

PANNAL AND BURN BRIDGE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Examination- Further Consultation (January/February 2024)

Pannal and Burn Bridge Parish Council: Response to issues raised during the Further Consultation

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	REPRESENTOR	REPRESENTATION MADE	RESPONSE
Policy TTT1: Improved Walking, Horse Riding & Cycling Provision	British Horse Society	Policy TTT1 recognises that improvements are required in shared use, we would like to see equestrians included in cycle schemes ensuring that horse riders are not left sandwiched between cyclists on their left and motor vehicles on their right. Grass verges must remain as an important refuge for horse riders.	The parish council (PC) understands that this further Regulation 16 consultation relates to the Design Code document, the NP policies which refer to or rely on it (including their locational implications as shown on the NP Policies Map), and the implications arising from the new NPPF vis a vis the NP’s meeting of basic conditions. This comment does not seem to be relevant to any of the purposes of the consultation. Policy TTT1 neither relies on nor refers to the Design Code document.
Policy TTT6: Highway Improvement Schemes	North Yorkshire Council	Re Follifoot Road/A61 Junction – creation of two lanes on Follifoot Road; NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the	The parish council (PC) understands that this further Regulation 16 consultation relates to the Design Code document, the NP policies which refer to or rely on it

		<p>location. It is recommended that all aspirations concerning the publicly maintainable highway, or objectives involving proposed highway implementation are discussed with the relevant representatives of NYC prior to including in the plan, to prevent the inclusion therein of aspirations which are not feasible. This junction arrangement has recently been investigated by transport consultants working on the West of Harrogate. Issues surrounding third party land ownership, topography and the need to satisfy design standards were identified as issues precluding any physical changes to the junction lanes. Mitigation works identified as part of the West of Harrogate works involve replacing the existing signal infrastructure and the introduction of MoVa to better deal with the sequencing of the signals and timings.</p>	<p>(including their locational implications as shown on the NP Policies Map), and the implications arising from the new NPPF vis a vis the NP's meeting of basic conditions. This comment does not seem to be relevant to any of the purposes of the consultation. Policy TTT6 neither relies on nor refers to the Design Code document. (NB the PC would additionally make the point that North Yorkshire Council and/or its predecessor North Yorkshire County Council have been previously consulted at both Regulation 14 and Regulation 16 stages and have not previously made these detailed comments on Policy TTT6)</p>
<p>Policy TTT6: Highway Improvement Schemes</p>	<p>North Yorkshire Council</p>	<p>Re Spring Lane (Westminster Drive to Yew Tree Lane) - traffic calming in the form of chicanes/ directional priority measures; NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that all aspirations concerning the publicly maintainable highway, or objectives involving proposed highway implementation are discussed with the relevant representatives of NYC prior to including in the plan, to prevent the inclusion therein of aspirations which are not feasible. Due to the width of Spring Lane over majority of its length, combined with low traffic flows it is unlikely that there is a need for chicanes and directional priority measures to operate effectively.</p>	<p>The parish council (PC) understands that this further Regulation 16 consultation relates to the Design Code document, the NP policies which refer to or rely on it (including their locational implications as shown on the NP Policies Map), and the implications arising from the new NPPF vis a vis the NP's meeting of basic conditions. This comment does not seem to be relevant to any of the purposes of the consultation. Policy TTT6 neither relies on nor refers to</p>

			the Design Code document. (NB the PC would additionally make the point that North Yorkshire Council and/or its predecessor North Yorkshire County Council have been previously consulted at both Regulation 14 and Regulation 16 stages and have not previously made these detailed comments on Policy TTT6)
Policy TTT6: Highway Improvement Schemes	North Yorkshire Council	<p>Re Burn Bridge Road/Burn Bridge Lane - traffic lights at Crimple Beck Bridge.</p> <p>NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that all aspirations concerning the publicly maintainable highway, or objectives involving proposed highway implementation are discussed with the relevant representatives of NYC prior to including in the plan, to prevent the inclusion therein of aspirations which are not feasible.</p> <p>Transport consultants working on the west of Harrogate have investigated this option, and has been discussed with the NYC traffic signals team. Issues surrounding third party land ownership and the need to satisfy design standards do not allow for the bridge to be signalised. The current proposal for this location involves the removal of the priority pinch point and reinstate two-way traffic over the bridge, plus the installation of a speed table on the bridge to help retain a lower 20mph speed limit and the installation of a minimal width footway.</p>	<p>The parish council (PC) understands that this further Regulation 16 consultation relates to the Design Code document, the NP policies which refer to or rely on it (including their locational implications as shown on the NP Policies Map), and the implications arising from the new NPPF vis a vis the NP's meeting of basic conditions. This comment does not seem to be relevant to any of the purposes of the consultation. Policy TTT6 neither relies on nor refers to the Design Code document. (NB the PC would additionally make the point that North Yorkshire Council and/or its predecessor North Yorkshire County Council have been previously consulted at both Regulation 14 and Regulation 16 stages and have not previously</p>

			made these detailed comments on Policy TTT6)
Policy TTT6: Highway Improvement Scheme	North Yorkshire Council	<p>Re Princess Royal Way – creation of a west side pavement from Thirkill Drive Roundabout to the PROW at Swarth Hill/Walton Head Farm.</p> <p>NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that all aspirations concerning the publicly maintainable highway, or objectives involving proposed highway implementation are discussed with the relevant representatives of NYC prior to including in the plan, to prevent the inclusion therein of aspirations which are not feasible.</p> <p>Considerations to ensuring the footway can meet with design standards including minimum widths will need to be considered.</p>	<p>The parish council (PC) understands that this further Regulation 16 consultation relates to the Design Code document, the NP policies which refer to or rely on it (including their locational implications as shown on the NP Policies Map), and the implications arising from the new NPPF vis a vis the NP's meeting of basic conditions. This comment does not seem to be relevant to any of the purposes of the consultation. Policy TTT6 neither relies on nor refers to the Design Code document. (NB the PC would additionally make the point that North Yorkshire Council and/or its predecessor North Yorkshire County Council have been previously consulted at both Regulation 14 and Regulation 16 stages and have not previously made these detailed comments on Policy TTT6)</p>
Traffic, Transport & Travel - General	British Horse Society	<p>We therefore ask that the Todmorden (<i>sic</i>) Neighbourhood Plan Area includes equestrians as vulnerable road users, to ensure that their needs are considered equally alongside those of pedestrians and cyclists.</p>	<p>The parish council (PC) understands that this further Regulation 16 consultation relates to the Design Code document, the NP policies which refer to or rely on it (including their locational implications as shown on the NP</p>

			Policies Map), and the implications arising from the new NPPF vis a vis the NP's meeting of basic conditions. This comment does not seem to be relevant to any of the purposes of the consultation. The plan's policies relating to horse-riding neither rely on nor refer to the Design Code document.
Traffic, Transport & Travel - General	British Horse Society	We therefore suggest that horse-riding should be included within the plan and would welcome the opportunity to contribute to the development of this document.	The parish council (PC) understands that this further Regulation 16 consultation relates to the Design Code document, the NP policies which refer to or rely on it (including their locational implications as shown on the NP Policies Map), and the implications arising from the new NPPF vis a vis the NP's meeting of basic conditions. This comment does not seem to be relevant to any of the purposes of the consultation. The plan's policies relating to horse-riding neither rely on nor refer to the Design Code document. (NB the PC would stress that the NP does in fact include horse-riding in Policy TTT1)
Traffic, Transport & Travel - General	British Horse Society	planning policy should support the automatic inclusion of horse riders on shared off-road routes, unless there are specific reasons why this is not possible.	The parish council (PC) understands that this further Regulation 16 consultation relates to the Design Code document, the NP policies which refer to or rely on it

			(including their locational implications as shown on the NP Policies Map), and the implications arising from the new NPPF vis a vis the NP's meeting of basic conditions. This comment does not seem to be relevant to any of the purposes of the consultation. The plan's policies relating to horse-riding neither rely on nor refer to the Design Code document. (NB the PC would point out that Policy TTT1 does already address the safety of all users of shared routes)
Traffic, Transport & Travel - General	British Horse Society	We would urge North Yorkshire Council (<i>sic</i>) to incorporate the principles set out in this guidance (<i>NB from Hampshire Countryside Access Forum</i>) into their planning policy: most particularly, that equestrians should be considered and consulted with at an early stage within the planning of any major housing or infrastructure development.	The parish council (PC) understands that this further Regulation 16 consultation relates to the Design Code document, the NP policies which refer to or rely on it (including their locational implications as shown on the NP Policies Map), and the implications arising from the new NPPF vis a vis the NP's meeting of basic conditions. This comment does not seem to be relevant to any of the purposes of the consultation. The plan's policies relating to horse-riding neither rely on nor refer to the Design Code document.
Traffic, Transport & Travel - General	British Horse Society	The equestrian community in Pannal and the surrounding districts currently has many difficulties in finding safe access within the area. Many issues could be addressed and resolved through good	The parish council (PC) understands that this further Regulation 16 consultation relates to the Design

		planning of future development. We hope therefore that the Pannal & Burn Bridge Neighbourhood plan will include policies that will support this.	Code document, the NP policies which refer to or rely on it (including their locational implications as shown on the NP Policies Map), and the implications arising from the new NPPF vis a vis the NP's meeting of basic conditions. This comment does not seem to be relevant to any of the purposes of the consultation. The plan's policies relating to horse-riding neither rely on nor refer to the Design Code document.
Traffic, Transport & Travel - General	British Horse Society	we would ask the Council, to consider using some of the CIL money arising from future developments to improve the off-road network for higher status users of the PROW in the surrounding area which would benefit both the existing and new residents.	This is a matter for the PC and does not relate directly to the NP, except where specific non-planning community actions involving bridleways are identified. The comment is in any case beyond the scope of this consultation.
Traffic, Transport & Travel - General	North Yorkshire Council	The 2015 Community-led Plan Survey, a 2018 Save Crimple valley survey and various focus group exercises have highlighted various traffic and transport related observations, which the plan seeks to address. Based on the findings to the surveys and focus groups, the Neighbourhood Plan aims to put in place policies covering improved walking/ cycling/horse-riding provision; new car parking provision to serve the school, enhanced car parking standards for new development in the vicinity of Pannal Station and Pannal Primary School; and highway improvements to address congestion and rat-running. It does not however offer the empirical evidence that would be required to demonstrate the extent of the	The parish council (PC) understands that this further Regulation 16 consultation relates to the Design Code document, the NP policies which refer to or rely on it (including their locational implications as shown on the NP Policies Map), and the implications arising from the new NPPF vis a vis the NP's meeting of basic conditions. This comment does not seem to be relevant to any of the purposes of the consultation. The

		<p>perceived issues or to support the advancement of the most appropriate measures to be progressed.</p> <p>All of the proposals would require agreement and progression by NYC in its capacity of Local Highway Authority. It is recommended that in order to achieve a robust plan with clear, achievable ambitions, that dialogue is opened directly with the LHA to explore the feasibility of the proposed improvements.</p>	<p>NP's traffic, transport and travel policies neither rely on nor refer to the Design Code document. (NB the PC would additionally make the point that North Yorkshire Council and/or its predecessor North Yorkshire County Council have been previously consulted at both Regulation 14 and Regulation 16 stages and have not previously made these comments)</p>
Traffic, Transport & Travel - General	North Yorkshire Council	<p>Thank you for providing North Yorkshire Countryside Access Service with the opportunity to comment on the Pannal and Burn Bridge Neighbourhood Development Plan. The general principles on page 30 of the Plan appear to support Policy TTT1. We would support efforts to achieve greater connectivity of the public rights of way network, to provide non-motorised travel and recreational opportunities for the residents of the village, e.g. by developing more routes for walkers, riders and cyclists, in line with NYC standards. Any new or improved/upgraded routes should be designed to link to existing public rights of way within and outside of the developments.</p> <p>It should be noted that minor changes can be made to the network from time to time by application from the public, and given the timescales of these proposed plans, future consultation with the Countryside Service must be made to establish the alignment of the network at that stage, as it may have changed from what is shown on the current NYC online digital mapping.</p>	<p>The parish council (PC) understands that this further Regulation 16 consultation relates to the Design Code document, the NP policies which refer to or rely on it (including their locational implications as shown on the NP Policies Map), and the implications arising from the new NPPF vis a vis the NP's meeting of basic conditions. This comment does not seem to be relevant to any of the purposes of the consultation, as the NP's traffic, transport and travel policies neither rely on nor refer to the Design Code document. (NB the PC would additionally make the point that North Yorkshire Council and/or its predecessor North Yorkshire County Council have been previously consulted at both Regulation 14 and Regulation</p>

			16 stages and have not previously made these comments)
Traffic, Transport & Travel – Non-Planning Community Actions	North Yorkshire Council	<p>In addition to the Plans core planning provisions, a series of complimentary actions have been identified. The LHA has provided comment on each of the actions identified in the plan.</p> <p>ACTION: Lobby for peak time traffic flow optimisation at A61 intersections, i.e. more ‘green light time’ at Pannal Bank/A61 8-9am and 4-6pm for traffic exiting the village</p> <p>NYC LHA Response:: NYC’s Traffic Engineering team propose that there is a potential to deliver above traffic flow optimisation along the A61, although this would need to be secured through development contributions for the “West-of-Harrogate”. The Traffic Engineering team remain open to any improvement suggestions, where they can be linked to/and or funded and delivered via other development or project opportunities.</p> <p>ACTION: Lobby for creation of two lanes on Follifoot Road at A61 junction.</p> <p>NYC LHA Response: NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that all aspirations concerning the publicly maintainable highway, or objectives involving proposed highway implementation are discussed with the relevant representatives of NYC prior to including in the plan, to prevent the inclusion therein of aspirations which are not feasible.</p> <p>This junction arrangement has recently been investigated by transport consultants working on the West of Harrogate. Issues surrounding third party land ownership, topography and the need to satisfy design standards were identified as issues precluding any physical changes to the junction lanes. Mitigation works identified</p>	<p>The parish council (PC) understands that this further Regulation 16 consultation relates to the Design Code document, the NP policies which refer to or rely on it (including their locational implications as shown on the NP Policies Map), and the implications arising from the new NPPF vis a vis the NP’s meeting of basic conditions. This comment does not seem to be relevant to any of the purposes of the consultation. The non-community actions cited neither rely on nor refer to the Design Code document. Neither are they NP policies. (NB the PC would additionally make the point that North Yorkshire Council and/or its predecessor North Yorkshire County Council have been previously consulted at both Regulation 14 and Regulation 16 stages and have not previously made these detailed comments on proposed non-planning community actions)</p>

		<p>as part of the West of Harrogate works involve replacing the existing signal infrastructure and the introduction of MoVa to better deal with the sequencing of the signals and timings.</p> <p>ACTION: Explore introduction of 30mph zone on A61 from Crimple Hall to Thirkill Drive roundabout.</p> <p>NYC LHA Response: NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that the Local Highway Authority is contacted directly so that the feasibility of such suggestions can be explored.</p> <p>ACTION: Lobby for a controlled pedestrian/cycle crossing of Leeds Road in the immediate vicinity of the South of Almsford Bridge employment site.</p> <p>NYC LHA Response:: NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that the Local Highway Authority is contacted directly so that the feasibility of such suggestions can be explored.</p> <p>ACTION: Lobby for a pedestrian refuge/safety island on A61 at Almsford Bridge to connect the public rights of way to west and east.</p> <p>NYC LHA Response:: NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that the Local Highway Authority is contacted directly so that the feasibility of such suggestions can be explored.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>ACTION: Lobby for the repositioning of the weight limit signs, currently positioned at the top of Pannal Bank, to the A61 opposite Costa (southbound lane) and at the VIDA/BMW boundary (northbound), so that they are visible to heavy goods vehicle drivers before they have committed to a turn into Pannal.</p> <p>NYC LHA Response:: NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that the Local Highway Authority is contacted directly so that the feasibility of relocating signage can be explored with its appropriate officers, prior to this being included as an ambition of the plan.</p> <p>ACTION: Lobby for improved HGV/bus signage at the following locations:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Junction of Church Lane/Rossett Green Lane -Junction of Yew Tree Lane/Rossett Green Lane <p>NYC LHA Response: NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that the Local Highway Authority is contacted directly so that the feasibility of new / relocated signage can be explored with its appropriate officers, prior to this being included as an ambition of the plan.</p> <p>ACTION: Lobby for enforcement of existing HGV weight limits in parish.</p> <p>NYC LHA Response: NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>the Local Highway Authority is contacted directly so that the feasibility of such suggestions can be explored.</p> <p>ACTION: Spring Lane: introduce HGV access only restriction NYC LHA Response: NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that the Local Highway Authority is contacted directly so that the feasibility of such suggestions can be explored.</p> <p>ACTION: Spring Lane – lobby for extension of 20mph zone from current limit to Hill Foot Lane/Yew Tree Lane roundabout; and to introduce chicane/directional priority measures. NYC LHA Response: NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that the Local Highway Authority is contacted directly so that the feasibility of such suggestions can be explored.</p> <p>ACTION: Burn Bridge Road – lobby/press for installation of traffic lights at Crimple Beck Bridge. NYC LHA Response:: NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that all aspirations concerning the publicly maintainable highway, or objectives involving proposed highway implementation are discussed with the relevant representatives of NYC prior to including in the plan, to prevent the inclusion therein of aspirations which are not feasible.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Transport consultants working on the west of Harrogate have investigated this option, and has been discussed with the NYC traffic signals team. Issues surrounding third party land ownership and the need to satisfy design standards do not allow for the bridge to be signalised. The current proposal for this location involves the removal of the priority pinch point and reinstate two-way traffic over the bridge, plus the installation of a speed table on the bridge to help retain a lower 20mph speed limit and the installation of a minimal width footway.</p> <p>ACTION: Yew Tree Lane – lobby to: -Install street lights between Methodist Church and Rossett Green Lane; -Restore pavement to full width and repair collapsed walls.</p> <p>NYC LHA Response: NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that all aspirations concerning the publicly maintainable highway, or objectives involving proposed highway implementation are discussed with the relevant representatives of NYC prior to including in the plan, to prevent the inclusion therein of aspirations which are not feasible.</p> <p>ACTION: Church Lane – lobby to create full width pavements between the entrance to Pannal House Farm and Main Street.</p> <p>NYC LHA Response: NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that all aspirations concerning the publicly maintainable highway, or objectives involving proposed highway implementation are discussed with the relevant representatives of NYC prior to</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>including in the plan, to prevent the inclusion therein of aspirations which are not feasible.</p> <p>ACTION: Pannal Railway Bridge – lobby for package of measures in order to address pedestrian safety issues: -Extend yellow box across bridge between traffic lights; -Synchronise traffic lights with Pannal Bank/A61 traffic lights, via a scoot system; -Install monitoring cameras; -Install pedestrian crossing lights.</p> <p>NYC LHA Response: NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that all aspirations concerning the publicly maintainable highway, or objectives involving proposed highway implementation are discussed with the relevant representatives of NYC prior to including in the plan, to prevent the inclusion therein of aspirations which are not feasible.</p> <p>ACTION: Lobby for Introduction of time-limited parking restrictions on Main Street – from Pannal Green north to Spring Lane - covering school drop-off and pick-up times.</p> <p>NYC LHA Response: NYC is the Local Highway Authority. Any proposed changes to on-street parking will require conversations with the relevant NYC representative in order for the proposal to be assessed, prior to being included as an ambition of the plan.</p> <p>ACTION: Lobby for introduction of time-limited parking restrictions on the south side of Crimple Meadows, between the Main Street Junction and the Crimple Meadows Junction, covering school drop-off and pick-up times. This is to prevent the obstruction to emergency service vehicles wishing to enter Crimple Meadows and</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>also to prevent pavement parking that precludes mobility scooter/wheelchair/pram passage.</p> <p>NYC LHA Response: NYC is the Local Highway Authority. Any proposed changes to on-street parking will require conversations with the relevant NYC representative in order for the proposal to be assessed, prior to being included as an ambition of the plan.</p> <p>ACTION: Lobby for introduction of time-limited parking restrictions on Rosedale covering school drop off and pick-up times.</p> <p>NYC LHA Response: NYC is the Local Highway Authority. Any proposed changes to on-street parking will require conversations with the relevant NYC representative in order for the proposal to be assessed, prior to being included as an ambition of the plan.</p> <p>ACTION: Lobby for introduction of time-limited parking restrictions on Pannal Avenue and Station Road covering peak morning commuter times.</p> <p>NYC LHA Response: NYC is the Local Highway Authority. Any proposed changes to on-street parking will require conversations with the relevant NYC representative in order for the proposal to be assessed, prior to being included as an ambition of the plan.</p> <p>ACTION: Lobby for introduction of a lined box cycle refuge at Pannal Bank traffic lights.</p> <p>NYC LHA Response: NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that the Local Highway Authority is contacted directly so that the feasibility of such suggestions can be explored.</p> <p>ACTION: Lobby for creation of two disabled parking spaces on Crimple Meadows, between “the entrance to the recreation field</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>and the field entrance to Bromfield Cottage (23 MainStreet)” i.e. the Main Street/Crimple Meadows Junction and 23 Main Street. NYC LHA Response: NYC is the Local Highway Authority. Any proposed changes / requests for the creation of on-street parking will require conversations with the relevant NYC representative in order for the proposal to be assessed, prior to being included as an ambition of the plan.</p> <p>ACTION: Princess Royal Way – lobby for the creation of a west side pavement from Thirkill Drive Roundabout to the PROW at Swarth Hill/Walton Head Farm.</p> <p>NYC LHA Response: NYC is the Local Highway Authority, responsible for the regulation of the local highway network. NYC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that all aspirations concerning the publicly maintainable highway, or objectives involving proposed highway implementation are discussed with the relevant representatives of NYC prior to including in the plan, to prevent the inclusion therein of aspirations which are not feasible.</p> <p>Considerations to ensuring the footway can meet with design standards including minimum widths will need to be considered.</p>	
<p>Policy ED2: Employment Site South of Almsford Bridge – Development Requirements</p>	<p>North Yorkshire Council</p>	<p>Where it is clear that the development will have material impact on the North Yorkshire’s local highway network the LHA will want to be included in the agreeing the scoping for the Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan (TP), which will include junction identification and sustainable travel considerations. The need for any highways infrastructure will be identified and conditional through the planning process as appropriate.</p>	<p>The parish council (PC) understands that this further Regulation 16 consultation relates to the Design Code document, the NP policies which refer to or rely on it (including their locational implications as shown on the NP Policies Map), and the implications arising from the new NPPF vis a vis the NP’s meeting of basic conditions. This comment does not</p>

			seem to be relevant to any of the purposes of the consultation. Policy ED2 neither relies on nor refers to the Design Code document. (NB the PC would additionally make the point that North Yorkshire Council and/or its predecessor North Yorkshire County Council have been previously consulted at both Regulation 14 and Regulation 16 stages and have not previously made these detailed comments on Policy ED2)
Neighbourhood Plan - General	Zero Carbon Harrogate	<p>ZCH feels that there are significant gaps in the Plan in relation to policies which will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and mitigate for the effects of climate change. The only specific mention of climate change is in regard to trees:</p> <p><i>POLICY GNE7: DEVELOPMENT AND TREES New development should conserve trees wherever possible and introduce new tree planting as part of combatting climate change, increasing biodiversity, creating high quality healthy living environments and enhancing the public realm.</i></p> <p>Planting trees in the Pannal and Burn Bridge neighbourhood, while of some benefit in helping to achieve net zero carbon emissions will not make any significant impact on these unless there are also changes to how housing is constructed and travel and transport undertaken in our area.</p>	The parish council (PC) understands that this further Regulation 16 consultation relates to the Design Code document, the NP policies which refer to or rely on it (including their locational implications as shown on the NP Policies Map), and the implications arising from the new NPPF vis a vis the NP's meeting of basic conditions. This comment does not seem to be relevant to any of the purposes of the consultation.
Design Code - Specific	North Yorkshire Police	<p>Page 59 1A - Sustainability & Energy <i>"Covered and secure cycle storage units are preferred but where enclosures are open suitable racks or hoops should be provided."</i> Consideration could be given to including further details regarding what would be considered as suitable racks or hoops. For example.</p>	While it is acknowledged that the comment does relate to the Design Code document, none of the NP policies rely on or refer to Code 1 (P59-60). As such, the PC considers

		“Any cycle rack or hoop should be of a design that enables both of the wheels and crossbar to be secured to it.”	the comment to be outside the scope of the consultation.
Design Code - Specific	North Yorkshire Police	<p>Page 64 Code 4 - Parking, Gardens and Boundary Treatments 4B - Side of Dwelling Driveway Parking “Front gardens should be a minimum depth of 6m to allow movement around parked vehicles and also be well screened with hedgerows when providing parking space to the front of a dwelling”.</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted that for aesthetic reasons the code requires that parking to the front of dwellings should be screened with hedgerows, in terms of designing out crime any boundary treatment to the front of a property should be a maximum height of 1m to enable passive surveillance of the property from the street and therefore consideration should be given to including some wording to reflect this.</p>	While it is acknowledged that the comment does relate to the Design Code document, none of the NP policies rely on or refer to Code 4 (P64-5). As such, the PC considers the comment to be outside the scope of the consultation.
Design Code - Specific	North Yorkshire Police	<p>Page 64 Code 4 - Parking, Gardens and Boundary Treatments 4B - Side of Dwelling Driveway Parking “Parking being provided on a driveway to the side of a dwelling should be of sufficient length (5m minimum) so that a car can park behind the frontage line of the dwelling.”</p> <p>Again, whilst it is accepted that this requirement is for aesthetic purposes, best practice suggests that owners should be able to see their vehicle from within the home. Therefore, consideration could be given to requiring that, where practical, a window should be provided in the side elevation from a normally occupied room to enable this.</p>	While it is acknowledged that the comment does relate to the Design Code document, none of the NP policies rely on or refer to Code 4 (P64-5). As such, the PC considers the comment to be outside the scope of the consultation.
Design Code - Specific	North Yorkshire Police	<p>Page 65 4E - Back Gardens 4F - Boundary Treatments “When rear boundaries abut the settlement edge, surrounding landscape or open green spaces soft planted boundaries of</p>	While it is acknowledged that the comment does relate to the Design Code document, none of the NP policies rely on or refer to Code 4 (P64-5). As such, the PC considers

		<p>hedgerows and trees must be used to soften the transition into the natural environment and protect views.”</p> <p>Research has shown that offenders prefer to gain access to a dwelling from the rear of a property and therefore consideration should be given to Including some wording in this section advising that care needs to be taken when planting trees to ensure that once mature that they are not located too close to rear boundary treatments that would enable them to be used as a climbing aid to breach them and gain access into the rear garden.</p> <p>“Front boundaries should respond to the boundaries used within adjacent dwellings to provide continuation of street character. Appropriate boundary choices are illustrated below.”</p> <p>Again, to ensure that passive surveillance of the property from the street is not impeded, consideration should be given to including some wording to advise that any boundary treatment to the front of a property should be a maximum height of 1m, and in relation to planting should be maintained to that height.</p>	<p>the comment to be outside the scope of the consultation.</p>
Design Code - Specific	North Yorkshire Police	<p>Page 67</p> <p>05 Next Steps</p> <p>“As well as using this document, future developers should also make sure that they have observed the guidance in the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities’ National Design Guide.”</p> <p>Consideration could be given to including the following wording: “...and have incorporated the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)”</p> <p>“Further standards on residential developments should also be obtained from Building for a Healthy Life, a government-endorsed industry standard for well-designed homes and neighbourhoods.”</p> <p>Consideration could be given to including the following wording: “... and Secured by Design (SBD) , which is an initiative promoted by the National Police Chiefs Council (NPCC)and has been shown</p>	<p>While it is acknowledged that the comment does relate to the Design Code document, none of the NP policies rely on or refer to the guidance contained under ‘Next Steps’. As such, the PC considers the comment to be outside the scope of the consultation.</p>

		through independent analysis that SBD housing developments experience up to 87% less crime.”	
Design Code - Specific	Zero Carbon Harrogate	Zero Carbon Harrogate (ZCH) wishes to make a number of comments and suggestions regarding the Pannal and Burn Bridge Neighbourhood Plan and Code 1 of the Design Statement, which relates to sustainability. Overall, we feel that the Code could be more specific in its aim to support the vision of a future “built on the pillars of environmental, transport and social sustainability” for the period up to 2035 – over ten years. Therefore, we suggest that the wording is strengthened, making it clear that Passivehaus standards should be the norm by the end of that timescale.	While it is acknowledged that the comment does relate to the Design Code document, none of the NP policies rely on or refer to Code 1 (P59-60). As such, the PC considers the comment to be outside the scope of the consultation.
Design Code Specific	Zero Carbon Harrogate	ZCH makes a number of detailed comments regarding Code 1 of the Design Code document (P59-60). Conclusion As stated above, we request that more consideration is given to driving change in how new houses are built and older houses extended and refurbished in Pannal and Burn Bride. By setting out a clear direction of travel and indicating that Passivehaus standards will be expected to be the norm in 2035, we believe Code 1 of the Design Statement can have a significant effect on sustainability which meets the aims of the Neighbourhood Plan.	While it is acknowledged that the comment does relate to the Design Code document, none of the NP policies rely on or refer to Code 1 (P59-60). As such, the PC considers the comment to be outside the scope of the consultation.
Design Code - General	Historic England	We note that the Design Code does not make any reference to the NPPF and specifically para. 133, nor to the National Model Design Code (latest update 14 th October 2021) and makes a single reference to the National Design Guide (latest update 30 th January 2021). It is evident that the Pannal and Burn Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Design Code has not been drawn up with reference to the Government guidance, although it nevertheless represents reasonable good practice in Design Coding. In the context of the pre-existing guidance however, the Examiner may wish to consider the need for the Neighbourhood Plan & Design Code to be reviewed and if necessary, updated to ensure consistency with the Government policy and guidance.	The PC is in agreement with the comment made in respect of overt reference to Government guidance. It would however argue that the document is consistent with the principles set out in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code, as required by NPPF para 133 (NB formerly para 128 as cited in the Basic Conditions Statement ref NP Policy BE5; Historic England present no

			<p>evidence to the contrary) and point also to the Historic England comment that the NP “represents reasonable good practice in Design Coding”. The PC is not aware of any requirement for a Design Code to faithfully reflect every aspect of national guidance.</p> <p>In so far as the NP only relies on/refers to the Design Code document in respect of only 1 of its 26 policies, i.e. Policy BE5, the PC does not see any need for a review/update of the document – an evidence base document at that - as suggested. Nowhere does Historic England make any comment in respect of the document as it informs Policy BE5 or indeed any other NP policy.</p>
--	--	--	---