any new development sites through the Local Plan, need to use GIS data (provided by the Coal Authority) to undertake a check to identify whether there are coal mining features present within the site, which would require remediation or stabilisation prior to development.</p>	<p>Future site assessments will utilise GIS data provided by the Coal Authority to identify whether there are coal mining features present within the site which would require remediation or stabilisation prior to development.</p>	No	<p>Sustainability appraisal and future site checks will utilise GIS data provided by the Coal Authority to check whether coal mining features are present on site.</p>
<p><u>Air Quality:</u> SP9 states that development will "...avoid the creation or worsening of traffic congestion...". This means that applications will fail this test unless the level of highway congestion is exactly the same as that which</p>	<p>The NPPF states that "encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion", hence the aim of SP9 to "avoid the creation or worsening of</p>	Yes	<p>Air Quality section of the policy provides reassurance that, unless severe, traffic impacts resulting from development will not be the means of a refusal of planning permission.</p>

<p>existed pre-development. This approach is inconsistent with the NPPF, which states that planning permission should only be refused where the resultant traffic impact would be severe; in all other cases, planning applications should be approved.</p>	<p>traffic congestion”.</p> <p>However it also states that “plans and decisions should take account of whether improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.”</p> <p>Policy could be reworded to provide greater reassurance that applications will not be refused on traffic impact grounds unless the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe, in line with NPPF.</p>		
---	---	--	--

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Environment Response Paper

Policy SP10: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (replaced by draft policy ENV9: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy)			
Aim of the Policy: In seeking to reduce carbon emissions the policy establishes a positive approach to renewable and low-carbon energy and encourages well-conceived proposals for sustainable generation projects and infrastructure.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No place for micro-turbines in Craven’s countryside. Wrong to allow blanket development of micro-turbines. Craven is visible from much of the Yorkshire Dales National Park and high visibility of infrastructure will be in direct conflict with reasons for the Park’s designation. <p>Turbines will spoil the landscape should not be part of the Local Plan nor favourable in development terms.</p>	<p>National legislation gives permitted development rights (subject to condition) to single micro turbines on domestic properties. Therefore limited control exists in such circumstances. The Council at present does not consider it appropriate to introduce Article 4 Directions restricting permitted development rights on micro-turbines.</p> <p>In other cases a Written Ministerial Statement released in June 2015 and new practice guidance has resulted in additional requirements for wind turbines. The policy will therefore need to be amended to incorporate these requirements.</p>	Yes	The policy has been amended to incorporate new requirements on wind energy development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be a cautious approach to wind energy development given landscape impacts that arise. 	The wind energy policy will be amended in light of new practice guidance	Yes	The policy has been amended to incorporate new requirements on wind energy development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration should be given to the addition of a specific policy on mitigating for the cumulative impacts of small scale renewable energy projects as it can be difficult to ensure they follow the mitigation hierarchy in managing the impacts of individual projects as well as cumulative impacts. 	The draft policy as worded makes reference to the consideration of cumulative impacts arising from new renewable energy infrastructure. This relates to all types if energy generation including small scale projects. It is therefore not considered necessary for an additional policy for small scale projects.	No	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete the words 'taking account of how the location, scale and design of proposals may have specific impacts on an area for example by causing visual clutter or conflict, disrupting the skyline or fragmenting the landscape including any cumulative or combined impacts when other existing or planned developments are taken into account.' 	<p>The Council is seeking to promote appropriate renewable energy schemes in reducing the impacts of climate change. However, it is of great importance that full consideration is given to visual and landscape impacts of new development, this enables a balanced decision to be made taking account of all potential considerations.</p>	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan should include a reference to the Forest of Bowland AONB Energy Positions Statement 2011. 	<p>Noted. The Council is in general agreement with the content of the Position Statement and a reference will be inserted.</p>	Yes	<p>A reference to Forest of Bowland AONB Energy Positions Statement 2011 has been added to the policy's supporting text.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'visual clutter caused by the placement of wind turbines' as an example of development to be discouraged. 	<p>Noted. Visual clutter is an important factor in making decisions on renewable energy developments, this change is therefore agreed.</p>	Yes	<p>A reference to visual clutter has been added to the policy's supporting text.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include a reference to Code for Sustainable Homes 	<p>The Code for Sustainable Homes has now been abolished and therefore no reference should be included.</p>	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy SP10 should be more assertive in protecting high-quality landscapes and treasured environmental assets. Policy SP10, second bullet point amend to read:- "Avoid developments which may detract from the natural, built and historic assets of the area and ensuring that developments harmonise with the local environment, and respect the character of the immediate setting and wider landscape". 	<p>Agreed</p>	Yes	<p>The policy has been amended as suggested.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan should provide greater commitment towards encouraging renewable energy development including 	<p>Whilst new practice guidance requires that any areas where wind energy may be brought forward should be identified in local plans, the</p>	Yes	<p>See new/revised policy ENV9 and supporting text.</p>

<p>identifying specific areas that are appropriate. Emphasis should be made on the benefits for energy reduction, tackling climate change, decline of biodiversity and the green economy.</p>	<p>AECOM 2011 study identifies little scope for renewable energy development in Craven. Nevertheless, the revised policy will emphasise the benefits of renewable energy and will set out a positive and encouraging framework for the consideration of renewable energy developments.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insert the following paragraph 5, page 44, 'The development of infrastructure for renewable and low carbon energy will need to safeguard Craven's landscape, heritage, biodiversity and the living conditions of nearby residents.' 	<p>Noted. These are relevant considerations.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policy ENV9 and supporting text.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First bullet point should be expanded to read 'Supporting well-conceived projects and infrastructure proposals that offer a good balance of economic, environmental and social benefits which are not outweighed by one or more negative impacts that include but are not limited to, negative and unsustainable environmental impacts on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape • Heritage, biodiversity • and people's homes. 	<p>Noted. These are relevant considerations.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policy ENV9 and supporting text.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy is too caveated. Many of the reasons for rejecting renewable and low carbon energy sources should be removed with more support for such schemes even if they do have certain undesirable impacts. 	<p>Noted. The policy does need to strike the right balance between the various considerations.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policy ENV9 and supporting text.</p>

*These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Housing Response Paper

Policy SP11: Housing Growth (replaced by draft policy SP1: Meeting Housing Need)			
Aim of the Policy: To set a target for the delivery of new homes across the plan area over the plan period, in order to ensure that Craven’s housing stock grows in line with increases in the number of people and households in the area and to ensure that local housing requirements are met and the choice of housing in the local area is improved.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RSS figure of 250 dwellings per annum was an appropriate figure which derived from robust and credible evidence. Having regard to the NPPF the annual target should be higher than the RSS figure with an aim to boost the housing supply as opposed to setting targets which are significantly lower. 	The revised draft local plan is based on an updated SHMA (2015) and includes a housing figure of 256 dwellings per annum.	Yes	See new/revised policy SP1: Meeting Housing Need.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall the document is welcomed as very readable, clear and comprehensive. 	Noted.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 houses/year for Burton is a little excessive when compared to other communities (2/year being a more realistic target) I support the stated intent of small scale growth for Burton in Lonsdale over many years. 	In the revised plan, Burton is included in Tier 4a: Villages with Basic Services of the settlement hierarchy with a housing allocation equivalent to 3 dwellings per annum.	Yes	See new/revised policies SP1, SP4 and SP11.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that the ‘limit’ of 45 Houses (+10% windfall) over 15 years could be met if no development occurs for a decade and then suddenly a large developer builds bland urban housing despite Craven 	Noted. Policies in the revised plan will support the delivery of housing that is appropriate to the local context in terms of scale, character and appearance.	Yes	See new/revised policies ENV1 e), ENV3 and H1.

Council's best intent!			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One of the Skipton's unique points is its sudden contained appearance. This should not be lost by development. 	Noted. Policies in the revised plan will support the delivery of development that is appropriate to Skipton's character, appearance and setting.	Yes	See new/revised policies ENV1 and ENV3, in particular.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The figures relating to population projections and housing need do not match up. The data is not sufficient to allow a full understanding of the housing need. Further information is required on impact of existing services e.g., education, water supply etc. 	Data is available in the 2015 SHMA and this will be part of the evidence base supporting the revised plan. Further evidence and policy on service infrastructure has been developed, but this is likely to develop further as work on the draft local plan progresses.	Yes	See new/revised policies SP1, SP12 and INF1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on the phasing of sites should be provided. Suggestion to include clear colour coding to show which sites can be developed when, including sites with existing permission & sites under construction in first phase. It should be made clear that conversions of existing buildings to residential use will be included in the housing requirement. 	Noted. Work on these matters has progressed and has informed the revised plan.	Yes	See new/revised policy SP1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy should contain an allocation for Lothersdale or the supporting evidence to the plan should make clear why this is not considered appropriate, with a robust justification beyond reliance on an arbitrary threshold. 	Work on the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy, plus background work on SHLAA site assessments and sustainability appraisal, has progressed and has informed the revised plan.	Yes	See new/revised policy SP4, in particular.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy identifies a requirement figure of 5 dwellings per annum within Sutton in Craven. This figure is considered to be too low. 	In the revised plan, the figure remains at 5 to reflect Sutton's position in Tier 4a of the settlement hierarchy (Villages with Basic Services). See new/revised policy SP4.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the information provided by the Council, the requirements of the NPPF and advice contained within the NPPG it is 	The revised plan is based on an updated SHMA (2015) and now includes a housing figure of 256 dwellings per annum.	Yes	See new/revised policy SP1: Meeting Housing Need.

considered that the proposed housing requirement falls significantly short of the objectively assessed housing needs of the area. It is recommended that the Council plan for a housing requirement which not only meets its affordable housing requirement but also stimulates economic growth.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy states that windfall houses are in addition to the planned development for a settlement. Why can't they be included in the overall housing requirement? 	Basically, windfall is unpredictable and therefore unplanned. However, the approach to dealing with windfall has been refined in the revised plan.	Yes	See new/revised policy SP1d).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The allocation of houses could be spread a little wider so that even the smaller villages could have a few house built. eg 3-4 houses over the time period. Suggestion that 2 dwellings per year would be a more appropriate for Embsay as it is felt that there is not a need for 45 houses over the next 15 years but there may be a need for 30. Is there likely to be a new Housing Needs Survey in the near future? 	Noted. Smaller villages have been included in Tier 5 of the revised settlement hierarchy. Housing need is examined in the updated SHMA (2015), which forms part of the evidence base for the revised plan.	Yes	See new/revised policies SP1 and SP4.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield sites and small infill sites rather than greenfield sites should be the focus of new housing in Hellifield. 	Noted. Site assessments and sustainability appraisal will identify brownfield and infill sites that have advantages over greenfield sites.	Yes/No	Any changes will come naturally following SHLAA site assessments and sustainability appraisal.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include a footnote of the form: "Note that this figure of 160 new houses per annum is based on recent data and therefore represents a rebaselined value. All historic shortfall figures for the region are now considered to be irrelevant." 	The updated SHMA (2015) recommends a figure of 256 dwellings per annum, which is a "rebaselined" figure.	Yes	See new/revised policy SP1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The future requirement for Giggleswick should be increased, particularly in the 	In the revised plan, the figure for Giggleswick reflects its position in Tier 4b of the settlement	No	

context of the overall scale of housing delivery required across the entire District.	hierarchy. See new/revised policy SP4 and, for further context, SP1.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be no new developments in Rathmell, look for areas that can support families, offer amenities and employment. 	In the revised plan, Rathmell's growth would reflect its position in Tier 4a of the settlement hierarchy (Villages with Basic Services).	Yes	See new/revised policy SP4.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDC are encouraged to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Prepare an up-to-date evidence base which uses current evidence and complies with the requirements of both the NPPF and PPG; and (b) Revisit Policy SP11 to ensure that the housing requirement proposed will be effective at meeting housing needs. In this regard, it is our strong view that the CDLP housing requirement will need to significantly increased if it is to be found sound following examination. 	The revised plan is based on an updated SHMA (2015) and now includes a housing figure of 256 dwellings per annum.	Yes	See new/revised policy SP1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only relatively small scale housing developments should be permitted, as close to the centre of Settle as possible either on windfall or brown sites to preserve the character of the town and for ease of access for the increasing number of elderly residents envisaged. 	Noted. The revised plan will support these things, but greenfield development on the edge of the town is likely to be needed as well, in order to meet the objectively assessed need for housing and employment land.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an imbalance between the housing requirement proposed for Settle and Giggleswick, given the fact that the population of Settle is only 2.6 times that of Giggleswick. If both Settle and Giggleswick are considered together, a long term solution would be to develop an industrial estate adjacent to the Settle bypass, and encourage industry and 	Noted. These outline suggestions need to be – and are being – examined in more detail. Depending on the outcome, proposals would need to be introduced via the next draft of the local plan.	Yes/No	Any changes will need to follow site assessment (SHLAA) and sustainability appraisal processes.

<p>businesses to relocate there. As it would be more prominent, it may encourage fresh light industry to move into the area, providing much needed work opportunity for local people. The vacated land on Sowarth could then be used for new housing, which would be well placed for the amenities in the town centre. This would also help to relieve the already problematic congestion in the centre of Settle.</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of houses to be built should be 500 hundred a year and the amount of affordable houses on any one site should be a maximum of 25%. 	<p>The revised plan is based on an objectively assessed need for housing (including affordable housing) of 256 dwellings per annum, which is derived from an updated SHMA (2015).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policies SP1 and H2.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed growth, particularly housing and employment development, will support the sustainability of Ingleton as a service centre for the wider area. Ingleton and Kirkby Lonsdale will continue to perform complementary roles. The new homes and jobs provided will have benefits for the wider Upper Lune Valley and Western Dales area – which includes parts of the Craven LPA area, Lancaster District and parts of South Lakeland inside and outside the Yorkshire Dales National Park. 	<p>Noted. In the revised plan, Ingleton is included within Tier 3 of the settlement hierarchy and identified as a Local Service Centre.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policies SP4 and SP9.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sutton has provided over 320 new dwellings over past years, therefore it is questions whether there is an undersupply of housing in Sutton. 	<p>The updated SHMA (2015) examines housing need and recommends a “rebaselined” housing figure. Completions and planning permissions are taken into account in the revised plan.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policies SP1 and SP4.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should make it clear that the Mill development site in Cononley can be 	<p>The local plan is unlikely to impose any restriction on the timescale for developing the</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policies SP3, SP4 and SP11.</p>

<p>developed to the full 45 capacity over a shorter timescale (3 yrs ?) in order to encourage a developer to take it on. In Cononley, brownfield sites should be classed for priority as potential sites for development and type of housing should be indicated.</p>	<p>mill site. The deliverability of sites will be assessed in the SHLAA. This will include discussion with landowners and developers, and the development of brownfield sites will be encouraged and promoted. The revised plan indicates the appropriate housing mix for individual allocated sites.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If additional information in respect of development sites is provided (often only available at the planning application stage) Yorkshire Water?? will be able to better understand the potential impacts of development on infrastructure and, as a result, it may be necessary to coordinate the delivery of development with the timing for delivery of infrastructure improvements. We suggest that this should be included as a detailed development management policy. Statutory consultee has suggested a policy wording for the Council to consider. Many of the rural areas of the District will be supported by infrastructure which is proportionate to its rural location. Yorkshire Water would like to emphasise that disproportionate growth in any settlement, particularly smaller settlements, has the potential to place a strain on existing water and wastewater infrastructure. 	<p>Noted. The approach to water and waste water infrastructure has been refined for the revised plan. The revised spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy seeks to ensure that the scale of growth is appropriate to the location.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policies SP4, SP12, ENV8 and INF1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NYCC Health and Adult Services is currently planning on developing extra care housing in High Bentham and Ingleton. The site of the former Ingleton Middle School has 	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No</p>	

<p>been put forward to the CDC for consideration. This service notes that the site in High Bentham - HB011 - has been proposed for housing which is supported {as extra care is a housing model, carrying C3 planning class and providing at least 40% affordable units).</p>			
<p>• NYCC Children and Young People’s Service have stated that were the likely allocations identified in this consultation to go through in their respective areas, the following schools would likely to need additional accommodation, given NYCC current forecasts although some of them have some current capacity and we would need to reassess the position when the timing of any development is clearer: - Bradleys Both - Carleton Endowed - Embsay CE - Gargrave CP - Bentham - Ingleton - Settle CE - Glusbum CP - Cowling CP Some of these schools are on sites where further development may be difficult. The number of additional dwellings in Skipton town could potentially create a need for places equivalent to 2 x single form entry primary schools or 1 x 2-form entry primary school. Given that the proposed sites are scattered across the town in relatively small developments no one site would appear to create the opportunity to call for land or a contribution sufficient to allow the development of wholly new school provision so this would be challenging</p>	<p>Noted. These appear to be matters for further ongoing engagement and co-operation as the draft local plan and NYCC’s assessments progress. However, the approach to education infrastructure provision has been refined for the revised plan.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policies SP5, SP12 and INF1.</p>

<p>especially given the constraints on a number of existing school sites in Skipton town.</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft Local Plan proposes very low concentrations of development outside of the main market towns, which might impact negatively on the sustainability of communities. This is made in the context of NYCC having had to close a number of small primary schools in the rural parts of Craven in recent years due to reducing number of families with young children living in these areas. NYCC Children and Young People’s Service would expect developer contributions to assist in providing this essential additional infrastructure and would urge Craven District Council to work with us to develop a Section 106 or CIL charging policy for education contributions. 	<p>This comment needs to be read in context with the previous comment - see above. In the revised plan, housing provision includes a small sites allowance for smaller villages (Tier 5 of the settlement hierarchy).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policies SP1d), SP4, SP12 and INF1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is considered that housing requirement split of 50% in Skipton and 70% in South Sub Area are appropriate ‘splits’ given the scale of development proposed and the comparative scale and importance of Skipton and the South Sub-Area to the District as a whole. It is also recognised that these are ‘minimum’ figures. 	<p>Noted. A similar approach has been carried through into the revised plan.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policies SP1 and SP4.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Low Bentham attracts any more development (which it is believed that it should not be a focus of increased housing growth in the future), it should attract the requisite funding for the provision of 	<p>Noted. Bentham (High and Low) is identified as a Key Service Centre in Tier 2 of the revised settlement hierarchy and the general approach to infrastructure provision has been refined.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policies SP1, SP4, SP7, SP12 and INF1.</p>

genuine infrastructure.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broughton Hall Estate wishes to explore a small scale housing allocation in order to meet the Estate's and Parishes local needs. Such an allocation could provide for: affordable rented housing; housing to meet the needs of the ageing population within the parish; housing to meet the needs of the estate workers. 	<p>Noted. In the revised plan, there is no allocation proposed on the estate, but other draft policies may support a proposal, depending on its merits.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policies SP1d), SP4, H1, H2 and EC3.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is considered that the role of Bolton Abbey, as a service village, should be recognised in the Local Plan and new development should be directed to it accordingly in order to enhance the service offer of the village. 	<p>Noted. There are also other national park settlements that are slightly within the plan area, which the national park authority has designated as service villages (Long Preston, Langcliffe). It may be appropriate to identify these settlements on the policies map and to take account of the national park's designation in our own policies.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><i>[Show Bolton Abbey, Long Preston and Langcliffe as national park service villages on the policies map and recognise them within the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy.]</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selected 160 dwellings per annum housing requirement figure is an underestimate which will not meet the social and economic needs of the District across the plan period due to the need for a better balance between homes and jobs in Craven, it is not possible to meet the full quantum of affordable need as stated in the SHMA (2011) it is highly desirable that both market and affordable housing provision is enhanced; and the need to take into account up to date population and household population projections. There is a need for a more up to date and robust evidence base to calculate Craven's objectively assessed housing need. 	<p>The revised plan is now based on an objectively assessed need for housing (including affordable housing) of 256 dwellings per annum, which is derived from an updated SHMA (2015).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policy SP1.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The housing requirement should be significantly higher in order to meet objectively identified needs. 	<p>The revised plan is now based on an objectively assessed need for housing of 256 dwellings per annum, which is derived from an updated SHMA (2015).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policy SP1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is support for the identification of the South Sub Area as the Primary area for growth and the listed villages in the second tier of the settlement hierarchy as the secondary focus for growth in this sub area. 	<p>This approach has been carried through into the revised plan, but in a refined form.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policy SP4.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan period needs to be made clear as it is the basis for calculating the housing requirement and supply; paragraph 157 of the Framework suggests a 15-year plan period. 	<p>Work on the draft plan has progressed and the plan period can now be expressed more clearly.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policy SP1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determination of the objectively assessed need, should be undertaken with full regard to the duty to co-operate, as set out in section 110 of the Localism Act. The draft Local Plan does not make clear what co-operation has taken place nor the actions that resulted from it and, without such explanation, cannot be deemed to have met the legal requirements of the duty. It is recommended that the council makes explicit how it has worked to identify and resolve cross-boundary issues so that it can be determined whether or not the legal requirements of the duty to co-operate have been met. 	<p>Noted. This is an ongoing and incomplete process, which is helping us to make progress on the draft local plan. As work progresses, greater clarity and explanation will be possible, with a view to meeting the full demands and legal requirements of the duty before formal publication.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Ongoing and incomplete at this stage.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P.43 of the document mentions avoiding building on good agricultural land. However, the inset map for Settle shows 	<p>P.43 (policy SP9) refers to the plan area's best agricultural land (grade 3) not greenfield sites, which is a wider category. The policy seeks to</p>	<p>No</p>	

building plans for housing at SG025, SG027 and SG068, all of which are green field sites.	avoid grade 3 land wherever possible, but allows for exceptions to be made where justified. The policy and site selection are consistent.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The information on population projections appears to contain some contradictions. On P.45 it states that there will be a decrease in the population of those aged under 45, including children. If this is the case, why the plans for building so many new homes that are likely to be primarily aimed at this age group in the Settle area? 	This relates to the aim of maintaining balanced mixed communities, which are considered to be more sustainable. Providing a variety of homes, including homes that will enable people under 45 to move in or stay, is likely to help in achieving that aim. Otherwise, trends point towards a declining and aging population with negative social and economic implications.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There appears to be a lack of 'joined up thinking' re. population, housing needs and jobs. 	This has improved in the revised plan.	Yes	See new/revised policies SP1, SP2 and SP3.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A large part of the purpose of the plan revolves around providing affordable housing for local people and local job creation. However, this important aim could be completely negated if people are encouraged to commute from outside (as hinted at on P.58) or people are attracted to living in the town simply to commute and spend their money elsewhere. 	Cross-boundary commuting is part of the regional context, which the local plan needs to acknowledge and take into account. At the same time, the plan needs to coordinate the local provision of housing and employment, in the interests of achieving sustainable development. This aspect of the plan will be refined and improved as work progresses.	Yes	See new/revised policies SP1, SP2 and SP3.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are too many houses proposed for Settle, Giggleswick and Rathmell, which would destroy the character of these settlements and also place increase pressure on existing services e.g., GP Surgeries and schools. 	An important aim of the local plan is to meet the objectively assessed need for housing in ways that conserve the character of settlements and ensure the provision of essential supporting infrastructure. This is set out more clearly in the revised plan.	Yes	See new/revised policies SP1, SP4, SP6, SP11, SP12, ENV1, ENV2, ENV3 and INF1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The allocation of additional housing stock in Bentham (83 dwellings) and Cowling (100 dwellings) is illogical and requires 	In the revised plan, Bentham is identified as a Key Service Centre, in Tier 2 of the settlement hierarchy, and is allocated 26 dwellings per	Yes	See new/revised policies SP1, SP4, SP7 and SP11.

justification.	annum. Cowling is identified as a Village with Basic Services, in Tier 4a, and is allocated 2 dpa.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bradley has had a large number of houses currently on the market for a considerable amount of time. Considering what Bradley can offer in terms of services and amenities is there a demand for the number of houses proposed and for the category of residents envisaged? 	In the revised plan, Bradley is allocated 2 dwellings per annum, which reflects its designation as a Village with Basic Services, in Tier 4a of the settlement hierarchy.	Yes	See new/revised policies SP1, SP4 and SP11.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of 30 houses in Hellifield should be phased for the latter part of the plan period (nothing for the first 5 years of the local plan) to allow for the necessary integration. 	Noted. However, phasing of this type (which is not related to the timing of infrastructure delivery) is unlikely to be justifiable. The plan is required to provide an upfront supply of deliverable sites and to adopt a plan-monitor-manage approach to ensure delivery is achieved. Imposing a delay on delivery, of the type suggested, is likely to be considered inappropriate.	No	

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Housing Response Paper

Policy SP12: New Homes (replaced by draft policy H1: New Homes on Unallocated Sites)			
Aim of the Policy: To ensure that local housing requirements are met by the construction of new homes on sites identified on the local plan map and to set guidelines for additional housing growth on windfall sites.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be no limit on sustainable development. This is contrary to the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development. 	Agree (although sustainability is partly about operating within limits). The policy needs to provide a better interpretation of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.	Yes	See new/revised policy H1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any windfall allowance should be justified on the basis of evidence, in accordance with the NPPF (para. 48). 	Agree, but no windfall allowance is proposed in the policy. Windfall homes would be additional. The policy should be reviewed to see if this can be made clearer.	Yes	The revised policy now refers to allocated and unallocated sites. In addition, a new small sites allowance has been introduced in policy SP1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy should say more about housing needs and demands, and how they will be met and reconciled. There should be more detail on the required mix of housing – including size, type, cost and tenure – in different locations. This would produce a better strategy for meeting housing need in the area. Currently, it seems driven by targets rather than need. 	Agree. This should be resolved as work on the draft plan progresses. Updated evidence from the new SHMA, due in 2015, will be instrumental in this.	Yes	See new/revised policies SP1 and SP3.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More explanation and detail is needed. Considerations of location, number, design and green infrastructure are too vague. The term “windfall sites” needs to 	Agree. These are helpful suggestions that should be taken on board. As there may be some practical limits to the level of detail that may be gone into within a single policy, it may	Yes	See new/revised policies SP5 - 11 and H4.

<p>be explained. There should be more detail on density. There should be an appendix setting out detailed requirements for the development of local plan sites and an additional bullet point referring to that appendix. A list of local plan sites, with dwelling capacities, should be included in the policy. The policy should say which census figure is to be used.</p>	<p>be helpful to consider cross-referencing between policies, or the use of appendices, or the addition of SPDs.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The second bullet point (affordable housing) is unnecessary and contradicts Policy SP13. It should be deleted. 	<p>Agree. The wording of the policy needs to be reviewed and improved to ensure better coordination with policy SP13: Affordable Housing.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Bullet has been deleted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Plan should make provision for self-building, e.g. through the Right to Build scheme. 	<p>Agree. Self-building needs to be dealt with more directly within the local plan.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><i>[Require provision of self-build plots on suitable allocated sites and specify requirement in the site commentary.]</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification and assurances are needed regarding housing land supply, including: how sites already with/obtaining planning permission affect the housing requirement identified in the plan; and how windfall development may negate the need to release local plan sites. 	<p>Agree. This should be resolved as work on the draft plan progresses. Recent work on a new 5-year land supply report and housing trajectory, due out in 2015, will be helpful in resolving this issue.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policy SP1.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local plan/policy should refer to the emerging minerals and waste joint plan and policies relevant to Craven, including the need to consider mineral sterilisation. 	<p>Agree. This should be resolved as work progresses on both the emerging minerals and waste plan and draft local plan.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised Introduction, site assessments and sustainability appraisal.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local plan should clearly set out the factors employed in the site selection methodology and a sustainability appraisal should set out the 	<p>Agree. This should be resolved as work on the draft plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised site assessments and sustainability appraisal.</p>

<p>methodology results in full.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Code for Sustainable Homes level 5 or 6, or Passivhaus Standard should be used. Land should be made available for self-builders who usually build to higher standards. <p>(issue raised in relation to draft policy SP2)</p>	<p>The Local Plan will identify housing allocations in sustainable locations as locations for future housing development. These sites may be developed by self-builders or larger house builders. Where proposals are put forward for residential self-build, they would be assessed against the relevant policies in the plan, including SP2 and SP12 New Homes. Para 50 of the NPPF states that in order to deliver a wide choice of homes, Local Planning Authorities should plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic and market trends and the needs of different groups in the community including those wishing to build their own homes. Draft Policy SP12: New Homes could be amended to include this element of the community in bullet point 3.</p>	<p>Yes, a change is required to the Local Plan in terms of the strengthening of policy wording relating to those wishing to build their own homes.</p>	<p><i>[Require provision of self-build plots on suitable allocated sites and specify requirement in the site commentary.]</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of sites put forward for development by landowners has resulted in a virtual “shopping list” for potential developers, prompting numerous planning applications being submitted prior to the local plan being finalised. There is nothing in the draft plan to confirm whether these dwellings would be removed from the maximum numbers stated in the draft local plan. There is also no indication that other sites with planning permission (e.g., land off Back Lane), but not started, will be counted in the numbers recommended for each parish. The draft local plan should make it very clear what the situation is 	<p>Agree. This should be resolved as work on the draft plan progresses. Recent work on a new 5-year land supply report and housing trajectory, due out in 2015, will be helpful in resolving this issue.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policies SP1 and SP4.</p>

regarding pre local plan housing numbers.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy suggests parishes without housing allocations would be allowed windfall homes up to 0.5% a year, on average, to the number of existing homes in the parish. It is not clear whether this policy would be applicable to Lothersdale. The policy could contain a list of settlements, or reference to such a list in an appendix, for avoidance of doubt. 	Noted. (NB. Policy SP11 includes a list of settlements with housing allocations.)	Yes	See new/revised policy H1.

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Housing Response Paper

Policy SP13: Affordable Housing (replaced by draft policy H2: Affordable Housing)			
Aim of the Policy: To address the shortfall in affordable housing by requiring developers to provide affordable housing within residential developments, by using financial contributions from developers to improve and make more effective use of the existing housing stock and by enabling the development of rural exception sites.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council appears to have no commitment to fulfilling the housing requirement. A reassessment of their policy (based on the Harrogate model) is needed when in some cases the Bradford and Leeds system/policies are more appropriate. 	<p>Noted. The council will need to ensure that its policy is in line with the NPPF, planning practice guidance and local evidence of affordable housing need and development viability. The council already discusses and shares good practice with neighbouring authorities, with the housing team taking the lead.</p>	Yes	<p>The policy has been revised to reflect updated evidence from the 2015 SHMA and the housing team will be consulted.</p> <p><i>[Further revisions may be needed to reflect finalised viability evidence and any changes to the NPPF and practice guidance resulting from the government's current proposals.]</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More social housing needs to be built, especially for young people and families. Private landlords are asking too high rents, which means that Housing Benefits are going in the private landlords pockets. 	<p>This comment is noted and is in line with the aims of the policy.</p>	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of houses to be built should be 500 a year and the amount of affordable housing on a site should be a maximum of 25%. 	<p>Noted. The council will need to ensure that its policies are in line with the NPPF, planning practice guidance, the objectively assessed need for housing (OAN) and viability evidence.</p>	Yes	<p>The policy has been revised to reflect the 2015 SHMA and OAN.</p> <p><i>[Further revisions may be needed to reflect finalised viability evidence and any changes to the NPPF and practice guidance resulting from the government's current proposals.]</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The North Yorkshire SHMA is out of date. 	<p>This has been done. The revised draft plan will</p>	Yes	<p>The policy has been revised to</p>

<p>CDC should reassess affordable housing needs as part of a general update to the evidence base to ensure that the Local Plan is justified and effective.</p>	<p>be based on updated evidence from the 2015 SHMA.</p>		<p>reflect updated evidence from the 2015 SHMA.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The figure of 160 houses to be provided per year is less than the identified affordable housing requirement as evidenced in the 2011 SHMA. (HMRC). 	<p>Noted. However, it is not always required/ necessary/practicable for a total housing figure to equal or exceed an affordable housing figure. The situation is more complex and is explained in the policy's introductory text.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HMRC would support policies and site allocations to consider the needs of older people and those in rural communities. HMRC also note the identified housing requirements of young people and the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities in Craven. 	<p>This comment is noted and is in line with the aims of this and other draft local plan policies.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft Affordable Housing and Community Infrastructure Viability Study (Aug 2013) identified that an affordable housing target of 40% was viable, however it is considered that a target of 35% is more appropriate in order to provide flexibility, which is stated in the 2013 Peter Brett Associates report "Affordable Housing and Community Infrastructure Viability Study". Clarification is needed from CDC regarding the selection of a 40% target. 	<p>Noted. The study does indicate that 40% is a broadly viable and deliverable target, and the practical experience of developers, registered providers and the council, over several years, serves to reinforce this conclusion. Of course, a general target is sufficiently flexible to take account of particular circumstances, on a case-by-case basis. Whilst the policy's introductory text provides clarification on these points, it could be made clearer that viability evidence has yet to be finalised.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Footnotes in the policy's introductory text have been revised to make it clearer that viability evidence and related policy requirements have yet to be finalised.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The threshold for affordable housing should be raised to a minimum of 10 units. 	<p>Noted. Any threshold will need to take account of viability evidence as well as the NPPF, planning practice guidance and the objectively assessed need for housing.</p>	<p>Unclear at this stage</p>	<p><i>[Revisions may be needed to reflect finalised viability evidence and any changes to the NPPF and practice guidance resulting from the government's current proposals.]</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The second bullet point of the policy 	<p>This comment is unclear and the second bullet</p>	<p>No</p>	

should be deleted as para 174 of the NPPF makes clear that affordable housing standards should be set out within the plan and this cannot be variable outside the plan.	point doesn't appear to be relevant.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council should note guidance set out in the Government's "Assessment of Housing and Economic Development Needs". 	This has been followed in the 2015 SHMA and Employment Land Review (ELR).	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-building has been suggested as an alternative way of providing affordable housing. 	Noted. Self-building opportunities are helpful in providing additional housing options for people, but are unlikely to fall within the NPPF's definition of affordable housing.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More thought should be given on how to provide social and sustainable housing and a framework to ensure developers will meet people's needs i.e., young people and young families, provide appropriate housing and still make a profit. 	This has been done using updated evidence from the 2015 SHMA. Further work may be needed in response to finalised viability evidence and any changes to the NPPF and practice guidance resulting from the government's current proposals.	Yes	The policy has been revised to reflect updated evidence from the 2015 SHMA. <i>[Further revisions may be needed to reflect finalised viability evidence and any changes to the NPPF and practice guidance resulting from the government's current proposals.]</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Craven has a significant need for affordable housing, largely as a result of a mismatch between house prices and local income. 	This comment is noted and is in line with current evidence.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about the apparent anomaly between affordable housing demand and the provision of housing numbers proposed by the plan. 	Noted, but this isn't really an anomaly – it's more the result of a broader complexity and wider set of considerations, which are explained in the policy's introductory text.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed housing requirement of 160 dwellings per annum is not adequate as it does not deliver the number of new housing shown to be required by various models (Edge Analytics Report) and it will not deliver the required affordable 	Updated evidence from the 2015 SHMA and emerging ELR is also highlighting these issues. The council's OAN has been confirmed as being higher than the housing target proposed in the initial draft local plan.	Yes	The policy has been revised to reflect the 2015 SHMA and OAN.

housing. It will lead to negative job growth and will not address the problem of the ageing population.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council should consider larger exception sites in high demand areas in order to meet the identified need. 	Noted. However, the NPPF does define exception sites as being rural and small, so any sites that are clearly urban and large are unlikely to meet the definition.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a proposal to take a precise financial contribution in addition to units where the 40% contribution does not result in a whole number. Does CDC have the resources to deal with the likely volume of cases of viability challenge? It might be better to adopt the Harrogate Council approach to round up or down depending on whether the proportion is up to or over 0.5 of a unit. Standardising the process should mean that work can continue to be done “in house” rather by the District Valuer, which may result in protracted timescales, greater cost to the developer and a less satisfactory result for the Council. 	The requirements of the draft policy are supported by draft viability evidence and should therefore be broadly achievable. However, at the same time, there must be scope for viability testing of individual proposals to take account of the particular circumstances of a case. This is not viewed as a challenge, but as an essential and integral part of the process. It isn’t clear how rounding up to a whole number would have less impact on viability than a pro-rata contribution equivalent to a fraction of a whole number. The council’s viability appraisals aren’t done in-house, but by Harrogate’s valuer. Referral to the District Valuer is not routine and is only used as a final resort.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial contributions from small sites below the onsite policy threshold should be based on market value less transfer value multiplied by the number of homes and affordable percentage. 	The policy’s introductory text proposes this kind of calculation with further guidance to follow in an SPD. However, adding some further detail to the policy itself – on the lines suggested – would be helpful.	Yes	Further detail on the calculation of financial contributions has been added, as suggested. It appears as a footnote to the introductory text.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is concern that the overall housing target may be too low, but support for the 40% affordable housing target. This will not fully address housing need, but, subject to site specific financial viability, is a 	Noted.	No	

pragmatic and achievable target.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is some concern about the approach to exception sites as the proposed policy is likely to result in a large amount of work for the Council in dealing with viability. Increasing market housing to a point where affordable housing is viable would fuel land prices. The reality of this approach is that 100% affordable housing is financially viable on greenfield sites that only have agricultural value. 	The draft policy approach is in line with the NPPF and includes the necessary safeguards.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is confusion and inconsistency in the policy text around affordable housing tenure etc. 	Whilst this comment is not specific, a general check will be made for any possible confusion or inconsistency.	Unclear	The text around affordable housing tenure has been revised.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern was raised about the 40% requirement for affordable housing specifically relating to the Skipton South site, as this requirement, along with other site existing costs would make the site unviable. 	The requirements of the draft policy are supported by draft viability evidence and should therefore be broadly achievable. At the same time, individual proposals or sites may give rise to specific viability issues, which will be considered on a case-by-case basis.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy suggests parishes without housing allocations would be allowed windfall homes up to 0.5% a year, on average, to the number of existing homes in the parish. It is not clear whether this policy would be applicable to Lothersdale. The policy could contain a list of settlements, or reference to such a list in an appendix, for avoidance of doubt. 	This comment refers to draft policy SP12: New Homes. In that policy, a cross-reference to policy SP11, which includes a list of settlements with housing allocations, should help to clarify the matter.	No	<i>The comment has been transferred to the New Homes policy response paper.</i>

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Housing Response Paper

Policy SP14: Gypsies, Travellers & Showpeople NOTE: This policy is now referred to as Draft Policy H3: Gypsies, Travellers, Showmen and Roma.			
Aim of the Policy: The aim of this draft policy is to address the local housing requirements of the gypsy, traveller and showpeople community who live in or travel through the plan area. It aims to contribute to the overarching national aim of ensuring fair and equal treatment for travellers in a way that facilitates their traditional way of life, whilst respecting the interests of the settled community.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
The community prefer to be referred to as Gypsies, Travellers, Showmen & Roma.	Noted, however guidance “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites” published by DCLG in August 2015 provides definitions of “gypsies and travellers” and “travelling showpeople”. It is therefore considered that in order to conform to government guidance and to reflect this comment rising during consultation the community is referred to as Gypsies, Travellers, Showpeople and Roma.	Yes	The community will be referred to as Gypsies, Travellers, Showpeople & Roma.
Flood Risk on gypsy, traveller and show people sites. It is suggested that this policy could specifically state that sites within flood zone 3 would be not supported (EA comment).	Draft policy SP9 relates to Flood Risk, Water Resources and Land & Air Quality. The first part of this policy aims to ensure that any development takes place in areas of low flood risk wherever possible and always in areas with the lowest acceptable flood risk, which is in line with para 100 of the NPPF. Any future proposals for gypsy, travellers, showmen and roma sites would be assessed against policy SP14 and any other relevant policies, for example SP9 on Flood Risk. Draft policy SP14 does not set out specifically which type of development is appropriate/not appropriate	Yes	The bullet point relating to flood risk (renamed point h) has been amended to read “Occupiers of the site and their belongings are not exposed to unacceptable environmental conditions including flood risk”. Draft policy SP9: Flood Risk has been renamed ENV6: Flood Risk

	<p>within each flood zone, as this would be a repetition of national planning guidance. Draft policy SP14 states that extensions to existing sites or proposals for new sites may be provided where there is evidence of newly arising need and where ... “occupiers of the site and their belongings are not exposed to unacceptable flood risk.” It is considered that existing provisions set out in the NPPF relating to flood risk and draft policy SP9 provides an adequate detailed policy context relevant to proposals for gypsy, traveller , showmen and roma where there is flood risk.</p>		
<p>Use of planning conditions to maintain sites in a good state.</p>	<p>Draft policy SP14 sets out the requirements which are expected to be met when an extension or new site is proposed, including that the site is or can be connected to all necessary utilities and infrastructure. This would include access to waste disposal and toilet facilities. Appropriate and relevant planning conditions can be used when planning permission is granted. Requirements for the use of planning conditions do not have to be set out in strategic planning policy.</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>The evidence to this policy needs to be clearer. There is no indication what need exists or how it will be met and when.</p>	<p>The draft policy does state that “the housing requirements of G&T, Showmen & Roma will be met by maintaining an adequate supply of sites in line with current evidence of existing and future need”. The current evidence base relating to G&T, Showmen & Roma comprises the 2013 Traveller Housing Needs Survey & March 2015 Technical Note on G&T Household Formation and Growth Rates, and the 2008</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The revised draft policy H3 aims to meet the housing requirements of the G&T, Showmen & Roma community by maintaining an adequate supply of sites in line with current evidence of existing and future need. As there is no need for a public site, nor any evidence of deficiencies in service provision for</p>

	<p>G&T Accommodation Assessment. This evidence identifies an existing supply of privately owned sites in Craven, a possible future need for one privately owned pitch beyond 2015 and no requirement for a public site in Craven.</p>		<p>any of the Gypsy & Traveller families in Craven, it is considered that any future need can be dealt with via a criteria based policy. The supporting text to this policy has been amended to include reference to the current evidence base i.e., 2013 Traveller Housing Needs Survey & 2008 G&T Accommodation Assessment. A web link to this evidence has been inserted.</p>
--	---	--	--

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Economy Response Paper

Policy SP15: Business Growth (replaced by draft policy SP2: Economic Activity and Business Growth)			
Aim of the Policy: To support growth, diversification, productivity, jobs, higher wages and long-term stability in the local economy.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
Transport connectivity improvements (both public and private) could enhance economic links between Craven and opportunities and skills in Lancashire and Greater Manchester – i.e. through improvements to the A56, and through reinstatement of the former Colne to Skipton railway line.	Noted	Yes	See part d) of new/revised policy SP2: Economic Activity and Business Growth.
Support for sustainable growth of Broughton Hall Business Park. Clear support for the adoption of SP15 which supports the growth and diversification of the employment base in Craven to ensure that Broughton Hall Business Park remains competitive in the tough local and regional office markets.	Noted	Yes	Support is maintained in part a) of new/revised policy SP2: Economic Activity and Business Growth.
The language in the draft plan over emphasises economic growth and there is a danger of the plan area becoming too commercialised.	Noted	Yes	The revised plan leads with an expanded section on sustainable (economic, environmental and social) development.
The loss of employment generating sites (such as Glusburn Mill, Cononley Mill, Skipton South site being allocated as housing/mixed use) may outweigh the benefits of developing a brownfield site for	The value of sites to the local economy will be taken into account in both the allocations process and in policy governing windfall development.	Yes	The provision and safeguarding of employment sites is dealt with in new/revised policy SP2: Economic Activity and Business Growth.

housing. These sites should be treated as windfall sites and not included within the Plan.			
South Craven is identified as a major employment provider but there are no allocations in the South Craven settlements.	Allocations are proposed in Skipton, which is the principal settlement of the south sub-area. Allocations in other southern settlements are subject to final recommendations in the Employment Land Review Study.	Not known at this stage	<i>[Allocations in south sub-area to be finalised following final ELR recommendations]</i>
Need to adequately address the issue of the inevitable increase in traffic which will accompany new housing/employment development (i.e. junction at Cononley Lane End).	Noted	Yes	Infrastructure requirements (including road improvements) are dealt with in new/revised policy SP12: Infrastructure, Strategy and Development Delivery and in the commentary to site allocations (SP11).
The Settle area has plenty of provision for new residential/ housing with no serious provision for employment which will result in an increased burden on the A65 as residents commute out of the area to work. The plan needs to identify land for business premises where they will be able to establish their roots and have room to grow, separate from residential properties. Mixed use sites for 'new employment' are not adequate. B1 is not the solution.	Noted	Yes	See new/revised policy SP6: Strategy for Settle.
A large supply of skilled labour from outside Craven would be advantageous to businesses and employment prospects. However increasing this available pool of labour would be enhanced by better road and public transport links into the major employment centre of Skipton.	Noted	Yes	Support is maintained in part d) of new/revised policy SP2: Economic Activity and Business Growth.

Given the existing connectivity between the northern sub area and the eastern part of South Lakeland District (employment and retail in Kendal and Kirkby Lonsdale) and schools (Kirkby Lonsdale), then policy support in the emerging Craven Local Plan (SP15) for enhanced transport connectivity with South Lakeland (Cumbria) is welcomed.			
--	--	--	--

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Economy Response Paper

Policy SP16: New Land and Premises for Business (replaced by draft policy SP2: Economic Activity and Business Growth)			
Aim of the Policy: To enable businesses to grow and adapt by providing an improved choice of employment sites for business, industry, storage and distribution (Class 'B' uses) in sustainable locations.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
The Local Plan should include a reference to the emerging North Yorkshire County Council, City of York Council and North York Moors National Park Authority Minerals and Waste Joint Plan. It should also set out what policies that plan will determine that will then influence decision making in Craven, including the need to consider the impact of mineral sterilisation (NYCC Planning, Minerals and Waste).	Noted	Yes	See new/ revised Introduction. Also site assessments and sustainability appraisal.
The Local Plan should clearly set out what factors have been utilised in the site allocation selection methodology (for all allocations), to ensure that the significant legacy of past coal mining activity in Craven and the resulting potential for unstable land together with the issue of mineral sterilisation is properly considered in the site allocation process. (NYCC Planning, Minerals and Waste)	Noted. Whilst these factors are being taken into account in the allocations process, the methodology and its explanation will be improved and refined as work on the draft local plan progresses.	Yes	The site allocation selection methodology has been refined and made clearer.
With regards to the Skipton Rock Quarry site (identified for employment) it will be	Noted.	Yes	[This should be mentioned in the site commentary.]

important to ensure that development would not prevent minerals extraction in the future, and would safeguard coating plant infrastructure. (NYCC Planning, Minerals and Waste)			
Various objections to the allocation of 2ha of new employment land in the Settle south area (near A65) as this allocation is based on uncertain evidence. Such an allocation only benefit a small number of already successful businesses who would like to relocate near to the A65 but lack a business case for the necessary infrastructure investment. Concerns also expressed about the loss of the area as green space, the detrimental effect industrial development would have on the approach to Settle, the loss of grade 3 agricultural land, flooding issues, and effect on the vibrancy of the town centre should businesses move out to this site.	Noted.	Yes	<i>[Further work on feasibility, viability etc is needed plus further consultation.]</i>
Need to attract industries and employers who provide jobs for the people who live in Skipton or the South sub-area, not those coming in from outside of Craven.	Noted. This issue is being addressed by aligning the local plan strategies for housing and business growth, so that people are more able to live and work locally.	Yes	See new/revised policy SP2: Economic Activity and Business Growth.
The Local Plan should include an Appendix which sets out detailed considerations which would need to be taken into account in the development of employment sites.	Noted. This is likely to be done in a new/revised policy, rather than in an appendix.	Yes	See new/revised policy EC1: Employment and Economic Development.
Query as to any further development potential at Riparian Way Business Park.	The draft local plan will be guided by the final recommendations of the Employment Land Review Study.	No	
Query as to whether the redevelopment of Hayfield Mill, Glusburn reflects recent	The site has been submitted to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.	No	

conversations with Cirteq?			
Objection to further industrial development in Gargrave as the area is more suited to tourism.	Noted.	Yes	See new/revised policies SP2: Economic Activity and Business Growth, EC1: Employment and Economic Development and EC4: Tourism.
The Plan should include an Appendix which sets out the detailed considerations which would need to be taken into account in the development of all the sites that are allocated for business development. An additional Paragraph should be added to the end of Policy SP16 along the following lines:- “Site allocated in this Local Plan be required to accord with the development principles set out in Appendix x”	Noted. This is likely to be done in a new/revised policy, rather than in an appendix.	Yes	See the commentary to site allocations in SP5 to SP11 and policy EC1: Employment and Economic Development.

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Economy Response Paper

Policy SP17: Strategic Employment Site (replaced by draft policy SP2: Economic Activity and Business Growth)			
Aim of the Policy: To deliver a strategic employment site in the south of Skipton, which will realise growth potential and meet economic objectives in a sustainable, well-connected location.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
Opposing views of both support and objection expressed for the mixed use development at the Skipton South site, which will deliver B1, B2 and B8 uses, along with residential development. Need for this site to deliver new formal playing pitches (i.e. in north-eastern corner of site). Objections to supermarket on this site.	Noted	Yes	See new/revised policies SP2: Economic Activity and Business Growth and SP5: Strategy for Skipton.
English Heritage commented that an assessment is required of impact of the proposed Skipton South site on the adjoining Skipton Conservation Area.	Noted. This is being done as part of the new heritage study.	Yes	<i>[The revised local plan will be informed by the final recommendations of the heritage study.]</i>
Likely traffic flows between the A629 and the Skipton South site should be analysed, and the link road should be restricted to its primary purpose of routing HGVs. Concern about HGVs exiting site onto Carleton Road (one way system suggested onto bypass for HGVs).	Noted. This is being addressed by the new highways study.	Yes	<i>[The revised local plan will be informed by the final recommendations of the highways study.]</i>
Objection to further commercial and retail park ribbon development along the A629 between Snaygill roundabout and Skipton i.e. Guysons	Noted	Yes	See new/revised policy EC2: Safeguarding Existing Employment Areas.

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Economy Response Paper

Policy SP18: Rural Economy NOTE: This policy is now referred to as Draft Policy EC3: Rural Economy			
Aim of the Policy: To support Craven’s rural economy so that it may grow and diversify in a sustainable way to provide long term economic, environmental and social benefits for local communities.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to sustain/maintain rural farming practises in relation to biodiversity and adaption to climate change. 	<p>Bullet points 2, 3 & 4 aim to help rural businesses, including agricultural practices to succeed and to function efficiently.</p> <p>There are many opportunities that exist for rural farming practices to improve biodiversity and adapt to climate change, which falls outside the remit of the planning system.</p> <p>Where development is proposed to realise these opportunities the draft Local Plan aims to address this issue.</p> <p>Draft policy SP7: Biodiversity aims to grow and improve biodiversity where there is growth in housing, business and other land uses, including farming.</p> <p>Draft policy SP10: Renewable & Low Carbon relates to climate change and aims to increase the generation of renewable and low carbon energy and therefore reduce carbon emissions.</p> <p>This draft policy would be relevant to any proposals for development, including those associated with farming.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Bullet points 2, 3 & 4 renamed b), c) & d).</p> <p>Draft Policy SP7: Biodiversity renamed ENV4</p> <p>Draft Policy SP10: Renewable & Low Carbon renamed ENV9.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need good communication links for rural businesses (broadband) 	<p>Craven District Council is a partner of the Superfast North Yorkshire project. The project aims to rollout high quality broadband to 100% of the districts businesses and residents by 2017.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The supporting text to the policy has been amended to include reference to the Superfast North Yorkshire Broadband Project and its aim to roll out high quality broadband to 100% of Craven's businesses and residents by 2017.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This draft policy should include reference to the need to protect natural and historic assets of Craven when redeveloping rural farm buildings 	<p>The draft Local Plan includes policies relating to countryside & landscape and heritage, which may be relevant to proposals for redeveloping farm buildings. Where this is the case any proposal would be required to accord with these and other relevant policies.</p> <p>The last bullet point of draft policy SP18 does make reference to preservation of the character of the countryside and landscape.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Renamed draft Local Plan Policy EC3: Rural Economy has been amended to say that the proposals of the type described at points a) to f) will be supported provide they accord with all relevant local plan policies and any relevant neighbourhood plan policies, and will help to achieve plan led sustainable development. Existing draft policies relating to countryside & landscape and heritage may be relevant to any proposals.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to remove B1 live work conditions on live work units and have a quicker process for their removal where no design changes are proposed, which currently requires submission of a planning application. 	<p>Where applications have been submitted to CDC to remove historic live/work conditions, they have been refused. This decision has been upheld by Inspectors. The removal of such conditions will continue to require a planning application to be submitted and considered in the usual way.</p> <p>Recent changes to permitted development rights for agricultural buildings now allow up to 450m² of agricultural buildings to be converted to residential use, with a total number of 3 homes that can be developed under this right. Where proposals come forward in excess of</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Draft Policy EC3: Rural Economy states at point e), that proposals will be supported for the conversion of barns for residential and/or employment uses within sustainable rural locations, providing opportunities for people to live and work locally.</p> <p>Point f) also aims to protect existing live/work units due to the valuable contribution they make to the rural economy.</p>

	this threshold CDC will not attach a live/work condition to any approval.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft plan makes no mention of promoting diversification of the rural economy and enhancement of tourism opportunities in Clapham-cum-Newby and Forest of Bowland/ Gisburn Forest specifically. 	<p>The aim of draft Policy SP18 is to support the rural economy so it may grow in a sustainable way.</p> <p>Clapham is not identified in draft policy SP1 Spatial Strategy and Sub Area Growth.</p> <p>Neither of these policies specifically refers to Clapham and Forest of Bowland/ Gisburn Forest specifically and opportunities for recreation related facilities including additional footpaths & bridleways, however any proposals that come forward in this location would be assessed against these and other relevant draft policies.</p>	No	Draft policy SP1: Spatial Strategy and Sub Area Growth renamed SP4: Spatial Strategy & Housing Growth.

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Economy Response Paper

Policy SP 19 Tourism (replaced by draft policy EC4: Tourism)			
Aim of the Policy: To encourage tourism to grow in a sustainable way, so that it helps to improve the economy, environment and quality of life.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [Ideas relating to change] Changes to other policies required
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan should not encourage tourism which is extensive, brash, pollutant and maximises only gain as this type of tourism would destroy valuable assets e.g., tranquil settings, wildlife and existing small scale tourist activities. Additional bullet point suggested as follows: <i>“Ensuring that proposals for development – of the types described and supported in principle above – will succeed in preserving the character of the countryside and landscape, safeguarding the natural, built and historic environment, and in achieving sustainable development overall.”</i> 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The explanation to the draft policy states <i>“This plan’s general support for sustainable growth in tourism does not mean support for any and all tourism-related development proposals that may come forward. Individual proposals will need to accord with other relevant policies of the plan, promote relevant plan objectives and achieve sustainable development.”</i> The key aim of the policy is sustainable growth in tourism, which helps improve the economy, environment and quality of life.</p>	Yes	A bullet point has been added, as suggested.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable tourism should be supported by visitor friendly fees i.e., car parking, accessible pedestrian routes and regular transport services providing good access for residents and visitors, including better transport links across Pennines to Lancashire/northern Manchester 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The issue of fees falls outside the remit of the planning system.</p>	No	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cultural tourism needs to be more than just acknowledged as an activity. It should be recognised and actively promoted (in line with current Arts Council priorities). Ensure new developments are sympathetic to cultural tourism, in particular ensuring spaces are created that will enable larger numbers of people to gather for arts and cultural events. 	<p>The vision for the north area (p.19) includes a new park, in Bentham, to provide recreation and social opportunities for residents and visitors. This could be expanded to include arts and cultural events for larger numbers of people. The best opportunity to create such a park may be in the proposed allocation of site HB028 (High Bentham inset map, p.75), which includes the provision of strategic open space.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised north area vision, which promotes cultural tourism in the development of a new park. <i>[This could also be reflected in the commentary for site HB028.]</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference should be made to land at Hellifield (Tourism Development Opportunity Site) being available for tourism uses. The site is ready, available and deliverable and should be taken forward as an allocation in the new local plan. If not the plan would be unsound. 	<p>Given the extant planning permission for the site and continued interest in developing the site for tourism uses, it may be appropriate to designate the land as a committed tourist development opportunity site. Such a designation would need to take full account of commitments already made in the approved proposals and planning permission.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>A new designation of “committed tourist development opportunity site” has been created and the policy has been revised to encourage tourist development at other “key locations” around existing railway stations at Skipton, Bentham, Hellifield, Bolton Abbey and Embsay.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for development of Bentham as a visitor gateway of the Forest of Bowland AONB, linked to the Way of the Roses. 	<p>This could be addressed in the vision and strategy for Bentham and in identifying the area around Bentham railway station as a key location for tourist development (see above).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>“Gateway” aspirations have been included in the vision for Bentham. Bentham station area has been identified as a key location for tourist development.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tourism in Settle is detracted by HGVs travelling through the town. Relocating business premises to an out of town location (such as proposed Settle bypass site) would improve this situation and benefit tourism in the town centre. 	<p>The revised draft plan is likely to include an employment allocation for land in the vicinity of Settle bypass. However, this is likely to be for a number of reasons. Much traffic to the town’s existing industrial estates doesn’t need to pass through the town centre at the moment (although it may pass through other areas of the town) and the proposal is unlikely to reduce quarry traffic, which would continue to pass through the town centre in order to access quarries in Ribblesdale.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><i>The revised consultation draft includes an employment allocation option for land in the vicinity of Settle bypass. However, this has been done for a number of reasons.</i></p>

	A current Rail not Road campaign, led by Friends of Upper Ribblesdale, advocates the movement of aggregate by train rather than HGV or, where transport by HGV is unavoidable, for a route to be used that has the least impact on local residents, local businesses and the local economy.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan should include examples of South Craven tourism opportunities e.g., moors, local walks, canal & river fishing, historic buildings, village trails and local pubs. 	Noted. However, the local plan has a specific purpose and the council provides promotional material for local tourism in other ways. The policy does not, therefore, attempt to promote the many facilities and activities available to visitors throughout Craven. However, the policy does encourage and support sustainable tourist development generally and identifies “key locations” that may offer the greatest opportunities for significant contributions towards sustainable tourism.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Skipton would benefit from an increase in safe, cycling friendly routes by adaptation of available roads and lanes and better signing on highways both in and out of the town. The development of a closed road circuit in Skipton would enhance the sporting aspect of cycling locally. 	Noted. SEE GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY REPOSE PAPER RE TEMP SPORTING EVENTS Fourth bullet point acknowledges sporting activities as a type of tourism activity that people choose to engage in. The Local Plan can encourage cycling routes to be incorporated in new development proposals on strategic sites in order to improve connectivity.	Yes	<i>[Following an update to the Assessment of Playing Pitches, Built Facilities and Open Space (see comment above) the next draft of the local plan will set out a new policy regarding sport and recreation which could be supportive of temporary sporting events that encourage tourism in the plan area.]</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aireville Park and its master plan needs to be included in the local plan. 	Noted. As noted, there is currently no mention of Aireville Park in the plan. As the plan area’s main public park, Aireville Park could be mentioned in supporting text to SP8, and	Yes	Aireville Park is referred to in the supporting text of draft policy ENV5: Green Infrastructure, both as a visitor destination and as an important green infrastructure

	possibly the Context section of the plan, in its capacity both as an important visitor destination and an important multifunctional green infrastructure hub. Aireville Park will be embedded within the strategy for the overall growth for Skipton and the green infrastructure network.		corridor through Skipton. Aireville Park features on the local green space map.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The canal towpath should be upgraded throughout the district. 	Upgrading of the towpath between Bradley and Skipton is scheduled for autumn/winter 2015. Such works are independent of the local plan and are being led by the council's economic development team. In general, the local plan aims to protect, enhance and promote the use of the canal. This approach will be refined as work progresses. Towpath improvements may be eligible for funding through any Community Infrastructure Levy adopted by the council.	Yes	The local plan's approach to the canal has been refined. In the tourism policy, the canal has been included in references to footpaths and cyclepaths, and canal areas in Gargrave and Skipton have been included in the list of "key locations".
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy should include the following suggested text: <i>"Delivering sensitive mixed use development at Bolton Abbey, including new tourism and leisure facilities on the allocated village centre site, through a Masterplan process, which supports the village's complimentary role as a tourism destination and service village."</i> 	The 7 th bullet point of the policy identifies key locations, including Bolton Abbey village area, which may be particularly suitable for tourism development and may offer opportunities for co-location with other businesses.	Yes	Bolton Abbey has been identified as a "key location" in the tourism policy and is included in Tier 4b of the settlement hierarchy (policy SP4).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Broughton Hall Estate welcomes the reference to Broughton in the context of Tourism. The Estate has a significant role in drawing in visitors (as day visitors and stay visitors) to Craven and its importance must be noted in the context of the future potential; Broughton also play a 	Noted. Broughton Hall Estate is referred to in the context section, in connection with tourism in the south sub-area, but this isn't followed through into the tourism policy. The estate does appear to be the kind of place where the "synergies of co-location" could arise and could	Yes	Broughton Hall Estate has been included as a "key location" in the tourism policy and Broughton Hall Business Park is referred to specifically in policy SP2: Economic Activity and Business Growth.

<p>significant role in raising the regional and national profile of Craven in the extensive filming (advertisements, mainstream films) that takes place across the estate and as a consequence of the success of the Business Park. The early Local Plan reference to Broughton and tourism is not followed through in subsequent policy concerning the Estate (SP15) or at Section 6, Economy and the Tourism policy. Recommendation: it is recommended that SP15 broadens its reference to also include the sustainable growth of the existing tourism offer at the Broughton Hall Estate. [NB. This comment was transferred from the Context response paper.]</p>	<p>be regarded as a “key location” in the policy.</p>		
--	---	--	--

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Economy Response Paper

Policy SP20: Retail and Town Centres (replaced by draft policies EC5: Town, District and Local Centres; EC5A: Residential Use in Town and Village Centres)			
Aim of the Policy: To ensure that retail development enhances consumer choice, vitality, viability and the character of centres within the hierarchy; to control frontages and advertising; to support small-scale retail development in villages; to support the development of other town centre uses and further education; to maintain ground-floor retail uses in the primary shopping frontages; and to enhance access, circulation and public open space.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empty properties need to be considered for renovation/occupation before new builds. 	<p>The draft retail and town centres policy needs to provide positive support to proposals for sustainable development, which may be proposals for renovation or new-build. This is clear from the presumption in favour of sustainable development and related national policy in the NPPF. However, support for the renovation/occupation of empty properties is absent in the first draft and should be included.</p>	Yes	See new/revised policies EC5 and EC5A.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various suggestions for alteration to town centre map boundaries, i.e. boundary changes suggested to the Main Shopping Area map for Skipton to include various shops on the south side of Newmarket Street and 'The Mill Shop' in the car park. Also query as to whether town centre maps are needed for Glusburn/Cross Hills. 	<p>Noted. Draft town-centre maps need to be reviewed and will improve as work on the draft local plan progresses. These are helpful suggestions, which will be taken into account.</p>	Yes	See new/revised town centre maps.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to attract, support and retain independent shops as opposed to national chain shops. 	<p>The draft retail and town centres policy needs to support consumer choice, vitality, viability, the distinct character of centres and proposals for sustainable development. This is likely to</p>	No	

	involve both independent and national chain shops. Ultimately, planning controls the use not the user, so a policy opposing national chains would be unfeasible as well as unsustainable.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan needs to avoid any substantial out of town retail developments which could weaken the position of the High Street. Need to strengthen the emphasis on the protection of the core retail area. 	Agree. The draft policy needs to include more on the sequential test for town centre uses outside existing centres (see NPPF). A new retail study will be available soon and will help us to review and improve the draft policy.	Yes	See new/revised policies EC5 and EC5A.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retail offer in town/village centres should match housing growth. 	Agree. This broad principle is reflected in the spatial strategy. Opportunities to increase retail offers may be identified in the new retail study.	Yes	See new/revised policies EC5 and EC5A.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for SP20 in that it seeks development that will not harm the cultural functions of town centres, as these facilities are essential for the health and well-being of a sustainable community. 	Noted	No	<i>[Maintain support for the cultural functions of town centres.]</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to High Bentham markets is inaccurate. The monthly farmers market no longer occurs and the weekly market consists of two stalls and are therefore not important elements of the town's continued vitality. 	Noted	Yes	See new/revised policies EC5 and EC5A.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large scale housing development planned for Cross Hills should be backed up by adequate provision for retail and parking. 	Noted. The draft policy seeks to support enhanced retailing and parking in Cross Hills and other centres. Specific opportunities may be identified in the new retail study.	Yes	See new/revised policies EC5 and EC5A.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When planning for growth near Skipton Station and around the Skipton South site (west of bypass), need to consider adequate transport improvements 	Noted. These growth proposals will be refined and improved as work on the draft local plan progresses.	Yes	See new/revised policies EC5 and EC5A.

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Infrastructure, Services & Facilities Response Paper

Policy SP21: Sustainable Buildings, Infrastructure and Planning Obligations (replaced by draft policies ENV3, SP12 and INF1)			
Aim of the Policy: The aim of the policy is two-fold. Firstly it aims to ensure that buildings are developed in the most sustainable way; and secondly it aims to secure planning contributions for associated infrastructure and coordinate with the delivery of development.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
Substantial concern from various individuals/groups/organisations that housing growth will not be matched by appropriate level of infrastructure investment (i.e. schools, road improvements to support industry and residents, health services, telecommunications, additional and adequate levels of car parking, adequate public transport including rail improvements). Delivery of development should be coordinated with timing for the delivery of appropriate infrastructure improvements.	<p>Policy could be amended to provide greater reassurance that the infrastructure needed to deliver the plan will be provided in a timely manner, to coordinate with the phasing of development. This approach could be backed up with the production of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and (if adopted by the Council) a CIL charging schedule.</p> <p>Some investment could be related to individual sites, whereas the Infrastructure Delivery Plan could deal with infrastructure related to more strategic growth (i.e. schools).</p>	Yes	<p>The proposed policy approach to sustainable buildings, infrastructure and planning obligations has been reworked and draft policy SP21 has been superseded by a revised policy on good design (ENV3), a revised strategy section (including SP12) and a new draft policy on planning obligations (INF1).</p> <p>The reworked approach demonstrates how appropriate levels of infrastructure will follow development and how infrastructure needed to deliver the plan will be provided.</p> <p>This will be backed up with an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and CIL charging schedule (if taken forward)</p>
If strategic sites are within fragmented ownership, prior to publication of local plan, need to establish, via a legal agreement, how the landowners intend to work together to ensure the coordinated delivery of	If a site is still within fragmented ownership at the time of its development, the Council would need to see evidence of agreement of a joined up approach to the delivery of infrastructure prior to the granting of planning permission i.e.	To be determined	<i>[Prior to publication of the local plan, ensure that development principles for strategic site allocations include the delivery of any necessary sustainable infrastructure. This</i>

sustainable infrastructure. (United Utilities comment)	as part of the developers' proposals. Land values would be equalised between land owners. On more strategic allocated sites, the development principles for the site would outline requirements for the necessary infrastructure. The likelihood of a site being in joint ownership at this stage however is quite low.		<i>could also be set out in relevant policies in the revised strategy section.]</i>
The Plan should not include a policy requiring higher levels of energy efficiency from dwellings. The cumulative impact of such policies combined with requirements for other contributions are likely to threaten the viability of development within the area. Reference to additional energy efficiency requirements above those specified in Building Regulations should be deleted.	Plan should be in line with current Building Regulations which require a specific level of energy efficiency from developments. A requirement for efficiency measures in excess of Building Regulations requires justification and supporting evidence, including evidence that requirements will not undermine the viability of development.	Yes	The revised policy on good design (ENV3) is in line with energy efficiency measures required by current Building Regulations.
Need a slow release of land for development to meet future housing needs. It is essential that any Section 106 managed cash bonus received is to benefit the area's infrastructure and not just lost in the CDC cutbacks ether.	Phased housing delivery, especially on bigger sites will ensure that a more coordinated approach can be taken between delivering housing and providing the necessary infrastructure to support it.	Yes	The phasing and delivery of housing and infrastructure is covered in the revised strategy section of the local plan.
Infrastructure improvements via Planning Obligations is insufficient if not supported by an effective enforcement structure.	Noted. The Council has an enforcement structure in place to ensure planning obligations are monitored and achieved.	No	
Need good communication links for rural businesses (broadband)	Noted. Craven District Council is a partner of the Superfast North Yorkshire project. The project aims to rollout high quality broadband to 100% of the districts businesses and residents by 2017.	No	

*These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Infrastructure, Services & Facilities Response Paper

Policy SP22: Community Buildings & Social Spaces			
NOTE: This policy is now referred to as Draft Policy INF2: Community Facilities and Social Spaces			
Aim of the Policy: To promote the continuation and improvement of village services and facilities, such as shops, pubs, sports facilities, community buildings, meeting places and places of worship by safeguarding existing services and facilities, securing the provision of new and better services and ensuring that they can modernise and grow in a sustainable way.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The term “community facilities” should be used instead of “Community Buildings and Social Spaces” as this term is all encompassing and ensures that valued services and facilities are covered and therefore protected. 	<p>Noted. The policy intention is to be comprehensive in valuing facilities with specific functions and place more general emphasis on the promotion of opportunities for social and community interaction. This is in recognition of the growing wellbeing issue of loneliness amongst increasing numbers of older people living alone. The draft policy will be amended to include the term ‘Community Facilities and Social Spaces’.</p>	Yes	<p>The term “Community Buildings and Social Spaces” has been changed to ‘Community Facilities’. This term also includes social spaces.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community facilities may be unviable in developer terms; however they are valued community facilities run for the benefit and wellbeing of the local community and should therefore be protected. 	<p>The aim of this draft policy is to maintain, improve and safeguard existing services and facilities.</p>	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sport England will challenge the soundness of the Local Plan if it is not justified by and up to date playing pitch 	<p>Noted. Craven District Council has commissioned consultants, Strategic Leisure to prepare an assessment of built sports facilities,</p>	Yes	<p>Draft policy INF3: Sport, Open Space and Recreation Facilities has been drafted and sets out the Council’s</p>

<p>strategy (within 3 years) and an up to date built sports facilities strategy (within 5 years)</p>	<p>pitches and open spaces. Once completed this work will form a key piece of evidence used to draft a policy on Sport, Open Space and Recreation Facilities.</p>		<p>policy approach to protecting existing facilities, the creation of new ones and the improvement of existing facilities. This policy reflects the site specific actions and general standards set out in the assessment of built sports facilities, pitches and open spaces 2016.</p>
--	---	--	---

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Local Plan Map (Section 8) Response Paper

Section 8: Local Plan Map			
Aim of the Local Plan Map: To present relevant designations, allocations and policies on a map of the entire plan area and on inset maps where necessary.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clapham does not have a Settlement map in the proposed Local Plan. Clapham is not mentioned in any of the documents that have led to formation of the Plan and Clapham hasn't been involved in a public consultation. Why has Clapham been overlooked? 	<p>The draft Inset Maps show proposed sites for housing and/or employment (refer to page 74 of the draft local plan), but as there are no proposed housing/employment sites in Clapham, no inset map has been produced for the village. However, Clapham is mentioned several times in the plan text.</p>	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England note that many of the allocations presented lie within proximity of sites and areas designated for nature conservation importance and landscapes including internationally protected Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Areas (SPA) and Ramsar, nationally protected sites of special scientific interest (SSSIs), the Yorkshire Dales National Park and the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). In addition to local designations. We advise that potential impacts from allocations on sites protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 will need to be assessed in a Habitats Regulations Assessment. Furthermore impacts on, but not limited to, SSSIs, nationally protected landscapes and local designations will need to be assessed in 	<p>Noted. These points will be addressed as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	Yes	<p>New site assessments and Sustainability Appraisal are being carried out – see Pool of Site Options consultation document and SA of Spatial Options, Pool of Site Options and draft policies.</p>

the Sustainability Appraisal.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Coal Authority supports the intention expressed on page 73 that relevant designations/constraints are to be illustrated on the Local Plan Map. It is useful for plan users to understand the broad spatial extent of such designations/constraints. The Coal Authority would suggest that you may want to consider illustrating the “Development High Risk Area” which we define for coal mining legacy will be included on the Local Plan Map. This is the GIS layer that we provided to your Development Management team, in order that they can identify instances where submission of a Coal Mining Risk Assessment would be necessary to support a development proposal. 	<p>Noted. Consideration will be given to adding this designation/constraint to the local plan map. More sophisticated mapping techniques will be required as work on the draft local plan progresses. The use of interactive PDF layers in the final iteration of the map may enable this kind of detail to be added.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><i>[Include Coal Authority’s Development High Risk Area in the final version of the local plan map, ideally as a PDF layer]</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The precise intent of the hatched area sites in the document is not immediately apparent i.e. is it hatched to show that the ‘target’ can be met without filling the whole site over 15 years or is it that part of the site is unsuitable? In this context the development density stated appears to refer to the whole site. These issues need clarification –they apply generically to the whole document. Could the areas considered for development within the individual sites be stated at this stage? 	<p>Noted. These aspects (site size, developable area, density, development principles) will improve as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See revised approach in the Pool of Site Options consultation document.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An enlargement of Inset Map Section 8: Local Plan Map would be helpful. Individual streets cannot be identified, which defeats the object. 	<p>Noted. More sophisticated mapping techniques will be required as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><i>[Use better, larger, clearer base maps for the final version of the local plan inset maps]</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of several of the sites identified in Section 8 could, potentially, result in harm to elements which 	<p>Noted. These points will be addressed as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See revised/new policies SP5 to SP11, which will include a set of development principles for each site,</p>

<p>contribute to the significance of Craven’s designated heritage assets. It also seems quite likely that several would also harm other elements which contribute towards Craven’s “high quality landscape and treasured environmental assets”.</p> <p>Because of the sensitive nature of some of these locations, it is not sufficient to rely on the very general Policies of this Plan as the basis for ensuring that the development of these areas is delivered in a way which will safeguard the area’s natural and historic environment. In order to assist those preparing detailed schemes for these allocations and to help ensure that the sites are developed in a sustainable manner, the Plan needs to set out the key considerations that need to be taken into consideration in the development of each of these areas. This could, for example, be included within an Appendix. However, if such an approach is used, the need for development proposals to have regard to the contents of the Appendix would have to be referred to as one of the Criteria of the relevant Local Plan Policy. Such an approach has been used in a number of other Local Plans and helps to provide certainty to both potential developers and local communities about precisely what will, and will not, be permitted on these sites. (English Heritage comment)</p>			<p>and the revised approach in the Pool of Site Options consultation document.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation Areas: A number of the areas being considered as potential allocations would result in the loss of currently-open areas either within or adjacent to one of the District’s 	<p>Noted. Conservation area appraisals and assessment of potential impacts are being carried out by specialist consultants in consultation with Historic England.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><i>[Ensure conservation area appraisals and impact assessments inform final site selections and development principles.]</i></p>

<p>Conservation Areas. As you will be aware, the Council has a statutory duty under the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 to pay “special attention” to “the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance” of its Conservation Areas. However, there appears to be no evidence of any assessment having been undertaken of the potential impact which the loss of these undeveloped areas and their subsequent development might have upon the character of the respective Conservation Area. In order to demonstrate that the allocation of these site is not incompatible with, either, the statutory duty placed upon the Council under the provisions of the 1990 Act or, indeed, the Plan’s own policies for the conservation of the historic environment, there needs to be an evaluation of what contribution these currently-undeveloped sites make to the significance of the Conservation Area, and what effect their eventual development might have upon that significance. We would also strongly recommend that Conservation Area Appraisals are produced for all the settlements where sites are being proposed as Allocations. This will:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Identify which buildings and spaces make a positive contribution to the character of the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and, therefore, should be retained in the development of a particular allocation.			
--	--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Assist the Council in determining the most appropriate form of development for each particular site. ○ Help to provide the necessary evidence the Council will need to justify the allocation of these areas. ○ For those Conservation Areas where a significant number of sites are being proposed (such as Cowling, for example) there would also need to be an evaluation of the cumulative impact which the development of all the sites suggested would have upon its character and appearance. (English Heritage comment) 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Listed Buildings: There are a number of sites which, if developed, would result in the loss of currently undeveloped land in the vicinity of a Listed Building. As you will be aware, there is a requirement in the 1990 Act that “special regard” should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. However, there appears to be no evidence of any assessment having been undertaken of the potential impact which the loss of these sites and their subsequent development might have upon the significance of the respective Listed Building. In order to demonstrate that the allocation of these sites is not incompatible with, either, the statutory duty placed upon the Council under the provisions of the 1990 Act or the Plan’s own policies for the conservation of the historic environment, there needs to be 	<p>Noted. Assessments of potential impacts on listed buildings and settings are being or will be carried out (some as part of the conservation area work referred to above).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><i>[Ensure listed building assessments inform final site selections and development principles.]</i></p>

<p>an evaluation of what contribution these currently undeveloped sites make to the significance of the Listed Buildings, and what effect their eventual development might have upon that significance. (English Heritage comment)</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be helpful if people could better understand how Craven geographically relates to the major cities and towns nearby. Therefore on several maps I would suggest adding the location of Leeds Bradford, Harrogate, York, Preston, Liverpool, Manchester and various towns in East Lancashire. One good map showing Craven relative to all other major towns and cities within 50 miles would be a major improvement to this draft plan. 	<p>Noted. More sophisticated context maps and diagrams will be required as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><i>[Include wider context maps (e.g. with a 50 mile radius) in the final version of the local plan.]</i></p>

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Bradley Response Paper to 1st Draft Local Plan 2014

Site BROO6 (Site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Main issues from consultation *	Response (agree, disagree, noted)	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific area of development should be defined i.e., northern part of site as the southern part is prone to flooding. Opportunity exists on southern part of site for a pedestrian/green area/public garden or picnic site in order to retain open entrance to the village. 	<p>Agree.</p> <p>Development principles for each preferred site will be prepared, setting out such details. Bradley Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Document Nov 2014 identifies parts of preferred sites BROO6 & BR007 that are considered suitable for new housing development.</p>	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of this site would have adverse impact on existing surrounding residents in terms of overlooking, loss of privacy, light, views and would have a negative effect on the value of existing houses. It would cause an increase in noise and light pollution and disturb the existing wildlife corridor and extensive landscapes. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Development principles for each preferred site will be prepared, which will consider layout in general terms. Details of layout in respect of overlooking etc would be considered at the planning application stage, where proposals will be assessed to ensure that they would not have a negative effect on existing residents.</p>	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site should not be developed. Sites BA001, BA002 & BA012 are better alternatives as they would provide access to Skipton without increasing traffic on Ings Lane and a children's play area. • Other preferable sites include BA014, BR015, BR016 & BR010. • Site other side of canal bridge preferred, 	<p>Noted.</p>	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

however no landowner details provided (is not a SHLAA site)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infill development is preferred on smaller sites which would limit environmental and visual impact. 	Noted. Bradley Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Document Nov 2014 states that new housing should comprise a number of smaller developments rather than all on one site.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of this site would result in loss of existing open views to the Mill on entrance to the village and erode impact of Cross Lane Mill. 	Noted.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal for 13 houses is too many for this site. 	Noted. CDC is currently looking at calculating revised densities on sites. This will be informed by preparing evidence on past density rates etc.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing housing development on this site would not meet objective PO1 of the draft plan as it would not enhance the environment and landscape, and would result in a loss of an important open space in the village. 		Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too much emphasis on proximity to children's play space as it is easily accessed from all parts of the village. 	Noted.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is the obvious place for new housing in Bradley as it would minimise traffic in village centre and on Skipton Road by the school, is very close to the village centre and would have little impact on nearby residents. 	Noted.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of this site would result in increased traffic on minor roads in 	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm whether or not the increase in	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site

<p>Bradley. Ings Lane would need widening to Canal Bridge. Canal Bridge is often broken in spring/summer months resulting in increased traffic congestion.</p>	<p>traffic flow would be appropriate and identify requirements for road improvements e.g. Ings Lane. Consultation with Canal and River Trust required.</p>		<p>assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development would exacerbate the existing poor pedestrian access across the A629 to access the bus service to Skipton, vehicular access when entering the village from Keighley and turning right out of the village towards Skipton. The problems with this junction results in vehicles using The Heath Road to Snaygill. 	<p>Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways required to establish if improvements can be made to access to existing bus stop on A629. Explore opportunities for planning gain from allocated sites to improve access to bus stop.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site lies within the Low Bradley Conservation Area and makes an important contribution to the setting of Cross Lane Mill, an important element in the approach to the village and one of the key buildings of the Conservation Area. The loss of this open area and its subsequent development, therefore, would be likely to result in harm to one of the elements which contribute to the significance of this designated area. Before allocating this site for development an assessment of impact on the Conservation Area is required. (English Heritage comment). 	<p>Conservation area appraisals are being carried out for villages and towns in the settlement strategy, including Bradley. As part of this work preferred sites have been assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site contains grade 3 agricultural land, which should not be lost. 	<p>Noted. The site checklist for this site states "The locality should be checked for other sites of lesser importance (e.g. Grade 4 Agricultural</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability</p>

	land) which may be preferable for allocation.”		appraisal work.
BR007 (Site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Main issues from consultation *	Response (agree, disagree, noted)	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site is within flood zone 3a (Note: Environment Agency flood zone information shows that this site is located within flood zone 1). South west portion of site floods. Drainage system is inadequate and often blocked with leaves etc. 	Environment Agency Flood Zone information from May 2015 states that this site is entirely in flood zone 1. Revised site assessment work will assess flood risk.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of 17 houses is too many. The site would not be able to take all 30 dwellings. 	Noted. CDC is currently looking at calculating revised densities on sites. This will be informed by preparing evidence on past density rates etc. It is not proposed that this site would accommodate all of the housing requirement for Bradley.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites BR006 & BR007 are supported as they would provide the houses needed on two larger sites rather than on smaller sites that would result in the loss of small existing open spaces in the village. The sites benefit from being away from the existing congested centre of the village. They are on the edge of the village but would not extend the boundary of the settled area further up the valley sides, as would be the case with BR010, BR016, BR001 & BR004. BR006 is adjacent to existing housing estates and would not be 	Noted.	Yes	Sites not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

<p>out of keeping. Only developing part of BR007 (nearest to road) might be a better option so as not to encroach to the edge of the canal.</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of this site would have adverse impact on existing surrounding residents in terms of overlooking, loss of privacy, light, views and would have a negative effect on the value of existing houses. It would cause an increase in noise and light pollution and disturb the existing wildlife corridor and extensive landscapes. 	<p>Noted. Development principles for each preferred site will be prepared, which will consider layout in general terms. Details of layout in respect of overlooking etc would be considered at the planning application stage, where proposals will be assessed to ensure that they would not have a negative effect on existing residents.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of this site would offer little or no impact on nearby residents and is very close to the village centre. 	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development would set an unwanted precedent. 	<p>Noted. Low Bradley is identified in the Sept 2014 Draft Local Plan as an identified village providing a secondary location for growth in the south sub area. As such the draft plan identifies that Bradley can provide 2 dwellings per year over the next 15 years i.e., 30 dwellings in total. The revised site assessment methodology will be used to confirm whether BR006 & BR007 are the most suitable site allocations for Bradley.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development at this site would take away the open space feel of the playing field by making it feel enclosed. The visual impact would be significant if this site was developed. 	<p>Noted. Conservation area appraisals are being carried out for villages and towns in the settlement strategy, including Bradley. As part of this work preferred sites have been assessed in terms of</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>

	their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is the breeding and feeding ground for a family of swans. 	Noted.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site lies within the Low Bradley Conservation Area. This field provides views out of the Conservation Area towards the rising land around Cononley and, as such, contributes to the character of this part of the designated area. The extent of this site would also result in a form of development poorly related to the character and landscape setting of the village. The loss of this site, and its subsequent development, therefore, would be likely to harm elements which contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area. Before allocating this site for development an assessment of impact on the Conservation Area is required. (English Heritage comment). 	Conservation area appraisals are being carried out for villages and towns in the settlement strategy, including Bradley. As part of this work preferred sites have been assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning permission was refused on this site in 2005 (11/2005/5319). Planning officer stated that works necessary to satisfy the local highway authority, which include the widening of Matthew Lane may have a detrimental effect on the Conservation Area. 	<p>Noted. Refusal was due to the fact that the site falls outside the development limits for Bradley and was contrary to policies ENV1, ENV4, BE11 and EMP5 of the adopted Local Plan 1999.</p> <p>Conservation area appraisals are being carried out for villages and towns in the settlement strategy, including Bradley. As part of this work</p>	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Widening of Matthew Lane would take land from the existing playing fields. 	preferred sites have been assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternatives to this site include BR015, BR001, BR002, BR006 (part) BR010 and part of BR012 as these sites can be accessed from Ings Lane, Matthew Lane and Skipton Road down to Snaygill roundabouts without increasing traffic in the village. Unclear why this site is preferable following outcome of 2013 engagement when above sites were preferable. 	Noted.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would favour small developments on above alternative sites over large scale development. 	Noted. Bradley Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Document Nov 2014 states that new housing should comprise a number of smaller developments rather than all on one site.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Put all new housing on BR016, which does not require access through the village and would add balance to the village. 	Noted.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
BR004 (Site not included in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Main issues from consultation *	Response (agree, disagree, noted)	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is a large site outside existing development limits and features a watercourse that floods after heavy rain. Access to the site through the existing Methodist Church car park and increased 	Noted.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

traffic would add to the already congested junction with Ings Lane. The junction of Mill Lane and Heath Crescent is a very busy one. Development of this site would have a negative impact on this junction.			
BR005 (Site not included in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Main issues from consultation *	Response (agree, disagree, noted)	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lidget Lane is very narrow with limited pavement provision. A junction here to access this site would be dangerous. 	Noted.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
BR001 (Site not included in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Main issues from consultation *	Response (agree, disagree, noted)	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of this site would have less impact on the aesthetics of the village as it would be unobtrusive. Existing access to the site is good and there is an opportunity to widen Skipton Road at this site. Development of this site would keep any increased traffic out of the already congested village centre. 	Noted.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
BR012 (site not included in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required	Changes made to the plan

	(agree, disagree, noted)	to the local plan (Yes/No)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of this site, which rises beyond the existing estate would result in a visually unacceptable extension of the village when approaching not only from the A629 but also from across the valley and hills to the south. 	Noted.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
BR016 (site not included in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Main issues from consultation *	Response (agree, disagree, noted)	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is preferred as it is large enough to take all the housing requirement, it would be a natural extension to the existing buildings, traffic generated from this site would have direct access to primary routes via Snaygill and it contains a spring which would be suitable for an allotment. There has been a request for allotments in the village for some years, which could be achieved through a Section 106 Agreement or CIL. 	Noted.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
General comments:			
Main issues from consultation *	Response (agree, disagree, noted)	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water supply - Local mains reinforcement may be required. Waste water – level of development proposed would result in small increase in domestic foul water 	Noted.		

which can be accommodated in the existing sewer network. No issues with the receiving waste water treatment works. (Yorkshire Water Comment)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There has been insufficient local consultation. 	Noted. Public consultation was carried out in 2013 on the SHLAA sites and again in 2014 on the draft Local Plan. Further consultation is planned for the next draft Local Plan in autumn 2015 followed by more formal consultation in advance of the examination.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School does not have the capacity to take more children i.e., from development of 30 houses over 15 years. 	Noted. Consultation currently underway with NYCC Education relating to existing and future capacity in schools in Craven.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bradley needs to retain its village feel. Development of smaller sites is favoured. It would be lovely to keep Bradley as an upmarket village by building a smaller amount of luxury homes to accommodate larger families. Smaller houses could then be dotted around the village on smaller plots of land. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Low Bradley is identified in the Sept 2014 Draft Local Plan as an identified village providing a secondary location for growth in the south sub area.</p> <p>The OAN will be used to calculate the housing requirement for Craven. The next draft Local Plan will then set out how this requirement will be distributed throughout the settlements in Craven, including Bradley.</p> <p>The revised site assessment methodology will be applied to sites to ascertain which sites are the most suitable for allocation.</p>		Awaiting calculation of OAN/housing requirement together with results of the revised site assessment work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wherever new housing is located, access to the village needs to be improved via widening of the road over The Heath to Snaygill, which would benefit the village and wider community, and via provision of an island on the A629. 	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways required to establish if improvements can be made to access to existing bus stop on A629 and access to Snaygill via The Heath road.		Further consultation with statutory consultees and infrastructure providers is ongoing.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of 30 houses in Bradley 	Noted.		Awaiting calculation of OAN/housing

would not “ensure development is in harmony with the openness, scenic beauty, heritage and vitality of the countryside (Draft Local Plan pg 33, section 4)	Low Bradley is identified in the Sept 2014 Draft Local Plan as an identified village providing a secondary location for growth in the south sub area.		requirement. Sites have been identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large mass of affordable housing would be a blot on the landscape of Bradley. 	The provision of affordable housing to meet the significant need that exists in Craven is a key aim of the draft Local Plan. This is in line with the requirements of the NPPF.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to assess any future housing development in terms of visual impact it will have on the settlement. 	Conservation area appraisals are being carried out for villages and towns in the settlement strategy, including Bradley. As part of this work preferred sites have been assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.		Sites have been identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If infrastructure of the village is considered inadequate (road, access to bus stop, drainage and sewerage) why extend at all? 	Consultation with infrastructure providers is ongoing.		Sites have been identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bradley has the following issues; infrequent bus service, only one small, expensive shop, potentially limited school capacity resulting from new housing development, play area is limited in its appeal, inadequate drainage and sewerage systems, poor mobile reception in Bradley, important integral green spaces in village. 	Consultation with infrastructure providers is ongoing. Bradley now has access to superfast broadband (both wireless & via BT).		Sites have been identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Burton in Lonsdale Response Paper to 1st Draft Local Plan 2014

Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
Site: BU001 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Entrance on a busy, unlit road with no pavement, or room for one without encroaching on other people's land. Extensive off site work (road improvements etc) should be required to ensure that development is permeable and easy to access. (This comment also was made for BU006 and BU008)	Noted. Development principles would ensure permeability throughout the site, pavements within the site boundary and appropriate access/egress arrangements, in consultation with NYCC Highways. Highways may also stipulate appropriate street lighting.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site is not in a sustainable location. The entrance to the site onto the existing road is over 300metres from the village centre.	The sustainability appraisal checks that were carried out on sites stipulated that a site should be within 800m (walking distance) of village shops/services.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
The site is not adjacent to Manor Close.	Noted.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: BU008 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Potential adverse impacts on the water supply serving the properties on Mount Wellington, adjacent to the south-east boundary of the site. Concern regarding potential damage done to these pipes during excavation, which run directly through the proposed site.	Works on site would be carried out in consultation with the appropriate statutory bodies to ensure existing infrastructure, such as water pipes, is identified and protected.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

Natural springs on site could exacerbate flood risk.	Site specific flood risk assessments will be carried out on site prior to allocation (– or development?). Development would be sited along western boundary of the site (roadside), furthest away from the flood risk areas (which exist around the beck along the eastern boundary of the site).	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Concerns regarding additional traffic on this country lane, which is narrow in places and has poor visibility and no footpaths.	Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm whether or not the increase in traffic flow on Ireby Road would be appropriate.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site has been identified as having highest negative sustainability impacts, yet still chosen as a preferred site. Question the system of choice of sites. An objective process for choosing sites should be described in the main documents and the sites chosen should be consistent with this process.	<p>The negative sustainability impacts set out in the sustainability check undertaken on this site could be overcome by appropriate and sensitive siting of housing (with regards to flood risk and impact on nearby listed buildings); the necessity of allocating some grade 3 agricultural land, in the absence of suitable grade 4 or 5 land being made available; and the fact that even though the village's existing play space is more than 400m from the site, Burton in Lonsdale is a small village and families from all parts of the village should be able to travel to the existing park with relative ease.</p> <p>Preliminary sustainability checks carried out for the 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan will be superseded by a full sustainability appraisal as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: BU009 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Too many sites being considered for size of	Noted. The distribution strategy is not yet	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for

village – no school, no industry and infrequent bus service. Number of houses should be reduced and BU009 should not be included. Develop in other villages which have more services to offer.	finalised. Further work on distribution of housing and the final housing target to be complete following finalisation of key evidence documents (SHMA, Employment Land Review)		2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Consider BU001 and BU008 before BU009 as they are adjacent to existing housing and near the centre of the village.	Noted. Site selection is not yet finalised. Site selection process to be complete following finalisation of key evidence documents (SHMA, Employment Land Review), revised site assessment work and full sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
BU009 in a rural wooded landscape. Development on this site would be detrimental to the approach to the village.	Noted. Site selection is not yet finalised. Site selection process to be complete following finalisation of key evidence documents (SHMA, Employment Land Review), revised site assessment work and full sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
BU009 is next to a steep hill therefore has drainage problems (due to underground springs).	Site specific flood risk assessments will be carried out on site prior to allocation (– or development?). Development would be sited away from high flood risk areas.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
BU009 is on a busy crossroads and has poor access. Used by heavy farm and commercial vehicles and not suitable for family accommodation.	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm whether or not the increase in traffic flow on nearby roads, and the access/egress arrangements to the site would be appropriate.		Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
BU009 is actually in Low Bentham and should contribute to that village's housing supply. Site is steep and separate to rest of Burton in Lonsdale village.	Noted. Although this site is within Bentham parish boundary its location relates more closely with the built form of Burton in Lonsdale. Further site assessment work will be carried out to establish the suitability of the site for allocation.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

Any social housing on BU009 would be in an unsustainable location for residents of such housing who may have need to access public services (social, health) and may not have means of travelling to such services given their economic position.	Noted. Preliminary sustainability checks carried out for the 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan will be superseded by a full sustainability appraisal as work on the draft local plan progresses.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: BU010 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Question as to why this site has not been included in the plan.	Site withdrawn from SHLAA by owner 21.11.14.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
General Comments:			
3 houses per year= 45 over 15 years. Water supply- Local mains reinforcement may be required (Statutory).	Noted.	No	
If approved, the number of houses built on the site of the former school should be deducted from the Local Plan target and not treated as a windfall in addition to the target. (Parish Council)	There is further work to do on the local plan's housing target and subsequent distribution strategy. Extant permissions from 2012 onwards will be taken into account when calculating the final distribution figures for each settlement.	Yes	Housing target and distribution strategy work to complete

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Carleton Response Paper to 1st Draft Local Plan 2014

Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
Site: CA012 (site identified in the 1st draft Local Plan)			
<p>The northern part of the site lies within the Carleton Conservation Area and the site also includes the Grade II listed building Grundy Farmhouse. The rising farmland contributes to the setting of both these designated heritage assets and the loss of this area and its subsequent development would be likely to farm elements which contribute to their significance. Before allocating this site for development an assessment of impact on the Conservation Area and listed building is required. (Historic England comment).</p>	<p>Conservation area appraisals will be carried out for villages and towns in the settlement strategy, including Carleton. As part of this work sites included in the pool of sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.</p> <p>In terms of CA012 a recent planning approval looks to site housing to the south of Grundy Farmhouse, between the listed building and the proposed preferred site. The setting of the listed building was taken into account during the application process of this approval. As such the setting of the listed building should not be directly affected by the addition of housing at CA012.</p>	No	Site identified in the pool of sites for the 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment & sustainability appraisal work.
<p>Appropriate for most types of dwellings except those used by the elderly as it will be a long walk to village amenities and shops</p>	Noted.	No	Site identified in the pool of sites for the 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment & sustainability appraisal work.
Site: CA014 (site identified in the 1st draft Local Plan)			
<p>The area nearest the village centre needs to be used for elderly dwellings as it will be near to village amenities and shops</p>	Noted.	No	Site identified in the pool of sites for the 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment & sustainability appraisal

			work.
General Comments :			
<p>3 houses per year = 45 over 15 years. Water supply – Local mains reinforcement may be required.</p> <p>Waste Water – this level of development will result in a small increase in domestic foul water (less than 1 litre per second) which can be accommodated in the existing sewer network. There are no issues with the receiving waste water treatment works. (Statutory Body)</p>	Noted.		
<p>The Local Plan needs to specify the housing type requirements and not leave it to developers to decide what they would like to build. When plans are submitted it is generally too late to make changes. Carleton-in-Craven has an acute shortage of dwellings suitable for elderly people.</p>	<p>The New Homes policy outlines the range of housing needed on local plan sites. In addition, development principles for each site could specify, where necessary, the type(s) of housing that would be preferred.</p>	Yes	<p>Development principles will be identified for preferred sites.</p>

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Cononley Response Paper to 1st Draft Local Plan 2014

Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
Site: CN006 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for CN006, although other sites in the village have been granted planning permission and/or implemented. Cononley has therefore provided a significant windfall to the housing supply. 	<p>Noted. Cononley has been identified in the Sept 2014 Draft Local Plan as an identified village providing a secondary location for growth in the south sub area. As such the draft plan identifies that Cononley can provide 3 dwellings per year over the next 15 years i.e., 45 dwellings in total. Residential completions or outstanding consents from 2012 will be taken into account in terms of the numbers of new housing provided in Cononley via site allocations over the plan period.</p>	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fields to the north of the mill should be excluded from development as per previous refusal and dismissal at appeal (enforcement action pending). Fields contain basic utilities which are covered by easements. Legal action being taken as, at present, basic access has been denied. 	<p>21/2011/12283 refusal for use of land as car park. Appeal dismissed 11/4/14. Revised site assessment to be undertaken together with a site visit. Consideration will be given to revision of the site boundary.</p>	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to change designation of site CN006 from mixed use to employment only and allocate CN005 for housing development, in order to promote Council Plan Objectives PO3 and PO6: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CN005 had positive sustainability 	<p>Revised site assessment to be undertaken together with a site visit.</p>	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Site is currently being considered for allocation for a mix of housing and some

<p>assessment and favourable community feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CN005 is enclosed by existing development in village and railway line (which screens development to some extent) ○ Residential development should be entirely contained in village, bounded by railway line. ○ CN006 should keep the existing level of employment land/floorspace – advantageous to local economy. 			employment uses.
Site: CN001 & CN011 (sites not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Inconsistencies between the assessments of sites CN001 and CN011. CN001 should be graded more negatively than CN011 as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ it has equal problems with flooding, ○ it has highways safety issues, ○ it has important historic buildings that would have to be demolished to develop the site, ○ it is surrounded by houses therefore more suitable for development, ○ it is wholly within the Conservation Area. 	Revised site assessment to be undertaken together with a site visit.	Yes	<p>Site CN001 not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Site CN011 identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
Site: CN004, CN005, CN009 & CN014 (sites not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CN005 and CN014 are currently being built on and should not form part of the plan. CN009 has been refused by 	CN005 – approval for 15 dwellings (some completed 21/2014/14241). Outline consent for 4 dwellings on east of site for 5 dwellings	Yes	Site CN009 identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability

<p>Planning. CN004 is being considered by Planning despite huge local opposition. The Local Plan does not reflect reality of today. (<i>comment is about Summer 2013 Feedback paper, not Local Plan</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The approved scheme for CN005, has been designed to allow access to the remainder of CN005 west of Moorfoot Lane. This would allow adequate access to this part of the site without causing further highway issues. 	<p>(21/2015/15985). Access via approved scheme on east of site. CN014 – approval for 4 dwellings (21/2014/14335) CN009 – Proposed 4 dwellings refused (21/2014/14925) due to loss of important open space & layout. CN004 – refused (21/2014/14630). Proposal for 10 dwellings.</p> <p>Residential completions or outstanding consents from 2012 will be taken into account in terms of the numbers of new housing provided in Cononley via site allocations over the plan period.</p>		<p>appraisal work.</p> <p>Sites CN004, CN005 & CN014 not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Site: CN0019 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing figure of 3 per annum should be higher and CN019 should be considered for 16 dwellings with 40% affordable housing. Sustainability assessment shows site has significant positive impacts (bus stop and train station). Housing across the road is much higher than proposed site and would provide the backcloth across the Aire Valley, for any new development on site. Minimum housing figure of 2400 will likely be challenged and Cononley, as a sustainable settlement, will be well placed to make a contribution to any additional homes that may be required. 	<p>Noted. Cononley is identified in the Sept 2014 Draft Local Plan as an identified village providing a secondary location for growth in the south sub area. The OAN will be used to calculate the housing requirement for Craven. The next draft Local Plan will then set out how this requirement will be distributed throughout the settlements in Craven, including Cononley. The revised site assessment methodology will be applied to sites to ascertain which sites are the most suitable for allocation.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The 2nd draft Local Plan draft policy SP4 sets out a housing requirement for Cononley of 3 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>

General Comments:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 houses per year = 45 over 15 years. Water supply – Local mains reinforcement may be required. • Waste Water – this level of development will result in a small increase in domestic foul water (less than 1 litre per second) which can be accommodated in the existing sewer network. There are no issues with the receiving waste water treatment works. 	Noted.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Summer 2013 Feedback for Cononley is now out of date. There needs to be an update. 	Noted. Public consultation was carried out in 2013 on the SHLAA sites and again in 2014 on the 1 st draft Local Plan. Further consultation is planned for the 2nd draft Local Plan in spring 2016 followed by more formal consultation once the Local Plan is published.	?	The 2 nd draft Local Plan will be informed by consultation responses received on the 1 st Draft Local Plan.

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Embsay Response Paper to 1st Draft Local Plan 2014

Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
Site: EM001 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Review the assessment of this site as it should be included in the Local Plan.	Noted.	Yes.	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Sites: EM010 and EM012 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
These sites should not be excluded from the Local Plan as they both performed well during the summer 2013 consultation.	Noted.	Yes.	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Potential exists to the south of EM012 and the north of EM010.	Noted.	Yes.	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
The planning application proposals have been revised and reduced in scale to take account of environmental evaluation and comments received during the 2013 consultation.	Noted.	Yes.	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
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.	Preliminary sustainability checks carried out for the 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan will be superseded by a full sustainability appraisal of all sites as work on the draft local plan progresses.	Yes.	Sustainability appraisal work to complete.
Further sites will need to be identified in a number of the second tier growth	Noted. The housing target and subsequent site selection and distribution are not yet finalised.	Yes.	Further work to complete on sustainability appraisal work.

settlements and these sites are well placed to make such a contribution.	Awaiting finalisation of key evidence documents (SHMA, Employment Land Review) and full sustainability appraisal.		
Site: EM013 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Reduce the number of houses to a small spacious cul-de-sac development at the end of the field nearest the cricket field and water pumping station.	Noted. Development principles for EM013 would identify appropriate areas for both open space and housing, should this site proceed to final allocation.	Yes.	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Any new houses on this site should be extensively screened to rescue their impact on both Low Lane and Shires Lane.	Noted. Development principles for EM013 would identify appropriate areas for screening, should this site proceed to final allocation.	Yes.	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Development of this site would represent urban sprawl and would be highly visible from anyone approaching the village along Low Lane from Halton East.	Noted.	Yes.	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
This site should not be used as the village should be kept rural.	Noted.	Yes.	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
There is enough development in the outline planning approval for the other site on Shires Lane.	The housing target set out in the 22/9/14 draft of the local plan is a minimum target. It is also likely that this housing target will increase in future drafts of the local plan, to take account of evidence of housing need as outlined in the updated SHMA (2015).	Yes.	Revised housing target for Embsay is 60, however, the total net completions to 31/03/2016 and commitments at 29/06/16 came to 62. Therefore 0 houses are required for allocation in Embsay as there is a +2 surplus of housing following the above completions and commitments.
This site is probably the least bad option due to the fact that it would have less impact on traffic and highway safety within the middle of Embsay when compared to other options	Noted.	No.	

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.			
No consideration has been given to the fact that part of the site is at high risk of flooding.	Noted. Site specific flood risk assessments will be carried out on site prior to allocation (– or development?) to establish localised flooding problems. The site is not within Flood Zone 2 or 3 as identified by the Environment Agency; however, should the site proceed to final allocation development would be sited furthest away from areas which have the potential to flood.	Yes.	Sustainability appraisal and guiding development principles for site to complete.
Development of this site would result in residential development on both sides of Shires Lane, which would provide a residential feel to the area.	Noted.	Yes.	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Development of this site would prevent access to the adjoining fields across the site.	Noted. Development principles for EM013 would ensure permeability throughout the site, should this site proceed to final allocation.	Yes.	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Sites: EM013 and EM016 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Development of these sites would remove much of the open aspects from the village cricket ground and allotments.	Noted. Whilst development of EM013 and EM016 may comprise the open aspects from existing amenity areas, this is not a material planning consideration and would not be a valid reason to keep these sites undeveloped. EM016 has already achieved outline planning permission in line with the NPPF.	Yes.	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Support for the Local Plan for Embsay/Eastby	Noted.	No.	

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.			
Site: EM016 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
The land which forms an extension to site EM016 (which has outline consent for residential development) is supported for allocation in the Local Plan as this site would mean that all 45 houses can be delivered on one single site without the need for the release of any other site within the village.	Noted. EM016 and the land to the south of this site have achieved planning permission in outline. The housing target, distribution strategy and site selection process are not yet finalised. Awaiting finalisation of key evidence documents (SHMA, Employment Land Review) and full sustainability appraisal.	Yes.	Revised housing target and distribution strategy are now finalised. Further work to complete on sustainability appraisal.
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.	This land has achieved planning permission in line with NPPF.	No.	
General Comments :			
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)	Noted.	No.	
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.	Noted.	No.	
Support the lack of any proposed new development in the existing gap between	Noted.	Yes.	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site

<p>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.</p>			<p>assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>As there have been continuing delays in producing a Craven Local Plan, to the detriment of the parish, there is now a pressing need for the district council to finalise the completion of the Local Plan as quickly as possible.</p>	<p>Plan-making takes an evidence-based approach. The initial 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan was based on evidence available at the time, but is not a finished document and is still a work in progress. New evidence on future requirements for housing, employment land and infrastructure is now being gathered and the next version of the plan will be based on that evidence. Gathering evidence is a time consuming but essential part of the plan-making process as it ensures that policy is formulated taking into account the most up-to-date information. This enables the</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>Ongoing gathering of evidence and policy refinement. Site assessment work has been completed.</p>

	plan to withstand the formal examination process and not be found unsound due to out of date evidence.		
--	--	--	--

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Gargrave Response Paper to 1st Draft Local Plan 2014

Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
Site: GA012 (site not identified in 2nd draft Local Plan)			
Some support for careful development of GA012 for employment purposes as it is already in this use. Should be in keeping with the surrounding area and protect setting of the nearby national park.	Noted.	Dependent on employment land review.	Site not identified in pool of residential sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Employment land review work to be finalised.
The meaning of "enhanced" development should be made clear and be acceptable to residents.	Noted. This will be clarified in future drafts of the local plan.	Dependent on employment land review.	Clarity on meaning of "enhanced" in future draft of local plan.
Concerns regarding access to site. Bridge may not be adequate to support an increase in HGVs.	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm access arrangements, should this site proceed to final allocation.	Dependent on employment land review.	Site not identified in pool of residential sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Employment land review work to be finalised.
Development of this site should relate to employment in tourism only; industrial, retail, warehouse and/ or distribution centre uses should not be permitted (i.e. uses that could harm the existing village retail offer should not be allowed).	Noted.	Dependent on employment land review.	Site not identified in pool of residential sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Employment land review work to be finalised.
The existing caravan park is promoting tourism which is of benefit to the local economy - it should remain in its current form and should not be further developed.	Noted.	Dependent on employment land review.	Site not identified in residential pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

			Employment land review work to be finalised.
Existing empty units on site therefore should not be further developed for employment until these units are filled.	Noted, however existing empty units are not an indication that future need would not arise for light employment on this site. Evidence of need will be taken into account should the site proceed to final allocation.	Dependent on employment land review.	Employment land review work to be finalised.
Concern that development of this site could encourage further development of surrounding area.	Should the site be allocated it would provide new light employment and commercial opportunities related to tourism. Further future development of the surrounding area would be subject to planning approval based on relevant local or national policy at that time.	Dependent on employment land review.	Site not identified in pool of residential sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Employment land review work to be finalised.
Any redevelopment proposals for this area would need to safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of the adjacent Conservation Area and Listed Building. (Historic England comment)	Conservation area appraisals are being carried out for villages and towns in the settlement strategy, including Gargrave. As part of this work preferred sites have been assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.	Dependent on employment land review.	Site assessment work following completion of Conservation Area Appraisal study.
Further development of this site could lead to easy and convenient access to GA009 and its development.	Noted.	Dependent on employment land review.	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Employment land review work to be finalised.
There should be strict controls on the scale and height (maximum 2 stories) of any development.	Noted.	Dependent on employment land review.	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Employment land review work to be finalised.
Concern regarding increase of traffic on already busy road (dangerous for pedestrians).	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm whether or not the increase in traffic flow on Eshton Road would be	Dependent on employment land review.	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability

	appropriate, should this site proceed to final allocation.		appraisal work. Employment land review work to be finalised.
Further development could exacerbate flood risk issues in area and further downstream.	Noted. Site specific flood risk assessments will be carried out on site prior to allocation (– or development?) to establish localised flooding problems. The site is not within Flood Zone 2 or 3 as identified by the Environment Agency; however, should the site proceed to final allocation development would be sited furthest away from areas which have the potential to flood.	Dependent on employment land review.	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Employment land review work to be finalised.
Site: GA025 (site not identified in 2nd draft Local Plan)			
Opinion is divided for development of GA025 in the Parish Council survey. Comments regarding this site generally did not support employment development even if they were supportive of residential development in this location. However opposing view was expressed that site should be all employment due to good access from main road (potential for canal side and leisure facility) This view thought that the site was too detached from the village for residential use.	Flooding issue in evidence. Too detached from the village for residential use.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
View that site should be solely residential because: employment use on elongated site would compromise residential amenity and market attractiveness; existing employment in northern end of village – need for more?; flood attenuation would take up part of land, leaving less room for employment uses; employment use would have no road frontage. Full residential use should be	Flooding issue in evidence. Too detached from the village for residential use.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

medium density, incorporate some social housing and reflect the rural nature of the area (particularly taking into account it's proximity to the national park).			
Support for mixed use qualified by need for confirmation on type and scale of employment use. Support for low rise, low density with lots of greenery to minimise the environmental impact (i.e. no large metal sheds as site is at the entrance to the village).	Noted. Development principles for GA025 would ensure type and scale of employment use, should this site proceed to final allocation.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Support expressed for site as it does not extend village significantly. However opposing view also expressed that development of the site would be a significant spread of the village (sprawl outside existing village limits), and would 'bookend' the village once development on GA020 is complete.	Support noted. Concerns regarding the visual approach to the village will be a factor when assessing site for future development. The issue of 'bookending' the village with development is not a material concern as each site is assessed on its own merit. The distance between GA025 and GA020 is such that their relative impacts on the village should not be assessed alongside one another.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Development of the site would remove the open aspect from the village's football and cricket grounds. Concern also that the next phase of development could potentially be in the cricket grounds.	Noted. Whilst development of GA025 may comprise the open aspects from existing amenity areas, this is not a material planning consideration and would not be a valid reason to keep this site undeveloped. Any potential future development of the cricket ground would be subject to planning approval based on relevant local or national policy at that time.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Several comments that the cricket club would be affected from an insurance point of view. Properties built on the other side of	Noted, however this is not a material planning consideration; rather it would be a private civil issue.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability

the cricket pitch would be at greater and more frequent risk of damage, potentially resulting in more claims against the club.			appraisal work.
This site would have less impact on existing residents; however, speed limits entering Gargrave will need to be changed to accommodate this site.	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm whether or not speed limits entering Gargrave would need to be altered to accommodate this site, should it proceed to final allocation.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
This site which is near to the A65 is preferable for development than other preferred sites which are near to the national park.	Noted.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Plan for site should identify which part would be used for dwellings and which part would be used for employment. The number of dwellings should be strictly limited, preferably to a lower number than stated in the draft plan.	Noted. Development principles for GA025 would ensure type and scale of employment and residential use across the site, should this site proceed to final allocation.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Access issues affect site: as currently proposed this site would not be able to achieve an acceptable road access arrangement onto the A65. This would have implications for the Systagenix factory opposite, whose existing access would be severely compromised. A more suitable access could be provided either by installing a roundabout on the A65 to serve both Systagenix and site GA025, or from Ray Bridge Lane via land to the east of GA025 (although there are concerns raised regarding poor access from Ray Bridge Lane which is narrow). Potential for an access into existing play area at top of Airedale Avenue?	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm appropriate access arrangements to accommodate this site, should it proceed to final allocation.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

Concern raised regarding potential flooding issues on site.	Noted. Site specific flood risk assessments will be carried out on site prior to allocation (– or development?) to establish localised flooding problems. Should the site proceed to final allocation development would be sited furthest away from areas which have the potential to flood	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Concern raised as this is the only site away from overhead cables where the Air Ambulance is able to land.	Noted. Consultation will take place with the relevant bodies to ensure the site is suitable for purpose, prior to allocation.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Concern over loss of grade 3 agricultural land.	Noted. To have no development on grade 3 agricultural land would be an ideal situation but may not be a practical possibility. Some sites on grade 3 agricultural land may be more suitable and sustainable than other grade 4 or 5 land in the area.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site should be reserved for possible expansion of playing fields.	The Council is carrying out an Assessment of Open Space, Playing Pitches, Sports Halls and Swimming Pools which will set out deficits and need for open space and recreation facilities across the district. This study will highlight any need for playing pitch expansion in Gargrave.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following the assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Sites: GA028 and GA029 (sites identified in pool of sites)			
Strong opposition expressed by a number of residents to any development on GA028 and GA029.	Noted.	No	Sites identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
This area around the canal and Chew Lane is seen as valuable for its amenity to both residents and tourists. The Pennine Way, the National Sustrans Cycle Way, the Canal, the river and greens, and the proximity to the	Noted.	No	Sites identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

National Park are seen as "pull factors" encouraging tourists to visit as are the generally rural and agricultural feel of the village.			
Support expressed for site as it does not extend village significantly and does not provide ribbon development along A65.	Noted.	No	Sites identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Concern regarding increase of traffic on already busy road (dangerous for pedestrians). Although opposing view also expressed that this road is quiet and could potentially take more traffic.	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm whether or not the increase in traffic flow on Eshton Road would be appropriate, should these sites proceed to final allocation.	No	Sites identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Further development could exacerbate flood risk issues in area and further downstream. Concern regarding existing surface water flooding down Mark House Lane which would be exacerbated by development. Sequential test, as set out in NPPF, should apply. Other sites in Gargrave are less likely to flood.	Noted. Site specific flood risk assessments will be carried out on site prior to allocation (– or development?) to establish localised flooding problems. Should the site proceed to final allocation development would be sited furthest away from areas which have the potential to flood	No	Sites identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Site specific flood risk assessment to be completed.
Concern regarding loss of good agricultural land. Grass cut for silage 4 times a year.	Noted. To have no development on grade 3 agricultural land would be an ideal situation but may not be a practical possibility. Some sites on grade 3 agricultural land may be more suitable and sustainable than other grade 4 or 5 land in the area.	No	Sites identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Concern regarding difficult vehicular access to site.	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm appropriate access arrangements to accommodate this site, should it proceed to final allocation.	No	Sites identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Concern that overdevelopment of site would exceed Local Plan housing targets.	The district housing target set out in the 22/9/14 draft of the local plan is a minimum	No	Sites identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site

	target. It is likely that this housing target will increase in future drafts of the local plan, to take account of evidence of housing need as outlined in the updated SHMA (2015).		assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Concern regarding effect of development on nearby listed bridge and lock.	Conservation area appraisals are being carried out for villages and towns in the settlement strategy, including Gargrave. As part of this work preferred sites have been assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed building and structures.	No	Sites identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Site assessment work following completion of Conservation Area Appraisal study.
This site lies within the Gargrave Conservation Area. In addition, the Canal Bridge Number 170 and its integral lock, at the south-western corner of this area, is a Grade II Listed Building. Before allocating GA028 or GA029 for development an assessment of impact on the Conservation Area and on the nearby listed buildings is required. (Historic England comment)	Conservation area appraisals are being carried out for villages and towns in the settlement strategy, including Gargrave. As part of this work preferred sites have been assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed building and structures.	No	Sites identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Site assessment work following completion of Conservation Area Appraisal study.
Need to protect the 15m wide strip of mature trees running the length of GA028/GA029 along the canal.	Noted. Development principles for GA028 and GA029 would look at protecting existing trees if necessary, should these sites proceed to final allocation. None of the trees on site are currently protected by Tree Preservation Orders.	No	Sites identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If these sites are identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.
View that other sites should be looked at first, however if need to build on this site, should be low density and well landscaped with big gardens.	Noted. Density work still to complete for sites proceeding to final allocation.	No	Sites identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Density work to complete following revised site assessment work.

<p>View that summer 2013 engagement with residents of Gargrave was not adequate to give a true picture of support / objection to this site. Support for site may have come from landowners or from residents on other side of village. The Parish Council's consultation on the sites via the Neighbourhood Planning process provides a different, less supportive view of this site.</p>	<p>Feedback from the 2013 summer engagement event was just one element of the site selection process for the 22/9/14 draft of the local plan, which also included preliminary sustainability checks and initial site assessment work. The draft plan is at an early stage and very much a work in progress, and further site assessment work, including full sustainability appraisal, will be carried out prior to any sites being included in the next draft of the local plan. Feedback from the Neighbourhood Planning process in Gargrave will also form an important part of the future site selection process.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Sites identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Concern over negative impact on existing wildlife in area (i.e. herons, kingfishers, rare black rabbits, trees, hedgerows, wildflowers etc)</p>	<p>Noted. Further site assessment work will investigate impacts on biodiversity on sites.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Sites identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If these sites are identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.</p>
<p>These sites are not suitable for retirement homes (downsize homes), which are needed in village, as they are ½ mile away from village centre services, station and church.</p>	<p>Noted. Development principles for GA028 and GA029 would set out the type of housing most suited to this location, should these sites proceed to final allocation.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Sites identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If these sites are identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.</p>
<p>Site: GA028 (draft preferred site)</p>			
<p>The site checklist describes access via Mark House Lane/Chew Lane. Access is actually via West Street, not Mark House Lane, and this is a narrow road with no pavement and resident car parking, which leads to a tight</p>	<p>Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm appropriate access arrangements to accommodate this site, should it proceed to final allocation.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Sites identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If these sites are identified as a preferred site,</p>

junction with Old Hall Croft.			development principles will be identified.
View that only medium density housing should be allowed on this site, with emphasis on green space to compliment and reflect the rural nature of the area, the close proximity of the National Park and the housing already available in Gargrave. There should be no need for affordable homes on this site, this need being satisfied by Sites GA029 and GA025.	Noted. Development principles for GA028 would set out the type of housing most suited to this location, should this site proceed to final allocation.	No	Sites identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If these sites are identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.
Site: GA029 (site included in pool of sites)			
This site should not include any employment. Employment use should be located elsewhere (i.e. GA001, GA012)	Noted. Not suitable as an employment site.	No	Sites identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.
Suggestion that this site should benefit from the same 'minor negative impacts' on the sustainability check that GA028 and GA012 received, rather than the 'potential significant negative impacts' result that it achieved.	Noted. Preliminary sustainability checks carried out for the 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan will be superseded by a full sustainability appraisal as work on the draft local plan progresses.	No	Sites identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.
Site: GA001 (site not identified in 2nd draft Local Plan)			
This site received an equal number of opposing and supporting votes in the Parish Council survey.	Noted.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Since this site has been identified as having economic development potential, is a	Noted. Preliminary sustainability checks carried out for the 22/9/14 version of the draft	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site

brownfield site and is already partially developed for employment, it should be classified as having a negative effect for housing and positive for employment land.	local plan will be superseded by a full sustainability appraisal as work on the draft local plan progresses.		assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: GA003 (site not identified in 2nd draft Local Plan)			
Support for site as it provides extension of the popular houses on St Robert Close.	Noted.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: GA004 (draft site in pool)			
This site is ideal for development for housing, but not for employment land. It has minimal flood risk and is in close proximity to school and play area. Whilst it is currently occupied by a residential home for the elderly it is understood that NYCC has plans to relocate the home to GA009/GA022.	Noted. Consultation with NYCC would establish their intentions for the site, should this site proceed to final allocation.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: GA005 (draft site in pool)			
The size of the site would limit the amount of development and would not destroy the tranquillity of St Andrews. New development would not be any closer to the church than existing properties in the area.	Noted.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
This smaller infill site would be developed with off-street parking to further avoid on-street parking.	Noted.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
New homes built on site would be at the higher end of the housing market and thus deter second home buyers; therefore the site should not be marked negatively for this in the sustainability assessment.	Noted. Preliminary sustainability checks carried out for the 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan will be superseded by a full sustainability appraisal as work on the draft local plan progresses.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: GA014 (draft site in pool)			

New homes built on site would be at the higher end of the housing market and thus deter second home buyers; therefore the site should not be marked negatively for this in the sustainability assessment.	Noted. Preliminary sustainability checks carried out for the 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan will be superseded by a full sustainability appraisal as work on the draft local plan progresses.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Access is a problem, unless the adjacent GA023 site is also developed for housing.	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm appropriate access arrangements to accommodate this site, should it proceed to final allocation.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
This site is well placed for sewerage and electricity access.	Noted.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: GA017 (draft site in pool)			
This is a reasonably sized plot but it would be problematic to develop because of the weight of traffic up and down Church Lane.	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm whether or not the increase in traffic flow on Church Lane would be appropriate, should this site proceed to final allocation.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: GA019 (site not identified in pool)			
Support for site as it is on edge of village and is beside the River Aire and could offer pleasant views over the river and fields, provided flood defences were confirmed.	Noted.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: GA020 (site not identified in pool)			
Site received support in Parish Council survey. This site, (next to the canal and school) has already received planning permission for residential development.	Noted.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
This site which is near to the A65 is preferable for development than existing preferred sites which are near to the national park.	Noted.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

<p>The number of houses to be built here should be deducted from the 75 required for the village over the next five years. This has happened in Embsay where a site with recent outline planning permission has formed part of the 45 that village needs over the plan period. <i>(Note from Policy Team: the draft plan is planning for 75 houses in Gargrave over the next <u>15</u> years)</i></p>	<p>The 22/9/14 draft plan identifies that Gargrave can provide 5 dwellings per year over the next 15 years i.e., 75 dwellings in total. This figure was based on the latest information at the time. It is likely that the overall housing target for the district will increase in future drafts of the local plan, to take account of evidence of housing need as outlined in the updated SHMA (2015). This could have knock on effects for village housing targets. It should be noted that residential completions or outstanding consents from 2012 onwards will be taken into account in terms of the numbers of new housing provided in Gargrave via site allocations over the plan period.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Further work to complete on revised housing target and distribution strategy.</p>
<p>Site: GA022 (site identified in pool)</p>			
<p>Support for site as it is on edge of village.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Site: GA023 (site identified in pool)</p>			
<p>Site has been classified as negative in sustainability check due to flood risk. However, whilst it is true that a field two away (south) from this site appears on the EA flood risk assessment, this site does not. It is also in an elevated position (compared to the flood risk area) and runs next to and to the north of existing mature houses. Other negative effects can be mitigated by the number and type of housing built.</p>	<p>Noted. Site specific flood risk assessments will be carried out on site prior to development to establish localised flooding problems. Should the site proceed to final allocation development would be sited furthest away from areas which have the potential to flood. All sites will undergo rigorous sustainability appraisal prior to final allocation.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>This site is well placed for sewerage and electricity access.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site</p>

			assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: GA024 (non-draft preferred site)			
Support for site as it is beside the river with pleasant views and near to Low Green, an open play area.	Noted.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: GA030 (site identified in pool)			
This site received a strong negative response to the Parish Council survey is as it was thought to be too large a development area on the outskirts of the village which would have a negative impact on the overall character of Gargrave.	Noted.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Development of site would adversely affect amenity of the area (directly on the Pennine Way), existing wildlife and agricultural value of land.	Noted.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.
Site has surface water flooding issues.	Noted. Site specific flood risk assessments will be carried out sites prior to allocation to establish localised flooding problems. Should the site proceed to final allocation development would be sited furthest away from areas which have the potential to flood.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.
Site: GA031 (site identified in pool)			
This site received a majority of support for development in the Parish Council survey, although it also received 26 opposing "votes".	Noted.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

Support for site as new housing would be an extension of Walton Close which is part of a housing association (12 low cost homes on site already). New housing would have pleasant views and relatively good access to Church Street, the railway station, A65 and A59, and High Green, a nearby open play area. The existing entrance to the site could be used and all services can be taken from Walton Close (i.e. the main sewer is already installed within the site).	Noted.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Opposition to the site based on the impact an increase in traffic would have on an already narrow, dangerous, busy road (which has been further exacerbated by development of holiday chalets on GA019 further up the road). There is also surface water flooding on road.	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm whether or not the increase in traffic flow on Church Lane would be appropriate, should this site proceed to final allocation.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
General Comments :			
5 houses per year = 75 over 15 years 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 no issues with the receiving waste water treatment works. (Yorkshire Water comment).	Noted.	No	Further consultation with infrastructure providers is on-going.
Gargrave Parish Council conducted a survey with residents' on their Neighbourhood Plan which included questions about SHLAA sites in the village. Opposition for development (704 votes) on various sites (i.e. GA005; GA009; GA014; GA017; GA022; GA023; GA027; GA028; GA029; GA030) was greater	Noted.	No	If these sites are identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.

than votes supporting development (345 votes) (i.e. GA020; GA031): Those supporting development often expressed the view that development should not cover the entire site.			
Support and opposition for different types of development, i.e. for "infill" development of existing small sites within Gargrave, and for development to take place at a distance from the centre of Gargrave on the outskirts of the village. Particular support expressed for development at infill/already partially developed/under-utilised land which is spread out around the village such as GA001, GA002, GA003, GA004, GA005, GA020 and GA021.	Noted. Infill development will be advocated through draft plan policy. Revised site assessment work will establish the most appropriate and sustainable sites for allocation.	No	If these sites are identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.
Brownfield sites much preferred over greenfield sites. Employment development is not supported in greenfield sites but has more support on brownfield sites. Possibility of using the existing Systagenix site for the development of a small business park.	Noted. The plan will prefer and support the development of brownfield land, however in the absence of enough brownfield land being made available across the district for future housing and employment uses, some greenfield land will need to be released. Further consultation with Systagenix could provide opportunities for employment expansion.	Yes	Approach in draft plan which supports brownfield land, but will need to use greenfield as well.
Clarification is required from CDC as to what "employment" and "mixed-residential and employment" are likely to consist of and importantly size/ numbers proposed.	The 22/9/14 draft of the local plan was an early draft and very much a work in progress. Future drafts of the plan will clarify these issues and provide more detail on densities and capacity.	Yes	Capacity and density work to complete following revised site assessment work.
Type and quality of development is important. High quality low density development is preferred whether this is for	Noted. Density work still to complete for sites proceeding to final allocation	Yes	Density work to complete following revised site assessment work.

affordable or for higher priced houses.			
Need houses for people who wish to downsize, i.e. smaller bungalows. The smaller infill sites in the plan are ideal for this type of development as they are within walking distance of all the facilities.	Noted. Infill development will be advocated through draft plan policy. Development principles on allocated sites will establish the most appropriate type of housing for the location.	Yes	Development principles could address the issue of housing type.
Smaller infill sites could accommodate off street parking, which at present is an issue in the village that has not been addressed by the draft plan.	Noted. The draft plan advocates the need to 'design out' anti-social parking.	No	
Focus on existing businesses, particularly on the High Street where there are empty business premises, rather than building business units elsewhere. Empty units on the industrial estate and Eshton Wharf are also a concern. Neighbourhood Plan could be a big influence.	The number of properties for sale/rent is not a proper indicator of employment need. The Council is carrying out a new Employment Land Review which will provide evidence regarding the need for allocated employment land across the district, including the need calculated for Gargrave.	Yes	Awaiting results of Employment Land Review.
Preventing unnecessary sprawl is an important issue as is addressing infrastructure concerns. The size of the proposed sites has prompted fears of overdevelopment and development "creep" into surrounding areas.	Noted. Further site assessment work will take into account the effect of development on the surrounding areas. Conservation area appraisals will aid this work where appropriate.	Yes	Awaiting results of revised site assessment work and Conservation Area appraisal work.
Hard to comment as difficult to know what is being proposed.	The draft local plan attempts to adopt a straightforward, plain-language approach, but this tends to be undermined by technical requirements and the document's length. The alternative approach of publishing a separate user-friendly summary is under consideration and likely to be increasingly necessary as work on the draft local plan progresses.	Yes	Produce summary documents to accompany full documents. They need to be concise, accessible, straightforward, engaging and easy to use, with plain language.
The ability of the sewage system and roads	The policy on Infrastructure could be amended	Yes	SP21 Sustainable Buildings,

to cope with new development needs assessing.	to provide greater reassurance that appropriate infrastructure improvements will be delivered in a timely manner, to coordinate with the phasing of development. This approach could be backed up with the production of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and (if adopted by the Council) a CIL charging schedule.		Infrastructure and Planning Obligations strengthened to provide greater assurance of coordinated delivery of development and infrastructure.
The lack of good transport connections is an issue many would like to see addressed, in particular bus and train services.	Sustainability appraisal will ensure that allocated sites are well connected to transport routes and services. Frequency of bus and train services is beyond the remit of the local plan, being the responsibility of NYCC, Network Rail and private bus operators.	Yes	Sustainability appraisal work to complete.
The environment and amenity value of the sites is an important concern and it featured strongly in suggestions as to issues a Neighbourhood Plan would address.	Noted. Further site assessment work will investigate impacts on biodiversity and amenity value of sites. Feedback from the Neighbourhood Planning process in Gargrave will also form an important part of the future site selection process.	Yes	Awaiting results of revised site assessment work.
Desire to protect existing leisure sites such as the cricket and football grounds, the greens and the tennis club.	The Council is carrying out an Assessment of Open Space, Playing Pitches, Sports Halls and Swimming Pools which will set out deficits and need for open space and recreation facilities across the district. This study will highlight the need to protect playing pitches in Gargrave.	Yes	Awaiting results of the Open Space, Playing Pitches, Sports Halls and Swimming Pools Assessment.
View that the Gargrave Neighbourhood Plan Working Group should consult on sites for Gargrave and Craven DC should only consult on strategy.	Feedback from the neighbourhood planning process in Gargrave will form an important part of the future site selection process. A neighbourhood plan needs to accord with the strategic policies of the local plan, but this doesn't mean that non-strategic policies aren't needed in a local plan. A local plan and a	No	

	neighbourhood plan can be progressed at the same time (this may even be a necessity) and the process will be aided by positive working relationships		
Regarding the Employment Land (EL) allocation for Gargrave – all possible sites have access problems because apart from the A65 all access roads are narrow village streets. The prospect of adding in commercial traffic grates with most people’s concept of sustainability.	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm whether or not the increase in traffic flow roads in the village would be appropriate, prior to sites proceeding to final allocation.	Yes	Awaiting results of revised site assessment work.
Gargrave already has a significant amount of mature EL, more in comparison with other village settlements, and the allocation is at least twice the pro rata allocation in terms of the housing allocation (basis for estimating the total EL requirement for South Craven Division). On that basis only up to 1 hectare of EL land would be allocated to Gargrave, about the size of the GA012 site. Systagenix could provide needed EL as it has redundant buildings and land which the company might make available or rented out for commercial purposes. The site has a private road to the A65.	The Council is carrying out a new Employment Land Review which will provide evidence regarding the need for allocated employment land across the district, including the need calculated for Gargrave. Further consultation with Systagenix could provide opportunities for employment expansion.	Yes	Awaiting results of Employment Land Review.
The recreational/play areas in Gargrave are mainly the upper, middle and lower greens adjacent to the River Aire. Consequently most sites proposed, like those already developed, are some distance away. This can only be ‘fixed’ by planning constraints which require the situation to be addressed on a site-specific basis or by provision in the	Noted.	No	

<p>emerging Gargrave Neighbourhood Plan. No need to keep repeating the point for every site assessment.</p>			
<p>The 2nd homes argument can be made for almost anywhere in the country, village or town and is overused. It needs to be used sparingly where there is a significant risk of developers being able to market properties in relation to benefits on a specific site at the expense of sustainability of housing developments as part of the strategic objective of the LP. Homes for rent could be substituted for the 2nd homes argument and would have a positive effect on sustainability.</p>	<p>Noted. Preliminary sustainability checks carried out for the 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan will be superseded by a full sustainability appraisal as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Awaiting results of the revised site assessment work and sustainability appraisal.</p>

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Giggleswick Response Paper to 1st Draft Local Plan 2014

Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
Site: SG004 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
<p>This site (Glebe Field) should be included as a preferred site in the local plan. Craven DC state that the site has not been preferred due to "...several minor negatives for quality, flood risk, biodiversity and townscape, plus an uncertain outcome for heritage assets..." as quotes by the Sites Preferred and Not Preferred For Consultation document (Sept 2014). This site is entirely within flood zone 1 and therefore not at risk of fluvial flooding. Whilst Tems Beck is located in close proximity to the western boundary of the site it is not considered to be an obstacle to development and has not prevented the delivery of other dwellings close to the Beck. The site is not known to be of high value in ecological terms and would be appropriate for low density development (8-10 dwellings), is sustainable and would not have an adverse impact on the existing character of Giggleswick. Further work will be done by the respondent on the suitability of this site, with the request that it is discussed with CDC.</p>	<p>Noted. Preliminary sustainability checks carried out for the 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan have been superseded by a full sustainability appraisal.</p>		<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Site is currently being considered for Local Green Space designation.</p>
Site: SG014 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Development of this site in addition to the	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd

relatively new development & residential planning permission on Lords Close will result in approx. 140 new cars accessing what was a quiet road over a tight bridge/junction.	would confirm whether or not the increase in traffic flow onto Bankwell Road would be appropriate, should this site proceed to final allocation.		draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
The provision of a small playground does in no way make up for the loss of open green space for local children to play on.	Noted.		
The vast numbers of housing currently or built in Giggleswick should be taken into account when considering the next planning application on land sold by Giggleswick School.	Noted. Residential completions or outstanding consents from 2012 onwards will be taken into account in terms of the numbers of new housing provided in Gargrave via site allocations over the plan period.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
There's a willing landowner to make money from land assets and a Local Council pressured to build more housing. I don't believe anyone's comments will make a difference to the planning outcome.	This comment is difficult to respond to because it contains generalisations and unsubstantiated arguments, and doesn't address the contents of the draft local plan or make suggestions for change.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
The Council should consider reducing the new housing targets in Giggleswick and should stop approving housing on sports fields.	The 22/9/14 draft plan identifies that Giggleswick can provide 2 dwellings per year over the next 15 years i.e., 30 dwellings in total. This figure was based on the latest information at the time. The overall housing target for the district has now increased in the 2016 draft of the local plan, to take account of evidence of housing need as outlined in the updated SHMA (2015). Although this has had some knock on effects for village housing targets, in Giggleswick there is still a requirement to provide for 2 houses per year over the plan period. It should be noted that residential completions or outstanding consents from 2012 onwards have been taken into account in	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

	terms of the numbers of new housing provided in Giggleswick via site allocations over the plan period.		
This site is suitable for residential development as it is entirely within flood zone 1, is accessible from an access road that runs between Bankwell Road and Lord's Close and has no known utility issues, therefore it is readily capable of being implemented into the existing infrastructure network.	Noted.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
The site would represent a logical rounding off of the existing residential development in this location, and a suitable and sustainable sites for development, which was the conclusion reached by CDC's SHLAA.	Noted.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
The loss of an element of school playing fields could be mitigated by investment being made south of Eshton's playing fields through improvement to the qualitative value of the facility, such as through the provision of an all-weather sports pitch to be used by the local community. The eastern margins of Lord's playing field (previously used as a playing field) could be brought back into use and upgraded.	Noted.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: SG015 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
This is an undeveloped site, which includes a small number of trees. An arboriculture assessment together with an illustrative layout was submitted to CDC in 2014, which show that the site could be developed whilst retaining the most valuable trees.	Noted.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

CDC controls a small area of this site. CDC and the landowner will therefore need to work together to promote and dispose of the site. Further discussions with CDC would be appreciated.	Noted.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
There are no known utility or infrastructure capacity issues in the area that would pose an obstacle to the early delivery of this site, which is small scale and can be readily accommodated within the existing infrastructure network.	Noted.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Any perceived loss of recreation/amenity space can be mitigated through investment works to other existing spaces. (see proposals to improve existing playing fields detailed at site SG014 above)	Noted.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
General Comments :			
Water supply - Local mains reinforcement may be required. (Yorkshire Water Comment)	Noted.		
Land south west of Furlane Ends and north of Brackenber Lane should be considered for housing development.	Noted. This land could already form part of the SHLAA however a site plan was not submitted with the representation so it is difficult to determine exact boundaries of the land in question. The Council has assessed all suitable and available sites as part of the updated site assessment work and land in this area has been identified in the pool of sites in the 2 nd draft of the Local Plan.	Yes	Site potentially identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work (need site plan to confirm).

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Glusburn and Cross Hills Response Paper to 1st Draft Local Plan 2014

Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
Site: SC014 & SC082, SC016 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
<p>The plan needs to be changed to increase the number of dwellings anticipated to come forward on SC014 and SC082, in order to reflect its genuine and realistic capacity. Indicative site layout submitted for site SC014 during the consultation period showing a mix of houses and apartments and area of open space suggesting that the yield from this site should be increased to between 65-70.</p>	<p>The 22/9/14 draft plan identifies that Glusburn and Cross Hills can provide 7 dwellings per year over the next 15 years i.e., 105 dwellings in total. This figure was based on the latest information at the time. It is likely that the overall housing target for the district will increase in future drafts of the local plan, to take account of evidence of housing need as outlined in the updated SHMA (2015). This could have knock on effects for village housing targets. It should be noted that residential completions or outstanding consents from 2012 onwards will be taken into account in terms of the numbers of new housing provided in Glusburn via site allocations over the plan period.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Further work to complete on revised housing target and distribution strategy.</p> <p>Site SC016 identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Sites SC014 & SC082 not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Site SC082 is likely to come forward later in the plan period, however it is considered that this site could accommodate more than 50 dwellings, as indicated in the draft plan. This site has potential to accommodate a significant number of apartments through conversion of the traditional buildings that front the site.</p>	<p>Noted. See above response.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Further work to complete on revised housing target and distribution strategy.</p> <p>Site SC016 identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Sites SC014 & SC082 not identified in</p>

			pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site SC014 in particular should take preference over any greenfield alternatives (SC016), as it is sequentially preferable.	Noted. Preliminary sustainability checks carried out for the 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan will be superseded by a full sustainability appraisal as work on the draft local plan progresses.	Yes	Site SC016 identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Sites SC014 & SC082 not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
The plan should encourage both sites (SC014 & SC082) to come forward before SC016, and site SC014 within the first five years of the plan.	Noted.	Yes	Site SC016 identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Sites SC014 & SC082 not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
The plan needs to be changed to ensure it reflects the genuine capacity of Glusburn for future housing development, as it has greater capacity than is currently indicated in the draft plan. All of the requirement for Glusburn could be achieved on sites SC014 & SC082. Alternatively the requirement could be increased with increased development on these sites in addition to retaining the allocation of site SC016.	The 22/9/14 draft plan identifies that Glusburn and Cross Hills can provide 7 dwellings per year over the next 15 years i.e., 105 dwellings in total. This figure was based on the latest information at the time. It is likely that the overall housing target for the district will increase in future drafts of the local plan, to take account of evidence of housing need as outlined in the updated SHMA (2015). This could have knock on effects for village housing targets. It should be noted that residential	Yes	Further work to complete on revised housing target and distribution strategy. Site SC016 identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Sites SC014 & SC082 not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and

	<p>completions or outstanding consents from 2012 onwards will be taken into account in terms of the numbers of new housing provided in Glusburn via site allocations over the plan period.</p>		<p>sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Site: SC037 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)</p>			
<p>Support expressed at the summer 2013 engagement event for site SC037 on the grounds that it could provide housing over a long period for both Sutton and Glusburn & Cross Hills; it may be of a sufficient scale to enable improvement of the railway crossing; it would benefit from easier access to the trunk road; and it would avoid already congested parts of each village. Site should be included as a preferred site.</p>	<p>Noted. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of all sites in the SHLAA.</p>		<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>General Comments:</p>			
<p>Water supply - Local mains reinforcement may be required. Waste water – The sites would drain via the Aire Valley Trunk Sewer. Yorkshire Water are currently developing our Aire Valley Strategy and Drainage Area Plan (DAP) outputs will be a key part of our future scenario planning. It is intended that as Local Plans are finalised for Craven and Bradford Districts (the sewer serves settlements in both) new development scenarios in the DAP will be revised and further feasibility undertaken. It is proposed that we will consider short, medium and long term responses to the supply demand challenges. Yorkshire Water would therefore seek to ensure that new</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		

development is suitably phased to allow Yorkshire Water to provide adequate capacity in the network to serve growth in both districts.			
The local plan map for Glusburn and Cross Hills does not take into account Green Lane, Malsis School and Ashfield Farm sites, therefore complete revision of the map is required.	The map shown in the 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan focussed on the draft preferred sites at that time. Further site assessment work is being carried out on all SHLAA sites to determine those that will go forward for consideration in the next draft of the local plan.	Yes	Also awaiting the results of the revised site assessment work with regards to choice of sites.
SC083 put forward for consideration during the consultation period.	Noted.		

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Hellifield Response Paper to 1st Draft Local Plan 2014

Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
Site: HE013 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
This site is owned by The Gargrave Poor's Land Charity	Noted.	No	
<p>The Parish Profile exercise and consultation process for Hellifield have made it clear that any further development in the village is only acceptable in small infill sites and to be spaced over the 15 year period. There is no indication that this has been listened too. The preferred site HE013 only appeared at the parish consultation event stage of the process and proposes to build the entire allocation on a greenfield site. There is concern that the implications of this decision will probably result in the entire site being fully developed within the plan period. Development of this site would detract from the character and appearance of the village by masking the church and the views towards the listed Hellifield Peel.</p>	<p>The 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan indicates that only part of HE013 would be required to accommodate the proposed number of dwellings for Hellifield over the plan period (i.e. 30, or 2 per year over the next 15 years). In addition, should this site be taken forward for final allocation, the draft plan indicates that there is potential for strategic open space on site which would be sited to the west of the site, thereby helping to preserve the setting of the grade II listed church.</p>	No	Site identified in the pool of sites for the 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Concerns regarding the pressure from future development on utility services have not been fully noted.	The 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan was an early version and very much a work in progress. Future drafts of the plan will be more explicit in respect of the need to align development with the appropriate infrastructure, including utility services.	Yes	Further consultation with infrastructure providers is ongoing.

<p>There is no indication in the draft plan of the phasing of development to meet the requirements of the Hellifield Village Plan.</p>	<p>The draft local plan is a statutory development plan and is not required to be in alignment with village plans. The neighbourhood planning process is a better way for parishes to help influence the planning process as adopted neighbourhood plans would form part of the statutory development plan. To date, Hellifield Parish has not indicated its intention to produce a neighbourhood plan. Should it do so, the Local Planning Authority would endeavour to work closely with the neighbourhood plan working group to ensure the two plans are in conformity and a sustainable solution is achieved for land allocation in Hellifield.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Details regarding any phasing of development on allocated sites will be set out in later drafts of the Local Plan.</p>
<p>No development is necessary in Hellifield as the village has had housing growth of 70% as opposed to the average of 20% for the region.</p>	<p>Noted. The 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan set out a draft housing target of 2 houses per year over the next 15 years (i.e. 30 houses). Whilst Hellifield has seen a substantial increase in its housing stock over the past 15 years, the local plan needs to plan for future need in the area and housing figures have been suggested across the District in sustainable locations to meet the evidenced need.</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>Further work to complete on revised housing target and distribution strategy.</p>
<p>Previously other more suitable sites were proposed (Section 53 of the original Craven Plan), which are “small, physically & visually well related to the settlement & not exceeding local need”. Two smaller sites should be chosen, one for market housing and one for affordable housing.</p>	<p>Noted. Further site assessment work will refine and consolidate the appropriate location for housing allocation in Hellifield. In accordance with current policy the Council will be seeking 40% affordable housing on all sites of 5 dwellings or more.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in the pool of sites for the 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>The site boundary should be reduced to provide uncertainty in terms of whether the</p>	<p>The 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan was an early version and very much a work in</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in the pool of sites for the 2nd draft Local Plan following site</p>

<p>entire site would be developed or not, and to provide a gap between the preferred site and the church. This site was the preferred site of the Parish Council, providing the boundary can be clarified and the development can be phased to the latter part of the plan period.</p>	<p>progress. Future drafts of the plan will be more explicit in respect of guiding development principles for each allocated site. This will include general layouts for sites and areas which we would expect to retain as open space.</p>		<p>assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.</p>
<p>This site is earmarked for 30 dwellings, however it has capacity for more. Does this mean that the number of 30 dwellings will be fixed as a maximum? Will the site will be developed beyond 2030? Will all 30 dwellings be built in a single phase? The site is also identified as having potential for strategic open space. Will this occupy all the remaining land and will it be safeguarded?</p>	<p>The 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan was an early version and very much a work in progress. Future drafts of the plan will be more explicit in respect of guiding development principles for each allocated site. This will include general layouts for sites and areas which we would expect to retain as open space. There will also be more detail provided regarding expected densities and phasing of development on allocated sites.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in the pool of sites for the 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.</p>
<p>This site should not be considered for housing due to access and egress issues onto the busy A65 and its proximity to the listed church buildings.</p>	<p>Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm access arrangements, should this site proceed to final allocation.</p> <p>The draft plan indicates that there is potential for strategic open space which would be sited to the west of the site, thereby helping to preserve the setting of the grade II listed church.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in the pool of sites for the 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Significant development has taken place in Hellifield in recent years, which has an impact on schools and other services. The lack of local employment opportunities would mean that new residents would have to travel by car to work meaning that the new home owners would need a minimum</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Further consultation with infrastructure providers is ongoing.</p>

of two cards per household.			
Why is new housing development being considered on this site when a recent planning application on Gisburn Road has been rejected due to it being close to the Grade II listed Church? How much are people being given by builders for the planning permission? Why do Parish Councillors have their needs adhered to when the image of the village is being ruined by a building site in the main road in a dangerous position? New housing, including affordable housing should be added to existing developments e.g., off Gisburn Rd.	Noted. The 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan was an early version and very much a work in progress. Sites will be analysed further and undergo full Sustainability Appraisal prior to the next round of consultation. In addition all housing sites of 5 or more dwellings will, according to current policy, be required to provide 40% affordable housing.	No	Site identified in the pool of sites for the 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
If two houses per year are to be built then a large site is not needed. Are two houses allowed to be built on a site at a time? CDC have recently given permission for two houses on Thorndale Street, which is the limit for next year.	The figure of 2 houses per year is just an average of the 30 houses over the next 15 years (i.e. the plan period) that the local plan would plan for on allocated sites. It is also a minimum figure as national planning policy current advocates the approval of housing development in sustainable locations. Windfall development over and above this figure (i.e. such as that approved on Thorndale Street) would be assessed in line with current policy on sustainable development.	No	Site identified in the pool of sites for the 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Consideration should be given to the original sites proposed as HE013 is totally unsuitable given its close proximity to the Grade II listed church.	Noted.	No	Site identified in the pool of sites for the 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Presumably affordable housing could not be achieved on this site due to the standards required to fit with the setting of the listed	All housing sites of 5 or more dwellings will, according to current policy, be required to provide 40% affordable housing.	No	Site identified in the pool of sites for the 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability

church building.			appraisal work.
Services in Hellifield are limited and reducing e.g., the Auction Mart are closing the only post office.	Noted. Hellifield is considered a sustainable location, being located on the A65 and relatively close to both Skipton and Settle for access to key services.		Further consultation with infrastructure providers is ongoing.
New housing creates jobs for builders not living in the area, it takes away fields, cuts jobs and put farmers out of business.	Noted.		
Where are the jobs going to be for those living in the affordable housing? Trains and buses are rare and it is impossible to work for a living without a vehicle. Are those living in the affordable housing going to be given a vehicle?	Noted.		
Are the householders in Hellifield to be given compensation for 10 years of major road works and loss of value on the homes overlooking the site?	Noted.		
Are the business interests of local/Craven councillors to be taken into account? Are they putting forward areas for housebuilding not near to their properties?	Noted.		
There are quite a few affordable houses currently for sale in Hellifield. If this site is developed then there would be more available properties in Hellifield for sale. There is no housing or affordable housing shortage.	Noted.		
Affordable housing does not need to have view of fields and does not need to be built on fields.	Noted.		
Is it the intention to build large expensive	Noted.		

houses that only rich people can buy?			
Alternative site currently with garages on near the clothes shop would be better.	Noted.		
How can people who cannot afford to buy a house live in Hellifield when a lot of money needs to be spent on transport to work?	Noted.		
This site contributes to the setting of the Grade II Listed St Aidan's Church, which is seen across this open farmland as one travels towards the village from the A65. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Before allocating this site for development an assessment of impact on the listed building is required. (Historic England comment).	<p>Conservation area appraisals are being carried out for villages and towns in the settlement strategy, including Hellifield. As part of this work preferred sites have been assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.</p> <p>In terms of HE013 the draft plan indicates that there is potential for strategic open space which would be sited to the west of the site, thereby helping to preserve the setting of the grade II listed church.</p>	Yes	Site identified in the pool of sites for the 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site : HE001 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
This site is owned by CDC	Noted.	No	
Sites : HE004, HE007, HE008, HE009 & HE011 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
These sites are owned by Craven Cattle Marts Ltd	Noted.	No	
Site : HE008 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
The Parish Council does not support development/allocation of this site. There is a current planning application on this site, which is located in updated EA flood zone 3. This updated information on flood risk should be incorporated into future Local Plan work.	The application that the Parish Council refers to was refused on flood risk grounds. Final allocated sites will be sequentially selected on the basis of siting development in areas at least risk of flooding. Sustainability appraisal will take into account the most up to date information from the Environment Agency on	No	Site not identified in the pool of sites for the 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

	flood risk.		
The “Sites Preferred and Not Preferred for Consultation” document states that feedback from public consultation in summer 2013 for this site was neutral. The Parish Council disagrees with this as many people have fed back to them that they feel strongly about the site being developed. Many people left the summer consultation event having only given verbal rather than written feedback. Hellifield Parish Council do not see why verbal feedback cannot be taken into account.	See above. To avoid misunderstanding and misrepresentation, the Local Planning Authority can only take written comments into account during consultation exercises.	No	Site not identified in the pool of sites for the 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site : HE009 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
This could be an alternative site to HE013 so long as the updated flood risk information from the EA does not affect the categorisation of the site. Initial sustainability appraisal of this site highlighted potential for employment use due to its proximity to an A road.	Application 42/2015/15870 was refused by Planning Committee contrary to officer advice. The appellant is currently appealing this decision.	No	Site identified in the pool of sites for the 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
General Comments :			
Water supply - Local mains reinforcement may be required. (Yorkshire Water comment)	Noted.		
Any future housing development in Hellifield should be limited to small infill sites.	Noted. Infill development will be advocated through draft plan policy. Revised site assessment work will establish the most appropriate and sustainable sites for allocation.	?	Revised site assessment work will identify sites to be included in the pool of sites or not.
The station is at the moment owned by the railway company but most of the building and land to the west is owned by the West	Noted. The future potential of this land will be explored as work on the local plan progresses.	Yes	Revised site assessment work will identify sites to be included in the pool of sites or not.

<p>Coast Railway. This land would make an ideal car park and the road to nowhere a good entrance. Given that this station is a major junction both into Leeds and Lancashire there is potential for commuters into Lancashire and also to bring tourists into Craven. However the line needs opening up to passenger services. This land also has the potential for small businesses - jobs need to be brought into Craven to avoid retirement settlements.</p>	<p>Passenger train services are beyond the remit of the local plan.</p>		
<p>The plan should specifically identify and include sites of high biodiversity value with Craven, such as Hellifield Flashes which is species-rich, and act to fully protect these sites.</p>	<p>As part of the preparation for the next draft of the local plan the local planning authority has drawn up a methodology for the designation of Local Green Space, based of guidance in the NPPG (National Planning Policy Guidance). This methodology will form the basis of a 'call for sites' that may be suitable for designation as Local Green Space. Sites submitted will be assessed in line with national guidance and suitable sites will form part of the next round of consultation for the draft local plan, with the aim of having an adopted local plan which proactively protects designated green space across the plan area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Once agreed, a list of sites designated as local green space will be included in the plan, and mapped on the plan's accompanying Policies Map.</p>
<p>No employment site is indicated on the plan. When the plan is adopted what will be the status of the area bounded by the A65, Waterside Lane and Station Road, which was previously earmarked as a development site? Will it be removed as a development site or modified to reduce its potential impact on the community and countryside?</p>	<p>The future potential of this land will be explored as work on the local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Revised site assessment work will identify sites to be included in the pool of sites or not.</p>

<p>Hellifield village is surrounded by land owned by businesses and organisations outside the community. As such it could be subject to speculative planning applications such as the current one off Back Lane. What safeguards will the local plan have to prevent such development during the plan lifetime?</p>	<p>In addition to development on allocated sites, the draft local plan will advocate, through policy, the approach that unallocated sites may add up to 10% to the planned average annual building rate for that parish.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Revised site assessment work will identify sites to be included in the pool of sites or not.</p>
<p>Affordable housing is an essential element of the draft plan. In relation to Hellifield will such housing be prioritised to existing, established Hellifield families rather than open to all corners; be actually affordable? The last affordable housing development, Station Court, included houses for sale, which were at the time offered at some £40,000 above the asking price for some existing housing stock.</p>	<p>The local plan will seek the provision of 40% of new dwellings as affordable housing on-site as part of developments of 5 dwellings or 0.2 ha or more.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>The County Council have expressed an interest in building extra care housing in Hellifield as this would meet the needs of the wider population of Settle and Gargrave. Joined up thinking is needed as Hellifield would not be suitable for such a plan if the current replacement bus service was taken away.</p>	<p>Agree. Extra care housing should be sited in sustainable and accessible locations to suit the needs of older residents. To date the Local Planning Authority has not been approached by North Yorkshire County Council with regards to extra care housing in Hellifield.</p>	<p>?</p>	
<p>There does not need to be anymore housing in Hellifield. Building on farmers fields is not the way forward. Building on farmers fields cut jobs. People who are poor cannot afford to live where there are no jobs or enough cheap transport. Building needs to be done in towns where there are jobs, schools and</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		

public transport easy to access. Giving money/planning permission to builders building big homes for rich people is not something a council should do. It leaves Craven Council open to allegations of taking bribes. Homes that are affordable should be built by the council in places where work is available			
--	--	--	--

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

High Bentham Response Paper to 1st Draft Local Plan 2014

Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
Site: HB011 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Site should be ring fenced for "Extra Care" housing as lack of residential facilities for older people. Easy access to town centre.	Agree. North Yorkshire County Council has expressed an interest in developing this site for extra care housing.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Potential problem with access on Low Croft which is too narrow for both construction vehicles and general traffic. No proper footpath. Better access would be from Robin Lane.	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm the appropriate access/egress arrangements to the site.		Further consultation with infrastructure providers is ongoing.
Site: HB017 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Thought to be a good site for mixed use (housing and commercial).	Noted. Further site assessment work will refine and consolidate the appropriate locations for housing and employment allocations in High Bentham.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Opposite view point stated that site should be fully developed for employment use rather than mixed use. It is an established industrial area and is more suited to employment use. HB027 could take this site's housing allocation as it is more suitable for housing than HB017.	Noted. Further site assessment work will refine and consolidate the appropriate locations for housing and employment allocations in High Bentham.		Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: HB023 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Field with footpaths running through should not be used for housing development, rather they should remain the responsibility of the	Agree. Development principles for HB023 would look retain existing footpaths through the site, should this site proceed to final	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability

landowner. This would break up areas of housing and leave the fields in their existing natural state (i.e. footpath provision at recently developed Bargh's Meadow was poor, i.e. narrow path between tall fence and untrimmed edge, overlaid with large limestone chippings – attracts rubbish, feels unnatural and does not feel anything like the path across a flowering meadow that preceded it). If HB023 is developed, the footpath should be diverted through HB022, which then should not be developed at a later stage.	allocation.		appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.
Most easterly field in HB023 should not be developed.	Noted. Further site assessment work will refine and consolidate the appropriate locations for housing allocations in High Bentham.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Concern about serious flooding problems in south-western part of site (behind Moonsacre), and around the beck that flows west of the Telephone Exchange. Plan for new development should also consider the impact on water levels and flooding on Furness Drive and south of Low Bentham Road.	Site specific flood risk assessments will be carried out on site prior to allocation (– or development?). Development would be sited furthest away from areas of the site prone to flooding.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Further consultation with infrastructure providers is ongoing.
Access on to B6480 is at bottom end of a blind hill and blind bend and traffic is already too fast along this road. Serious safety issues for both people and animals. Previous refusal on site due to access.	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm the appropriate access/egress arrangements to the site.	?	Further consultation with infrastructure providers is ongoing.
A new safe pedestrian route for primary and nursery children to use from High Bentham to the new school has been designated on	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm the appropriate access/egress arrangements to the site.	?	Further consultation with infrastructure providers is ongoing.

north side of B6480. The proposed access for HB023 compromises the safety of children travelling to new school.			
Site is on a green wedge area. Concern that the need for new housing does not outweigh the green wedge designation. Green wedges should be protected to help integrate Bentham into the countryside.	HB023 is not within the green wedge area, protected by the Council's adopted local plan saved policy BE3: Green Wedges.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Brownfield sites should be utilised before this large greenfield sites which attracts a lot of wildlife.	Agree. In line with the NPPF, the draft local plan will encourage the effective re-use of brownfield land. However, there is currently not enough brownfield land available to provide houses to meet the District's objectively assessed need (OAN). As such some greenfield sites will be allocated to meet that need.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site steep for development.	Noted. Topography issues are for the developer to consider should a planning application be submitted for the site.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.
Proposed housing is too dense for size of site.	Noted. Further density work still to complete for sites proceeding to final allocation	?	If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified, together with indicative densities.
Site abuts recently developed Bargh's Meadow. Danger that additional development on HB023 would lead to a huge area of low-cost / social housing development which would alter the existing	Noted. Development principles on allocated sites will specify that sites should have a mix of housing to suit the identified housing need for the area.	?	If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.

well-balanced feel of this small market town of Bentham.			
Tranquillity, which is already compromised in the area due to new school, would be further compromised with proposed new housing development.	Noted. This issue will be picked up through sustainability appraisal.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Subsistence issues for homes along B6480 if housing built behind them (i.e. trees already fallen over in gardens due to waterlogging issues and poor drainage)	Noted. This issue will be picked up through the revised site assessment work.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Infrastructure issues such as impact of health care system, impact on sewers and drains (viability cost to increase sewerage which is already working to full capacity).	Policy SP21 (Sustainable Buildings, Infrastructure and Planning Obligations) could be amended to provide greater reassurance that the infrastructure needed to deliver the plan will be provided in a timely manner, to coordinate with the phasing of development. This approach could be backed up with the production of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and (if adopted by the Council) a CIL charging schedule.	Yes	Amendment to draft policy SP21 to provide ensure that the infrastructure needed to deliver the plan is provided. (IDP)
Development of this site, coupled with HB030 would result in overdevelopment in this area of the town, resulting in loss of the location's rural agricultural history and character and additional strain on infrastructure in this area.	Noted. This issue will be picked up through the revised site assessment work.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: HB027 (site identified in the 1st draft Local Plan)			
Should be considered for housing, not employment as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is currently surrounded by housing It does not present a flood risk (issues with incorrect outcomes for 	Noted. These issues will be picked up through the revised site assessment work.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

<p>flood risk cited in Council's sustainability check).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is not suitable for agriculture due to size and steep topography. • The land has no employment potential. 			
<p>HB027 is a filled in quarry and may not be suitable for development.</p>	<p>Noted. This issue will be picked up through the revised site assessment work.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Site: HB028 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)</p>			
<p>Development is too large scale and would result in the loss of too many greenfields.</p>	<p>Noted. This issue will be picked up through the revised site assessment work.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Flood risk issues around Church Beck.</p>	<p>Site specific flood risk assessments will be carried out on site prior to allocation</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Further consultation with infrastructure providers is ongoing.</p>
<p>Should be partially development for employment use, rather than HB027 which is more suitable to housing.</p>	<p>Noted. These issues will be picked up through the revised site assessment work.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan as a mixed use site, offering housing and employment uses, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>HB028 edges the town's gateway from Slaidburn and from the railway, giving visitors their first impression of the town. As such it requires protection as open space.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>If HB028 is developed the Cattle/Sheep</p>	<p>The Auction Mart are land owners of part of</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd</p>

<p>market would be put at risk. The Auction Mart would lose fields for grazing and would potentially become less viable. The Auction Mart and the activities that go on there (i.e. thousands of sheep enclosed in fields) also communicates to residents and visitors what Bentham is about. The noises, smells, vehicle loading and road congestion that are created by the Auction Mart are an important part of community life and the benefits far outweigh the problems they pose. Farmers also use the banks, shops, doctor's surgery in Bentham that are easily accessible from the free parking at the Auction Mart. This is a hard to reach group in the community and should be supported (i.e. the surgery has set up mini-clinics at the Auction Mart to target specific issues in the farming community).</p>	<p>HB028 and have shown a clear interest in developing the site.</p>		<p>draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>New park should be sited on the field north (and in sight of the) of the railway line and east of the station entrance (i.e. west end of HB028). This field is ideally placed, attractive, within easy reach of the town centre and seen by rail passengers as they come into Bentham. New park should not be made 'low maintenance' with too much decking, paving and gravel. Rather it should be a wildlife haven ((wildflower meadows, bee friendly plants, an apiary, bat boxes, bird boxes, a pond, trees, organic vegetables & fruit trees).</p>	<p>Noted. Guiding development principles for larger strategic sites will set out appropriate land uses for each part the site, should they proceed to final allocation.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.</p>
<p>If one of the reasons for developing the</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd</p>

<p>whole area of HB028 is to make it possible to build a road suitable for lorries to get to Station Road/ Angus Fire, it would need to cut across the field where a park could potentially be sited. This would create a very different and less attractive atmosphere and would push any potential park even further away from the town centre. Need to ensure that we don't embark on unnecessary, expensive, major road building operations which will change the town completely, i.e. look at all alternatives, including using the railway.</p>			<p>draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.</p>
<p>Housing development on HB028 would add to congestion on Station Road and at the junction with Main Street. Access may be better via HB027 onto Springfield Road.</p>	<p>Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm whether or not the increase in traffic flow on nearby roads, and the access/egress arrangements to the site would be appropriate.</p>		<p>Further consultation with infrastructure providers is ongoing.</p>
<p>Need to retain green spaces and footpaths and heritage trails through site which are vital for drawing walkers to the area and vital to the health and wellbeing of residents who use them. Housing development should be surrounded by greenspace.</p>	<p>Noted. Development principles would ensure permeability and greenspace throughout allocated sites.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.</p>
<p>Allotments should be included on this site.</p>	<p>Noted. Guiding development principles for larger strategic sites will set out appropriate land uses for each part the site, should they proceed to final allocation.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be</p>

			identified.
A community renewable energy generation project to provide power for the new houses and for existing dwellings would be a good idea	Noted.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.
Need more detail as to where housing would be sited and where green space would be retained.	Noted. Guiding development principles for larger strategic sites will set out appropriate land uses for each part the site, should they proceed to final allocation.	?	If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.
Site: HB030 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Development of this site, coupled with HB023 would result in overdevelopment in this area of the town, resulting in loss of the location's rural agricultural history and character and additional strain on infrastructure in this area.	Noted. These issues will be picked up through the revised site assessment work.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
This site should be used as open parkland, which would maintain the area's rural roots and make it an attractive place for people to both live and visit, which in turn would encourage more tourism and business into the area.	Noted. Guiding development principles for larger strategic sites will set out appropriate land uses for each part the site, should they proceed to final allocation.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Should be partially development for employment use, rather than HB027 which is more suitable to housing.	Noted. Guiding development principles for larger strategic sites will set out appropriate land uses for each part the site, should they proceed to final allocation.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Need more detail as to where housing would be sited and where green space	Noted. Guiding development principles for larger strategic sites will set out appropriate	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site

would be retained.	land uses for each part the site, should they proceed to final allocation.		assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: HB026, HB033, HB035, HB038 (sites not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Infill sites would be preferable to large sites as they would be less intrusive and encourage newcomers to integrate with the existing community (i.e. HB026, HB033, HB035 and remains of HB038). Addition of more, smaller sites, but with the reduction of numbers on each site.	Noted. Site selection is not yet finalised. Site selection process to be complete following finalisation of key evidence documents (SHMA, Employment Land Review), revised site assessment work and full sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Sites HB026, HB033 & HB038 are identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Site HB035 not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
HB035 (Felsteads) is not included as a preferred site and yet has outline planning consent. This development should be combined with development of school on half of HB038, and then the remainder of HB038 should also be developed for housing.	Sites with planning consent from 01/04/12 onwards will contribute to the housing target for the district. As such the housing approved on these sites will be deducted from the housing target for the plan period (i.e. 2012 – 2032). Sites allocated in the local plan will address the shortfall between existing extant consents and the housing target, which is based on an objectively assessed need for the area. As noted above though, site selection is not yet finalised. Distribution of housing and final site selection process will be completed following finalisation of key evidence documents (SHMA, Employment Land Review) and full sustainability appraisal.	Yes	Sites HB026, HB033 & HB038 are identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Site HB035 not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
General Comments :			
Need more smaller sites in High Bentham (as opposed to giant proposed sites) to preserve	Noted. Site selection is not yet finalised. Site selection process to be complete following	Yes	Pool of sites identified for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment

<p>the character of the town, i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • field north of Springfield Crescent which has road access, • on sites between Low and High Bentham, close to the proposed new school (taking care not to obstruct views to the south), so that parents could walk their kids to school and avoid car journeys which would further congest the town, • near Felstead, • field to west of Naylor Myers timber yard, • land next to Ford House, Low Bentham Road, • any part of HB011 not needed for extra care, • Campbell Hatcheries. 	<p>finalisation of key evidence documents (SHMA, Employment Land Review), revised site assessment work and full sustainability appraisal.</p>		<p>and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>The east of Bentham should be considered as well to help spread the impact of new development on the town.</p>	<p>Noted. Site selection is not yet finalised. Site selection process to be complete following finalisation of key evidence documents (SHMA, Employment Land Review), revised site assessment work and full sustainability appraisal.</p>		<p>Pool of sites identified for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Information in the 'Retail and Town Centres' section of the Local Plan is incorrect. Need more accuracy about the reality of markets in Bentham and need to support them to ensure viability of town centre (i.e. Bentham only has a small weekly market - veg stall and fish stall on Wed and Sat, and there is no monthly farmers market).</p>	<p>Further research shows that there is a weekly market in Bentham which acts as a 'farmer's market', as well as a Farmer's Auction Mart. The latter has sales on Tuesdays and Wednesdays, along with weekly (seasonal), fortnightly (seasonal), monthly and special sales.</p> <p>A Retail and Leisure Study has also been</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Amendment to 'Retail and Town Centres' section to provide clarity on existing markets (i.e. it seems that the weekly market and the farmer's market are the same thing).</p>

	prepared for Bentham in 2016. The results of this assessment will inform the Retail and Town Centres section of the draft Local Plan.		
The transport infrastructure in Bentham is very stretched and whilst the town wishes to grow it cannot do so successfully without notice being taken of the need for improvements to the transport links, both in terms of train / bus timetables and the roads themselves. The B6480 / Station Road junction in High Bentham is a major bottle neck in the town which needs addressing, particularly if significantly more traffic is expected to use it with developments on the Station Road end of site HB028 and site HB017. Improved transport infrastructure would enable businesses to invest in facilities in Bentham for future growth and encourage more people to live in this very pleasant small town.	Noted and agreed. The retail and town centres section of the draft local plan acknowledges the challenges Bentham's transport infrastructure faces and policy aims to support development proposals which will improve these conditions.	Yes	A Retail and Leisure Study has also been prepared for Bentham in 2016. The results of this assessment will inform the Retail and Town Centres section of the draft Local Plan.
Looking outside of the limits, the access roads to both Low and High Bentham are poor and mostly unsuitable for HGVs and coaches as they are narrow and have low bridges. Bentham needs a direct road to the A65 suitable for all traffic and improvements westwards to the A682.	Noted. Improvements to the highways network fall outside the remit of the local plan, North Yorkshire County Council being the District's highways authority.	No	
Need clarity on difference between blue and yellow sites in plan.	Noted. The blue sites in the draft local plan are 'draft preferred sites' and the yellow sites are 'option sites', meaning there is still some work to do on these sites to establish whether or not they will be preferred in the next draft. The next draft of the Local Plan will be more	Yes	Pool of sites identified for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

	specific with regards to draft preferred sites and they will have been subject to further and more refined analysis and appraisal.		
Plan should also include new housing and other development that has recently been built in Bentham (i.e. at Bargh's Meadow, new school).	Noted. Maps in future drafts of the local plan will be more up to date and show recently built housing developments.	Yes	Updated O.S. mapping.
Antisocial parking is a real problem within both settlements where many properties were built without off street parking. Future developments should not be allowed in either High or Low Bentham without the provision of parking spaces.	Agree. Draft policy SP6 sets out general design principles, one of which supports the 'designing out' of anti-social parking. The aim is to 'avoid the creation or worsening of situations where anti-social parking has an impact on people's homes and quality of life'.	No	Addressed in draft policy SP6.
(Low and High Bentham) 15 houses per year= 225 over 15 years Water supply- Local mains reinforcement may be required (Yorkshire Water comment).	Noted.		

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Ingleton Response Paper to 1st Draft Local Plan 2014

Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
Site: IN009 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Development of this site for social housing is underway and should not be used in these calculations.	Land will be allocated in the Local Plan to meet the housing requirements of all, including those in affordable/social housing need. Sites proposed for housing allocation, which already have planning permission, will contribute to the overall housing requirement. Therefore such sites will continue to be included.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: IN003 & IN028 (sites identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Numbers to increase by a minimum of 15	Noted. The 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan set out a draft housing target of 5 houses per year over the next 15 years (i.e. 75 houses). Further work will be completed on the overall housing target form Craven and the distribution within Ingleton. The next draft Local Plan will also provide more detail regarding expected densities.	Yes	<p>IN003 not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>IN028 identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Further work to complete on revised housing target and distribution strategy.</p>
Site: IN028 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Whilst there is potential for limited development on the site, the extent appears to have taken no account of topography or	Noted. The 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan indicates that only part of HE013 would be required to accommodate the proposed	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability

the historic field boundaries resulting in development that would relate poorly to the character of the settlement and its landscape setting and would harm the character and setting of Ingleton Conservation Area.	number of dwellings for Ingleton over the plan period (i.e. 75, or 5 per year over the next 15 years). In addition, should this site be taken forward for final allocation, the draft plan indicates that there is potential for strategic open space on site.		appraisal work.
<p>Before allocating INO28 the following needs to be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assessment of the site in terms of the contribution it makes to Ingleton Conservation Area and the impact the loss of this site would have. 2. If it is considered that development would cause harm the plan needs to set out how harm might be removed or reduced. 3. If at the end of the process development would still cause harm, the site should not be allocated unless there are clear benefits that outweigh the harm (NPPF Para 133 or 134 requirement) 	Conservation area appraisals are being carried out for villages and towns in the settlement strategy, including Ingleton. As part of this work sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.	Yes	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Conservation Area Appraisals will inform identification of preferred sites.</p>
Site : IN031 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
This site should not be developed. The beauty of this area and trees with TPOs should be preserved for visitors to the area.	Noted	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
General Comments :			
The County Council is about to conduct a procurement exercise to secure a partner to develop extra care housing in Craven on sites in the council's ownership in High Bentham	Noted. Extra care housing should be sited in sustainable and accessible locations to suit the needs of older residents. DC will liaise with NYCC in respect of this current procurement	?	

and Ingleton. The former playing fields at Ingleton Middle School are being considered for extra care housing and public leisure use.	exercise. NYCC has identified Bentham and Ingleton as areas of potential development for extra care, 1 site to serve both areas.		
Water supply- Local mains reinforcement may be required.	Noted.	?	Consultation with infrastructure providers is ongoing.
Increase numbers from 5 properties a year to 10 for Ingleton.	Noted. The overall housing requirement and distribution is currently being looked at. As a result the number of houses provided in Ingleton may change in the next draft Local Plan.		Key evidence e.g., SHMA will inform the next draft Local Plan in terms of overall housing requirement and distribution in Ingleton.
Concerns about proposed major developments in close proximity in Lancashire and Cumbria, which could impact on the future of Ingleton.	Noted.		
Suggest Ingleton is allowed to grow without any more restrictions being put in place.	Noted. Craven has a duty to calculate an objectively assessed housing need (OAN) for Craven. This will then inform the overall housing requirement for Craven. The Local Plan will then set out how this requirement will be distributed throughout specific settlements throughout Craven, including Ingleton.		Key evidence e.g., SHMA will inform the next draft Local Plan in terms of overall housing requirement and distribution in Ingleton.

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Low Bentham Response Paper to 1st Draft Local Plan 2014

Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
Sites identified in the 1st Draft Local Plan			
Site: LB010			
Should not be developed for housing due to existing visual amenity – views to south and west from Greenfoot Lane, Cross Lane & Westend Lane brings countryside to edge of settlement. Opposite view that it should be developed as it is more in keeping with a small rural village.	Both views noted. Further site assessment work will refine and consolidate the appropriate locations for housing allocations in Low Bentham.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: LB015			
Acceptable site for housing providing scheme does not repeat disastrous 15-27 Harley Close Development.	Noted. Development principles will be established for each housing allocation.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred site development principles could address this issue.
Need to take account of PROW into the play area and accessible green infrastructure to Ellergill Beck.	Noted. Establishment of development principles for each housing allocation will take into account existing site assets such as existing PROWs & green infrastructure.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred site development principles could

			address this issue.
Access is an issue from LB015 onto the B6480 in terms of visibility; this area will require some form of traffic calming.	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm visibility and traffic calming requirements in relation to this site.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Further consultation with infrastructure providers e.g., NYCC Highways is ongoing.
Site: LB021			
Access is an issue for LB021 if using Hillside Road where emergency vehicles already struggle because of on-street parking. Also safety concerns for children playing in this area. Any increase in traffic along the private drive (which serves 8 existing houses) resulting from increased housing would be detrimental to present residents. Need to ensure that none of the proposed new houses are accessed by privately owned Ellergill Drive. Access through numbers 22 and 20 Hillside Road (bungalows designed for elderly people) will produce a great deal of extra noise and pollution, which is bound to be deeply disturbing. Is the proposed access to the field owned by Sanctuary North? Have CDC clarified the legal situation?	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm access requirements in relation to this site. The legal situation relating to the use of the land falls outside the planning system. This would be a matter to be considered during any sale of the land.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
This site includes one side of an avenue of lime trees, which are subject to tree preservation orders. There are also other mature trees on the site worthy of	Noted. Establishment of development principles for each housing allocation will take into account existing site assets such as protected trees/	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

<p>protection. Other heritage assets include the old kitchen garden wall, which should not be removed. As such LB021 should be removed in full or in part. The area between the 6 planned houses (as shown on concept scheme for site) and the private drive into Ellergill is protected woodland. LB021 should be amended to exclude this area of protected woodland which is well-used and well loved by Low Bentham residents. Site has been refused planning permission in the past on grounds that it is outside development limits, there is already sufficient housing in the area, poor access and adverse impact on nearby mature trees.</p>	<p>woodland and heritage assets. Revised site assessment and sustainability appraisal methodologies will be applied to all sites, including this one. This work, together with establishment of development principles will help identify the best sites to provide new housing for the next plan period.</p>		
<p>Development of the site poses a threat to biodiversity of the area.</p>	<p>Revised site assessment and sustainability appraisal methodologies will be applied to all sites, including this one, which will consider issues including biodiversity.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Concept statement shows 8 proposed houses, rather than the 6 proposed in draft Plan. Even though the concept statement suggests this site will provide 'natural infill', this is not the case. This site will be overlooked by over 30 existing houses and any new development would have a great environmental impact on them. Development would go against the draft Plan's Strategic Objective of "allowing the</p>	<p>Noted. All preferred sites identified in the Sept 2014 draft Local Plan will be reassessed in terms of densities that can be achieved. Sites will also be subject to a revised site assessment methodology and SA framework.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>

countryside to permeate built-up areas”.			
The sustainability check for LB021 mentions that even though the site is grade 3 agricultural land, this land is no longer used as such. However, LB021 supports sheep year round and includes a small shelter for them in bad weather. Development of LB021 would result in the loss of important agricultural land which runs into the heart of the village.	Noted. All SHLAA sites will be subject to a revised site assessment methodology and SA framework, which will make an assessment of agricultural land grading. Both methodologies have been amended following comments received during the Sept 2014 consultation on the draft Local Plan.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Development of LB021 would pose a threat to “dark skies” which is currently enjoyed by residents of Ellergill Lodge and would be contrary to the draft plans claim to “promote the understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of dark skies and support proposals that help secure the benefit of dark skies”.	Noted. All SHLAA sites will be subject to a revised site assessment methodology and SA framework.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Concerns raised about access to school playing fields. NYCC has bought the land providing access to the field from Doctor’s Hill and has granted Bentham Town Council right of access in perpetuity. This is not the developer’s ‘gift’ as suggested in concept statement.	Noted. The establishment of development principles and site assessment will take this right of access into account.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Sustainability check suggests that site is less than 400m from play space and is positively marked as such. The park does not offer any play equipment and has a dangerous access for children.	Noted. This information will inform appraisal of the site prior to consultation on the next draft Local Plan. An assessment of existing open spaces is currently being carried out, which will include the park in Low Bentham. The results of this assessment will also inform the next draft Local Plan.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

<p>Site should be restricted to sheltered elderly accommodation on a third of the site, woodland on a third and a third left as a walled garden to Ellergill Farm.</p> <p>What kind of houses would be provided on this site? Private houses at normal commercial prices are not in shortage in Low Bentham. Low cost social housing may not be suitable unless there is going to be substantial investment in physical and social infrastructure e.g there are no shops or medical services and public transport is minimal.</p> <p>Development of the site should be reconsidered in light of local needs e.g., parking and number of vacant properties in the area.</p>	<p>Evidence base to the Local Plan, including Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) will provide evidence on the types of housing required throughout the plan area over the next plan period i.e., size, tenure, type.</p> <p>The establishment of development principles will identify which elements or parts of the site should be retained/protected.</p> <p>Low Bentham has been identified as a key service centre for the north sub area, as a result of an assessment of existing services and facilities.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Ellergill House, immediately to the east of this area is a Grade II Listed Building. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that “special regard” should be had to the desirability of preserving Listing Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Before allocating this site for development an assessment of impact on the listed building is required (English Heritage Comment).</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>An assessment will be made of the impact of development of this site on the existing listed building.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Site LB024:</p>			
<p>LB024 should not become available for building and should remain a play area with investment in new play equipment as there is none in existence at the moment.</p> <p>Opposite view point stated that should use</p>	<p>Bentham Parish Council has purchased part of the former school playing field and have submitted a planning application (08/2016/16604) proposing residential development of the former play area (site</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>

<p>this existing play area for housing, but only if LB025 is kept as a play area. Loss of both play areas to housing is unacceptable. This field was given to the people of Bentham by a local Quaker, Philip Harvey, to be a recreation area. Need to check the terms of this bequest to see if it is legal to use this gift for another purpose.</p>	<p>LB024). This is a current application; decision is due after 21st July 2016. If this application is approved, Bentham Parish Council plan to ring fence any capital receipt towards new equipment at the former school playing field site. The legal situation relating to the use of the land falls outside the planning system. This would be a matter to be considered during any sale of the land.</p>		
<p>A S106 or Community Levy for play equipment (as approved by the Parks Dept) in the empty playground would be useful to a village absent of play facilities.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council is currently undertaking an assessment of open space, including play areas, which will highlight deficiencies and surpluses in the existing provision and set local standards. These local standards will be achieved via Local Plan policy and through the use of S106 Agreement. The Council is not, at this time progressing work on preparing an adopting a CIL.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. The Open Space Assessment scored existing sites in High and Low Bentham as average to very good and has identified existing and future deficiencies in all types of open space within the north sub area, which includes High and Low Bentham.</p>
<p>Sites LB021 & LB024:</p>			
<p>There is a problem with on-street parking on Burton Road and the lack of any safe pedestrian pavement, especially dangerous for children. The Council should therefore build in traffic calming measures, provide pavements/walkways and create car parking spaces for current residents on Burton Road and also visitors to the new proposed houses</p>	<p>Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm traffic calming, car parking & other relevant requirements in relation to this site.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>LB021 not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. LB024 identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability</p>

			<p>appraisal work.</p> <p>Further consultation with infrastructure providers e.g., NYCC Highways is ongoing.</p>
Sites Not Identified In the 1st Draft Local Plan			
LB014:			
<p>Proposed site too large. Reduce the proposed site to one field include parking arrangements for Hillside Terrace. Should remain as green space or changed to residential land for a small single storey dwelling.</p>	<p>Noted. All SHLAA sites will be subject to a revised site assessment methodology and SA framework,</p>	No	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
General Comments :			
<p>Concern raised about lack of information on sites to be able to make informed representations (i.e. concept schemes were not made public, except via a Freedom of Information request)</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan consultation Sept 2014 invited comments on all aspects of the plan, including sites and policies. As part of background work on preferred sites, the Council did invite suggested concept schemes to be put forward by land owners. These have not been published as they are not agreed schemes or layouts and have no planning status. The purpose of them is to inform calculation of densities on site and future development principles.</p>	Yes	<p>The 2nd draft Local Plan will identify a pool of sites for each settlement included within the settlement strategy. Informal consultation will on this draft will provide the public an opportunity to comment on sites contained within the pool.</p> <p>Where sites are identified as preferred site allocations, development principles will be established.</p>
<p>Looking outside of the limits, the access roads to both Low and High Bentham are poor and mostly unsuitable for HGVs and coaches as they are narrow and have low bridges. Bentham needs a direct road to the A65 suitable for all traffic and improvements</p>	<p>Noted. This would be a strategic transport issue. Plans for new road building are set out in the NYCC Transport Plan. The current Transport Plan has no proposals for the provision of a direct road to the A65.</p>		<p>Consultation with infrastructure providers is ongoing.</p>

westwards to the A682.			
Antisocial parking is a real problem within both settlements where many properties were built without off street parking. Future developments should not be allowed in either High or Low Bentham without the provision of parking spaces	Noted. Parking provision in new housing development is established via an assessment of sustainability of the site and settlement, and what the market requirements are in terms of private off street parking provision.		
Prior to any new development, safe footpaths must be provided on Doctors Hill as well as crossings on Bentham Road.	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm what improvements for pedestrians are required and can be achieved via new housing development in the village.		Consultation with infrastructure providers & statutory consultees is ongoing.

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Rathmell Response Paper to 1st Draft Local Plan 2014

Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
Site: RA001 (draft pool site)			
<p>RA001 cannot be both housing and open space. There is a robust sense of community in Rathmell. Open space for recreation for children and adults would add to the well-being of the population, however need to give a very clear definition of the "open space" particularly if community use is implied.</p>	<p>The 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan identified RA001 as a draft preferred site (blue) with the potential for strategic open space within the site (green dot). Guiding development principles on larger allocated sites would identify areas of the development site that would be devoted to open space. Should RA001 be allocated for development it would be expected to deliver appropriate open space to compliment any planned housing.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>There is a very large and important barn on the roadside and that must not be compromised by unsympathetic development of site or demolition/modern rebuild. A brief on the whole designated area is suggested.</p>	<p>Development principles on site and an assessment of the surrounding area would address this issue, should RA001 proceed to final allocation.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>The site is good agricultural land. It is prone to flooding which does not interfere with agricultural use but which would surely be detrimental to housing.</p>	<p>Noted, however there is a need to allocate some grade 3 agricultural land, in the absence of suitable grade 4 or 5 land being made available. Should RA001 be preferred in the next draft of the local plan flooding issues would be addressed through site specific flood risk assessments.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Access via Hesley Lane is poor. The Junction of Hesley Lane with Main Street Rathmell is</p>	<p>Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm footpath arrangements and the</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site</p>

narrow with poor sight lines and so steep a gradient that already it requires frequent repair. The Lane has many bends and is so narrow that in many places; especially adjoining the proposed site, vehicles from opposite directions cannot safely pass. This creates a hazard for pedestrians for whom there is no escape because of lack of a footway. Access/egress for houses on the proposed site would increase this hazard. If there is to be housing alongside it, Hesley Lane should be widened (especially at its junction with Main Street), and provided with a footpath.	appropriate access/egress arrangements to the site, should it be allocated.		assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: RA006 (draft pool site)			
Given its edge of village position, we would suggest an archaeological watching brief on those parts that have not been built on before.	Noted. Sustainability appraisal assesses the archaeological merit of a site, in consultation with North Yorkshire County Council.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Beautry Farmhouse is a Grade II Listed Building. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that “special regard” should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. The Local Plan should make it clear that any redevelopment proposals for this area should safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of this building. Amend accordingly (Historic England comment).	Conservation area appraisals are being carried out for villages and towns in the settlement strategy, including Carleton. As part of this work preferred sites have been assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
General Comments :			
2 houses per year= 40 over 20 years. Water	Noted.		

supply- Local mains reinforcement may be required (Yorkshire Water comment).			
More clarity is required on the definition of "potential for strategic open space".	The 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan identified draft preferred sites in blue and if they were large enough and had the potential for strategic open space within the site, a green dot was applied. Guiding development principles on larger allocated sites would identify areas of the development site that would be devoted to open space. Such sites would be expected to deliver appropriate open space to compliment any planned housing.	Yes	Development principles would address this issue, given the particular characteristics of each preferred site.
Any houses within the Rathmell planning area should be built with due consideration to the "country" nature of the village which gives it its unique character and which attracts tourists/visitors to enjoy "the beautiful landscape of upland pasture and moorland" quoted. Excessive development would be detrimental to the latter.	Noted.		Development principles would address this issue, given the particular characteristics of each preferred site.

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Settle Response Paper to 1st Draft Local Plan 2014

Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
Site: SG018 (site not identified in the 1st draft Local Plan)			
King's Mill is a Grade II Listed Building. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. The Local Plan should make it clear that any redevelopment proposals for this area will be required to safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of this building. Amend accordingly (Historic England comment)	Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.	?	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
No objection to SG018, SG029, SG042, SG065 and SG074, all of which are brownfield sites whose current appearance detracts from Settle's character and attractiveness. In total, these areas would account for 59 of the stated requirement of 240 houses over the next 15 years.	Noted. This comment is in support of the draft local plan approach.	No	
SG018 may need minor offsite reinforcement (Yorkshire Water comment).	Noted.	No	
Site: SG025 (site identified in the 1st draft Local Plan)			
Strong objection to any new development	Noted. Revised site assessment work will look at	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd

<p>within SG025 which would also be totally at odds with Policy SP12. It would be an unacceptable intrusion into valuable green space beyond the southern edge of Settle and would no doubt in the course of time be the beginning of ribbon development southwards.</p>	<p>the suitability of this site for allocation.</p>		<p>draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred housing site, development principles could address this issue.</p>
<p>Brockholes and Watery Lanes must be protected as they are much used and much valued public rights of way offering peace, wonderful views southwards and wildlife. Development here would be a serious detractor from these key values.</p>	<p>Noted. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Further consultation with statutory consultees and infrastructure providers is ongoing.</p>
<p>Development of the site would ignore the historic meaning of that area, as these fields are part of the fabric of the medieval settlements of Settle, Anley and Runley.</p>	<p>Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Objections on flooding and drainage grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area is wet and was part of medieval Settle's Ings. Ings were water meadows, deliberately allowed to flood during the winter to enrich the grass with silt (i.e. floodplains). Keepmoat had problems building Limestone View which is at a higher elevation than SG025: they had to sink many steel piles because the ground is so wet and boggy. • This site is known to flood, hence the proposed flood meadow to deal with 	<p>Site specific flood risk assessments will be carried out on site prior to allocation (– or development?). Development would be sited away from high flood risk areas.</p>	<p>No</p>	

<p>surface water drainage from phase 1 & 2 of the Ingfield Lane development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The culverted water course that bisects SG025 is a stream powerful enough to enable Runley Water Mill (corn and later cotton) to function. It floods downstream of the culverted area; the Victorian culvert that carries its waters under the railway embankment backs up and floods SG025 (even in recent dry spell). The other streams that make up this floodplain - Dog Kennel Beck and Lodge Beck - also flood. • Problems with flash-flooding due large catchment area draining to this site. Site has a high water table. • Foul water drainage is poor. The current proposal is to pump sewage into the existing foul water system, which has shown signs of overload during the past year, causing sewage to flood into gardens and the road on Cammack Lane. • The proposed lagoon as a feature to hold run off water seems sensible but a rise in the water table is not. 			
<p>Objections regarding access arrangements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access is proposed from SG025 at southern end, near where the filling station and coach depot used to stand (B6480). Skipton Properties 	<p>Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm whether or not the increase in traffic flow on nearby roads, and the access/egress arrangements to the site would be appropriate. NYCC would also set out need for traffic lights onto</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p>

<p>propose traffic lights there, however permanent traffic lights would equate to over-urbanisation. The sight line southwards is severely restricted by the railway bridge and traffic backing up under the narrow and height-restricted bridge will cause mayhem (including HGVs needing to travel in the middle of the road).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The access onto Ingfield Lane is insufficient for the large scale development proposed • The number of daily vehicle movements onto and out of SG025 onto Ingfield Lane and at the Falcon Manor cross-roads will place an impossible strain on that narrow road's traffic-handling capacity, as well as substantially increasing noise levels in what has been a quiet residential area. • Needs Highways Authority consultation. 	<p>main road.</p>		<p>If this site is identified as a preferred housing site, development principles could address this issue.</p> <p>Further consultation with statutory consultees and infrastructure providers is ongoing.</p> <p>Awaiting completion of the highways modelling study for Skipton.</p>
<p>Objection due to lack of following infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dental and doctors surgeries are at capacity, • School nearing capacity, • Car parking spaces in town will be strained as site is too far for many people to walk into town and will necessitate car journeys. 	<p>The policy on Infrastructure could be amended to provide greater reassurance that appropriate infrastructure improvements will be delivered in a timely manner, to coordinate with the phasing of development. This approach could be backed up with the production of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and (if adopted by the Council) a CIL charging schedule.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>SP21 Sustainable Buildings, Infrastructure and Planning Obligations strengthened to provide greater assurance of coordinated</p>

			<p>delivery of development and infrastructure.</p> <p>Further consultation with statutory consultees and infrastructure providers is ongoing.</p>
<p>Concern regarding jobs for new residents. Fear that Settle will become a long distance commuter suburb, with no plans for improvements to the public transport network. These commuters may choose retail offer in other places (i.e. large supermarkets in the places that they commute to).</p>	<p>The local plan is aiming to balance housing growth with growth in the economy by providing homes for the working age population in the larger market towns, to give these people the opportunity to both live and work in the District. The plan is looking to sustain the existing retail offer in Settle to encourage shoppers to buy locally.</p>	No	<p>Settle is identified as a market town within the draft local plan strategy, which reflects its role as a key market town within the plan area, offering a range of services.</p>
<p>Objection to using part of SG025 as light commercial as there are already 2 separate industrial estates in town. Better to join uses on existing industrial estates together and relocate them to one large industrial estate near the bypass (<i>see general comments below</i>). Employment use at this site would have no road frontage.</p>	<p>SG025 would provide a limited amount of industrial units to help increase employment offer in the town. This site is well placed, being in close proximity to an A road, thus providing employment units with easy and sustainable access.</p>	No	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred housing site, development principles could address this issue.</p> <p>Further consultation with statutory consultees and infrastructure providers is ongoing.</p>
<p>Concern that elderly accommodation would never be built on SG025 (current information is a bit vague). Even if it was it would be too far from the town with poor access, and would be subject to flash flooding, being at the lowest level of the site. Also, should be</p>	<p>NYCC have identified a minimum requirement of 203 units of extra care accommodation for the Craven area. Of the 203 identified units 81 units have been delivered in Skipton (Woodlands) and Settle (Limestone View). Other areas of potential development is Gargrave, Bentham and Ingleton.</p>		<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred</p>

<p>bungalows. Already a lack of care workers in area.</p>			<p>housing site, development principles could address this issue.</p> <p>Further consultation with statutory consultees and infrastructure providers is ongoing.</p>
<p>Concern regarding threat to wildlife should SG025 be developed (i.e. deer, bats, badgers and birdlife).</p>	<p>Noted. Sustainability appraisal will address this issue and look to the protection of existing wildlife species on site. The site will be interspersed with corridors and larger areas of open green space to enable wildlife to move through and around the site.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred housing site, development principles could address this issue.</p>
<p>Concern regarding light pollution generated from increase in cars/vans if site if developed.</p>	<p>Noted. Sustainability appraisal will address this issue and look at whether parts of the site are within convenient walking distances from town centre services (800m), thus reducing the need to use a vehicle for every trip out. It is noted though that, as the district is rural in nature, the development of any new housing would inevitably increase the use of cars/vans in an area.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred housing site, development principles could address this issue.</p>
<p>The western boundary of this site adjoins that of the Settle-Carlisle Conservation Area and development of this area could also impact upon the Settle Conservation Area. In addition, this site abuts the curtilage of the Falcon Manor Hotel which is a Grade II Listed Building. There appears to be no evidence of any assessment having been undertaken of</p>	<p>Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred housing site, development principles could address this issue.</p>

<p>the potential impact which the loss of this open area and its eventual development might have upon either the setting of the Grade II Hotel or the character of the nearby Conservation Areas. This is a very large site whose loss and eventual development is likely to affect the significance of not just the adjacent Settle-Carlisle Conservation Area but also, potentially, elements which contribute to the character of the Settle Conservation Area (such as views out of the designated area from Ingfield Lane). It is also likely to affect the rural setting of the Grade II Falcon Manor Hotel which is backdropped by the fields of this site and the rising land at the edge of the National Park. Before allocating this site for development an assessment of impact on the Conservation Area and listed building is required. (Historic England comment).</p>			<p>Evidence relating to open space and Conservation Areas will also inform any decisions relating to this site.</p>
<p>Objection to size of development. Don't want big housing estate at entrance to Settle. No need for so many new houses (particularly as houses already being built in vicinity). Development should be much smaller to keep the character of the town, and should not have too much impact on local facilities</p>	<p>Noted. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred housing site, development principles could address this issue.</p>
<p>Objection to planning process for SG025. Need consultation meetings for developments to be widely advertised (i.e. in Craven Herald with large heading for articles, not just leaflets through doors) where we</p>	<p>The draft local plan consultation procedures went in excess of planning regulations, the idea being that by leafletting every household in the district we would reach the widest population possible. Notice was also given in the Craven Herald and other</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p>

<p>can discuss traffic flow, drainage, sewage demands and education and medical facilities. Developers should not be solely represented on their proposed schemes at a consultation event. Council employees should be at consultation meetings to answer their questions. Proposed developments should be frozen until Craven Local Plan is adopted.</p>	<p>surrounding local newspapers, on the Council's website and displayed at Council offices.</p> <p>The Developer's pre-application consultation event was run by themselves in an attempt to explain the proposed development to the community and deal with any early enquiries prior to the application being submitted to the Council. Council officers are always available to discuss proposals for planning applications once they have been submitted to the Council.</p>		<p>Further public consultation events will be organised in Settle and other locations during consultation on subsequent drafts of the Local Plan.</p>
<p>SG025 should include a shop which could possibly double as a meeting place for the community i.e. toddler group.</p>	<p>Noted. This is a good idea and worthy of some investigation. Revised site assessment work and further work with the site owner could establish the feasibility of social space and retail offer on site.</p>	?	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred housing site, development principles could address this issue.</p>
<p>The sustainable surface water drainage proposals for the site will only be attractive to the people housed on the scheme.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Development of SG025 will necessitate a bus-stop on the Skipton Rd for people who do not drive and cannot walk in to town.</p>	<p>Noted. Whilst the planning process works closely with other service providers to ensure a site is sustainable, the installation of a bus stop would be under the remit of North Yorkshire County Council who would evaluate its necessity.</p>	No	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred housing site, development principles could address this issue.</p>
<p>No need to identify SGO25 and SGO68 as potential major housing development sites.</p>	<p>Noted. Revised site assessment work and sustainability appraisal will look again at the</p>	No	<p>Sites identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site</p>

<p>Should exclude these sites and take the other identified sites in the Draft Plan, along with other sites not in the Plan but which have existing planning approval for housing not yet built. Collectively these go a long way to delivering the projected needs of the area for many years to come.</p>	<p>suitability of all sites in the SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) for allocation. Residential completions or outstanding consents from 2012 onwards will be taken into account in terms of the numbers of new housing provided in Settle via site allocations over the plan period.</p>		<p>assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Existing committed housing sites will contribute to meeting the overall housing requirement for Settle. The April 2016 draft Local Plan took these commitments into account up to 31/3/2015. The submitted Local Plan will update the position on committed sites to 31/3/2016.</p>
<p>Development on SG025 would be contrary to local plan which states that “the number of new homes built on individual sites will be in scale with the settlement, so that growth feels steady and natural”. It would be a considerable overdevelopment of Settle on this site. Proposal for 150 homes plus a care home which will increase Settle’s population by 20%-25%.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Query as to why the site is not still designated as Special Landscape Area (as set out in old Local Plan).</p>	<p>The adopted Local Plan’s (1999) policy ENV4 Special Landscape Area was not saved in 2007 when the plan was reviewed, as instructed by Central Government. Local Planning Authorities were instructed to review their current local plan policies and only saved those that were relevant and specific to the plan area. ENV4 was not saved because it was not in general conformity with the (then) Regional Spatial Strategy, and it was not considered to be a necessary policy as it repeated national/regional policy.</p> <p>The draft local plan will continue to afford</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p>

	protection to the open countryside through its draft policy SP4 Countryside and Landscape. Whilst this draft policy does not advocate specific development limits around villages and towns, it does enable settlements to grow in ways that harmonise with the character of the immediate setting and wider landscape (including creating the important transition between built up areas and the surrounding countryside).		
Concern regarding the decrease in the stock of agricultural and green land.	Noted. To have no development on grade 3 agricultural land would be an ideal situation but may not be a practical possibility. Some sites on grade 3 agricultural land may be more suitable and sustainable than other grade 4 or 5 land in the area.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
Development of SG025 would threaten the 'dark skies' policy in the plan, especially when viewed alongside existing housing development in the area and that potentially planned at SG068.	The draft local plan (specifically SP4 Countryside and Landscape) sets a general policy framework to support the promotion of dark skies in appropriate locations. The policy justification could provide increased detail however on parameters as to how dark skies will be preserved.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work. The justification of draft SP4 policy has been amended to include greater detail on the means of preserving dark skies.
SG025 will require off- site reinforcement (the nearest existing water main to connect to is in Ingfield Lane). (Yorkshire Water comment)	Noted.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work. Development management issue.
The use of concrete raft roofings for buildings will increase the need for "build up" as the work continues to the south (from	Noted.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability

Ingfield Lane – road already started from existing housing site to SG025).			appraisal work.
A smaller development at this site to maximise integration and limit the feeling of a big estate, possibly reducing SGO25 and SG068 to "round off" the boundary of the town.	Noted. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site. Development principle on site (should it be allocated) would set out where areas of open space should be preserved.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred housing site, development principles could address this issue.
Site: SG027 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
No objections to housing development on SG027 which is in reality a fairly minor extension to current building in the area by Skipton Properties (Ingfield Lane) and a local land owner. These current building projects should be included in the areas designated for housing over the next 15 years.	Noted. Residential completions or outstanding consents from 2012 onwards will be taken into account in terms of the numbers of new housing provided in Settle via site allocations over the plan period.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
SG027 is elevated, and more deliverable for housing than some of the larger, flood prone sites.	Noted.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
SG027 will require off- site reinforcement (the nearest existing water main to connect to is in Ingfield Lane). (Yorkshire Water comment)	Noted.	No	Development management issue.
This site is visible from Ingfield Lane and, therefore, could impact upon the significance of the Settle Conservation Area. Before allocating this site for development an assessment of impact on the Conservation Area and listed building is	Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.

required. (Historic England comment)			
Sites: SG027 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan), SG028 and field south of Penny Green, to rear of ambulance station (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
These sites are more elevated and more deliverable for housing	Noted.	Yes	<p>Site SG027 identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Site SG028 not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
Site: SG032 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Strong objection to SG032, due to loss of large part of Greenfoot car park plus valuable and attractive and bird-rich green space around it. This is totally at odds with Policy SP12 which states new build will "fit in with the look and feel of ... its landscape setting and won't take up green space that's valued by the local community". Car park is also essential to tourism.		No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
SG032 is not the re use of a brownfield site and, like SG053, is a most valuable car park site which will not be available elsewhere should it be developed.		No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
This site lies within the Settle Conservation Area. The Local Plan should make it clear that any redevelopment proposals for this area will be required to safeguard those elements which contribute to the	Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.

significance of this part of the Conservation Area. Amend accordingly. (Historic England comment)			
Objection due to impact on nearby National Park.	Noted. SG032 does not directly adjoin the National Park boundary. In any case, should this site be allocated, any proposed development would be constructed sensitively, with due respect to the close proximity of the national park.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred housing site, development principles could address this issue.
Site: SG035 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Query as to whether SG035, the garage of FH Ellis should be a preferred site as the owners say they have no knowledge of any proposals to build on their business.	The owner has returned a Land Availability Questionnaire stating that the land is available for development. The land therefore forms part of the Council's SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) and was assessed alongside all other SHLAA sites in terms of its suitability for allocation. Initial sustainability checks, site assessments and early consultation flagged this site up as a potential site for allocation, thus it formed part of the early pre-publication consultation draft of the local plan. Further revised site assessment work will be undertaken on all SHLAA sites to determine continuing suitability. SG035 will continue to form part of the SHLAA until the Council is notified otherwise by the owner that the land is no longer available for development.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
Query as to why SG035, which is the only garage between Hellifield and Bentham employing mechanics, is seen as a site fit for development.	The site was assessed alongside all other SHLAA sites in terms of its suitability for allocation. Initial sustainability checks, site assessments and early consultation flagged this site up as a potential site	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.

	<p>for allocation, thus it formed part of the early pre-publication consultation draft of the local plan.</p> <p>Further revised site assessment work will be undertaken on all SHLAA sites to determine continuing suitability.</p>		
<p>This site lies within the Settle Conservation Area. The Local Plan should make it clear that any redevelopment proposals for this area will be required to safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of this part of the Conservation Area. Amend accordingly. (Historic England comment)</p>	<p>Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.</p>	No	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
Site: SG042 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
<p>No objection to SG018, SG029, SG042, SG065 and SG074, all of which are brownfield sites whose current appearance detracts from Settle's character and attractiveness. In total, these areas would account for 59 of the stated requirement of 240 houses over the next 15 years.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	No	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>This site lies within the Settle Conservation Area and its access runs between two Grade II Listed Buildings (Bond End and The Victoria Hall). The Local Plan should make it clear that any redevelopment proposals for this area should safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of this part of the Conservation Area and the two Listed Buildings. Amend accordingly. (Historic England comment)</p>	<p>Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.</p>	No	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p>

Site: SG053 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Query as to whether owners of SG053, Settle Social Club have any knowledge that the club and nearby Ashfield House are to be (presumably) demolished for housing.	Site owner has confirmed that the site is not available for development and it has been removed from the Council's SHLAA. The site will not form part of the next draft of the local plan.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
Settle social club should be converted, not knocked down. Whilst not a listed building (<i>building is in fact listed</i>), it is part of the character of the town centre and part of the local heritage.	Site owner has confirmed that the site is not available for development and it has been removed from the Council's SHLAA. The site will not form part of the next draft of the local plan.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
Building is listed. It should be removed from the development plan.	Site owner has confirmed that the site is not available for development and it has been removed from the Council's SHLAA. The site will not form part of the next draft of the local plan.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
This site lies within the Settle Conservation Area and includes the Grade II Listed Settle Social Club Building. The Local Plan should make it clear that any redevelopment proposals for this area should safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of this part of the Conservation Area and the two Listed Buildings. Amend accordingly. (Historic England comment)	Site owner has confirmed that the site is not available for development and it has been removed from the Council's SHLAA. The site will not form part of the next draft of the local plan.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: SG065 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
No objection to SG018, SG029, SG042, SG065 and SG074, all of which are brownfield sites whose current appearance detracts from Settle's character and attractiveness. In total, these areas would account for 59 of the stated requirement of 240 houses over the next 15 years.	Noted.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
Opposite view point states that this is not an appropriate location for housing but one for	Noted.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site

business/industrial use.			assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: SG068 (site included in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Strong objection to any new development within SG068 which would also be totally at odds with Policy SP12. It would be an unacceptable intrusion into valuable green space beyond the southern edge of Settle and would no doubt in the course of time be the beginning of ribbon development southwards.	Noted. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
Brockholes and Watery Lanes must be protected as they are much used and much valued public rights of way offering peace, wonderful views southwards and wildlife. Development here would be a serious detractor from these key values.	Noted. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
Development of the site would ignore the historic meaning of that area, as these fields are part of the fabric of the medieval settlements of Settle, Anley and Runley.	Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
No need to identify SGO25 and SGO68 as potential major housing development sites. Should exclude these sites and take the other identified sites in the Draft Plan, along with other sites not in the Plan but which have existing planning approval for housing not yet built. Collectively these go a long way to delivering the projected needs of the area for many years to come.	Noted. Revised site assessment work and sustainability appraisal will look again at the suitability of all sites in the SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) for allocation. Residential completions or outstanding consents from 2012 onwards will be taken into account in terms of the numbers of new housing provided in Settle via site allocations over the plan period.	No	Sites identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
Objection due to major impact on adjacent National Park.	Noted. SG032 does not directly adjoin the National Park boundary. In any case, should this site be	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site

	allocated, any proposed development would be constructed sensitively, with due respect to the close proximity of the national park.		assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
Concern over loss of good agricultural land.	Noted. To have no development on grade 3 agricultural land would be an ideal situation but may not be a practical possibility. Some sites on grade 3 agricultural land may be more suitable and sustainable than other grade 4 or 5 land in the area.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
Concern over potential flood risk on site.	Site specific flood risk assessments will be carried out on site prior to allocation (– or development?). Development would be sited away from high flood risk areas.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
Development of SG068 would threaten the 'dark skies' policy in the plan, especially when viewed alongside existing housing development in the area and that potentially planned at SG025.	The draft local plan (specifically SP4 Countryside and Landscape) sets a general policy framework to support the promotion of dark skies in appropriate locations. The policy justification could provide increased detail however on parameters as to how dark skies will be preserved.	Yes	SP4 policy justification to include greater detail on the means of preserving dark skies.
A smaller development at this site to maximise integration and limit the feeling of a big estate, possibly reducing SGO68 and SG025 to "round off" the boundary of the town.	Noted. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site. Development principle on site (should it be allocated) would set out where areas of open space should be preserved.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred housing site, development principles could address this issue.
SG068 will require off- site reinforcement (the nearest existing water main to connect to is in Ingfield Lane). (Yorkshire Water comment)	Noted.	No	Development management issue.
This site is likely to be visible from Ingfield Lane and, therefore, could impact upon the significance of the Settle Conservation Area.	Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability

<p>Because of the size of the allocation, it may also affect the rural setting of the Grade II Listed Falcon Manor Hotel. There appears to be no evidence of any assessment having been undertaken of the potential impact which the loss of this open area and its eventual development might have upon the character or appearance of the adjacent Conservation Area or the setting of the Listed Building. In order to demonstrate that the allocation of this area is not incompatible with the statutory duty placed upon the Council under the provisions of the 1990 Act, 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 character or appearance of the Conservation Area and the Falcon Manor Hotel and what effect the loss of this site and its subsequent development might have upon these designated assets. If it is likely to result in harm, the plan needs to set out the means by which that harm will be minimised in any eventual development proposals that may come forward. (Historic England comment)</p>	<p>buildings.</p>		<p>appraisal work.</p>
<p>Site: SG074 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)</p>			
<p>No objection to SG018, SG029, SG042, SG065 and SG074, all of which are brownfield sites whose current appearance detracts from Settle's character and attractiveness. In total, these areas would</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.</p>

account for 59 of the stated requirement of 240 houses over the next 15 years.			
Site: SG014 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
SG014 is "land locked" so depending on where the site access road is, off-site reinforcement may be required (Yorkshire Water comment).	Noted.	No	Development management issue.
Site: SG017 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
This site should be brought back into the provision of sites available.	Noted. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: SG028 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
SG028 is elevated, and more deliverable for housing than some of the larger, flood prone sites.	Noted. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: SG051 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
This site should be brought back into the provision of sites available.	Noted. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan following site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work.
General Comments :			
16 houses per year= 240 over 15 years. Water supply- there are some areas of Settle where the network would be insufficient and local reinforcement will be required (<i>see individual site comments</i>) (Yorkshire Water comment).	Noted.		
Instead of building housing on greenfields a long-term solution would be to relocate	Noted.	?	Further site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work will be

<p>Settle's industrial functions (business/retail/industrial) out of town, specifically alongside the bypass in the general area between the Rathmell turn-off and Giggleswick Railway Station (which although a green area now, does not seem to meet the criteria of being beautiful or special as it is already devalued scenically by the railway and the A65). This would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • free up Sowarth Field for housing development, • take most of the HGVs out of Settle's town centre and off residential Station Road, • give businesses more room to expand, • increase business' profile by being sited adjacent to a major east-west route, • attract more businesses to the area thus improving economy and the vitality and viability of our settlement. 			<p>carried out to identify preferred housing sites.</p>
<p>The plans regarding business growth and development need to ensure that they meet local needs and support the local area rather than destroying it.</p>	<p>The local plan is aiming to balance housing growth with growth in the economy by providing homes for the working age population in the larger market towns, to give these people the opportunity to both live and work in the District.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Proposed number of houses for Settle over 15 years is too high and no large scale development should be contemplated (i.e. SG025) because they would be detrimental to the attractiveness of this small town.</p>	<p>Noted. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of all sites in the SHLAA.</p> <p>The district housing target set out in the 22/9/14 draft of the local plan is a minimum target. It is</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Further site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work will be carried out to identify pool of sites and then preferred housing sites.</p>

<p>Only relatively small scale housing developments should be permitted, as close to the centre of Settle as possible either on windfall or brown sites to preserve the character of the town and for ease of access for the increasing number of elderly residents envisaged.</p>	<p>likely however that this housing target will increase in future drafts of the local plan, to take account of evidence of housing need as outlined in the updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2015).</p>		<p>Further work to complete on revised housing target and distribution strategy.</p>
<p>The draft plan has concluded that the growth section of the population is thought to be the 65 plus group. They will not want to live in towns that have large estate type housing developments. Also, given the age of this group on arrival in Settle, it is likely that because of life expectancy, during the lifetime of the Plan some new houses will fall vacant, thus calling into question the supposed need to build such a large cumulative total.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		
<p>There are several sites available in Giggleswick which would have much better access for development both for housing and commercial use, with much better road access (i.e. land south-west of Furlane Ends, and north of Brackenber Lane).</p>	<p>Noted. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of all sites in the SHLAA.</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>Further site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work will be carried out to identify preferred housing sites.</p>
<p>The Draft Plan indicates that “Craven’s labour force is not anticipated to grow over the next 15 years”. During this period we will probably continue to see the trend of the younger members of our communities moving out due to the lack of employment opportunities and affordable housing, and an increasing elderly population attracted by the location and way of life. In the meantime</p>	<p>The local plan is aiming to balance housing growth with growth in the economy by providing homes for the working age population in the larger market towns, to give these people the opportunity to both live and work in the District.</p>	<p>No</p>	

our communities become increasingly unbalanced and lose local facilities eg. Schools, and which will present increasingly more problems eg. Care of the elderly. The Draft Plan needs to be more proactive in addressing some of these issues.			
Plan needs to ensure that the areas freed up for housing development in the centre of Settle contain affordable housing, 1-2 bedroomed houses that meet the needs of younger people, the elderly and the disabled. Is there any need for more 3-4 bedroomed houses?	The local plan is aiming to provide a mix of housing to address the needs of all sections of society. The Council currently requires 40% affordable housing on new development sites and the local plan will stipulate that market housing on strategic sites should be 50% 1-2 bed properties, to cater for the increasing amount of smaller households. The plan also promotes extra care facilities across the district.	No	
Comment that urges planners to hold onto the current thinking in the draft local plan, i.e. "growth that brings benefits for ALL sectors of the community, not growth that is for its own sake". Need to be mindful of the Government's recent declaration to protect our greenbelt land from unnecessary development.	Noted.	No	
Field south of Penny Green and behind the ambulance station (not listed in plan) is elevated, and more deliverable for housing than some of the larger, flood prone sites.	Noted. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of all sites in the SHLAA.	?	Further site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work will be carried out to identify preferred housing sites.
Plan needs to address the needs of children and young people in/on the expanding housing developments. Earlier (i.e. 1940's) maps show a playground and tennis courts on the site which is now Booth's Supermarket.	Noted. Guiding development principles on larger, more strategic sites will address this issue. Development principles will specify open space, play areas, MUGAs etc if deemed fit.	Yes	Where sites are identified as preferred housing allocation sites, development principles could address this issue.
Car parking and light traffic flow are	The draft plan's Tourism policy (SP19) aims to "grow	No	

essential elements of the Tourist trade. Tourism is a most successful business in the district and in the adjacent National Park. Settle, Clapham and Ingleton are, with Skipton, the keys so this business and their needs should be an element in planning decisions.	[tourism] in a sustainable way, so that it helps to improve the economy, environment and quality of life”.		
Need to encourage planning permissions in used buildings or brownfield land in town. Regeneration from within gives the whole town a better look / feel to visitors.	Noted. This is the current draft plan approach, in line with NPPF.	No	
Need to construct small starter business units (industrial/office type) at the edge of town, say at Ingfield.	Noted. Draft site SG025 is currently being considered for mixed use potential, including light industrial units.	?	Further site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work will be carried out to identify preferred housing sites.
Need to encourage development of affordable rented or intermediate affordable housing and smaller homes for new households, to encourage younger people to stay or move to Settle. The current plan has too much emphasis on housing which currently looks to be of the wrong to benefit the community in the long term.	The local plan is aiming to provide a mix of housing to address the needs of all sections of society. The Council currently requires 40% affordable housing on new development sites and the local plan will stipulate that market housing on strategic sites should be 50% 1-2 bed properties, to cater for the increasing amount of smaller households. The plan also promotes extra care facilities across the district.	No	
Alternative housing site to larger southern sites could be the infill site on the other side of the railway line (between station road and the river). This site offers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • better drainage for surface run off to the river, • better access (wide splay with good vision) off the existing wide road (station road), • a better chance of integration due to 	Noted. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of all sites in the SHLAA.	?	Further site assessment work and sustainability appraisal work will be carried out to identify preferred housing sites.

<p>the wide range of building styles already in place,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• less disruption to dark skies due to street lighting already being in place along station road and cars using the bypass,• access to Giggleswick station to allow walking to both railway stations.			
---	--	--	--

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Skipton Response Paper to 1st Draft Local Plan 2014

Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
Site: SK009 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
New build development would have a negative visual impact on the character and setting of Chinthurst (formally Sunny Bank) and Springfield (next to the Chinthurst), which are two important Victorian suburban detached houses with group value.	Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings. Both Chinthurst and Springfield (now called St Andrew's House) are in the conservation area and St Andrew's House is a grade 2 listed building. As such development in their vicinity will have to have regard to their settings.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
This site has dangerous access, egress and limited visibility onto Otley Road.	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm whether the access/egress arrangements to the site would be appropriate.		Further consultation with infrastructure providers is ongoing.
This site lies within the Skipton Conservation Area and adjacent Grade II Listed Springfield. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. In addition the Council has a statutory duty to pay "special attention" to "the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance" of its Conservation Areas and the NPPF makes it clear that the loss of a building which makes a positive contribution to the significance of	Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

<p>a Conservation Area should be regarded as resulting in substantial harm to that area. If allocated the Local Plan should firstly identify which buildings make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area and therefore should be retained, and secondly make it clear that development proposals for this area would need to ensure that any elements which contribute to the significance of the adjacent Listed Buildings or remainder of the Conservation Area are not harmed. (Historic England Comment).</p>			
<p>Site: SK010 (site identified in 1st Draft Local Plan)</p>			
<p>This brownfield site should be retained for employment use and not re-designated for housing. I understand that the owner wishes to retain and expand the business.</p>	<p>The owner has returned a Land Availability Questionnaire stating that the land is available for development. The land therefore forms part of the Council's SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) and was assessed alongside all other SHLAA sites in terms of its suitability for allocation as housing through initial sustainability checks, site assessments and early consultation.</p> <p>Further revised site assessment work will be undertaken on all SHLAA sites to determine continuing suitability. SK010 will continue to form part of the SHLAA until the Council is notified otherwise by the owner that the land is no longer available for development.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>This site includes an early car showroom designed by Studdards & Alderson of Skipton for motoring pioneer Charles Mawson in</p>	<p>If this is identified as a preferred site, development principles would be identified for the site.</p>		<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability</p>

1921. This locally significant building, with large display windows should be recorded prior to any demolition and ideally retained.			appraisal work.
Site lies within Skipton Conservation Area. The Council has a statutory duty under the provisions of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of appearance of its Conservation Areas. The Local Plan should make it clear that any redevelopment proposals for this area will be required to safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of this part of the Conservation Area. (Historic England Comment).	Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: SK013 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Site constraints include lack of water supply and an increase in vehicles using Shortbank Road & Newmarket Street. Outcome of Cumulative Highways Study may recommend changes to the roundabout junctions.	Noted. The Council is carrying out highways modelling in Skipton to ascertain the cumulative impacts on all draft preferred sites on the road network. Any necessary highways improvements will be flagged up through this process and achieved through developer contributions (potentially CIL). Statutory consultees, such as Yorkshire Water have been part of the local plan consultation process from an early stage. Any issues regarding limited water supply for the area will be identified by them.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Awaiting results of the highways modelling work.
This greenfield site appears to be supported by the landowner, but opposed by many of the nearby residents. Reasons cited	Noted.		Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability

opposition reiterate the earlier objections raised for the Eley Croft site.			appraisal work.
Partial development of this site is acceptable, but housing should be limited to ensure retention of the existing green corridor between lower reaches of Rombolds Moor and Shortbank Road.	Noted. Draft policy SP8 Green Infrastructure specifies the need to “enhance existing or create new green infrastructure and secure its long-term management and maintenance”. In addition development principles on allocated sites will ensure that existing green networks are retained through and around sites, where possible.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
This site includes site of former open air swimming pool (currently children’s play area), which was fed by natural streams. This site is boggy, has poor drainage and floods, despite past works carried out by NYCC Highways to prevent flooding. The site still floods. Building more houses would compound this.	Site specific flood risk assessments will be carried out on site should it proceed to final allocation. Development would be sited away from high flood risk areas and mitigation measures would be put in place to alleviate any potential flooding issues on or around the site. Consultation with the Environment Agency and other relevant statutory undertakers, along with further site specific assessment work would ascertain whether this site would be suitable for allocation and development.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Ongoing sustainability appraisal, SFRA and guiding development principles for site to complete, along with further consultation with relevant statutory consultees.
Two previous planning applications refused due to insufficient water pressure and sewerage drainage. Installation of a pumping station, sewerage farm or fermentation tanks would be required.	Noted. Further consultation with the Environment Agency and other relevant statutory undertakers, along with site specific assessment work would ascertain whether this site would be suitable for allocation and development.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Further consultation with relevant statutory consultees is ongoing.
If Eley Croft is added to the plan then could SK013 be spared? If this site is added to the next plan period (beyond 15 years) it will enable serious thought to be given to alternative access routes and be more	Noted. The 22/9/14 draft of the local plan set out a housing target for the district that was based on the evidence of housing need available at that time. It is likely however that this housing target will increase in future drafts	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

<p>bearable to residents and make more sense.</p>	<p>of the local plan, to take account of updated evidence of housing need as outlined in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2015). As such, Skipton, being the principle town in the district, and the most sustainable location to live, will absorb the majority of the uplift in the housing figure. The existing amount of land preferred for allocation will be required to accommodate this increase in future housing development. Revised site assessment work will take another look at all the SHLAA sites to determine those that are the most sustainable, suitable and developable sites. This work will be done in consultation with the relevant statutory undertakers.</p>		<p>Awaiting identification of preferred sites.</p>
<p>Development of this site would open up the estate to crime. Currently the estate is not a through estate which provides a feeling of security and should not be lost.</p>	<p>Development principles on site would ascertain whether linkages would be made through the site to the existing housing estate to the south (i.e. linking Moorview estate with the Aldersley Avenue estate). Whether this would open Moorview up to crime is an unsubstantiated claim and in any case carries no weight in the planning system.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred housing site, development principles could address this issue.</p>
<p>Some residents not aware that this site is being considered again for housing.</p>	<p>It should be noted that the draft local plan consultation procedures went in excess of planning regulations. Every household in the district was leafleted about the consultation period for the draft local plan in order to reach the widest population possible. Notice was also given in the Craven Herald and other surrounding local newspapers, on the Council's website and displayed at Council offices.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Current properties enjoy a public footpath</p>	<p>Noted. Development principle on site, should it</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd</p>

used by children and adults to all properties to access Shortbank Road playground (Gully Park) and as a means of pedestrian access to Shortbank Road and the town centre.	proceed to final allocation, would address this issue.		draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred housing site, development principles could address this issue.
This site would yield more than 154 dwellings, given its size. Please advise whether the current plan for these 154 homes will include or exclude windfall.	Density work for sites is not yet finalised. It is expected that many sites will yield a higher density than was set out in the 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Density calculated at 30dpha. Further density work to complete.
This site should be withdrawn from the Local Plan.	Noted. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: SK015 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
The boundary of this site needs to be confirmed as the site specific plan dated Dec 2011 differs from the site shown on pg 87 of the Draft Local Plan.	The boundary of the site on pg 83 of the 22/09/14 version of the draft local plan is the confirmed boundary of the site, as specified by the landowner via Land Availability Questionnaire.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
This brownfield site appears to be supported by the current landowner/resident of the property but I am unsure whether the site will be deliverable within the timespan of the 2014 draft Local Plan.	Although the landowner has put the land forward for consideration, the Land Availability Questionnaire suggests that the site would not be available until the latter part of the plan period. To ensure a good supply of housing land for the entire plan period, the local plan needs to allocate sites for housing in the short (0-5 yrs), medium (6-10 years), and long term	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

	(11-15 yrs).		
Although an existing reservoir is adjacent to the site, I am unsure whether it is available for local water supply purposes. Additional/extended new water supply and sewerage disposal infrastructure on the outskirts of the town would be expensive to commission and maintain.	Noted. Revised site assessment work will take another look at all the SHLAA sites to determine those that are the most sustainable, suitable and viable sites. This work will be done in consultation with the relevant statutory undertakers, such as Yorkshire Water.	yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Any archaeological significance to be assessed in light of the industrial use of the site in the 19 th century.	Noted. Consultation will take place with NYCC Archaeology on all sites with potential archaeological significance, prior to final allocation.		Further consultation with infrastructure providers i.e., NYCC Archaeology is ongoing.
Site: SK016 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
This site should be deleted as a housing allocation as it is undeliverable being alongside existing sheltered housing, now owned and managed by Yorkshire Housing Group.	Yorkshire Housing, as owners of this site, have put it forward for consideration for potential residential development. The proximity of existing sheltered housing has no bearing of the suitability of this site for further residential accommodation. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
The cul-de-sac is the only vehicular access available to Skipton Town Council who own, manage and maintain the recreation ground.	Development principles on site (should it proceed to final allocation) would ensure that pedestrian and vehicular access would be retained to the recreation ground to the east.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
The grass verge and ditch have been modelled to allow runoff from the adjacent moorland (SK013) to overflow past the bungalows towards Shortbank Road.	Noted. Revised site assessment work will take another look at all the SHLAA sites to determine those that are the most sustainable, suitable and developable sites. This work will be done in consultation with the relevant	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

	statutory undertakers, such as the Environment Agency and Yorkshire Water.		
This site provides an important green corridor into the town, which should be protected. Development would have a negative environmental impact.	Noted, however access to the town will still be retained via the recreation ground (which will be retained as an important green corridor) and existing footpath and road to the north of the site.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: SK034 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Part of this site is suitable for housing development.	Noted.		Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Marton Mills, formally Broughton Road shed was a large weaving shed designed by W H Atkinson of Colne for Skipton Room & Power Co in 1897 and is the last north light roof in Skipton, last remaining engine house for a horizontal steam engine and last remaining textile chimney (incomplete), which is a landmark on the canal and in the town. These heritage features should be retained. Site has potential for residential conversion or linked to heritage and tourism aspirations with a working class emphasis. Potential for an industrial heritage trail linked to site SK060.	Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings. As indicated by the owner, development would be in the longer term (i.e. yrs 10-15 of the plan period) and, upon redevelopment, would have to sensitively address the heritage assets on site in light of its position on the canal frontage and within the Skipton Conservation Area. Development principles on site (should it proceed to final allocation) would look to taking advantage of the links to be made with the nearby canal footpath, which would directly connect the site to the town centre.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
This site lies within the Skipton Conservation Area. The Council has a statutory duty to	Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site

<p>pay “special attention” to “ the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance” of its Conservation Areas and the NPPF makes it clear that the loss of a building which makes a positive contribution to the significance of a Conservation Area should be regarded as resulting in substantial harm to that area. If allocated the Local Plan should firstly identify which buildings make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area and therefore should be retained, and secondly make it clear that development proposals for this area would need to ensure that any elements which contribute to the significance of the adjacent Listed Buildings or remainder of the Conservation Area are not harmed. (Historic England Comment).</p>	<p>area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.</p>		<p>assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Site: SK044 (site identified in 1st Draft Local Plan)</p>			
<p>This site is suitable for housing as it would continue the density of housing in an established residential area, is in a sustainable location and within the District’s principle settlement. Adequate amenity space and services should be provided.</p>	<p>Noted. This comment is in support of the draft local plan.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Site: SK049 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)</p>			
<p>Site is suitable partially for employment but not housing. Two fields forming the northern boundary of the site to be developed with access from Engine Shed Lane, if flooding can be avoided. Buildings should be kept low and a wide green belt/buffer created to shield the cemetery</p>	<p>Noted. The Council has been in discussion with the landowner and relevant statutory consultees in relation to the developable areas of this extensive site. Housing will form part of the development brief, along with light industrial and areas of green space (i.e. as a buffer around the cemetery to preserve</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Outline application (63/2015/15792) for mixed use development</p>

<p>and maintain the tranquillity.</p>	<p>tranquillity). Flood alleviation measures will also be put in place to avoid flooding on the developable areas. Skipton Flood Alleviation Scheme will also ensure mitigation measures are put in place to enable the safest and most sustainable development of this site.</p>		<p>comprising business/employment floorspace (use classes B1, B2 & B8) and residential dwellings (use class C3) with access from the A629 and Carleton Road, provision of infrastructure and associated landscaping approved March 2016. This permission for residential and employment uses will contribute to meeting these land use requirements as set out in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.</p> <p>Awaiting completion of the Skipton Flood Alleviation Scheme.</p>
<p>No development in south or west of the site as this would have a negative impact on the cemetery. Land south of Waltonwrays should be removed from the Plan.</p>	<p>Noted. Development principles for the site would specify that the cemetery should be surrounded by a buffer of greenspace and protective planting to ensure tranquillity is not compromised.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Outline application (63/2015/15792) for mixed use development comprising business/employment floorspace (use classes B1, B2 & B8) and residential dwellings (use class C3) with access from the A629 and Carleton Road, provision of infrastructure and associated landscaping approved March 2016.</p>

			<p>This permission for residential and employment uses will contribute to meeting these land use requirements as set out in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.</p>
<p>The allocation of additional land for burials is also required to protect the future of the cemetery.</p>		No	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Outline application (63/2015/15792) for mixed use development comprising business/employment floorspace (use classes B1, B2 & B8) and residential dwellings (use class C3) with access from the A629 and Carleton Road, provision of infrastructure and associated landscaping approved March 2016. This permission for residential and employment uses will contribute to meeting these land use requirements as set out in the emerging Local Plan. This existing consent does not include additional burial land.</p>
<p>Concern that lack of access from the by-pass will result in unacceptable intensification of traffic use in the town at Carleton Road.</p>	<p>The site would have access to the bypass, thus alleviating intensification of traffic on Carleton Road.</p>	No	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability</p>

			<p>appraisal work.</p> <p>Outline application (63/2015/15792) for mixed use development comprising business/employment floorspace (use classes B1, B2 & B8) and residential dwellings (use class C3) with access from the A629 and Carleton Road, provision of infrastructure and associated landscaping approved March 2016. This permission for residential and employment uses will contribute to meeting these land use requirements as set out in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>This approved scheme shows access of the site from the by-pass.</p>
<p>This site surrounds the cemetery which was added to the Skipton Conservation Area in its last review in 2008. The Council has a statutory duty to pay “special attention” to “the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance” of its Conservation Areas. 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 (Historic England</p>	<p>Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.</p>		<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Outline application (63/2015/15792) for mixed use development comprising business/employment floorspace (use classes B1, B2 & B8) and residential dwellings (use class C3) with access from the A629 and Carleton Road, provision of infrastructure and associated landscaping approved March 2016.</p>

comment).			<p>This permission for residential and employment uses will contribute to meeting these land use requirements as set out in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>As part of the application process, the scheme has been assessed in terms of the impact and contribution the development has on the existing Conservation Area.</p>
Support allocation of SK051 together with sites SK049 & SK051, which could deliver 240 dwellings.	Noted. This comment is in support of the draft local plan.	?	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>HAS SK049 & SK051 BEEN MERGED?</p>
This site owned by HBD (Henry Boot), who would fully support the allocation of this site & site SK051. Henry Boot seeks to promote both housing sites together with strategic employment site SK17 (unsure of location) as a comprehensive mixed use development.	<p>Noted. This comment is in support of the draft local plan.</p> <p>(NB. SK017 is no longer a SHLAA site. Unsure as to what the representation is referring to - perhaps the site number has been misquoted)</p>	?	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
Sites SK049 & SK051 are identified as having an indicative dwelling capacity of 178 dwellings. Not all of site SK049 is considered available for housing as 9.5ha of the 16.4ha total is identified for employment uses under Policy SP17 and the inset map suggests there is potential for strategic open space (location and extent yet to be defined).	Noted. Development principles on site would address this issue, setting out where employment, housing and open space would be located on site.	Yes?	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Outline application (63/2015/15792) for mixed use development comprising business/employment floorspace (use classes B1, B2 & B8) and residential dwellings (use class C3) with access from the A629 and</p>

			Carleton Road, provision of infrastructure and associated landscaping approved March 2016. This permission for residential and employment uses will contribute to meeting these land use requirements as set out in the emerging Local Plan.
Actual size of site SK049 is 24ha. The Council has excluded area of the site lying within flood zones 2 & 3 to calculate a developable area of 16.4ha. The entire sites can now be considered available for development in the medium term following the granting of planning permission by NYCC (2 nd Sept 2014) for a range of flood alleviation/defence works within and to the north of the town. The Environment Agency expects contractors to start on site in Spring 2015.	Noted.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
A concept scheme has been submitted showing the combined sites (SK049, SK051 & SP17) could potentially deliver the 9.6ha of employment land, 8.3ha of residential land and 7.1ha of roads/strategic open space/landscaping/balancing pond.	Noted. Outline application (63/2015/15792) for mixed use development comprising business/employment floorspace (use classes B1, B2 & B8) and residential dwellings (use class C3) with access from the A629 and Carleton Road, provision of infrastructure and associated landscaping approved March 2016.	Yes?	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Outline application (63/2015/15792) for mixed use development comprising business/employment floorspace (use classes B1, B2 & B8) and residential dwellings (use class C3) with access from the A629 and Carleton Road, provision of infrastructure and associated landscaping approved March 2016.

			This permission for residential and employment uses will contribute to meeting these land use requirements as set out in the emerging Local Plan.
On the basis of an average housing density of 30dph it is anticipated that sites SK049 & SK051 could collectively deliver approximately 240 dwellings, all within flood zone 1.	Noted. Outline application (63/2015/15792) for mixed use development comprising business/employment floorspace (use classes B1, B2 & B8) and residential dwellings (use class C3) with access from the A629 and Carleton Road, provision of infrastructure and associated landscaping approved March 2016.		<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Outline application (63/2015/15792) for mixed use development comprising business/employment floorspace (use classes B1, B2 & B8) and residential dwellings (use class C3) with access from the A629 and Carleton Road, provision of infrastructure and associated landscaping approved March 2016. This permission for residential and employment uses will contribute to meeting these land use requirements as set out in the emerging Local Plan.</p>
Submitted concept scheme shows location of employment uses adjacent to A629 and to the north western end of the site, the open space around the site entrance and cemetery, providing an attractive gateway to the site and ensuring protection of the setting of the cemetery and Conservation Area.	Noted. Development principles for the site would specify where different land uses would be accommodated and ensure that the cemetery is surrounded by a buffer of greenspace and protective planting to ensure tranquillity is not compromised.		<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Outline application (63/2015/15792) for mixed use development comprising business/employment floorspace (use classes B1, B2 & B8)</p>

			and residential dwellings (use class C3) with access from the A629 and Carleton Road, provision of infrastructure and associated landscaping approved March 2016. This permission for residential and employment uses will contribute to meeting these land use requirements as set out in the emerging Local Plan.
There are significant ground works and infrastructure costs associated with this site. Employment development in isolation would simply not be viable. Assuming a viable mixed use scheme can be agreed the site will be capable of meeting a large proportion of both the District's future employment and housing land requirements and needs in a sustainable location adjacent to the built up area of Skipton and the main arterial road through the Dale. It will also provide the opportunity to address existing access problems in the town through the establishment of a new road link to Engine Shed Lane.	Noted. The Council has been in discussion with the landowner and relevant statutory consultees in relation to the developable areas of this extensive site. Housing will form part of the development brief, along with light industrial and areas of green space (i.e. as a buffer around the cemetery to preserve tranquillity). Flood alleviation measures will also be put in place to avoid flooding on the developable areas, as will connective roads to the A629 bypass, Engine Shed Lane and Carleton Road to help alleviate potential traffic problems in the area.		Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Outline application (63/2015/15792) for mixed use development comprising business/employment floorspace (use classes B1, B2 & B8) and residential dwellings (use class C3) with access from the A629 and Carleton Road, provision of infrastructure and associated landscaping approved March 2016. This permission for residential and employment uses will contribute to meeting these land use requirements as set out in the emerging Local Plan.
Development of this site is dependent on the Skipton Flood Alleviation Scheme (FAS) being built. Only once this has been completed can the development commence. The	Noted.		Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

Skipton FAS will remove the area of the site which currently lies with Eller Beck's functional floodplain from this high risk zone.			Awaiting completion of the Skipton FAS.
This site should be expected to deliver new formal playing pitch for the town. It is located adjacent to Sandylands and provides an opportunity to enhance provision where it is currently most needed. There is a good opportunity to provide playing pitches in the north east corner of the site, which is low lying and subject to flooding and adjacent to existing adult pitches at Sandylands.	Noted. The Council has been in discussion with the landowner and relevant statutory consultees in relation to the developable areas of this extensive site. Funding for a new formal playing pitch could be achieved through planning obligations. A playing Pitch Strategy was completed in February 2016 which shows the need for a new sports hub based at the Sandylands site in Skipton, where the quality of existing football, rugby and cricket grass pitches would be improved.		Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. A Playing Pitch Strategy was completed in February 2016, which shows the need for a sports hub based at the Sandylands site in Skipton, where the quality of existing football, rugby and cricket grass pitches would be improved.
Site: SK051 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
This site is owned by Woolers Ltd	Noted.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
This site lies partially within Eller Beck's functional floodplain, but will be removed from this area of floodplain once the Skipton FAS has been completed. If this allocation is allowed it should be done so on the condition that the area of functional floodplain is left as green space until such a time as the Skipton FAS has been completed. (Environment Agency comment)	Noted.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site is not suited to housing being adjacent to the river and with a constrained access. It	As noted by the Environment Agency above this site lies partially within Eller Beck's	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site

<p>is situated near the existing junior playing pitch provision at Sandylands and could be utilised for new junior pitch provision with some land levelling and a small pedestrian bridge. It should be reallocated for formal recreational use.</p>	<p>functional floodplain, but will be removed from this area of floodplain once the Skipton Flood Alleviation Scheme has been completed. If this allocation is allowed it should be done so on the condition that the area of functional floodplain is left as green space until such a time as the Skipton FAS has been completed.</p> <p>The issue of allocating the land for formal recreation use would have to be based on evidenced need, as set out in the newly updated Playing Pitch Strategy.</p>		<p>assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Awaiting completion of Skipton FAS.</p> <p>A Playing Pitch Strategy was completed in February 2016, which shows the need for a sports hub based at the Sandylands site in Skipton, where the quality of existing football, rugby and cricket grass pitches would be improved.</p>
<p>This site should not be included in the Local Plan as the negative impact it would have on the setting of the Victorian villa and terraces on Carleton Road, which is part of the conservation area. The unique characteristic of this part of the town is its open fields on the urban fringe with open views, which should be retained.</p>	<p>Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.</p> <p>Noted. Revised site assessment work will look again at the suitability of this site for allocation.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>This site lies within the Skipton Conservation Area. The Council has a statutory duty to pay “special attention” to “the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance” of its Conservation Areas. Before allocating Site SK051 for development an assessment needs to be undertaken of the contribution which this site makes to the elements which contribute towards the significance of the Skipton Conservation Area and what impact the loss of this undeveloped site and its subsequent development might have upon those</p>	<p>Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>

significances. (Historic England comment).			
Site: SK058 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Support this site as a future housing allocation. Existing Victorian houses (Prospect Villas) and gardens should be retained and integrated into any scheme as they make an important contribution to the urban landscape. Only the factory site should be built on.	<p>Noted. At present the draft site includes both the factory building and the two attached houses facing the main road (nos. 85 and 87). The owners have made clear that they would like the entire site to be considered for allocation.</p> <p>The site falls within the Skipton Conservation Area. Any demolition of buildings would be subject to planning permission, the granting of which would be based on the merits of the buildings to be demolished in terms of their contribution to the character of conservation area.</p>	No	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Demolition of buildings in the conservation area is a development management issue.</p>
This site lies within the Skipton Conservation Area. The Council has a statutory duty to pay “special attention” to “the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance” of its Conservation Areas. If allocated the Local Plan should firstly identify which buildings make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area and therefore should be retained and, secondly make it clear that development proposals for this area would need to ensure that any other elements which contribute to the character of the Conservation Area are not harmed. (Historic England comment).	Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.		Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: SK060 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Development of housing on this site would displace commercial activities from here to	Noted. The site is in multiple occupation and future development would require both	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site

<p>the edge of the town, or business(es) services might disappear from the town, which are to be avoided.</p>	<p>coordination between land owners and the ability to find premises elsewhere (if that is the landowners' intention – not known at present). As such this site would probably be brought forward within the latter part of the plan period.</p> <p>The site is, however a very sustainable site, being brownfield and near the centre of Skipton, the district's principle town. It is also surrounded by existing residential properties and provides an attractive canal-side location for future residential development.</p>		<p>assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Support this site as a future housing allocation. Site contains the last almost complete textile mill site in the town. Retain the industrial buildings and incorporate high quality new build into this important canal side site.</p>	<p>Noted. The northern part of SK060 that contains the textile mill has already achieved planning permission for 43 dwellings (63/2015/15417). The mill is to be retained and redeveloped for residential apartments , along with housing on the remainder of the site. The southern two thirds of SK060 is still to be considered for housing allocation in the local plan.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Planning Permission achieved on mill site.</p>
<p>Mill is important for its juxtaposition with Middletown which is a quintessential textile colony. Future of the building should be linked to heritage and tourism aspirations with a working class emphasis. Potential for an industrial heritage trail linked to site SK034.</p>	<p>Noted. The northern part of SK060 that contains the textile mill has already achieved planning permission for 43 dwellings (63/2015/15417). The mill is to be retained and redeveloped for residential apartments, along with housing on the remainder of the site.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Planning Permission achieved on mill site.</p>
<p>This site lies within the Skipton Conservation Area. The Council has a statutory duty to pay "special attention" to " the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or</p>	<p>Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>

appearance” of its Conservation Areas. If allocated the Local Plan should firstly identify which buildings make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area and therefore should be retained and, secondly make it clear that development proposals for this area would need to ensure that any other elements which contribute to the character of the Conservation Area are not harmed. (Historic England comment).			
This is a potential brownfield site with potential contamination.	Noted. Consultation with the relevant statutory consultees will address this issue.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: SK061 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Support the site as a future housing allocation. It is one of the canal gateways to the town. Any development should consider the rural vista. Housing should be set back from the canal (the length of which is included within the Conservation Area).	Noted.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.
This site lies opposite the Skipton Conservation Area. The Local Plan should make it clear that any redevelopment proposals for this area should safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of this part of the Conservation Area. (Historic England comment).	Noted.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.
This proposed housing development is in the	Noted.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd

<p>wrong area given there is no adequate traffic infrastructure in place at present. Any housing built by the canal side will use the nearest exist onto Keighley Road via the single lane humped back bridge over the canal, which has no pedestrian access provides limited visibility onto Keighley Road.</p>			<p>draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.</p>
<p>This area already has outline approval and was given the go ahead for accent to build housing.</p>	<p>Application 63/2015/16162 for 88 dwellings and the construction of a new highway bridge over the leeds-liverpool canal was refused in March 2016.</p>		<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.</p>
<p>Site: SK080a SK081, SK082 & SK108 (sites identified in 1st draft Local Plan)</p>			
<p>It is essential that formal playing pitch provision is incorporated into the allocation requirements, specifying a minimum level of provision. There is also an opportunity to link with the exiting recreation provision at Whitehills.</p>	<p>The need for a new formal playing pitch in this area would be determined by the Council's updated Playing Pitch Strategy (completed end Oct 15). The Council could investigate the potential for a playing pitch to be linked to new primary school provision (should it be located on this site). SK082 could also provide green space for the site and link in with the existing recreation provision to the east. Development principles will help to address these issues.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>A Playing Pitch Strategy was completed in Februrary 2016, which shows the need for a sports hub based at the Sandylands site in Skipton, where the quality of existing football, rugby and cricket grass pitches would be improved.</p> <p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If these sites are identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.</p>

<p>Agricultural fields should not be used for housing. There was not favourable support for these sites from the community engagement feedback carried out in 2013. Infill housing up to the bypass should not be allowed because it will turn Skipton into a town like any other in the industrial north.</p>	<p>Noted, however this site is considered to be one of Skipton strategic development opportunities, providing much needed housing for the district in a sustainable location. Redevelopment of the site will also help to achieve a new primary school to alleviate pressures in the north Skipton catchment area. Other benefits include improvements to the green infrastructure network, connecting the northern part of the Skipton to the south, by ensuring green corridors run through the site and link up with Aireville Park and beyond.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If these sites are identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.</p>
<p>Development of sites SK080a, SK081 & SK108 would have a negative impact on existing schools, local services such as doctors and dentists, gas and electricity supplies, water and sewerage services. There would be potential safety issues due to increased vehicular activity along Gargrave Road & Rockwood Drive. There is no need for further housing in Skipton as there is already housing planned on Moorview Way together with an abundance of houses for sale in Skipton. Development in the open countryside would result in a loss of natural habitat. There will be additional costs for the local authority to maintain the prevention of flooding from surface water runoff.</p>	<p>All of these issues are noted however this site is considered to be one of Skipton strategic development opportunities, providing much needed housing for the district in a sustainable location. Updated housing need evidence suggests that the District housing target will need to be uplifted, and Skipton being the principle town will accommodate much of this uplift. It is envisaged that the majority of the uplift will be subsumed by existing draft sites, this site of which would provide a vital role in achieving housing. Infrastructure requirements to accommodate the site would be achieved through the planning process, either via planning conditions or planning obligations.</p> <p>Redevelopment of the site will also help to achieve a new primary school to alleviate pressures in the north Skipton catchment area; provide extensive green corridor links through the site and beyond; and ensure adequate</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Further consultation with infrastructure providers is ongoing.</p> <p>If these sites are identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.</p>

	highways safety measure are in place to respond to the impact of increased traffic flow in the area. Flood risk is not an issue in this area.		
Any development along Gargrave Road would result in the loss of “one of the most attractive entrances to the town” as safeguarded under saved Local Plan policy BE2.	Noted, however it is envisaged that should this site be redeveloped, the frontage to Gargrave Road would be screened by existing trees and a buffer of open green space. Housing would be set further back into the site to protect this attractive entrance into Skipton.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If these sites are identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue
The A629/A65/A59 roundabout is dreadful at rush hours, which will get worse if more housing is developed on these sites.	Noted. Traffic modelling in Skipton will determine the cumulative impact on draft sites on the highways network.	?	Awaiting completion of the highways modelling study for Skipton.
The planning decision to allow the Home Loan Management buildings should not be taken as a precedent for infilling further along Gargrave Road with inappropriate linear development.	Noted, however this site is considered to be one of Skipton strategic development opportunities, providing much needed housing for the district in a sustainable location.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
A new vehicular access into these sites would have poor visibility onto Gargrave Road and the access itself would be a steep gradient.	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm whether the access/egress arrangements to the site would be appropriate.		Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Further consultation with infrastructure providers is ongoing. If these sites are identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.
Any housing development would be contrary to saved Local Plan Policies BE2 & ENV10.	Noted, however it is envisaged that should this site be redeveloped, the frontage to Gargrave	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site

	Road would be screened by existing trees and a buffer of open green space. None of the trees on the Gargrave Road frontage are protected; however they do contribute to the nature of this attractive entrance into Skipton.		assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If these sites are identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.
Aireville Grange and woods should be designated as a Conservation Area.	This area does form part of the Skipton Conservation Area and as such any redevelopment of the adjacent site should be sensitive and appropriately sited to take their special attributes into account (i.e. open space buffers between Aireville Grange and new housing).	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If these sites are identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.
Housing numbers should be reduced on this site with strategic open space developed by the Council to link a pathway to Skipton Woods as agreed after Arup report on Gargrave Road.	Noted, however this site is considered to be one of Skipton strategic development opportunities, providing much needed housing for the district in a sustainable location. Updated housing need evidence suggests that the District housing target will need to be uplifted, and Skipton being the principle town will accommodate much of this uplift. It is envisaged that the majority of the uplift will be subsumed by existing draft sites, this site of which would provide a vital role in achieving housing. Redevelopment of the site will also include improvements to the green infrastructure network, connecting the northern part of the Skipton to the south, by ensuring green corridors run through the site and link up with Aireville Park and beyond. Links will also be	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If these sites are identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.

	made to Skipton Woods thus creating an extensive green network to be enjoyed by people and wildlife alike.		
Site: SK080 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
This site is on the boundary with the SINC. Yorkshire Wildlife Trust recommends that there is a buffer around the SINC in which there is no development and that any development just outside that buffer is carefully assessed to ensure that no damage is done to the biodiversity of the site.	Noted and agreed. A buffer of green space will be provided around the SINC to ensure the continued protection of biodiversity in the area.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.
Site: SK080a (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
This site adjoins part of the boundary of the Skipton Conservation Area. The Council has a statutory duty to pay “special attention” to “the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance” of its Conservation Areas. Before allocating this site for development an assessment needs to be undertaken of the contribution which this site makes to the elements which contribute towards the significance of the Skipton Conservation Area and what impact the loss of this undeveloped site and its subsequent development might have upon those significances. (Historic England comment).	Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.
Site: SK081 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
There is potential for development but not on entire site. Potential to form a natural extension of Aireville Park and a green route	Noted. Redevelopment of the site will include improvements to the green infrastructure network, connecting the northern part of the	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability

<p>through to White Hills. Grouping of trees running from Park View to Aireville Grange in addition to cope to the north of the site. Both require safeguarding.</p>	<p>Skipton to the south, by ensuring green corridors run through the site and link up with Aireville Park and beyond. Links will also be made to Skipton Woods thus creating an extensive green network to be enjoyed by people and wildlife alike. Trees along the road frontage will be retained in light of the contribution they make to the attractiveness of this entrance into Skipton (saved Local Plan policy BE2).</p>		<p>appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.</p> <p>Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.</p>
<p>Tree lined approach into the town should be retained, allowing no access from Gargrave Road. Existing pedestrian route following the beck should be retained and included in the suggested industrial heritage trail.</p>	<p>Noted. The trees along the Gargrave Road frontage will be retained in light of the contribution they make to the attractiveness of this entrance into Skipton (saved Local Plan policy BE2). It is envisaged however to have an access onto Gargrave Road, following consultation with NYCC Highways with regards to appropriate access and egress arrangements. Other existing routes through the site will be retained if possible as substantial parts of the site will be devoted to improving the green infrastructure network in the area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.</p> <p>Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.</p>
<p>Any residential development on this site would be seriously detrimental to the visual amenities of the landscape in the area.</p>	<p>Noted, however this site is considered to be one of Skipton strategic development opportunities, providing much needed housing for the district in a sustainable location. Updated housing need evidence suggests that the District housing target will need to be uplifted, and Skipton being the principle town will accommodate much of this uplift. It is envisaged that the majority of the uplift will be</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.</p>

	<p>subsumed by existing draft sites, this site of which would provide a vital role in achieving housing.</p> <p>It should be noted that redevelopment of the site will include improvements to the green infrastructure network and provide large areas of open space on site to offset the impact of development.</p>		<p>Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.</p>
<p>The southern and western boundaries of this site adjoin the edge of the 2008 extension to the Skipton Conservation Area. The Council has a statutory duty to pay “special attention” to “ the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance” of its Conservation Areas. Before allocating this site for development an assessment needs to be undertaken of the contribution which this site makes to the elements which contribute towards the significance of the Skipton Conservation Area and what impact the loss of this undeveloped site and its subsequent development might have upon those significances. (Historic England comment).</p>	<p>Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Conservation Area Appraisals will help assess this site in this respect.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.</p> <p>Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.</p>
<p>Site: SK082 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)</p>			
<p>The site continues from 108. A green corridor should be maintained to the ring road and to White Hills. Any housing should be limited to an extension of the development of SK108.</p>	<p>Noted. Site SK082 could provide green space for site SK108 and link in with the existing recreation provision to the east. Development principles will help to address this issue.</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred</p>

			site, development principles could address this issue.
Site: SK086 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
If this site was not suggested for housing with strategic open space, re-designation as an “Employment opportunity for enhancement” site would be welcomed. This could be a privately owned and managed underground decked car park, suitably screened and landscape. The lack of current visitor and commuter car parking in Skipton could be alleviated on the edge of the town centre.	<p>Noted. Outline planning application 63/2015/16113 for residential development with all matters reserved was approved in Jan 2016. The number of dwellings delivered on this site will contribute towards the overall housing requirement figure for Skipton.</p> <p>It should be noted though that Skipton, being the principle town in the District, will accommodate much of the uplift in the housing figure, evidenced by recent updates to housing need studies. Sustainable sites such as SK086 will be vital in accommodating the housing needed in the area.</p>	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Development should not be allowed on this site as it forms part of the distinctive landscape at the approach to the town and castle. Development would impact on views into the town, the ancient woodland, the castle woods and the parkland surrounding.	Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
This site lies within the Skipton Conservation Area. The Council has a statutory duty to pay “special attention” to “the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance” of its Conservation Areas. Before allocating site SK086 for development and assessment needs to be undertaken of the contribution which this site makes to the elements which contribute towards the significance of the Skipton Conservation Area	Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

and what impact the loss of this undeveloped site and its subsequent development might have upon those significances. (Historic England comment).			
Site: SK087 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Part of the northern corner is now a 5 pitch touring caravan sites, which may reduce the area available for housing/open space provision.	<p>The landowner's agent has been contacted to determine whether the site is still available.</p> <p>Application 63/2015/16036 for the change of use for touring park (20 pitches) including the creation of a new access road to the site. This proposal was refused in Dec 2015.</p>	No	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.</p>
Development should be avoided so far out from the town centre and affecting the park homes.	<p>Noted. Further work is to be undertaken to identify suitable sites for allocation.</p> <p>Subject to satisfactory design it is not considered likely that any proposed residential land use would have an impact on the amenities of the nearby park homes.</p>	No	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.</p>
This is an archaeological site relating to early quarrying.	Noted. Consultation will take place with NYCC Archaeology team prior to final allocation of sites.		Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

			<p>Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.</p> <p>Further consultation with infrastructure providers is ongoing i.e., NYCC Archaeology.</p>
This site is owned by Lafarge Tarmac.	A check of the land registry has identified that site SK087 is in split ownership with land to the south of the track running east-west through the site owned by Lafarge. The agents acting on behalf of Lafarge have been contacted and a Land Availability Questionnaire has been completed indicating that the site is available for development.	No	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.</p>
Support of this site as a housing allocation as it is vital to ensure that the targets for housebuilding set out in the draft Local Plan are met.	Noted. This comment is in support of the Plan.	No	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.</p>
This is a sensitive site in the already overdeveloped approach to the town from the north east. Setting of the adjacent ancient woodland would be damaged by the proposed development with detrimental consequences for tourism.	Noted. Further work is to be undertaken to assess the suitability of sites prior to the next draft of the Local Plan, this will include where necessary identifying development principles to ensure sites are developed which will retain any important trees on site.		<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Site currently being considered for</p>

	There is no ancient woodland adjoining this site.		both residential and designation as Local Green Space. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.
A previous planning application for housing on this site was rejected after an enquiry.	Noted. Checks identify that there has been no recent planning applications on this site for residential use. The Council is now preparing a new Local Plan which requires land to be allocated to meet the plan area's housing requirements. Further site assessment work is to be undertaken to determine the suitability of sites prior to allocation.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.
Site: SK086 & SK087 (sites identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Support for housing development on these sites as they would be infill areas with little current usage. They are close to the town centre and therefore accessible to services.	Noted. This comment is in support of the Plan.	Yes	SK086 not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work as site received outline consent for residential development in Jan 2016. SK087 identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.
Similar houses to those at Cross Banks and the Overdales should be built to attract middle income, wealthy professionals with	Noted. However, in order to establish balanced communities developments should contain a range of housing types and tenure including on	Yes	SK086 not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability

<p>disposable incomes to live in Skipton, which would be good for the local economy.</p>	<p>site affordable housing.</p>		<p>appraisal work, as site received outline consent for residential development in Jan 2016.</p> <p>SK087 identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.</p>
<p>Do we really want to see open space built up with houses and spoil the “entrance to Skipton”?</p>	<p>Noted. Further work is to be undertaken to identify suitable sites for allocation. Should the site be identified as being suitable, work will be undertaken to identify development principles where necessary.</p> <p>Whilst the council encourages the use of brownfield land, there is likely to be a need for greenfield development in order to meet the plan area’s housing requirements.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>SK086 not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work, as site received outline consent for residential development in Jan 2016.</p> <p>SK087 identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.</p>
<p>The junction A6131 onto the A65 is dreadful at rush hour and additional houses will make</p>	<p>Work is being undertaken by Highways consultants to understand junction capacity.</p>		<p>Awaiting completion of the highways modelling study for Skipton.</p>

the situation worse.	This will enable an understanding of potential for new housing development.		
There must be more appropriate sites available.	Noted. Further work is to be undertaken to assess site suitability of all sites in working towards allocation.	Yes	<p>SK086 not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work, as site received outline consent for residential development in Jan 2016.</p> <p>SK087 identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified for the site.</p>
Site: SK090 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
This site should be withdrawn from the Local Plan.	Noted. However, no reasons have been put forward as to why the site should be removed.	No	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.</p>
This site has flooding issues. The existing sewerage network does not have the capacity to deal with sewerage from any additional houses. The existing road	Noted. The western edges of the site are at higher flood risk. However, much of the site lies within Flood Risk Zone 1 and surface water flooding is not identified as a significant risk.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

<p>network (many of which are cul de sacs) where not built to take an increase in traffic, which would occur from vehicles accessing this site.</p>	<p>Consultation with utility providers has identified that capacity exists within Skipton for new development.</p> <p>Work is being undertaken by Highways consultants to understand junction capacity. This will enable an understanding of potential for new housing development.</p>		<p>Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Awaiting completion of the highways modelling study for Skipton.</p>
<p>The layout and boundaries of the site need clarification. Recent housing development at the south east corner has provided an additional short length of new highway and 5 homes. The site does not extend to the south west corner, which I understand is in CDCs ownership, along with the rest of the site.</p>	<p>Noted, the boundary of the site will be changed to remove the area of newly built housing to the south west corner.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>SHLAA site boundary has been amended.</p> <p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.</p>
<p>This site is undeliverable. It was proposed prior to the last Local Plan but not pursued because of an existing sewer and the informal but adopted footpath between Airedale Avenue and the railway underpass. It should be deleted as a potential housing allocation.</p>	<p>Noted. Further work is to be undertaken to assess the suitability of sites.</p> <p>Should this site continued to as a preferred site consultation will take place with Yorkshire Water. The location of the sewer, may impact on deliverability of parts of the site and require the layout to accommodate this.</p> <p>The retention of the footpath will form part of the development principles for any potential allocation.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Further consultation with utility providers is ongoing.</p> <p>Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could</p>

			address the issue of retaining the existing footpath.
There are fears that Elsey Croft, which abuts the south east corner of this site will be the catalyst for a Skipton east bypass, along which the vehicles from those 107 houses would reach Otley Rd via the Quarry Line railway underpass.	Noted. However, at present there are no current plans for a Skipton east bypass.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.
Allocation of this site for housing is supported; however access to the site needs to be clarified.	Noted. Should the site continue as a preferred site, broad development principles including suitable access will be established.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.
The draft Local Plan provides little detail on the proposed sites and therefore it is difficult to state how the plan could be changed.	Noted. At the next draft of the Plan, principles will be established which set out broad parameters for how sites should be developed appropriately.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could

			address this issue.
Concern relating to how this site would be made accessible to Otley Road and how development would affect existing wildlife.	<p>Noted. Work is currently being carried out to assess the highways capacity within Skipton. The outcome of this work will help to determine site allocations.</p> <p>Policies within the Plan will help to protect biodiversity this includes the design of new housing.</p>	?	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Site currently being considered for both residential and designation as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Awaiting completion of the highways modelling study for Skipton.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.</p>
Site: SK095 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Inclusion of this site in the Local Plan is supported.	Noted. This comment is in support of the Local Plan.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
This site adjoins the boundary of the Skipton Conservation Area. The Local Plan should make it clear that any development proposals for this area would need to safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of the adjacent Conservation Area. (Historic England comment).	Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: SK101 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Objection to inclusion of this site in the Local Plan as it provides important open views	Noted. Revised site assessment work will look again at the suitability of this site for allocation.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site

over farmland, access would be difficult to achieve and it is an important part of the town's settlement character.	Should the site be continued to be identified as a preferred site for allocation development principles will be established which seek to retain important views.		assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue.
Site: SK108 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
This site include part of the Skipton Conservation Area. The Council has a statutory duty to pay "special attention" to "the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance" of its Conservation Areas. Before allocating this site for development an assessment needs to be undertaken of the contribution which this site makes to the elements which contribute towards the significance of the Skipton Conservation Area and what impact the loss of this undeveloped site and its subsequent development might have upon those significances. (Historic England comment).	Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: SK113 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Objection to inclusion of this site as it is a vital approach to the town. There is a need to retain the open character and views of this area.	Noted. Revised site assessment work will look again at the suitability of this site for allocation. Should the site continue as a preferred allocation site development principles may be established should they be necessary to retain important views and measures such as screening.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
This site adjoins the boundary of the Skipton Conservation Area. The Local Plan should	Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site

make it clear that any redevelopment proposals for this area would need to safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of this part of the Conservation Area. (Historic England comment).	area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.		assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: SK114 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
This site already has planning permission granted on part of it and work should be commencing this year.	Noted. The draft allocation recognised the extant planning permission and potential development quantum reflects the area not subject to planning permission.	Yes	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Support for the inclusion of this site in the Local Plan. The archaeological interest of the site should be investigated and the important existing water course should be preserved.	Noted. Consultation will take place with NYCC Archaeology on all sites with potential archaeological significance, prior to final allocation.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue. Further consultation with infrastructure providers and statutory consultees is ongoing.
To the south east of this area there is a series of Scheduled Monuments. The nearest, a cup-marked rock, lies 140 metres or so from the south eastern edge of the site. Before allocating site SK114 for development an assessment needs to be undertaken of the contribution which this site makes to the setting of the Scheduled Monuments to the southeast and what impact the loss of the open area and	Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles could address this issue. Conservation Area Appraisals will be

subsequent development might have upon their significance.			prepared to inform such assessments.
Site: SK120 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Object to the inclusion of this site in the Local Plan. It should be returned to natural environment as it is importance to the tranquil setting of Waltonwrays.	Noted. Prior to allocation further work will be undertaken to assess the suitability of sites. However, should this site continue as a draft preferred site towards allocation it will be necessary to ensure development principles form part of any allocation which seek to protect the setting of the listed cemetery.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: SK122 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Support inclusion of this site in the Local Plan; however some open space should be provided as part of any development.	Noted. However, this site occupies a small land area and may not be suitable to achieve on site open space alongside housing.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
This site adjoins the boundary of the Skipton Conservation Area. The Local Plan should make it clear that any redevelopment proposals for this area would need to safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of this part of the Conservation Area. (Historic England comment).	Noted. Draft preferred sites will be assessed in terms of their contribution to the conservation area and nearby heritage assets, including listed buildings.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: SK135 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
This site is on the boundary with the SINC. Yorkshire Wildlife Trust recommends that there is a buffer around the SINC in which there is no development and that any development just outside that buffer is carefully assessed to ensure that no damage is done to the biodiversity of the site.	Noted.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

Support inclusion of this site in the Local Plan for housing. Development should not impinge on the present visual, recreational and amenity area immediately to the west. The two existing Rights of Way should be preserved and incorporated into any development.	Noted. However, this site is currently proposed for employment purposes not housing. Development principles will help to ensure the protection of the amenity area to the west as well as retention of the public footpath.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: SK088 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Representation received in response to the Council's decision not to include the site as a Draft Preferred Site For Consultation on the emerging Craven Local Plan. (Planning statement submitted)	Noted. Revised site assessment work will look again at the suitability of this site for allocation.		Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site: SK103 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
This land was not considered under the SHLAA as the site already has planning permission for an access road to the site and two dwellings.	Noted.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
A location plan, Land Availability Questionnaire and information relating to the Part Two Check of sites has been submitted to the Council to provide basic background information.	Noted.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
General Comments :			
Water supply – The infrastructure feeding Skipton would support these properties however the location of these developments may require off – site reinforcement of the mains network to support this growth.	Noted. Further consultation in light of increased housing requirements will need to take place to ensure that there is sufficient capacity for an uplift from that proposed within the 2014 consultation.	Yes	Further informal consultation carried out on 2 nd draft Local Plan.
Waste water – The various developments should be phased over the Plan period to ensure that adequate capacity can be	Noted. New housing development will be phased in the Local Plan over a five, ten and fifteen year period.	No	New housing development will be phased over the plan period.

provided at the receiving waste water treatment works (note there are no immediate issues).			
It is unclear how sites with consent will impact on Skipton. These sites should be included on a map to show overall land supply.	Noted. It is the current intention that committed sites with extant planning permissions will be plotted on the Policies Map forming part of the Local Plan. The amount of new housing with extant planning permission will be subtracted together with an allowance for small sites (under 5 dwellings) from the overall housing requirement leaving a residual amount for allocation.	Yes	As the plan emerges it will take into account existing housing commitments on an annual basis. The submitted Local Plan will, therefore take into account the most up to date position in terms of committed housing sites. Such commitments will contribute to meeting the overall housing requirements for the plan area.
Sites should be colour coded on the map to show how the sites will be phased.	Noted. A decision has not been made on this yet but this point will be considered further. However, it is likely that large sites will be phased over more than one period.	Potentially	Consider colour coding sites for phasing.
There is land within the main boundary of Skipton that is not identified on the map, which could be developed.	Unclear as to where these sites are located.	No	
Sites SK013, SK090, SK015 & SK016 (sites off Shortbank Road) – Skipton does not have the necessary infrastructure to support such a massive development. Development of these sites would cause additional problems with flooding and would result in additional congestion on the road network. The proposal to create access from Otley Road onto Moorview Way would result in Moorview Way and Hurrs Road becoming a short cut for drivers wishing to avoid Otley Road roundabout congestions. Traffic congestion would become much worse due	<p>Noted. Further consultation with the Environment Agency and other relevant statutory undertakers, along with site specific assessment work would ascertain whether this site would be suitable for allocation and development.</p> <p>In terms of highways capacity modelling is currently being undertaken to assess junctions and congestion. Results from this are still awaiting and will help to influence the progress of site selection.</p>	Yes	<p>An update to the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) is currently being completed.</p> <p>Sites SK013 SK090 and SK015 identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Site SK016 is not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and</p>

<p>to the fact that secondary schools, supermarkets, recreational facilities are all located on the other side of Skipton.</p>			<p>sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Concern that there is a need for such a large number of houses around the Shortbank Road area when other recent development (Belle Vue Mills) are standing empty, proving there is no great demand for extra residential properties locally.</p>	<p>Noted. Whilst it is accepted that a wing of Belle Vue Mill remains unoccupied up to date evidence presented in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies a market for new housing in Craven. Policies in the plan will help to ensure that housing mix and tenure is appropriate to suit the needs of people looking to move within or into Skipton.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>A specific chapter should be introduced into the Local Plan to deal with the need for new formal playing pitch provision in Skipton. Specific locations should be identified as part of proposed development allocations so that the delivery of new formal playing pitches is directly linked to increase demand arising from new development proposals.</p>	<p>Noted. A Playing Pitch Assessment is currently being carried out by external consultants. This will help to inform playing pitch requirements and policies within the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The 2016 Playing Pitch Strategy has informed drafting of Local Plan policy INF3, which sets out the Council's draft playing pitch requirements.</p>
<p>Yorkshire Wildlife Trust is pleased to see that there are a number of policies in the draft Local Plan which will protect and enhance wildlife and habitat in the area. There are also a number of preferred sites which fall within Living Landscapes and must be carefully considered to ensure that the developments are not causing any damage to current ecological networks or wildlife corridors within the area that any development contribute to increasing the overall biodiversity and connectivity of the area.</p>	<p>Noted. Prior to allocation further work will be undertaken to assess the suitability of sites. Should sites within Living Landscapes continue to progress to allocation it will be necessary that development principles are in place to protect biodiversity through design measures.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>If sites are identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified for the site to ensure no damage to ecological networks or corridors occurs.</p>

<p>Road safety for pedestrians is an issue for the residents of Stirton and Thorlby, placing increased emphasis on the car. White Hills Lane is an important leisure and amenity link for the people of Skipton and visitors alike to access the countryside, YDNP and canal towpath network through our lanes. The villages also represent important wildlife habitats for a range of animals e.g., bats, nesting farmland birds etc. The village has an active wildlife group. If the suburban area is enlarged then access to the countryside from the centre of Skipton will be harder to achieve. If development must go ahead there should be cycling, wildlife and pedestrian corridors and large areas of green space within the site.</p>	<p>Work is currently being carried out to assess the highways capacity within Skipton. The outcome of this work will help to determine site allocations.</p> <p>Whilst it is recognised that new housing required to meet the needs of the area is likely to result in an extension to the footprint of Skipton, careful consideration will be given to retaining and improving green infrastructure from the centre of Skipton out to the surrounding countryside. A policy within the Local Plan also specifically relates to green infrastructure.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Awaiting completion of the highways modelling study for Skipton.</p>
<p>Sites SK114, SK013 & SK015 directly conflict with SP6 (Good Design).</p> <p>Whilst it is clear that Craven DC is under pressure to meet central targets on housing growth, and that there is a demand for housing, particularly affordable housing in the town, trying to fulfil this with high density developments on elevated sites will be damaging. Lower density developments on smaller sites would be more acceptable.</p>	<p>Noted. Prior to allocation further work will be undertaken to assess the suitability of sites. Should these sites continue to progress to final allocation it may be necessary to consider development principles that help to protect the character and setting of the area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Sites are identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If sites are identified as a preferred sites, development principles will be established, which accord with Local Plan policies.</p>
<p>The location of Aireville Park, and other key Green Infrastructure corridors and hubs such as the Leeds-Liverpool Canal (including the Springs Branch), Gawflat Meadow, The Wilderness and Skipton Woods should be</p>	<p>Noted. Strategic green Infrastructure will be mapped as part of the Local Plan. This could either be done through the designation of Local Green Space or by illustrating existing amenity area and important open spaces on the Local</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Map strategic green infrastructure.</p>

identified on the Skipton Insert Map.	Plan map.		
---------------------------------------	-----------	--	--

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Sutton Response Paper to 1st Draft Local Plan 2014

Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan
Site: SC030 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Site should accommodate no more than 10 properties due to impact of traffic on narrow restricted road (issues for emergency vehicles and local transport). Parking issues already exist in area. Proposed properties should be 2 stories maximum due to impact on residents.	This site has now been granted outline approval for the demolition of redundant commercial premises and the erection of 10 dwellings with access and siting considered at reserved matters stage. Consultation with NYCC Highways via the application process would address this issue if necessary.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Flood issues in the area (i.e. North Road). Development would result in more destruction of natural drainage in area.	This site has now been granted outline approval for the demolition of redundant commercial premises and the erection of 10 dwellings with access and siting considered at reserved matters stage. Consultation with appropriate bodies via the application process would address this issue if necessary.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Concern over loss of green space. Should not infill every space.	This site has now been granted outline approval for the demolition of redundant commercial premises and the erection of 10 dwellings with access and siting considered at reserved matters stage.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
This site adjoins the boundary of the Sutton-in-Craven Conservation Area. The Local Plan should make it clear that any redevelopment proposals for this area would need to safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of the adjacent part of the	This site has now been granted outline approval for the demolition of redundant commercial premises and the erection of 10 dwellings with access and siting considered at reserved matters stage. Consultation with appropriate bodies via the application process	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

Conservation Area. Amend accordingly. (English Heritage comment)	would address this issue if necessary.		
Proposed development would be detrimental to the character of the village.	This site has now been granted outline approval for the demolition of redundant commercial premises and the erection of 10 dwellings with access and siting considered at reserved matters stage.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Infrastructure concerns, i.e. local schools and health care providers are already over-subscribed. Support expressed for development on this site as within existing development limits, mostly previously developed land, currently employment use, and within built up area	This site has now been granted outline approval for the demolition of redundant commercial premises and the erection of 10 dwellings with access and siting considered at reserved matters stage.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Traffic problems in this area would be exacerbated by development of this site.	This site has now been granted outline approval for the demolition of redundant commercial premises and the erection of 10 dwellings with access and siting considered at reserved matters stage. Consultation with NYCC Highways via the application process would address this issue if necessary.	Yes	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site SC040 (site identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Site should not have been selected based on response on the summer 2013 engagement event as the support expressed for the site was not representative of the wider community. Objections (224) to recent planning application on site were much more wide-spread and should carry more weight when deciding whether or not the site should be preferred than the 4 post-it notes that supported the site at the summer 2013 engagement. Summer 2013 engagement	Noted. The recent planning application on this site (66/2015/15334 – outline planning permission for the construction of 50 dwellings) did receive many objections. This application was refused in June 2015. The summer 2013 engagement was informal consultation done under Reg 18 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning (England) Regulations 2012. The aim of this informal consultation was to obtain views from the community on the overall draft housing	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

<p>event was misleading as it was not made clear at the time that the community should be expressing support or objection to sites and that these views would hold weight when planners came to decide on preferred sites. We would have objected strongly to this site (as would have many others) at that point if we had known.</p>	<p>number for Craven and the sites that were included in the Council's SHLAA at that time. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation.</p>		
<p>Parish Profiles should be used as part of the consultation to help ensure that "Sutton maintains its distinct rural identity with Greenfields both in and around the village. SC040 Residential development would be especially prominent and the attractive nature of the countryside here would render that prominence especially damaging. The identity and character of the village would be destroyed, including the visual landscape of mill houses, stone walls, hedgerows and traditional cottages. New residents would be a separate enclave and may not use the services and businesses in the village.</p>	<p>Noted. The existing Parish Profiles form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan. As such they will be used in its preparation, including site assessment work.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>Need to maintain the gap between the villages of Sutton and Eastburn. This is a crucial point in protecting village identity. SC040 is the most important gap as not only does it separate Sutton's identity from Eastburn but it separates Bradford Met from Craven.</p>	<p>Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>This is a large site at the edge of the settlement and should not be developed prior to brownfield sites suggested by Parish Council, i.e. Yeadon House. Sites that have</p>	<p>Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation. Sites with existing planning consents will be taken into account when allocating land for new</p>	<p>no</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>

just received planning permission, i.e. at West Lane, plus Yeadon House and other sites put forward by the Parish Council should all be shown on local plan maps and contribute to target for Sutton.	residential development over the next plan period.		
Development should not be permitted on a greenfield site save in exceptional circumstances. This site has real visual and agricultural value and is in current agricultural use.	Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
The site falls outside the existing development limit for Sutton and development of it would expand the village towards Eastburn.	Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Road issues: Sutton Lane is a narrow and winding road and is not equipped to deal with all the extra traffic generated by development of this site. Nor is Main St, which is already regularly clogged up (Sutton acts as a rat run to avoid congestion in Cross Hills). Visibility along Sutton Lane from a point to the west of the development is poor. Addressing this by road widening and straightening would destroy the character of this end of Sutton even further as it would have the look of a suburban estate. The stone wall along the edge of the fields would disappear, together with an ancient well. Further, the process of road widening and straightening would create unacceptable difficulties for local residents. Clearly, this would necessitate closure of half of the	Noted. Consultation with NYCC Highways would confirm whether there are any highway constraints relating to residential development on this site.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

<p>width of the road, with traffic lights and contraflow for a lengthy period of time, making it extremely difficult for the residents of Garden Place and Crofter's Mill to access the roads beyond. Pedestrian safety is also a clear issue. Poor lighting is an issue along this road.</p>			
<p>Drainage and flooding issues: if the fields are concreted over then water draining off the site could pour down the hillside and across the road and into Garden Place, onto Ravestone Gardens and into Wilson Street. Surface water run off would damage road surfaces and create icy conditions in the winter. Natural drainage would be damaged (i.e. underground springs) – this big site is needed for absorption of water from surrounding hillsides. Flooding would create problems on cricket field. Flooding would also create additional pressures on Aire Valley Trunk Sewer.</p>	<p>Site specific flood risk assessments will be carried out on site prior to allocation (– or development?). Development would be sited away from high flood risk areas.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.</p>
<p>Infrastructure issues: area already struggling to cope with health care provision; existing narrow roads in village could not cope with extra cars (approx. 150) – they are already at capacity esp at rush hour and increase in cars in area is not conducive to need to reduce travel by private car; pressure on existing water supply; sewer already at capacity for both surface water and sewage; need for footpath near site; additional school places will be needed at primary schools and secondary school in the area;</p>	<p>The policy on Infrastructure could be amended to provide greater reassurance that appropriate infrastructure improvements will be delivered in a timely manner, to coordinate with the phasing of development. This approach could be backed up with the production of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and (if adopted by the Council) a CIL charging schedule.</p>	<p>yes</p>	<p>SP21 Sustainable Buildings, Infrastructure and Planning Obligations strengthened to provide greater assurance of coordinated delivery of development and infrastructure.</p>

trains are already too busy at rush hour.			
Environmental impact of on local wildlife and habitats is unacceptable. Noise and disturbance to badgers, hedgehogs, bats, curlews, pheasants, rabbits, herons, kestrels and owls.	Noted. Sustainability appraisal will address this issue and look to the protection of existing wildlife species on site. The site will be interspersed with corridors and larger areas of open green space to enable wildlife to move through and around the site.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.
No need for this level of new housing as new housing built recently in village are up for sale and not selling.	The housing requirement for Craven is based on detailed evidence relating to population projections etc. This figure has been distributed between the settlements of Craven based on the size, level of existing services and sustainability. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation. Sites with existing planning consents will be taken into account when allocating land for new residential development over the next plan period.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Village has already provided fair share of affordable housing over the past few years, with the 3 mill developments (approx. 320 houses)	The level of past development together with existing planning consents will be taken into account when allocating land for new residential development over the next plan period. National Planning Guidance states that LPAs need to provide affordable housing where there is an evidenced need. There is such a need in Craven, therefore the Local Plan will include a policy to deliver affordable housing and will set out the Council's requirements for providing such housing.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Use Alvic field instead – houses would tidy	Revised site assessment work will look at the	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd

up this field which is currently only used by dog walkers. Development here could incorporate a more usable footpath.	suitability of this site for allocation.		draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Concern expressed that planned footpath between Sutton and Eastburn would not go ahead should SC040 be developed.	Noted. Allocation of this site would not necessarily mean that any planned footpath would not go ahead.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.
Objection due to loss of prime agricultural land for grazing and growing fodder.	Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation and in particular the grade of agricultural land.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Need to bring back empty home into use across the district before destroying green fields for housing.	Noted. The NPPF is clear that Local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings in line with local housing and empty homes strategies. The housing need of Craven over the next plan period, however cannot be met purely from this source. Conversion of existing buildings and new build residential development also will need to contribute to meeting the housing needs of Craven.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Parish profile, produced jointly between District and Parish Council and residents of Sutton identified village development limits, and this site is beyond those limits. The profile highlighted need to protect land beyond the development limits.	The draft local plan will afford protection to the open countryside through its draft policy SP4 Countryside and Landscape. Whilst this draft policy does not advocate specific development limits around villages and towns, it does enable settlements to grow in ways that harmonise	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

	with the character of the immediate setting and wider landscape (including creating the important transition between built up areas and the surrounding countryside).		
<p>Saved local plan policy ENV1 applies to SC040 as it seeks to protect the character of the open countryside from being spoilt by sporadic development and restricts development to small scale proposals appropriate for the enjoyment of the scenic qualities of the countryside and other appropriate small-scale development having a rural character and where the proposal clearly benefits the rural economy, helps to maintain or enhance landscape character; is essential for efficient operation of agriculture or forestry; or is essential to the needs of the community. SC040 does none of the above.</p>	<p>Policy ENV1 is saved until replaced by new Local Plan policy. Currently draft policy SP4 Countryside and Landscape does enable settlements to grow in ways that harmonise with the character of the immediate setting and wider landscape (including creating the important transition between built up areas and the surrounding countryside).</p>	?	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>Draft policy SP4 may be amended prior to consultation on the 2nd draft Local Plan.</p>
<p>SC040 defined in Landscape Character Assessment 2002 as 'Pasture with Wooded Gills and Woodland' and should be preserved as such. Woodlands as especially considered to be under threat and should be preserved.</p>	<p>Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation and in particular landscape character.</p>	No	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>
<p>NPPF emphasises need for good design which goes beyond aesthetic considerations and the visual appearance and architecture of individual buildings. Decisions should also address the connections between people and place and the integration of the new development in to the natural and built environment. SC040, which is on a rising</p>	<p>Noted. The new Local Plan has to be in conformity with the NPPF & NPPG in all respects, including guidance on design. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation.</p>	No	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>

<p>slope does not integrate development with natural environment. It would be too prominent.</p>			
<p>Concern over loss of opposing gable ends of the stone terraced cottages of Wilson Street and Harker street, which currently serve as a gateway to the village.</p>	<p>If allocated development principles would be established for this site, which would take into account any existing features to be retained on site, together with any important views out of/across the site, which should be retained when considering layout of new residential development.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.</p>
<p>Concern over loss of privacy and overlooking onto Wilson Street, Garden Place and Ravenstone Gardens.</p>	<p>If allocated development principles would be established for this site. The layout of new residential development would be considered at the planning application stage in terms of impact of the amenity of existing residents.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Development Management Issue.</p> <p>Site identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p> <p>If this site is identified as a preferred site, development principles will be identified.</p>
<p>Should be protected as a green wedge, rather than being developed.</p>	<p>The adopted Local Plan's (1999) policy BE3: Green Wedge was saved in 2007 when the plan was reviewed, as instructed by Central Government. Local Planning Authorities were instructed to review their current local plan policies and only saved those that were relevant and specific to the plan area. Draft policy SP4 Countryside and Landscape does enable settlements to grow in ways that harmonise with the character of the immediate setting and wider landscape (including creating the important transition between built up areas</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>Draft policy SP4 may be amended prior to consultation on the 2nd draft Local Plan.</p>

	and the surrounding countryside). Local Plans also have the opportunity to designate Local Green Space where appropriate.		
Glusburn allotment site would be a better alternative to development on SC040.	Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of this site for allocation and in particular landscape character. Communities will also have an opportunity to put forward areas of green space that they value, for example allotments for assessment as potential Local Green Space designations in the Local Plan.	No	Site identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work. Awaiting results of the LGS call for sites.
Site SC025 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
This site received support at the summer 2013 engagement event. It also had support from the Parish Council. Why was it omitted from preferred sites?	This site was not identified in the pool of sites for the 2 nd draft Local Plan as site assessment work and sustainability work showed the site to be in active employment use.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site SC042 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Support expressed for omission of this site as a preferred sites. Although the site received some support from the 2013 summer engagement event, the Parish Council did not support it.	This site was not identified in the pool of sites for the 2 nd draft Local Plan as site assessment and sustainability appraisal work showed the site to contain less than 0.1 ha of land that is at the lowest risk of flooding (flood zone 1)	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Site SC046 (site not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
Support expressed for site to be included in the local plan. Site received a significant positive outcome on the sustainability check and other Council checks. Sutton is in a sustainable location and there is a need for growth in the south sub area (with Sutton identified as a focus for secondary growth), which has services and facilities available to	This site was not identified in the pool of sites for the 2 nd draft Local Plan as site assessment and sustainability appraisal work showed the site had flood risk issues and difficulties with access.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

<p>match demand (i.e. shops, schools, doctors, good transport links to Leeds, Bradford, Manchester etc). Not enough brownfield land in the area to meet demand, therefore need to build on greenfield land over the plan period. These sites have a greater ability to attract funding for affordable housing and supportive infrastructure, and flood risk areas can be avoided during the build.</p>			
<p>This site would help boost housing supply in Sutton. The housing figure for Sutton is considered too low for the following reasons:</p> <p>a) The overall requirement figure represents a minimum and there should be increased flexibility built into this calculation to enable the best sites with development potential to be identified within the Local Plan.</p> <p>b) Policy SP12 (New Homes) acknowledges that additional housing over and above the requirement figure will be achieved on windfall sites. Whilst it is not disputed that windfall sites can make a useful contribution to housing supply, it would be more appropriate to include an element of flexibility within the overall housing land figure identified by including further housing allocations such as this site within the plan at this stage, so that a 5 year supply of housing land is readily available at all times. It is understood at the current time that the Council does not have an available 5 year</p>	<p>This site was not identified in the pool of sites for the 2nd draft Local Plan as site assessment and sustainability appraisal work showed the site had flood risk issues and difficulties with access.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Site not identified in pool of sites for 2nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.</p>

housing land supply.			
Allocation of the site for housing development would meet the Local Plan Strategic Policy Objectives and would be consistent with all policy considerations as set out within the Local Plan.	This site was not identified in the pool of sites for the 2nd draft Local Plan as site assessment and sustainability appraisal work showed the site had flood risk issues and difficulties with access.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
<p>Since the submission of the earlier representations the following additional work has been carried out in relation to the site:</p> <p>a) Initial site access appraisal – the conclusions of this exercise are that access to the site could be provided in several locations with the two preferred access locations from Crag Lane (1) or Crag Close (2) as shown on the adopted highway plan attached. There also exists a further access option via Willow Way (3). The availability of a single point of access would be acceptable to accommodate up to 50 dwellings. Any increase over this number would more than likely require an emergency / secondary access which could be provided given the various access alternatives that exist.</p> <p>b) Initial site layout – based upon the initial site access appraisal together with market detail received from local residential agents an initial indicative layout has been prepared which demonstrates that the site could accommodate circa 53 dwellings with a mix of dwelling types. Clearly this is essentially a</p>	This site was not identified in the pool of sites for the 2nd draft Local Plan as site assessment and sustainability appraisal work showed the site had flood risk issues and difficulties with access.	No	Site not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.

<p>capacity exercise at this stage and it would be subject to detailed discussion with Council and consultees at the time of any planning application submission to establish the appropriate number of dwellings and a corresponding supportive layout.</p> <p>c) Land ownership – adjacent to the site land and existing dwellings are vested within the ownership of two housing associations; Yorkshire Housing Association and Muir Housing Association. The site is also adjoined by general market properties. As such the site has the opportunity to genuinely provide a mix of housing provision including both general market and affordable housing properties. Discussions with both housing associations together with the District Council would take place to ensure that the site, if considered appropriate for allocation, would ensure the delivery of an appropriate mix of both general market and affordable housing provision as part of an overall scheme for the site.</p>			
Sites SC073, SC075 & SC076 (not identified in 1st draft Local Plan)			
No objection to these sites.	Noted.	No	Sites not identified in pool of sites for 2 nd draft Local Plan, following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
General Comments :			
5 houses per year= 75 over 15 years Water supply- Local mains reinforcement may be	Noted. Further consultation in light of increased housing requirements will need to	Yes	Further informal consultation will be carried out on 2 nd draft Local Plan.

<p>required. Waste water- The sites would drain via the Aire Valley trunk sewer. We are currently developing our Aire Valley Strategy and Drainage Area Plan (DAP) outputs will be a key part of our future scenario planning. It is intended that as local plans are finalised for Craven and Bradford Districts (the sewer serves settlements in both) new development scenarios in the DAP will be revised and further feasibility undertaken. It is proposed that we will consider short, medium and long term responses to the supply demand challenges. We would therefore seek to ensure that new development is suitably phased to allow Yorkshire Water to provide adequate capacity in the network to serve growth in both districts (Yorkshire Water comment).</p>	<p>take place to ensure that there is sufficient capacity for an uplift from that proposed within the 2014 consultation.</p>		
<p>There appears to be an inconsistent approach as to how land was selected to be included or not.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Assessment and sustainability appraisal work on sites was undertaken objectively using an agreed methodology.</p>
<p>Developers should consult communities before submitting certain planning applications, to further strengthen the role of local communities in planning.</p>	<p>Noted. Requirements for developer pre application consultation is set out within the Council's validation requirements used to validate planning applications.</p>		<p>Development Management Issue</p>
<p>Need more awareness of local plan and consultation exercises. People need to be made more aware that this is their opportunity to comment and how significant the local plan is for Craven (article in Craven Herald not sufficient).</p>	<p>Noted. The draft local plan consultation procedures went in excess of planning regulations, the idea being that by leafletting every household in the district we would reach the widest population possible. Notice was also given in the Craven Herald and other surrounding local newspapers, on the Council's</p>	<p>No</p>	

	website and displayed at Council offices. Subsequent consultation on the Local Plan will be carried out and will follow the regulations.		
Comments made by the people of Craven should be made publicly available after the consultation is finished. Comments should also be fully taken into account when developing the local plan.	Noted. Detailed summaries of all comments received on the Sept 2014 draft local plan are available to view on the Council's website here . Summaries have been prepared for both the different sections of the plan and for individual settlements.	Yes	Comments made on the Sept 2014 draft Local Plan have been used to prepare the 2nd draft Local Plan.
Brownfield sites should be developed instead of sites preferred. These include land and premises south of Bridge Road; Land between 11 and 13 Harper Grove; Old Yeadon House site; Low Fold; Manor Way. Also brownfield sites in larger surrounding cities such as Leeds and Bradford.	Noted. Revised site assessment work will look at the suitability of all sites in the Craven SHLAA. Leeds and Bradford Councils are responsible for identifying land for housing and employment to meet the need for the next plan period in their areas.		A pool of sites for Sutton has been identified following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Planning should be about protecting people and places that already reside in area.	Noted.		
Even though there is no official green belt within Craven, green fields surrounding villages should be afforded the same protection in order to preserve the village's individuality.	Noted. The draft local plan will afford protection to the open countryside through its draft policy SP4 Countryside and Landscape. Whilst this draft policy does not advocate specific development limits around villages and towns, it does enable settlements to grow in ways that harmonise with the character of the immediate setting and wider landscape (including creating the important transition between built up areas and the surrounding countryside).	No	A pool of sites for Sutton has been identified following site assessment and sustainability appraisal work.
Concern that decisions made in draft local plan will go through without proper consultation with the public (decisions already seem to be made). Faith and	Noted. The draft local plan consultation procedures went in excess of planning regulations, the idea being that by leafletting every household in the district we would reach	No	Consultation on the 2 nd draft Local Plan.

confidence in Local Plan is low.	the widest population possible. Notice was also given in the Craven Herald and other surrounding local newspapers, on the Council's website and displayed at Council offices. Subsequent consultation on the Local Plan will be carried out and will follow the regulations.		
Need to give the community more time to comment as not everyone is on the internet. Put back deadline for comments.	Noted. Consultation on the Sept draft Local Plan took place over a 6 week period of informal consultation in line with Regulation 18 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning (England) Regulations 2012. The Council provided opportunities for comments to be submitted both online and in writing, which meets the requirements of the regulations.	No	Further opportunities exist during further consultation periods, including consultation on the 2 nd draft Local Plan.
Parish Councillors should have more say in decision making.	Noted. Parish Councils are general consultation bodies as defined in The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning (England) Regulations 2012. As such Parish and Town Councils have to be notified and invited to make representations on the local plan. Town and Parish Council's, therefore have an important role to play in preparing the plan, particularly in their geographical area.	No	Further opportunities exist during further consultation periods for Town and Parish Councils to engage with the Local Plan preparation process, including consultation on the 2 nd draft Local Plan.
Local Plan should have been sent to all households, rather than just placed in library.	Noted. The draft local plan consultation procedures went in excess of planning regulations, the idea being that by leafletting every household in the district would inform the population of Craven. Notice was also given in the Craven Herald and other surrounding local newspapers, on the Council's website and displayed at Council offices. Sending paper copies of the draft Local Plan to	No	Further opportunities exist during further consultation periods, including consultation on the 2 nd draft Local Plan.

	all households in Craven would be an extremely costly exercise.		
Traffic management plans for village need to be shared.	Noted.	No	

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

General Comments Response Paper

General comments on the draft local plan			
Aim of the plan: To set out, in a locally specific way, how land is to be used for things like housing, business, recreation and conservation; how the right development is to be achieved in the right location at the right time; how sustainable development can be achieved overall; and how decisions on planning applications will be made.			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan [ideas relating to change]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a fear amongst some residents that if they offer alternatives to the CDC preferred sites in their settlement that CDC will simply add these to its LP and increase the housing allocation to the settlement. Because this indicates the level of distrust amongst residents for CDC elected representatives and officers, steps need to be taken to allay this fear and do more to inform, reassure and encourage active participation in the formal consultation. 	<p>Noted. The draft local plan will be refined and improved through consultation and revision. As progress is made, issues of information, reassurance and participation can be worked through. The work done and progress achieved so far is not complete and further effort will be needed before these issues can be addressed fully.</p>	<p>Not to the plan itself</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need to have a Local Plan in place as soon as possible to manage planning and defend against wildcat developers, but we must take care that no opportunity is presented whereby this process could be de-railed by challenge. 	<p>Noted. However, the aim of the local plan is not to “defend against wildcat developers”, which is an inaccurate and unhelpful characterisation.</p>	<p>No</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly identification of housing (numbers) and Employment Land (area) are strategic, with allocation of total area to subdivisions in Craven. However there doesn't seem to be any disclosure on exactly how EL area is calculated and allocated to settlements. Plan should not have identified EL sites in settlements with no mention of sustainability testing. There is also no clear correlation between housing numbers and imposed EL sites. 	<p>Noted. These issues will be addressed as work on the draft local plan progresses. The initial draft will be improved and refined using updated evidence (from a new SHMA and employment land review) and full sustainability appraisal.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policies SP1 and SP2; and sustainability appraisal.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan should not to be consulting on the non-strategic policy of housing sites when a neighbourhood plan is in development. 	<p>A neighbourhood plan needs to accord with the strategic policies of the local plan, but this doesn't mean that non-strategic policies aren't needed in a local plan. A local plan and a neighbourhood plan can be progressed at the same time (this may even be a necessity) and the process will be aided by positive working relationships.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan is supposed to be a summary of the evidence base for the selection of sites. It is a weak effort which cherry picks points in support of CDC preferences rather than allowing sites to be identified through the assessment itself. It is also based on (a) opinion gathered at community events, poorly advertised, the great significance of which was poorly explained, poorly understood by residents and poorly attended and (b) Stage 1 & 2 check lists which contain inaccurate information and aren't evenly compiled. 	<p>The 22/9/14 version is an early informal draft of the local plan, not a finished document, and was put together to generate discussion and feedback. It will be improved and refined as work progresses towards formal publication. Suggestions about what needs changing, why it needs changing and how it should be changed are particularly helpful. (See page 2 of the draft local plan document.)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See the latest iteration (5/4/16) of the site allocations methodology in the Pool of Site Options etc. consultation document. Also, see sustainability appraisal of site options and draft policies.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan is not clear enough. A straight forward, 	<p>The draft local plan attempts to adopt a</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>A summary may be produced for the</p>

<p>plain language one pager should have been made available with the publication of the 22nd Sept draft LP outlining the process which CDC has adopted. This should be rectified for the formal consultation.</p>	<p>straightforward, plain-language approach, but this tends to be undermined by technical requirements and the document's length. The alternative approach of publishing a separate user-friendly summary is under consideration and likely to be increasingly necessary as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>		<p>formal consultation ('publication').</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Parish Council (Embsay with Eastby) has sought to engage actively with the planning process and it has adopted a realistic position with regard to new development within the Parish. This Council recognises that there is a need for the settlements to accommodate some new development and that this will help to sustain the limited services and facilities that exist. We believe that this is demonstrated by the 'Local Land Development Position Statement', a copy of which is enclosed with these representations for ease of reference. It would be preferable if we had the resources available to us to provide comments on the plan in its entirety; the Parish is not an 'island'. We have, however, to be pragmatic and have confined our comments to how the plan will impact upon this Parish. 	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan indicates an end date of 2030, yet the start date is more elusive. It is noted Policy SP11 indicates that the housing requirement is for the next 15 years. This suggests a plan period of 2015 to 2030, however, this is not formally stated. It is recommended that the plan period (both start and end date) be clearly 	<p>Agree. This issue will be addressed as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See paragraph 1.1 of the new/revised Section 1: Introduction.</p>

<p>identified within the opening chapters of the plan. Establishing the plan period is essential for the purposes of calculating the housing requirement, the housing trajectory, the five year land supply, and consideration of whether it is necessary to address any backlog in delivery. The NPPF (paragraph 157) indicates a preference for plans to have a 15 year time horizon. In this regard it would appear that the Craven Local Plan will meet this preference, providing it is adopted next year. If the Council anticipates any slippage in its timetable it is recommended that the plan period be extended to ensure that a 15 year horizon be retained.</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Craven District contains coal resources which are capable of extraction by surface mining operations. These resources cover an area amounting up to 25% of the overall Craven District area, including the part in the Yorkshire Dales National Park. The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not unnecessarily sterilised by new development. Where this may be the case, The Coal Authority would be seeking prior extraction of the coal. Prior extraction of coal also has the benefit of removing any potential land instability problems in the process. In the part of Craven outside of the National Park, which forms this plan area, mining legacy is concentrated in the north-west around Ingleton and Bentham (North Sub-area) and in the south-east around Skipton and Glusburn & Cross Hills (South Sub- 	<p>Noted and agreed. This issue will be addressed as work on the draft local plan progresses and through further cooperation with The Coal Authority.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See stage 2 of the site allocations methodology in the Pool of Site Options etc. consultation document and sustainability objective SO20.</p>

<p>area). Although mining legacy occurs as a result of mineral workings, it is important that new development recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. However, it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable. As The Coal Authority owns the coal and coal mine entries on behalf of the state, if a development is to intersect the ground then specific written permission of The Coal Authority may be required.</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amazingly complex, full of jargon and generalisations e.g. spatial strategy, multifunctional countryside, windfall proposals etc. Most residents want an end to housing expansion and infilling and require the protection of green sites. Over development leads to a loss of character and visual amenity. According to Rightmove there are currently over 500 houses for sale within 5 miles of Skipton and over 1000 within 10 miles of Skipton, plus hundreds for rent. Do we really need more when jobs are scarce? 	<p>Noted. Jargon etc. will be addressed as the draft plan is improved and refined. Growth in housing is a necessary component of the plan (see NPPF). Infilling and greenfield development will be acceptable in appropriate circumstances and cannot be ruled out. Designation of local green space will prevent development of important sites. The plan will reconcile the need for growth with the need to avoid “over-development” and loss of character and visual amenity. The number of homes for sale/rent is not a proper indicator of housing need. The new SHMA will provide the evidence necessary to balance homes and jobs.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The second draft plan is more specific and contains more explanation and evidence. Potential local green space designations are included.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The continual updating involved in Cravens iterative process of site selection and policy 	<p>Preliminary sustainability checks carried out for the 22/9/14 version of the draft</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See sustainability appraisals, which form part of the consultation</p>

<p>development by consultation leads to justification of Cravens preferred site or policy by amendment. Craven have written that they have 'cherry picked' employment for Gargrave and are now using the consultation to amend those sites and policy to fit responses. The NPPF describes correct process as using the evidence of sustainability through assessment to identify the most sustainable sites and policies. Craven DC's approach is qualitative not quantitative which gives no ranking of most sustainable to least sustainable and as a consequence does not identify the most sustainable site or policy. This poor practice has led to the selection of unsustainable sites (i.e. GA028 and GA029).</p>	<p>local plan will be superseded by a full sustainability appraisal as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>		<p>documents (5/4/16).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If this Plan had been produced in a timely fashion Craven District Council (officers and Councillors) may not have been presiding over the current shambles whereby housing developments are blighting Craven, many built on green field sites while brown sites could have been alternatively developed. Developers have taken advantage of this abject failure and the Council have had to approve many developments that a properly and timely developed Local Plan could have prevented. 	<p>This comment is difficult to respond to because it contains generalisations, inflammatory language and unsubstantiated arguments, and doesn't address the contents of the draft local plan or make suggestions for change.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need in Skipton for a cultural building. In the TCPA guidance suggests that there should be 45 sq m of arts facilities space per 1,000 people. This should be reflected in this policy document 	<p>Noted. The need for cultural buildings in the plan area would be determined through an appropriate evidence-base study. Proposals to provide cultural buildings will be supported in the next draft local plan.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policy INF2.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although there is to be a Community Infrastructure Levy 123 document written after the Local Plan, does any reference need to be made to the CIL's priorities in the Plan? 	<p>The need for and delivery of strategic infrastructure will need to be set out within the plan. Further evidence is being gathered (e.g. highways, schools) to enable further progress to be made on this issue.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See latest iteration (5/4/16) in new/revised policy SP12.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council are progressing with an Open Space Assessment that will essentially assess the quantity and quality of all open space and identify future needs. However, this does not follow Sports England's methodology. It is understood that this requires the local Authority to obtain the Post Code of every playing member of a club and that this is something that has the backing of the various Governing Bodies. Unfortunately, this appears to only apply to selected sports. Sport England's methodology therefore appears to be not only extremely time consuming but selective. The Council's Open Space Assessment is considered be more equitable and also comprehensive. 	<p>Noted. The assessment is progressing with the support of Sport England.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new draft policy INF3.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is understood that the New Homes Bonus has another 2 or 3 years to run. It appears to be extremely selective and the distance criteria very restrictive. It is considered that the Community Infrastructure levy is a much more appropriate mechanism for assisting strategic important needs such as Sandylands Sports Centre. Craven District Council has over the years granted significant capital expenditure to projects such as Aireville Swimming Pool at Skipton and the Sports Hall at Upper Wharfedale School at Threshfield. It also makes an annual payment to the Swimming Pool at 	<p>Noted. The council is considering the introduction of CIL and is making progress on a sport and open space assessment and strategy.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policies SP12, INF1, INF2 and INF3.</p>

<p>Settle. Unfortunately, Sandylands Sports Centre, a self-help Registered Charity, and the main provider of community sport and recreational facilities in Craven with over 200,000 person visits per year, receives no such funding.</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a long term strategic plan and therefore should be looking at the possibility of more wide-ranging and especially longer terms issues. The Draft Plan basically assumes housing, employment and transport will be essentially “steady state” – i.e. focusing on low key, smaller developments. There are no big plans for either major developments or big infrastructure projects. This assumption is not actually realistic over a period of decades. 	<p>Plan-making takes an evidence-based approach. The initial 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan was based on evidence available at the time, but is not a finished document and is still a work in progress. New evidence on future requirements for housing, employment land and infrastructure is now being gathered and the next version of the plan will be based on that evidence. Once adopted, a local plan is monitored and reviewed, which means it can adapt to changing circumstances and requirements during its lifetime.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revise Context section and Section 4: Strategic Policies and Spatial Strategy.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the key underlying issues in this area is that the population of Craven, and in particular Skipton and the Dales, is noticeably getting older. Also, as houses in Skipton (and particularly in the Dales National Park) become completely unaffordable for youngsters, this will cause businesses in Craven various employment issues, especially that our future employees will be forced to commute further to get to work. In order to provide business with a labour force and therefore to promote continued economic growth, in the longer term it will be necessary to bring in labour from 	<p>Noted, although these trends are likely to raise issues of housing growth as well as the improvement of transport links. Work on the draft local plan will continue to progress and new evidence on local requirements for housing, employment land and infrastructure will help to resolve these issues.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revise Context section and Section 4: Strategic Policies and Spatial Strategy.</p>

<p>elsewhere, i.e. outside of Craven. Quite simply travelling will become a major issue for businesses if we cannot get good and well educated people to work for us and travel to work. Therefore these two demographic and housing trends will put increased pressure on improving transport links into Skipton.</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan is ignoring the several large cities and many large towns in Lancashire (and even towns in nearby East Lancashire). These towns and cities in Lancashire should be key local markets for businesses in Skipton and the rest of Craven. Manchester City region is very strongly growing at the moment, and looks likely to grow for many years to come. Therefore more consideration should be given to links with Lancashire and Manchester 	<p>Noted. Whilst the draft local plan doesn't completely ignore links with Lancashire and Manchester, this aspect of the plan could certainly be improved.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised Context section and Section 4: Strategic Policies and Spatial Strategy.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport is a key issue which needs to be addressed (in the long term) to help develop businesses who operate in Craven. Quite simply - businesses in Craven must have good and improving transport links to be viable. With an ever-increasing amount of business being undertaken on the internet, more than ever it is vitally important that we have excellent transport links (road, rail and air). This is especially important to be able to dispatch goods ordered over the internet to customers worldwide. As such the following ought to be considered or studied as part of the Craven long term plan; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improvements to A56 Road, to improve link Skipton to M65 and Manchester/Liverpool. 	<p>Noted. Any strategic infrastructure needed to implement the local plan will be set out within the plan itself, including how and when that infrastructure will be provided. Further evidence is being gathered to enable this to be done. However, the infrastructure provision advocated in this comment appears to be far beyond the scale and scope that is likely to be required for implementation of the local plan.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised Context section and Section 4: Strategic Policies and Spatial Strategy.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improvements to A65 Road – to improve link with Lake District (bypass a few villages) - A59 to Harrogate - Harrogate needs a bypass (to access A1M, York and Humberside) - Rail links to Manchester and Lancashire – these must be improved - would not support expansion of Leeds-Bradford airport. Our most important airport is Manchester and we want better links to Manchester 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broadband Connectivity: This internet is now a vitally important asset to all business. Needs a mention in the plan. 	Noted.	Yes	See new draft policy INF5.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of Life: need a combination of good job, good housing, good local facilities and good clean environment. None of the proposals for developments have anything in them that contribute to the quality of life – such as parks, cycle tracks, good urban spaces. Another key concern would be that future proposals do not mix in heavy industry with residential developments. 	Noted. The principles outlined in this comment are reflected in the draft local plan already, but requirements for individual housing and employment sites are to be improved and refined.	Yes	Requirements for individual housing and employment sites will appear in the Commentary for each site identified under policies SP5 to SP11.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no mention of who owns the land currently and what discussions have been held or if compulsory purchase is a consideration. This information needs to be included so that residents are clear on what the potential impacts will be. 	Owners of sites identified in the draft local plan have confirmed that their land is available and no compulsory purchase is proposed. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment provides more information and was used as a background document during consultation.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New planning guidance states explicitly for the first time that "once established, green belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This overrides 	This comment may be based on a misconception (which is not uncommon) that "greenfield" land in Craven is "green belt". In actual fact, there is no designated	No	

existing guidance which states that "inappropriate development" on the green belt "should not be approved except in special circumstances".	green belt in Craven. Green belt is typically designated around or between larger urban areas to prevent sprawl and coalescence (e.g. Leeds and Bradford).		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan is too unrealistic. Account for costings and 'where the money comes from' statements. Ideally a budget showing options and expected costs would be useful. This would enable residents, business and other stakeholders to comprehend this nice, but unrealistic, plan. 	A local plan doesn't have an actual budget, but policies and proposals need to be financially viable. Otherwise developers and infrastructure providers won't be able to meet the plan's requirements and the plan won't be implemented. Viability evidence will be improved as work on the draft plan progresses.	Yes	Viability evidence and testing will accompany the final 'publication' draft.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The timing of the draft plan needs to be up to 2020 to align with the NYCC Plan. If the plans were both synchronised in a timely fashion then costings for projects and resources could be accommodated. This would save Craven Council and NYCC money, which is the residents money after all. 	A local plan is required to plan for a period of 15-20 years (see NPPF). Joint working, consultation and the Duty to Cooperate enable coordination and synchronisation between many stakeholders, plans and timetables.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be useful to include paragraph numbers in order to assist those commenting on the plan. 	Noted. This will be addressed as work on the draft local plan progresses. (NB. No automatic paragraph numbering in MS Publisher.)	Yes	Paragraph numbers have been included in the second draft local plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a need for strategy planning in respect of changes to refuse collections on 'public rights of way' and 'healthy & safety'. Collection of refuse bins from cobbled streets in Skipton may not continue and this is a concern for those that are unable to take their bins somewhere else for collection because of health issues and whether or not there is space anywhere else where the refuse bins can actually be placed altogether for collection as a 	These issues relate more to the planning and operation of council services (waste collection and council tax) rather than to spatial planning and the draft local plan. However, it should be noted that external storage space, including space for the storage of recyclable waste, is already mentioned in draft policy SP6: Good Design.	No	

<p>whole. This needs strategic thinking, so that no 'public right of way' or 'health & safety' issues are breached. Also of the move is actioned, then residents need to see a reduction in the rates bills as a consequence.</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The County Council suggests that further work is undertaken to articulate and present the process, evidence and analysis of alternative options that has underpinned the strategic approach of the Draft Plan. Similarly, work is on-going to refresh, complete and present other elements of the evidence base. Through discussions we have identified ways in which the County Council can assist and contribute towards this on-going process and we look forward to doing so in due course (North Yorkshire County Council comment). 	<p>These issues will be worked through as the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See the new/revised strategy section (Section 4) and the Alternative Spatial Strategy Options consultation document, plus sustainability appraisal.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important that Local Plans look to unlock the economic potential of their areas as well as addressing their full range of social and housing needs. It is also important that any infrastructure requirements are fully understood, and that they are deliverable. Furthermore, given the specific projected demographic trends facing Craven District, the County Council considers it important that the developing Plan seeks to ensure the long term sustainability and viability of rural settlements and services in the most effective way possible. (North Yorkshire County Council comment) 	<p>Such work will continue in the preparation of a second draft of the local plan, which will include relevant improvements and refinements.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See the new/revised sections on context, sustainable development and strategy (Sections 2-4).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for new development in Bolton Abbey in order to ensure its dual-role can be enhanced to the benefit of the local 	<p>Noted. Further work will be carried out on the draft local plan's approach to Bolton Abbey, including consideration of the</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised paragraph 4.17 onwards. Bolton Abbey is now designated as a village with basic</p>

<p>community, economy and those who visit it. The provision of new housing, visitor accommodation and commercial development (to include enhanced service provision) over the coming years will benefit the local economy, the community of Bolton Abbey and those communities of the surrounding areas, which use it as a service village. The emerging Craven District Council Local Plan is of fundamental importance to delivering the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees objectives for Bolton Abbey over coming years and decades. While the recognition of Bolton Abbey within the Pre-Publication draft is welcomed there is a clear need for future iterations of the plan to provide greater support and plan-led certainty for development in the village in order that its role can be enhanced. Greater policy support for development of a specific site within the village ensures compatibility with the approach that has been taken by the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority, in relation to this cross-boundary village, by elevating Bolton Abbey in its settlement hierarchy to the level of Service Village. The amendment of Craven District Council's Local Plan in relation to Bolton Abbey would also sit comfortably within the scope of national planning policy and guidance and the clear support it provides for new development which enhances the role of rural settlements.</p>	<p>approach suggested in this comment.</p>		<p>services and is included in tier 4b of the settlement hierarchy. Subsequent policies on housing (H1) and the economy (EC1, EC4) acknowledge this designation and the settlement's role.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In progressing preferred sites the Local Highways Authority will need reassurance that 	<p>Input from the local highway authority has been used in the work done so far and</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Evidence gathering, in the form of highway surveys and modelling, is</p>

<p>the proposed growth can be accommodated on the Local Highway Network. Necessary infrastructure needs must also be identified. (North Yorkshire County Council Highways comment)</p>	<p>ongoing cooperation will be a necessity in making further progress on the draft local plan.</p>		<p>ongoing and is being carried out in consultation with the local highway authority. Results will inform subsequent iterations of the draft plan.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In terms of the growing older population and problems with increased isolation and loneliness, provision and support needs to be easily accessible with offer of support made clearly visible at obvious places i.e. Doctors Surgeries, local media, leaflets in Rates Bills that go out each year etc. 	<p>These issues are addressed in draft policy SP22, which will be improved and refined as work on the draft local plan progresses. However, decisions made by service providers about how they publicise their support services are beyond the remit of a local plan.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan does not provide a wholly positive policy approach and, in a number of areas, is inconsistent with national policy. Key areas where there are concerns are summarised as follows: (1) Housing requirement: We are concerned the proposed housing requirement does not reflect the true, full objectively assessed needs for the district and has been arbitrarily constrained. It is not fully clear whether the council has assessed the potential to deliver a higher housing requirement or tested this against potential delivery constraints. (2) Duty to Cooperate: The process of determining the Council's objectively assessed housing needs should be undertaken with full regard to the duty to co-operate as set out in section 110 of the Localism Act. (3) Affordable Housing: The Council's proposed housing requirement is likely to significantly constrain the scope for addressing affordable housing needs in Craven. 	<p>Noted. These issues will be addressed further as work on the draft local plan progresses. The 22/9/14 version will be improved and refined and new evidence – like the 2015 SHMA – will be taken into account.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised Section 4: Strategic Policies and Spatial Strategy and draft policies ENV3 and H2, which address points on the housing requirement / OAN, affordable housing need, spatial distribution and sustainable construction standards.</p>

<p>This supports the need to increase the council's overall housing requirement. (4) Spatial distribution of housing: Supportive of the Council's approach to direct development to larger, key settlements. However, the plan should provide sufficient flexibility to address situations where housing does not come forward as expected and to allow development across a broader range of settlements and sites, where sustainable. (5) Housing standards: The Council should reviews its policies concerning sustainability standards for new housing so that they concur with current Government thinking, including the standards emanating from the recent Housing Standards Review.</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Planning Policy Framework requires local planning authorities to work collaboratively across boundaries, yet there is little evidence in the draft plan of such collaboration with the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority. It would be very helpful for the plan to commit to such collaboration. 	<p>This will be addressed further as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Co-operation with the national park authority is ongoing – for an example see paragraphs 4.8 to 4.10 on the OAN. A full duty to co-operate statement is in preparation and will be finalised before formal 'publication' of the local plan.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan is full of woolly policies that undermine the stated aims identified at the beginning; it says what but fails to say how exactly; it's like a fairy story; it downgrades the Craven area; it could apply to any urban area in England; it lacks a language of commitment and responsibility; is full of should, would and may be and therefore open to interpretation. Too much interpretation of local opinion was based upon post it notes written by planners at the 	<p>The draft local plan is an early informal draft that needs to be improved and refined (see page 2 of the 22/9/14 version). Concerns raised in these broad and general criticisms should be allayed as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The second draft local plan has been improved and refined throughout.</p>

local parish meetings. The data is neither quantitative nor qualitative.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan must show a clear recognition of 'phasing'; must include full accountability of all windfall developments within targets; must factor in the hundreds of existing permissions granted in the Craven area already; must illustrate adequate recognition of the value of food, farming and Craven's outstanding grazing land; must provide clear recognition and protection for biodiversity, tranquillity, heritage assets and dark skies. 	These issues will be addressed further as work on the draft local plan progresses.	Yes	See new/revised policies SP1, ENV1, ENV2, ENV3, ENV4, sustainability objectives, sustainability appraisal and site selection methodology, which are included in the second draft local plan consultation documents.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no heritage map clearly identifying Conservation areas, mapping assets clearly for all to see. We have no green belt in Craven but we do have green wedge however this is now a vague wiggly line that is open to misinterpretation by the more predatory developers 	As work progresses, conservation areas and other heritage assets will be shown on the policies map and inset maps. No green wedge is proposed in the 22/9/14 version of the draft local plan. The key diagram will be improved. "Predatory developers" is an inflammatory and unhelpful characterisation.	Yes	See new/revised policies map for symbols identifying conservation areas and other heritage assets. Work on inset maps and the key diagram is ongoing – these will be finalised before formal 'publication' of the local plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to address the caravan problem - those large parks in the area granted permission for holiday use and slowly morphing into back door housing estates - usually in areas where planning for houses would not normally be granted. 	This broad allegation lacks detail and appears to be advocating enforcement action against current unauthorised residential use of holiday caravan parks, which is outside the scope of the draft local plan consultation.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no SHLAA document to support the Plan. The nearest thing to a SHLAA document is the 'Craven Local Plan Draft 22/9/14 – Sites Preferred and Not Preferred for Consultation' which is not compliant with SHLAA guidance. A SHLAA document that meets the SHLAA Guidance needs to be produced. This needs to 	The council's SHLAA has been available on-line for some time and was used as a background document during consultation. The government's guidance has changed recently and a revised SHLAA needs to be prepared. Sites with planning permission will be taken into account in calculating the	Yes	Work on a revised SHLAA is ongoing. The second draft local plan is supported by a consultation document providing a pool of site options and an accompanying sustainability appraisal. See new/revised policy SP1, which takes

<p>be open and transparent, which the existing document is not. The Council already have the evidence to create the document (data which used to be available on the Council's website). The SHLAA document needs to make the phasing clear. Sites with planning permission are suitable for development now, as they have already proved to be sustainable and suitable sites. Other sites should be suitably phased, which the Plan can then be built around. The Plan at this stage doesn't discuss phasing of housing sites.</p>	<p>housing requirement, which will be set out in greater detail within the next draft plan.</p>		<p>account of sites with planning permissions in the housing requirement.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • United Utilities wishes to highlight that we will seek to work closely with the Council during the Local Plan process to develop a coordinated approach to delivering sustainable growth in sustainable locations. New development should be focused in sustainable locations which are accessible to local services and infrastructure. United Utilities will continue to work with the Council to identify any infrastructure issues and appropriate resolutions throughout the development of the Local Plan. 	<p>Noted. The statement is welcomed.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hellifield Parish Council is on the whole supportive of the general content of the Local Plan. 	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The calculation for local affordable housing in parishes should be based on more current information and not on data obtained in the last housing survey, undertaken in 2011. 	<p>Up-to-date evidence will be available from the 2015 SHMA and will be used to make further progress on the draft local plan.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised policy H2.</p>

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.

Consultation Process Response Paper

Policy: Not applicable – this paper relates to comments on the draft local plan consultation process.			
Aim of the Policy: Not applicable – consultation is guided by regulations and the council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).			
Main issues from consultation *	Response	Change required to the local plan (Yes/No)	Changes made to the plan <i>[ideas relating to change]</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods of consultation are obscure and opaque and suggest that you have no intention of listening. There needs to be full consultation with ALL locals in formulating the local village plan. 	<p>Methods of consultation included email, website, libraries, newspaper article, Twitter, meetings/appointments and flyers posted to all addresses in the plan area (27,430 in total). The response was good and all comments have been taken into account. See Consultation Stat’s and Policy Response Papers for further details.</p>	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific terms need defining within the consultation e.g., what is mean by “Employment” when referring to specific sites. 	<p>Noted. This will be clarified in the next draft.</p>	Yes	<p>New/revised Section 7: Economy now refers specifically to uses within Class B of the Use Classes Order. <i>[Further clarity could be provided in a footnote.]</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CDC needs to be fair about the number of houses to be built e.g., 75 over 15 years is a lot more with all the other development which is currently going on. 	<p>Noted. The presentation and explanation of housing figures will improve as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	Yes	<p>See new/revised Section 4: Strategy Policies and Spatial Strategy, and policies SP1 and SP4 in particular.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Views from the consultation have been ignored. Parishes have put in small infill sites that relate to the small annual targets. The large sites identified do no relate to the small annual targets. Brownfield sites should be used first. 	<p>All comments have been taken into account. See Policy Response Papers for further details.</p>	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Plan should be developed faster and in a more professional manner. Data provided by ONS on population are merely a snapshot and provide a basis for more informed decision making. Once they are produced they are out of date, 	<p>Noted. These aspects will improve as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	Yes	<p>Demographic (SHMA) and SHLAA evidence has been updated.</p>

but that is no excuse not to use them. The SHLAA was published in 2008.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with Cumbria County Council is suggested on the potential cross border education impacts of growth. 	Cross-boundary matters are dealt with under the Duty to Co-operate and North Yorkshire County Council is our primary consultee on education impacts.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Craven District Council should only be consulting on the strategy for Gargrave in the Local Plan and the Gargrave Neighbourhood Plan Working Group should consult on sites as prescribed in paras 183, 184 & 185 of the NPPF. By consulting on sites, CDC has caused confusion in Gargrave and damages the working group's consultation on sites. To continue to consult on sites in Gargrave will lead to likely challenge. 	Due to the coincidence of timings, consultation on the draft local and neighbourhood plans needs to progress together. However, both can help to foster greater understanding and participation.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation should have been done on all sites in Gargrave rather than the "chosen" sites only. The outcome of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group consultation event for sites GA028 & GA029 was in start contrast to Craven's. 	Whilst the draft local and neighbourhood plans are progressing together, they are at slightly different stages of consultation.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation on the draft Gargrave Neighbourhood Plan, including asking for views on the draft Local Plan sites and asking for alternative sites to be put forward, has been written up in detail and shared informally with CDC. (has this been done?) 	Noted. Information is being shared as part of a co-operative approach to the parallel preparation of the local and neighbourhood plans.	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In reviewing the evidence base it is clear that there is a lack of evidence in relation to the employment land need and associated draft employment/mixed use allocations in Gargrave. There are concerns in relation to the site assessment process, in particular relating to the application of criteria relating to 	At this stage the evidence base and site assessment process are incomplete. Gathering evidence and refining site assessments will continue as work on the draft local plan progresses. NB: The Environment Agency's surface water flooding maps are not entirely adequate for the task and the council will need an updated Strategic Flood Risk Assessment	Yes	An up-to-date Employment land Review (ELR) and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) are being commissioned and new site assessments are being carried out.

<p>flood risk and the lack of reference to the latest Environment Agency Surface Water Mapping.</p>	<p>(SFRA).</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gargrave Parish Council propose a meeting is arranged with CDC and their consultants Kirkwells where the emerging narrative, vision, objectives, themes and proposed site assessment criteria of the draft Neighbourhood Plan can be presented. A discussion can be had with the aim of agreeing the way forward for the progression of the two plans. A call for sites is planned together with undertaking of site assessments by the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group. Existing SHLAA sites will also be assessed against the same criteria. Consultation with the village is planned for early 2015 on a proposed alternative approach to the draft Local Plan allocations together with other Neighbourhood Plan proposals. 	<p>Meetings with the parish council, neighbourhood plan group and consultants are welcomed and encouraged.</p>	<p>No</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation has not been accessible, transparent, robust nor accurate. The use of jargon has meant that people are still unaware of what the Local Plan is and what it means/what impact it will have on communities. It is too much to expect the majority of individuals to access and understand the complexities of the Localism Act, the NPPF & the process of Sustainability Appraisal. Leaflets and posters are too wordy. A straight forward, plain language one pager should have been made available with the draft Local Plan outlining the process which CDC has adopted. The collection of feedback via the use of post-it notes and 	<p>Methods of consultation included email, website, libraries, newspaper article, Twitter, meetings/appointments and flyers posted to all addresses in the plan area (27,430 in total). Comments about complexity are noted, but an attempt was made to make the draft local plan accessible, understandable and straightforward, such as in the explanations provided in the Introduction. The response was good and all comments have been taken into account. See Consultation Stat's and Policy Response Papers for further details. Aspects of the first draft local plan, which have caused concerns, will improve as work progresses towards a refined second draft.</p>	<p>No</p>	

<p>then the interpretation of them is laughable. If the Local Plan was advertised as “we want to build business units for employment purposes on these green fields and destroy this beauty spot” there would be a larger and angrier response.</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expecting older people to use online feedback forms is difficult, especially when Bradley has a poor internet connection. 	<p>Noted, but paper feedback forms were also available and feedback could be submitted by letter – many handwritten comments were submitted in this way.</p>	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sutton Parish Council advertised the Local Plan throughout the village and advised people to comment in three ways, CDC’s online form, to the local plan email address and also by post to Local Plan Residents Feedback. Opportunities to express views fully must be provided. Not everyone is used to downloading or filling in forms online or they are not able to make a trip into Skipton to pick up a form. 	<p>It is noted and appreciated that the parish council helped to publicise the consultation locally. Parishes are encouraged to adopt this kind of role and positive participation is always welcomed. Paper forms were also available in local libraries and at local drop-in events or by post, if requested.</p>	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the interests of openness, it would be useful if you publish people’s views as you would with a planning application. 	<p>Detailed summaries of all comments (plus these policy response papers) are available on the council’s new local plan web-page.</p>	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objections made to planning applications on preferred sites should carry weight in the Local Plan process. 	<p>Noted. However, it is important to ensure that both processes operate soundly according to their own requirements and to acknowledge differences and separation.</p>	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The selective exclusion of specific data included in the SHMA & Edge Analytic reports e.g., the affordable housing land requirement set out in the SHMA, the distribution of this requirement and that the housing requirement for Craven will need to address the ageing population by encouraging inward migration of people of working age, appears to have led to a 	<p>Noted. These aspects will improve as work on the evidence base and draft local plan progresses.</p>	Yes	<p>See new/revised sections on context and strategy (Sections 2 and 4), e.g. key issues in paragraph 2.40.</p>

<p>draft plan that does not meet the recommendations set out in these two reports and has undermined the entire plan forming process.</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The public consultation was done without adequate information for the public to make an informed decision and a negligible proportion of Craven’s population turned up to have its say. Up to this point the process has been floored and the findings should therefore carry little weight. 	<p>Much information was provided on the council’s new local plan web-page, in order to support an early-stage, informal consultation. The incompleteness of information was acknowledged and explained on page 2 of the consultation document. Methods of consultation included email, website, libraries, newspaper article, Twitter, meetings/appointments and flyers posted to all addresses in the plan area (27,430 in total). The response was good and all comments have been taken into account - see Consultation Stat’s and Policy Response Papers. The completeness and availability of information will improve as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The second draft local plan is more detailed and comprehensive and is based on a more complete and up-to-date evidence base.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a fear amongst residents that if they offer alternatives to the CDC preferred sites that CDC will simply add these to its LP and increase the housing allocation to the settlement. More needs to be done to allay this fear and do more to inform, reassure and encourage active participation in the formal consultation. 	<p>Information about land requirements and land availability and about the process of distributing development and selecting preferred sites will improve as work on the draft local plan progresses. Hopefully this will help to provide the necessary information, reassurance and encouragement.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised Section 4: Strategic Policies and Spatial Strategy, plus the supporting Pool of Site Options consultation document and Spatial Strategy Options consultation document.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear correlation between housing numbers and imposed employment land sites. 	<p>This aspect will improve as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See new/revised paragraphs on Housing Delivery and Economic Growth (4.11 to 4.15) and draft policy SP2.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There has been no mention of sustainability testing of the preferred housing and employment land sites. 	<p>Preliminary sustainability checks were carried out and presented on the council’s new local plan web-page – see the “Sites Preferred and Not Preferred for Consultation” document. Sustainability appraisal will be carried out in due course.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See the Pool of Site Options consultation document, which includes sustainability appraisal.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Preferred and Not Preferred Sites Document is weak effort which cherry picks points in support of CDC preferences rather than to be identified through the assessment itself. It is based on poorly attended community events and Stage 1&2 check lists which contain inaccurate information. Stage 1&2 checklists should be placed on the CDC website to provide a fuller picture. Transparency for the public is more important than vague and imagined concerns over commercial confidentiality. 	<p>Preliminary sustainability checks and site assessments will improve as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See the Pool of Site Options consultation document, which includes the latest iteration of sustainability appraisal and site assessments.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parish Profiles should be used as part of the consultation and preparation of the Local Plan. The Parish Profile for Sutton states “Sutton village maintains its distinct rural identity with greenfields both in and around the village”. 	<p>Craven’s many villages possess distinct rural identities and are important to the character of the area. Sutton’s own rural identity is acknowledged in its position within the growth hierarchy set out in draft policy SP1. Although greenfield development will be necessary to meet the districts housing need, the draft local plan seeks to manage development in a way that conserves local character and identity.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>A revised settlement/growth hierarchy is set out in Table 4, page 40, of the second draft local plan. Sutton’s rural identity is acknowledged in its designated role and function as a Village with Basic Services, alongside villages like Low Bradley and Cononley.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is distrust that CDC in holding this informal consultation, which it says is not inclusive of legal niceties, simply to ‘out’ criticisms so that it can prepare defensive arguments against them in order to retain its draft LP to the next stage with perhaps only cosmetic changes. 	<p>An informal consultation stage is part of the statutory local plan process. Constructive criticisms will be used to improve the first draft local plan. The second draft local plan is likely to be significantly improved compared to the first.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Changes made to the plan have been significant (not cosmetic) – see the revised documents.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CDC must restrict its formal consultation on its Local Plan to strategic policy issues alone. It must reconsider the situation, especially where it has delegated planning authority to local communities and the scope of the formal consultation to come, at the very least in settlements where a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) is in development. 	<p>A local plan needs to contain both strategic and non-strategic policies, but a neighbourhood plan needs to conform to the strategic ones only.</p>	<p>No</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDC has not done a sufficient job of explaining its approach to the Local Plan, particularly with regard to employment land selection and the actual scope of the informal consultation. It should also have placed its stage 2 check lists in the public domain so that at least some residents/organisations would have had the opportunity of a fuller picture of the process. 	<p>Information about land requirements and land availability and about the process of distributing development and selecting preferred sites will improve as work on the draft local plan progresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>See the Pool of Site Options consultation document, which includes the latest iteration of sustainability appraisal and site assessments.</p>
---	---	------------	--

* These are amalgamated points. Similar comments from the consultation have been grouped together in order to formulate a response to that particular issue.