



Craven Local Plan Examination

Representations on the Further Main Modifications and Craven District Council Responses Where Required

03/09/2019

Note: This document lists the representations received for each Further Main Modification during the consultation on the Further Main Modifications to the draft Craven Local Plan from 18th July to 29th August 2019. The document includes only representations on the proposed Further Main Modifications to the local plan, and provides a response to them where required.

All the full original representations received during the consultation period have been sent to the Inspector for his review and consideration of the points raised within them.

FMM Ref	Representor ID No	Key Issues Identified in the Representation	CDC response (where required)
FMM87a	J Houlton 074	<p>Support FMM87a , but object to exclusion of land to north of Short Lee Lane.</p> <p>I strongly support the FMM 87a Policy ENV10 Local Green Space, insofar as it provides protection as a local green space for the area SK-LGS66 – Land to the north of Skipton up to and including the PROW at Short Lee Lane, west of Skipton Castle Woods, and east of Grassington Road, Skipton.</p> <p>However, I object to the exclusion from this LGS as per SK-LGS66 of the piece of land to the north-west of the proposed area – that is the north west corner of the map as originally proposed in SK-LGS64, bounded in the north by Skipton Bypass, in the west by Grassington Road, and in the south by Short Lee Lane. This omission does not create a sound or coherent definition of this green space.</p> <p>This piece of land is an integral part of the drumlin topography and landscape of neighbouring Park Hill which are now rare in the town of Skipton, and which provide a rare and essential link into the agricultural landscape surrounding the town. The views from top of Park Hill northwards out of the town are as important as views from the hill southwards over the town and Aire Valley, and this piece of green space needs protection.</p> <p>Furthermore, if this land should become available for housing over the next decades, and is built on, the tarmacing and use of PROW Short Lee Lane by vehicles will have negative impact on the local green space as proposed in SK-LGS66, and will restrict and impinge on residents’ amenity from the use of Short Lee Lane for leisure and</p>	<p>The majority of representors to FMM87a welcome the inclusion of SK-LGS66 – Land to the north of Skipton up to and including the PROW at Short Lee Lane, west of Skipton Castle Woods SINC, and east of Grassington Road, Skipton as a Local Green Space designation, but consider that the LGS area should be expanded to also include land to the north of Short Lee Lane (which would not result in an extensive tract of land) to :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable the creation of a sound and coherently defined green area; • Protect the historical significance and setting of Park Hill, including views from Park Hill; • Maintain the amenity of Short Lee Lane for leisure and recreational use; • Maintain the well-being value of Park Hill; • Maintain an area important for wildlife; • Maintain the quiet and tranquil nature of the area; <p>If the Inspector considers it necessary in his final report to recommend a change to the proposed further main modification, the Council would support designation of an area of Local Green Space, to the west of Skipton Woods which includes Park Hill, Short Lee</p>

		exercise.	Lane, Little Wood and the land to the north of Short Lee Lane. Map appended to this Schedule to show revised area of Local Green Space referenced SK-LGS65.
FMM87a	K Spracklen 073	Support FMM87a , but object to exclusion of land to north of Short Lee Lane. While I am pleased with the inclusion of Park Hill as a Local Green Space (LGS), I believe the LGS needs to be expanded to include the land between Short Lee Lane and the Bypass. This is all part of the setting of Park Hill. To exclude this parcel of land means there is real risk the tourism value and local wellbeing value of Park Hill could be reduced by house-building on this land.	See response to representor 074 above
FMM87a	R Beck 097	Support FMM87a , but object to exclusion of land to north of Short Lee Lane. It is considered that the whole of the land (SK-LGS_66 – Ref. FMM87a) from the south of Short Lee Lane up to the recently modified Local Green Space around Park Hill be also designated Local Green Space. This land is integral to that around Park Hill. It is clearly viewed off Grassington Road, at the entrance to Skipton from the north-west, and off the Public Right of Way, the route of which runs through this land. It is also an important part of the historical significance of Park Hill and the immediate surrounding topography. To be able to view parts of dwellings rising above the stone boundary wall to the summit of Park Hill would be seriously detrimental to the setting of Skipton Castle, Skipton Parish Church, Skipton High Street	See response to representor 074 above Note: The Council believes that the representor is referring to the area of land to the north (rather than to the south)of Short Lee Lane to be included in the LGS designation.

		and Skipton Conservation Area. It would completely undermine the recent modification of including Park Hill as a designated Local Green Space. The Secretary of State is therefore urged to extend the Local Green Space from Park Hill down to Short Lee Lane at Skipton.	
FMM87a	D Bean 298	<p>Support FMM87a , but object to exclusion of land to north of Short Lee Lane.</p> <p>I feel that the field above north of Short Lee Lane should be left as a green field, because if it was given the go-ahead to change the use, it would cause very many problems with access due to Grassington Road being only a B Class road and being very narrow. Also, all the character of Skipton would change, as there are now very few green areas left as a person enters Skipton.</p>	See response to representor 074 above
FMM87a	M Hoole 299	<p>Support FMM87a , but object to exclusion of land to north of Short Lee Lane.</p> <p>I am pleased that the inspector has now recommended an area of local green space should be designated around Park Hill. To ensure Park Hill is further protected, it is essential that the land north of Short Lee Lane should also be included in the proposed local green space. If this is not done, it will have an adverse effect on Park Hill and Skipton Woods, especially if the land was to be used for house building at the size of approximately 11 acres, which would take some 500 houses accommodating some 1,000 people, plus cats in such close proximity to Park Hill. The wildlife which lives around Park Hill uses the land in question and vice versa. Part of the land is partly surrounded by ancient hedgerows, ditches, and dykes. The field has</p>	See response to representor 074 above

		<p>also been designed with a hill to help cut the noise of traffic to local residents. Grassington Road, which runs adjacent to both tracks of land, has a 60mph speed limit before becoming 30mph at the bottom of Park Hill. The respondent has noticed an increase in traffic since the completion of new house building in Higher Raikes. At times residents in Grassington Road have great difficulty in getting into Grassington Road from side roads and houses due to the volume of traffic. Grassington Road is very narrow from the Roundabout (A65/A59) to town and in places has no footpath. There is also a weight restriction. During school term, the road is used by numerous double and single buses, transporting school children home. These two areas of land are a wonderful amenity to local residents, walkers, wildlife watchers and dog walkers, and are used seven days per week from dawn until dusk. There is an old saying "God has stopped making land". If this stretch of land is not protected along with Park Hill, the whole area could be lost forever. The respondent respectfully asks the inspector that careful consideration be given to this land when making his final decision, which would affect future generations of Skipton, plus wildlife.</p>	
FMM87a	C Walton 278	<p>Support FMM87a , but object to exclusion of land to north of Short Lee Lane.</p> <p>Re. SK-LGS64. Land bounded by Skipton Woods, Short Lee Lane and Grassington Road.</p> <p>I am pleased to read that a significant portion of the Park Hill area in Skipton has again been designated as green space. I am sorry that the area described above was not also included and hope that</p>	<p>See response to representor 074 above</p> <p>Note: The representor refers to the area described above as SK-LGS64, but this reference refers to the original LGS area. The representor's comments however appear to indicate that the objection is to the exclusion of the area of land north of Short Lee Lane.</p>

		<p>decision may be overturned.</p> <p>This is an integral part of the whole site and development will detract from the rural setting of both Skipton and Park Hill.</p> <p>At present Short Lee Lane is a country road, really a track, and an easy access into Park Hill. Development of the area listed above will turn the Lane into a significant road bringing much more traffic onto Grassington Road. So close to a busy roundabout traffic congestion will increase and detract from the quietness of Park Hill. If built on there would be few, if any, people living in that area who could manage without a car.</p> <p>What Skipton is in desperate need of is well built affordable housing and housing for older people and those wishing to down size. This is definitely not the site for that type of housing. There are no facilities up there – shops, surgeries, community venues. Little public transport. There is already a massive amount of housing being built in Skipton but none suitable for people with smaller budgets or in need of smaller accommodation. Until there is a serious shortage of the larger, unaffordable houses that are being built all over Skipton, many of which are for the top end rental market, this area should be left as a quiet, green space offering recreational facilities for all.</p>	
FMM87a	J Bleay 303	<p>Support FMM87a , but object to exclusion of land to north of Short Lee Lane.</p> <p>With regard to the very welcome proposed designation of Park Hill and Short Lee Lane as Local Green Space, I would strongly urge the inclusion, in this parcel of land, of the long field lying between Short</p>	See response to representor 074 above

		<p>Lee Lane and the Skipton By-pass. Visually this is an integral part of the Park Hill/Skipton Castle Woods space and is a most popular area for walking and for appreciation of wildlife of all sorts – an area, too, of peace and tranquillity.</p>	
FMM87a	<p>L Primmer 275</p> <p>and</p> <p>H Nicholas 276</p>	<p>Support FMM87a , but object to exclusion of land to north of Short Lee Lane.</p> <p>We appreciate the modifications made by the Inspector to the “Park Hill” area issue but feel that there is still no reason why the entire area cannot be designated a Local Green Space area.</p> <p>The value of open spaces around a settlement is rightly appreciated by the National Planning Policy Framework, as such spaces are invaluable for health and exercise.</p> <p>The description of the area as "an extensive tract of land" and "blanket designation of open countryside" is somewhat exaggerated, however, as the area is clearly limited by immovable boundaries.</p> <p>If the field to the north of Short Lee Lane were to be omitted from the Local Green Space designation, what could happen to it at some point in the future, when it would become an isolated, unprotected area adjacent to Skipton bypass? The field is used by curlews (on the red endangered list), who nest there regularly, and by other wild life. It is also a very small addition to the Park Hill area, not one which would turn the area into "an extensive tract of land".</p> <p>To make Short Lee Lane the northern boundary of the Local Green Space could also leave Park Hill itself open to future threats. The inclusion of the field between the lane and the bypass in the</p>	See response to representor 074 above

		<p>designation, however, would create a consistent and limited area for a Local Green Space, with permanent boundaries, two man-made and one natural, thereby achieving a fixed area of land which would benefit both present and future generations of locals and visitors.</p>	
FMM87a	<p>P and S Harvey</p> <p>206</p>	<p>Support FMM87a, but object to exclusion of land to north of Short Lee Lane.</p> <p>Firstly, it is with very good news that the decision to amend Park Hill back to Green space has been made following the volume objections earlier this year.</p> <p>However, it was very disappointing that not all the land was included in this update means we must raise a further objection to the amendment for this to be included in this final review process.</p> <p>The latest plan leaves an isolated piece of land that borders to the left of Grassington Road and the A65 without the Green Space protection, while acknowledging this is still within the conservation area boundary.</p> <p>This wedge of land by the main A65 roundabout, without this additional level of protection, gives the potential for future development and must be protected in the same way as the adjacent Park Hill. Any development of this land locked area would have a massive detriment to our current property opposite this location as well as the large number of local people and visitors to Skipton as we explained in our earlier objection in March 2019.</p>	See response to representor 074 above

		<p>Any development of this area would require significant changes to the local landscape due to the change in levels and gradients on the site and would be a totally isolated development impacting the ancient monument and Park Hill. In addition, it would require significant changes to the local road infrastructure impacting the noise levels to gain access to the site from either Grassington Road or the A65.</p> <p>Please take this letter as our formal objection to the revised SK-LGS66 as we strongly believe this also need to include this key space in the same way as the rest of the Park Hill location in the final Plan.</p>	
FMM87a	Dr E Wilson 302	<p>Support FMM87a, but object to exclusion of land to north of Short Lee Lane.</p> <p>I consider this modification to be unsound.</p> <p>I write to appeal for the land to the north of Short Lee Lane and adjacent to the bypass to be designated as local green space.</p> <p>This land borders the larger Park Hill area which has rightly been reconsidered for inclusion in the local green space plan due to its local and historical significance. Allowing the land to the north of Short Lee Lane to be vulnerable to development would have a significant, detrimental impact on the character and ambience of Park Hill. In addition it would be hugely disruptive to the many native wildlife species which inhabit these fields.</p> <p>I strongly believe that residential or commercial development of this land would lead to increase pressure on an already fragile town infrastructure. Grassington Road would be the only point of access to the plot. This road already sees more traffic than in previous</p>	See response to representor 074 above

		<p>decades, to increase this further would be detrimental not only to current residents of the road but would also negatively affect the natural space surrounding Skipton Woods and Park Hill by increasing both noise and air pollution.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate the national importance of ensuring appropriate affordable housing is available, should this land be developed into a residential plot it is unlikely to sustain any useful portion of such housing due to its location of one of the town's most affluent roads.</p> <p>Skipton proudly states that it is the 'gateway to the Dales'. If we do not take action now to protect the invaluable green space at its borders, we risk becoming merely another town outside of the spectacular national park that we are privileged to reference in our town adage.</p> <p>By protecting this land from development we ensure that Skipton continues to embrace its heritage for the benefit of its inhabitants, tourists and wildlife alike now, and long after we are gone.</p>	
FMM87a	Embsay with Eastby Parish Council 209	<p>Support FMM87a</p> <p>Embsay with Eastby Parish Council is disappointed that the Inspector has not been persuaded to safeguard the initially proposed area of Local Green Space, between the communities of Skipton and Embsay, immediately to the east of Skipton Woods. However, whilst regretting the Inspector's recommended omission of this Green Space from the modifications to the Craven Local Plan, the Parish Council does recognise that a compromise solution has been put forward to achieve an acceptable size of area, with historic and recreational</p>	No response required

		value. Embsay with Eastby Parish Council is happy to support this.	
FMM87a	Skipton Civic Society 044	<p>Support FMM87a</p> <p>We very much welcome this proposal that a significant part of the land situated north of Skipton Castle – known locally as Park Hill – should now be reconsidered as being a viable area of Local Green Space, as defined under paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework..</p> <p>We have always maintained that the land in question does qualify for Local Green Space designation, as it is in reasonably close proximity to the communities it serves and it is demonstrably special – not only to these local communities, but also to the whole town of Skipton. It has significance for its beauty, its historical significance, its recreational value, its contribution to our health and well-being and its high visibility from so many quarters of the town.</p>	No response required
FMM87a	W Feather 247	<p>Support FMM87a</p> <p>The respondent considers FMM87a to be legally compliant, sound and in compliance with the Duty to Cooperate.</p>	No response required
FMM87a	M Ludlam 301	<p>FMM87a is not Legally Compliant, Sound or In Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>The plans objectives are contradictory and flawed. PO3 aims to conserve and enhance Craven’s landscapes. Developing the only green and agricultural land on the approach to Skipton’s Gateway to the Dales would ruin the approach to Skipton. It would be urban</p>	The respondent appears to be objecting to the previous Main Modification MM87 which proposed the deletion of SK-LGS64 rather than the Further Main Modification FMM87a which is to propose a Local Green Space designation, referenced SK-LGS66 – Land to

		<p>sprawl (not infill) which would push the countryside further away. The land in question is open countryside used for agricultural which is contradictory to the plans claims of protecting and enhancing the local landscape character. The plans state that the countryside is the jewel in the crown for Craven but is not taking that into consideration at all.</p> <p>Land in question should be designated as LGS.</p>	<p>the north of Skipton up to and including the PROW at Short Lee Lane, west of Skipton Castle Woods SINC, and east of Grassington Road, Skipton .</p>
FMM90a	HBF, J Harding, 028	<p>FMM90a: Supporting Text for Policy H1 Para 6.2:</p> <p>The HBF generally supports the proposed amendment to paragraph 6.2 and the deletion of 'C3'.</p>	No response required
FMM93a	HBF, J Harding, 028	<p>FMM93a: Policy H2 Affordable Housing:</p> <p>The HBF generally supports the inclusion of '<i>where falling within Use Class C3</i>', which is considered to add further clarity to the policy.</p>	No response required
N/A	C Stansfield 296	<p>Surely the use of brown field sites is preferable to green field sites. Every one knows that developers are reluctant to use these as profits are compromised.</p> <p>Local infrastructure does not support mass development.</p> <p>Who carries out the environmental impact studies?</p>	<p>It is unclear which, if any of the Further Main Modifications the respondents comments refer to. No response required.</p>

N/A	United Utilities 010	No comments	No response required
N/A	The Coal Authority 011	No comment	No response required
N/A	NYCC, 039	No comment	No response required
N/A	National Grid 058	No comment	No response required
N/A	Highways England 072	No comment	No response required
N/A	Pendle BC, 297	No comment	No response required
N/A	Sport England 300	No comment	No response required
N/A	Environment Agency 050	No comment	No response required

