

Dear Tony,

**RE: CRAVEN LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION
RESPONSE TO INSPECTOR'S MATTERS AND QUESTIONS**

I write to set out my client's responses to the Craven Local Plan Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions regarding their land North of Springfield Crescent and East of Butts Lane, High Bentham, otherwise known as site HB026

The following questions are answered to the best of their knowledge and we will be in attendance on the day to answer any further questions.

Q. 20 What is the surface water hazard identified in the supporting text to Policy SP7? Is the allocation consistent with Paragraph 100 of the Framework, which states that Local Plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development to avoid where possible flood risk to people and property?

The surface water hazard associated with site HB026 is Lairgill Beck, which adjoins a small part of the north-west corner of the site allocation. No risk is considered in flooding terms, with the EA flood maps identifying the land within Zone 1.

The beck lies at a much lower position than the significant majority of the site and any development will be set back from the beck due to the topography of the land which falls away steeply down to the beck to the rear of the site.

An application would require a flood risk assessment in any event as the site is over one hectare in size.

Q. 21 What is the current status regarding applications for planning permission on the site?

No formal planning application has yet been submitted for this site. Pre-application has been completed with the Council, and the owner is currently working with a housing development

partner to bring the site forward in due course. The landowners have been actively promoting the site through the plan-led process and fully support its allocation for residential development.

Q. 22 Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities how the design will 'take account of impacts on the Forest of Bowland AONB'?

High Bentham lies outside the Forest of Bowland AONB. However, the boundary of the AONB lies to the south of the settlement and it appears that the statement is referenced in each of the High Bentham allocations to provide the Council, one assumes, with sufficient flexibility to refuse planning permission for proposals that do not take account of potential impacts on the AONB. Further clarification on this matter may be acceptable, provided it did not result in an undue restriction on the potential development as this could impact on the delivery of housing in the settlement of High Bentham and wider requirement for new housing. Clarification that the allocations at High Bentham do lie outside of the AONB designation would also be sought in this regard, albeit with clarity that the AONB is a consideration in future determinations.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name] MRTPI
Associate