



Craven Local Plan Examination

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

09/05/2019

Note: This document lists the representations received for each Main Modification during the consultation for the Main Modifications to the draft Craven Local Plan, arising from the examination of the local plan by the Inspector in October 2018. The document includes a summary only of each of the representations on the proposed 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.

| MM Ref | Representor ID No | Summary of Key Issues Identified in the Representation | CDC response (where required) |
|--------|---------------------------|--|---|
| MM1a | Historic England 017 | Supports modification, which introduces reference to Settle's intimate feel and distinctive character. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM3 | Skipton Civic Society 044 | Support modification to revise numbers to reflect current situation. | No response required |
| MM3 | S Wilton 118 | This is a sensible modification as it ensures the Plan reflects the current position. It would be even more helpful if the net additional dwelling figure could be continually updated on any on-line version of the Plan to ensure it always contained the up-to-date figure | Whilst the plan itself cannot be a 'live' online document, the Council will publish, in its annual Authority Monitoring Report, up to date figures on housing completions and housing supply requirements. |
| | | | |
| MM5 | HBF, J Harding 028 | Supports modification, which introduces full table from SHMA Update 2017, recognises other sources of evidence and refers to flexibility in part (c). | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM6 | Gladman 012 | Supports deletion of percentages in part (a) of policy, but changes do not go far enough. Consideration of housing market demand indicators should be taken into account in determining housing mix. Broadly supports changes to part (b), but they do not go far enough. Higher density should be acceptable in town centres and highly accessible locations. Lower density should be acceptable in lower order settlements in response to their form and character. This | These issues were raised and addressed during the examination hearing session on Matter 8. The resulting modification ensures that the policy is now clear and effective with respect to those issues. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change |

| | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|--|--|
| | | would reflect Government's approach and changes to Design in the 2019 NPPF. | is required. |
| MM6 | J Adams 204 | In part (b) 'regard to local and site-specific circumstances' is non-specific and should be replaced with wording more in keeping with SP12 and INF7. 'Regard to local' should be followed by 'sustainability issues, infrastructure requirements, safety and inclusivity'. | The reason or need for the proposed change is not clear and the suggested wording appears to be less clear and effective than the proposed modification. The policy, as modified, should ensure clarity and effectiveness and no further modification should be necessary in the interests of soundness. |
| MM6 | S Coetzer 226 | In part (b) 'regard to local and site-specific circumstances' is non-specific and should be replaced with wording more in keeping with SP12 and INF7. 'Regard to local' should be followed by 'sustainability issues, infrastructure requirements, safety and inclusivity'. | See response to representation 204 on MM6 above |
| MM6 | F Hall Coetzer 227 | In part (b) 'regard to local and site-specific circumstances' is non-specific and should be replaced with wording more in keeping with SP12 and INF7. 'Regard to local' should be followed by 'sustainability issues, infrastructure requirements, safety and inclusivity'. | See response to representation 204 on MM6 above |
| | | | |
| MM7 | CPRE North Yorkshire 009 | CPRE North Yorkshire welcomes the clarity that the additional text provides at paragraph 4.40 in relation to Tier 5 settlements. This clearly describes the service role as being limited to the residents of the settlements – for settlements which have 15 or more closely grouped residential properties. This helpfully distinguishes between those settlements in Tier 4 and those considered to be within the 'open countryside'. | No response required |

| | | | |
|-----|---------------|--|---|
| | | It goes on to clarify at paragraph 4.46 to set out what will be allowed (limited development) in relation to Tier 5 settlements – i.e. 1.5% of total housing growth across the plan period in these settlements. | |
| MM7 | R Pringle 036 | <p>MM7 is unsound, not legally compliant and could breach the Duty to Cooperate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The emphasis in paragraph 4.47 and 4.49 has been changed from building on allocated sites and brownfield sites in settlements to basically ‘building anywhere’ and on land outside a settlements main built up area in the countryside. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The new wording is ambiguous with no definitions included ○ These major changes have been made without being the subject of discussion at the examination hearing and the consultation protocol. ○ The change is in conflict with national planning policy. • The sections about traffic have been deleted. <p>Apart from the inclusion of additional wording regarding the Council’s regular monitoring of the performance of each settlement in meeting its planned growth levels, which is justified, the modification should be deleted and the original wording re-instated.</p> | <p>There appears to be a misunderstanding over what these changes mean. The changes proposed in MM7 and MM8 should be read as a whole. Reading these modifications as a whole, it is clear that there is no significant change to the plan’s overall approach to supporting the principle of housing development on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • appropriate land within the main built up area of settlements, and • land adjoining a settlement’s main built up area that is unallocated – but only if the settlement’s planned growth level is not being met, or it is a rural exception site in accordance with Policy H2 , or there are special economic, environmental and/or social circumstances which justify development. <p>Policy criterion H and paragraph 4.47 both refer to supporting proposals for housing <u>within the built up area of a settlement</u>. The matter of adding support for housing on other appropriate land as well as previously developed land within a main built up area was discussed and agreed at the examination hearing in response to the Inspector’s questions 2 and 3 of Issue 3, Matter 4. The policy support is conditional on proposals being in conformity with all other relevant plan policies. For example, it will not be appropriate to support housing on land protected by Policy ENV10:</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>Local Green Space. Supporting housing on other appropriate land within the built up area of a settlement, as well as previously developed land, will assist in minimising the loss of countryside to housing.</p> <p>The changes proposed regarding the wording of the plan on when it may be appropriate to allow housing on land unallocated for housing adjoining a settlement's main built up area still retain the same approach as contained in the Publication Draft Plan. The plan continues to support the delivery of the plan's housing allocations and appropriate land within the built up area and, continues only to allow housing proposals adjoining settlements (apart from rural exception sites for affordable housing) if allocated and windfall housing within the built up area are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not able to meet the settlements planned growth, or • development is justified by special economic, environmental and/or social circumstances, and • proposals are compliant with the criteria in Part I) i), ii), iii), iv), v), vi). <p>The Publication Draft Plan Policy SP4 did not promote a 'brownfield land' first approach. This would not have been consistent with national planning policy.</p> <p>During discussion of Policy SP4 at the examination hearing, the Inspector questioned whether the proposed criterion regarding traffic impact was appropriate to include within this strategic policy. The Council agreed at the hearing that this criterion could be deleted from this policy. The issue of ensuring proposals have an acceptable traffic impact is dealt</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|---|---|
| | | | <p>with in the proposed new policy INF7: Sustainable Transport and Highways (MM120 and 121). This issue has not been deleted from the plan as a whole.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM7 | Skipton Civic Society 044 | <p>MM7 is unsound and not legally compliant for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the changes allow random growth at a settlement giving no direction for where a settlement spreads <p>The plan used to encourage sustainable development by using brownfield sites first and to secure growth as planned. Retain the wording previously proposed.</p> | See response to representation 036 on MM7 above. |
| MM7 | S Wilton 118 | <p>MM7 is unsound for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction of the wording 'or other appropriate land' as it stands is vague and provides a 'blank cheque' enabling developers to argue that any land is appropriate. The deletions and insertions in paragraph 4.49 detract from the sound principle that any brownfield sites should be considered first and only if there are none available should consideration be given to other land. <p>Delete the word 'or other appropriate land' from paragraph</p> | See response to representation 036 on MM7 above |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---|--|
| | | 4.47, and ensure paragraph 4.49 unequivocally establishes 'brownfield first' principle. | |
| MM7 | B Martin 182 | <p>MM7 is unsound, not legally compliant or in compliance with the Duty to Cooperate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The change of wording from favouring 'allocated land previously developed land in tiers 1 to 5' to favouring 'brownfield land and other appropriate land' will allow developers and the Council to build anywhere they want. • This is a huge shift in policy after consultation and the examination hearings, and did not form part of the discussions at the hearing. <p>The original draft was not unsound.</p> <p>Support for the additional wording suggested by the Inspector to update the housing monitoring figures more frequently than the Council were previously proposing.</p> | See response to representation 036 on MM7 above. |
| MM7 | L Gould 194 | <p>Object to MM7 for the following reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The change of wording from a brownfield first approach to supporting brownfield land and other appropriate land' is a significant change and will allow development on greenfield adjoining settlements rather than encourage the use of previously developed land as previously agreed. | See response to representation 036 on MM7 above |
| MM7 | A Dowbiggin, Carleton Neighbourhood Planning | <p>MM7 is unsound and not in compliance with the Duty to Cooperate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introduction of support for housing on 'other | See response to representation 036 on MM7 above. |

| | | | |
|-----|-------------|--|---|
| | Group 264 | <p>appropriate land' in paragraph 4.47 is 'very woolly', subjective and open to misinterpretation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 4.49 changes regarding land on the edge of settlements and particularly if land does not come forward does not comply with national planning policy which give protection to the rural countryside. • The changes could allow greenfield land or land on the edge of settlements to be unnecessarily developed, particularly where brownfield sites are available but land agents and developers choose not to bring those forward. | |
| | | | |
| MM8 | Gladman 012 | <p>Highly supportive of the modifications to Criteria H and I of Policy SP4. However, concern is expressed over the modified wording in the table within the policy. It is considered too imprecise, meaning that some settlements may see a substantially lower amount of development over the plan period than envisaged in the spatial strategy. This could harm the implementation of criterion H.</p> <p>The development requirements for each settlement should be expressed as minimums. The adoption of this approach would provide greater certainty relating to the level of housing needed in each settlement over the plan period. It would also mean that the distribution of housing is better aligned with the overall housing requirement, which is also expressed as a minimum.</p> | <p>The Council disagree that the modified wording in the policy table would mean that some settlements could see significantly lower levels of housing growth than the spatial strategy envisages. The policy table has been modified to show a settlement's provision for the plan period as a whole rather than to yearly averages, but still qualified by the indication that the figures are 'approximate', so some variation is expected. To express the figures as 'minimum' provision in each case would recast the policy and goes beyond the subject matter of the Main Modification.</p> <p>The insertion of the word 'minimum' for each settlement's planned growth would probably introduce unnecessary and immediate pressure to provide more housing in the plan's smaller settlements than that which has been allocated in the Local Plan. This unnecessary pressure for growth, having allocated and</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|----------------------|---|--|
| | | | <p>provided for more than sufficient land for housing, would potentially also be in conflict with the NPPF plan led approach. The purpose of the revised wording of the policy table and relevant supporting text is to broadly maintain the overall distribution of growth in accordance with the conclusions of the plan's spatial strategy and sustainability appraisal. Through Policy SP4's criterion to allow the release of housing on unallocated land adjoining settlements if their planned growth is not being met, the plan's spatial strategy will not be put at risk.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM8 | Historic England 017 | <p>As originally worded, the original Criteria J.c. and K.c. ii appeared to encompass more than simply the conservation of heritage assets. Moreover, since any type of development could, potentially, be used to justify Enabling Development, it was unclear why it was limited to housing in Tier 5 Settlements and in the open countryside.</p> <p>In addition, since it is the conflict with planning Policies which is the test, Enabling Development may be justified within settlements on sites safeguarded by Local Plan Policies (such as undeveloped areas within settlements). This modification addresses the shortcomings of the Criteria in the Submission Plan.</p> | No response required. |

| | | | |
|-----|------------------|---|--|
| MM8 | R Pringle 036 | <p>MM8 is unsound and not legally compliant for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The changes to the policies map are not reflected in the corresponding part of the plan (the table in the policy on page 16 of the Draft Schedule on Main Modifications). <p>The policies map has removed the 'brownfield' Carla Beck site, Carleton, from the plan and this makes sense because the Inspector asked the Council to update housing need and numbers as regularly as every 3 months. (The developer of this site has chosen to build only 4 houses instead of the originally allocated 24 houses). However, as a direct consequence of this change the policy table should show a reduced planned level of growth for Carleton from 55 to 35 dwellings to make the plan sound.</p> <p>The representation considers that corresponding increases need to be made in the numbers needed in the tier 2 villages of Settle and Bentham in line with the policies in the plan. This is what the Council informed the Inspector during the examination.</p> <p>If the plan seeks to build the 20 houses lost on the Carla Beck site elsewhere in the village of Carleton then the policies in the plan are unsound.</p> <p>The representation refers to dialogue that took place during the discussions of Matter 4 at the examination hearing.</p> <p>The figures for Carleton need (the planned growth for housing) to be amended from 1.2% and 55 dwellings to 0.8% and 35 dwellings, and the figures for Bentham and Settle</p> | <p>The policies map accompanying the local plan is no longer marking the Carla Beck Farm site at Carleton as a housing commitment for 24 dwellings. The latest planning approval on the site is for 4 dwellings and this is below the threshold for marking sites on the policies map. This position reflects the discussion the Council had with the Inspector at the examination on housing land supply. The Inspector's view was that the plan's future housing land supply should only account for 4 dwellings on this site, as this represented the most up to date intentions of the landowner. The Council's view expressed at the examination was that the site should remain as having a potential yield of 24 dwellings.</p> <p>The representation correctly indicates that, during plan preparation, there have been relatively minor adjustments made to the level of growth of some settlements compared to those recommended as the preferred growth option in the plan's sustainability appraisal of spatial strategy options published in April 2016 (Examination document Sp001). These adjustments and the reasons behind them were discussed at the examination hearing and set out in the Council's response to the Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions (Question 6, Issue 2, Matter 4). The updated position on the planning permission at Carla Beck Farm was also discussed at the examination hearing.</p> <p>These discussions did not result in an Inspector's recommendation to change the planned growth of any settlements listed in the policy table. Hence, there is no proposed modification to the percentage of growth or the dwelling numbers planned for in Carleton. (The MM8 change in the policy table merely replaces an</p> |
|-----|------------------|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>need changing from 10.9% and 501 dwellings to 11.1% and 511 dwellings.</p> | <p>annual dwelling delivery figure with a whole plan period dwelling delivery figure for each settlement). The consultation recently undertaken was to seek views on the proposed modifications and not those parts of the plan that have already been the subject of consultation and examination. Therefore a change to the planned growth levels of any settlement's planned level of growth is outside the scope of this consultation.</p> <p>The representation appears to refer to the plan's policies as being able to 'move' housing that might be 'lost' in one tier of settlements to another tier of settlements. This is not the case. The plan's policy approach, which is the same as that contained in the Publication Draft Plan and which was discussed at length at the examination hearing, is <u>to ensure that the planned level of growth for each settlement is met within that settlement</u>. (see Council's response to representations on MM7 above). Policy SP4 provides the mechanism for this to take place.</p> <p>The Council's view remains, that whilst it may be prudent to adopt a cautious approach from a housing monitoring position and reduce the housing supply figure to 4 for this site, as it currently stands without any development on the site, the site may still yield a significantly higher number of dwellings up to 24 dwellings. Furthermore, the village has, since September 2017, seen permissions for 8 new dwellings in the form of windfall development. The latter were not taken into account when the Publication Draft Plan was published and the planned level of settlement growth in Policy SP4 was put forward.</p> <p>Therefore, in considering whether to change the</p> |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | | proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| MM8 | CTS (Rural Solutions) 046 | Strong support for Proposed Main Modification MM8 regarding policy SP4 Spatial Strategy and Housing Growth which makes the policy more effective, in particular the additional text in criterion I, sub-criterion a), which clarifies that Bolton Abbey should receive limited new housing during the plan period; such housing will help to maintain the economic viability of the relatively high amount of employment uses at Bolton Abbey and also reduce the related carbon footprint of journeys to work, thus making the settlement even more sustainable than at present | No response required |
| MM8 | B Martin 182 | <p>MM8 is unsound, not legally compliant and not in compliance with the Duty to Cooperate because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The changes proposed on the policies map are not reflected in the policy table <p>The new owner/developer's non-business decision on the Carla Beck site at Carleton to reduce the sites' housing yield should not affect or influence planning policy. As a result, Carleton's established allocation figures should stand (including the 24 at Carla Beck), otherwise a dangerous precedent would be set.</p> | See response to representation 036 on MM8 above |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|
| MM8 | A Dowbiggin 264 | <p>MM8 is unsound and not in compliance with the Duty to Cooperate because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The housing numbers planned for in Carleton should be reduced to ensure that they: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflect the reduction in housing yield from 24 to 4 at the Carla Beck Farm site at Carleton, Will allow the level of growth in each settlement tier to be achieved Comply with the plan's spatial strategy Satisfy the legal requirements of the NPPF in sections 157 and 182. <p>It should also be made clear that if housing allocations are lost in the individual Tiers then what is the strategy for replacing those allocations?</p> | See response to representation 036 on MM8 above |
| | | | |
| MM10 SK089 & SK090 | Wilman family (Carter Jonas) 008 | <p>MM10 is sound.</p> <p>Policy SP5 Strategy for Skipton Tier 1: Changes proposed through this Modification mainly suggest clarifications to the figures. On the face of it these are accepted as indicative figures. Our concerns regarding the net area and yield remain.</p> <p>The two layouts commissioned by CDC (EL5.002a & EL5.002b) are simplistic and do not reflect the true nature of the site, constraints, flood risk (on SK089), drainage infrastructure and geography resulting in an unrealistic yield, which the indicative layout for the SK089 part of the overall site suggests is 54 dwellings.</p> | <p>The site references in the representation have been incorrectly ascribed. For clarity the site reference relating to the part of the site allocation owned by the Wilman family is SK089 and the site reference for the part of the allocation owned by CDC is SK090.</p> <p>CDC note that the indicative figures are accepted.</p> <p>The current scheme for site SK090 prepared by CDC & Barnfield Joint Venture (JV) proposes a yield of 53 dwellings.</p> <p>CDC remains confident that the indicative yield can be achieved for the allocation overall (SK089 & SK090).</p> |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>The representor suggests a more realistic density on a sloping site on the edge of Skipton is about 20 dwellings per hectare and the state that they are aware that the emerging scheme being pursued through the Craven Barnfield JV, comprises of no more than 34 units (equating to 20dph), representing only 60% of the anticipated Local Plan yield. Transposed across the net site (6.8ha), this suggests a yield of 125 units.</p> <p>Furthermore the suggested location for the proposed school does not meet the locational requirements suggested by the County Education Authority (LEA) which would seek to provide the buildings and associated playing fields on a generally level area.</p> <p>Such matters of detail do not render the Local Plan unsound; it simply provides uncertainty when a planning application does come forward.</p> <p>We would suggest a collaborative approach with regard to delivery of infrastructure and the SK089 site through the Council's JV with Barnfield Construction.</p> | <p>The issue of the location of the proposed primary school was discussed during the examination hearing sessions and these discussions led to the main modifications proposed.</p> <p>CDC would also encourage a collaborative approach to the delivery of sites SK090 & SK089.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM10 SK081, SK082 & SK108 | R Stuttard 211 | <p>MM10 is not in compliance with the Duty to Cooperate. MM10 states that the number of proposed houses has changed from 324 to 339, an increase of 15 extra houses. This will probably create 15 more cars, travelling on Rockwood Drive during rush hours. This road is already congested with parked cars on both sides, resulting in single way traffic.</p> | <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|------|----------------------|---|-----------------------|
| MM11 | Natural England 051 | Natural England notes and welcomes this modification which sets out the requirements for mitigating for recreational disturbance in line with the recommendations of the Habitat Regulations Assessment. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM14 | Historic England 017 | MM14 is sound. This site lies within the Skipton Conservation Area. The proposed Modification better expresses the requirements for any development proposals insofar as they affect the Conservation Area. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM15 | Historic England 017 | MM15 is sound. This site lies within the Skipton Conservation Area. The proposed Modification better expresses the requirements for any development proposals insofar as they affect the Conservation Area. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM17 | Historic England 017 | MM17 is sound We support the proposed Modifications which relate to the green infrastructure provision and the retention of the tree copses to the south-east of the site. These reflect the recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment and will help to ensure that the site is developed in a manner which will conserve the character of this part of the Skipton Conservation Area. | No response required. |

| | | | |
|------|------------------------|---|--|
| MM17 | Natural England 051 | Natural England notes and welcomes this modification which sets out the requirements for mitigating for recreational disturbance in line with the recommendations of the Habitat Regulations Assessment. | No response required. |
| MM17 | TRCPR (Youngs RPS) 054 | <p>MM17 is unsound.</p> <p>In respect of site SK081, SK082 and SK108 (incorporating SK080a) - support for the Council's modification of the Policies Map to remove the defined boundaries for Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>Objection to the need to add a blanket Green Infrastructure designation across the housing allocation, when the requirement for Green Infrastructure will already be set out in the development principles under Policy SP5.</p> <p>Objection to the locational references in the development principles for this site, specifically the references to the north and western boundary, which is in the ownership of our client. There is no evidence in the supporting assessment documents to the Draft Local Plan that indicates that the north and western boundary of the site is the most appropriate location for Green Infrastructure. MM17 relating to green infrastructure on this site is considered to be entirely unjustified and as such makes the draft Local Plan unsound.</p> <p>In responding to Matter 5, Issue 2, Question 19, raised by the Inspector, CDC stated that "the evidence for the identification of this area of green infrastructure is provided in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) (October 2017)". CDC also stated that this area of Green Infrastructure is provided "to mitigate against and reduce the identified visual impacts" ... and "to mitigation against landscape impact on the Yorkshire Dales National Park (YDNP), which is located to the north west of the site."</p> | <p>Support for the removal of defined boundaries for green infrastructure (GI) on the site is noted.</p> <p>The points raised by the representor were discussed during the examination hearing sessions and these discussions led to the main modifications proposed.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>However, the Council had decided the boundary for Green Infrastructure long before the date of this assessment, with the boundary set exactly to the split of ownership between our client and the Council, and no other tangible evidence apparent.</p> <p>Representor's view that the LVIA 2017 demonstrates that this area would have the least visual impact if developed.</p> <p>Representor has undertaken and submitted their own viewpoint analysis highlighting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that the north and west area of the site is the least visible from the YDNP and the most developable, being flat and well contained. • With regard to the impact on the Conservation Area, the majority of the north and western area of the site is completely screened from the Conservation Area by the Computershare Building and the Local Green Space designation adjacent to Gargrave Road. <p>The Council suggests that there needs to be a buffer to the Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) in the interests of biodiversity. Yet the Sustainability Appraisal (March 2018) specifically states that "Development is likely to have a low impact on biodiversity value". There was no requirement for a buffer to be provided for the SINC in respect of the Higher Raikes housing development.</p> <p>Enhancements to biodiversity can be addressed through Green Infrastructure provision across this site and it does not need to be limited to the north and western boundary.</p> <p>All references in the development principles to the location of the proposed Green Infrastructure should be removed,</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>allowing the most appropriate location for Green Infrastructure to be determined through a comprehensive masterplanning exercise, including a LVIA and Biodiversity Appraisal, both of which are already stated as a requirement in the development principles.</p> <p>The proposed modification 'MM17' should be revised as below:</p> <p>...This is a greenfield site in a prominent position on the edge of Skipton, in relatively close proximity to the Yorkshire Dales National Park and a SINC. Development proposals for this site will incorporate a Green Infrastructure corridor measuring approximately 3.5ha along the north and western boundary of the site to provide landscape mitigation for the Yorkshire Dales National Park, the SINC and the adjoining Skipton Conservation Area. It will also provide new PROW connections with the existing residential area at Rockwood, Aireville Park and the Railway Station beyond to deliver recreational walking opportunities aimed at relieving pressure on the North Pennines Special Protection Area (SPA) & Special Area of Conservation (SAC).</p> <p>...The Masterplan will define areas of green infrastructure based on the second development principle set out above <u>the conclusions of the LVIA and Biodiversity Appraisal</u>; show land safeguarded for a new primary school, if required; demonstrate connectivity of the site with the surrounding area and PROW network and will demonstrate how all the development principles for this site are to be addressed.</p> | |
| MM17 | R Stuttard 211 | <p>MM17 is not in compliance with the Duty to Cooperate. MM17 (site SK081 SK082 SK108) states "If the safeguarded area is no longer required for a primary school-additional residential development will be acceptable in principle."</p> | <p>The principle of allocating this site for new residential development and a new primary school is not subject to a main modification.</p> |

| | | | |
|------|-----------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>If additional residential development is built on this land it will create even worse traffic problems on Rockwood Drive. If a new primary school is built, traffic bringing children up Rockwood Drive in the morning will also increase the traffic problem and this will have an impact on congestion on Gargrave Road.</p> | <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM17 | P Brewer 232 | <p>MM17 is unsound. Objection to allocation of this site on grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development will not be supported by existing infrastructure e.g., access, drains. • Site of proposed primary school is where the Raikeswood Prisoner of War Camp was located. Archaeological remains would be destroyed by school and residential development. • New school or additional housing would be detrimental to the existing community and out of scale for the local area. • Development of a large greenfield site would result in loss of wildlife, flora and fauna. • Development would have a detrimental effect on the westerly approach to Skipton and would damage the towns 'Gateway To The Dales' philosophy. | <p>The principle of allocating this site for new residential development and a new primary school is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM17 | J & M Collings 243 | <p>MM17 is not legally compliant, is unsound and is not in compliance with the Duty to Cooperate. Previous consultation responses are not listened to. People making decisions do not live here. Site contains vast amount of wildlife including rare bird, deer & pheasants. Number of houses has increased on the site, existing schools at maximum and traffic is appalling. Build on brownfield sites and protect greenfield sites should</p> | <p>The principle of allocating this site for new residential development and a new primary school is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |

| | | | |
|------|------------------|---|--|
| | | be not built on. Keep Skipton quiet and beautiful for future generations. | |
| MM17 | S Crolla 244 | The plan to build 300+ houses has been made surreptitiously. This is the first I have heard of it. Development of this site would alter desirability and character of the town. I understand the houses would not be affordable. Existing access to Park Wood Way is poor, and Gargrave Road is already strained due to Keelham Farm Shop, access to the park, and a number of schools. Existing schools are full and other existing infrastructure is at capacity. There must be brownfield sites available. | The principle of allocating this site for new residential development and a new primary school is not subject to a main modification. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| MM17 | R Bridges 266 | MM17 is unsound. Sustainability Report identifies four possible access routes to the site, including Park Wood Way and Park Wood Drive. Objection to these two residential streets being used to access the site. More than 500 cars would use these routes on a daily basis in addition to traffic generated from a new primary school. It should be stipulated that the site should not be accessed via Park Wood Way and Park Wood Drive as it would be dangerous and inappropriate. Access via Gargrave Road is acknowledged to be possible by NYCC Highways therefore access via residential streets is not necessary. | The principle of allocating this site for new residential development and a new primary school is not subject to a main modification. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| MM17 | R Copley 267 | MM17 is unsound. In terms of justification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are between 339 and 400 houses needed in Skipton? • Unless the intakes of the existing two popular selective schools in Skipton change, there will not be places at them for any school-age children resident in | The principle of allocating this site for new residential development and a new primary school is not subject to a main modification. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that |

| | | | |
|------|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | <p>the new development (other than by displacement).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development is bigger than the existing Rockwood Estate, with only a single entrance and exit. It would be shapeless urban sprawl. <p>In terms of effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will be a stand-alone community with no integration with the existing Rockwood Estate. Proposed new development would equally face away from Rockwood, with its main spine located much closer to the HML/ComputerShare side of the area. What is being proposed is merely suburban sprawl, not any cohesive attempt at community building. The modification makes no mention of how access to, and exit from, this development would occur. It appears that this can only be on its south side, at Gargrave Road, next to Aireville Grange and opposite the entrance to the Craven College/Craven Leisure Centre complex entrance road. | no change is required. |
| | | | |
| MM19 | Natural England 051 | Natural England notes and welcomes this modification which sets out the requirements for mitigating for recreational disturbance in line with the recommendations of the Habitat Regulations Assessment. | No response required. |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|------|--|---|--|
| MM20 | Wilman family (Carter Jonas) 008 | <p>MM20 is sound.</p> <p>Discussion with the LEA (Local Education Authority) suggest that a “nursery provision” may be attached to a primary school, hence the extent of the potential land requirement.</p> <p>It would be appropriate for the policy wording to suggest “and up to 1.8has for the provision of a new school”. This would reflect the comments of the LEA.</p> <p>The explanatory part of the Policy now includes a review mechanism (linked to INF6) should the educational need for a new school fall away or the format of the requirement change. The principle is supported of providing a new school for this part of the town; however, some flexibility is required and we would suggest changes to the narrative as it is highly likely that any education provision will be located on SK090. “A new primary school will be provided on up to 1.8 ha of the area of sites SK089 & SK090 to meet the educational requirements for Skipton, over the plan period, unless this identified educational need is met elsewhere in the town. If a new primary school is no longer required on this site, as determined by the Local Education Authority and in accordance with Policy INF6, residential development will be acceptable in principle, subject to meeting other local plan policies.”</p> <p>Changes to the narrative include reference to green infrastructure provision and “to maintain the open rural feel”, particularly for the existing PROW’s (footpaths), and safe walking routes to the school site. We would suggest reference is made simply to the school and removal of the word “primary”. The inference from this narrative is a relatively low density open aspect development, unlike the</p> | <p>The part of the site allocation owned by the Wilman family has been identified incorrectly in the representation as SK090. The correct site reference for the part of the site allocation specified in MM20 is SK089.</p> <p>Support for the review mechanism (linked to INF6) should the identified primary educational need be met elsewhere in the town is noted.</p> <p>Support for the main modification relating to access is noted.</p> <p>The points raised by the representor were discussed during the examination hearing sessions and these discussions led to the main modifications proposed. The reference to the provision of a new primary school on 1.8ha of the site reflected the most up to date position of the education authority and was not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector’s attention is drawn to the Council’s view that no change is required.</p> |
|------|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>layout commissioned by the Council (EL5.002a & b).</p> <p>Amendments to the narrative about access (deletion of "Otley Road") are supported and provide a greater degree of clarity.</p> <p>With regard (cross) reference to INF7, we would accept that there are likely to be consequences to the local highway network with new development coming forward. It is appropriate that a contribution to the A6131/A65 located to the east of the site may be suitable. However, it not clear what level of impact there will be upon the operation of the A65/Gargrave Road/A629/A59 junction as it is located on the opposite side of the town and unlikely to be affected by development of the SK089/090 site. We would request that this element of the Modification is deleted.</p> | |
| MM20 | Natural England 051 | Natural England notes and welcomes this modification which sets out the requirements for mitigating for recreational disturbance in line with the recommendations of the Habitat Regulations Assessment. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM21 | Natural England 051 | Natural England notes and welcomes this modification which sets out the requirements for mitigating for recreational disturbance in line with the recommendations of the Habitat Regulations Assessment. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM22 | Canal & Rivers Trust 015 | <p>MM22 is unsound.</p> <p>Although the Trust do not object in principle to the proposed modification in respect of site SK101, we wish to highlight</p> | In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that |

| | | | |
|------|----------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>that the new wording, which states that a PROW will be created along the proposed green infrastructure corridor, could indirectly encourage the removal of mature vegetation on site.</p> <p>The Trust are concerned that the MM22 implies that a PROW will be created along the canal itself (which forms a central part of the green infrastructure corridor). As a result, there is a risk that a new footpath or other PROW could require the removal of trees. The existing vegetation adds significantly to the existing character of the canal and also provides a habitat for wildlife. As such, their removal could be contrary to the aims of draft policies ENV3 and ENV4 of this Local Plan document and also the aims of paragraph 170 (part d) of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to avoid harm to biodiversity.</p> <p>The Trust advise that, in the event that the PROW is promoted in the site allocation, the wording should imply that the route should safeguard existing trees on site which are fundamental to the function of the Green Infrastructure Network.</p> | <p>in the interests of clarity a further modification to MM22 (set out in italics) would be supported in respect of the development principle relating to the creation of a GI corridor and a the creation of a PROW within it as follows:</p> <p>Development on this site will be set back from the Leeds & Liverpool Canal to provide <u>create</u> an area of green infrastructure of <u>approximately 0.6ha. within the site</u> <u>A PROW will be created along the proposed green infrastructure corridor which will to promote urban short walks for exercise and recreation and to provide pedestrian links from the site to the surrounding footpath network.</u> <u><i>In designing and creating a new PROW within the proposed green infrastructure corridor an assessment of the existing vegetation on the site will be required with appropriate mitigation incorporated into development proposals where necessary in order to avoid unnecessary loss of existing vegetation.</i></u></p> |
| | | | |
| MM23 | Historic England 017 | <p>MM23 is sound.</p> <p>To the south-east of this area there is a series of Scheduled Monuments. Although the Heritage Impact Assessment considered that the impact upon the Scheduled Monuments themselves would be negligible, nevertheless, there still may be potential for archaeological remain on this site. The proposed Modification better-expresses the requirements relating to archaeology.</p> | No response required. |

| | | | |
|------|---|--|--|
| MM23 | Natural England 051 | Natural England notes and welcomes this modification which sets out the requirements for mitigating for recreational disturbance in line with the recommendations of the Habitat Regulations Assessment. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM26 | Henry Boot Dev. Ltd (ELG Town Planning) 029 | <p>MM26 is unsound.</p> <p>H Boot continue to fully support the continued allocation of Site SK049 for B1, B2 and B8 Employment Uses as allotted in Policy SP5. They note the rounding- down of the site area figure to 6ha and accept this as a minor administrative change that has no implications for the actual site area that is available for development.</p> <p>The representor also fully accepts that: any development proposals on Site SK049 must be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment and drainage strategy and that the Flood Risk Assessment will need to incorporate the findings of both the Environment Agency's Skipton Flood Alleviation Post-Scheme Modelling Report for Eller Beck and Waller Hill Beck and the District Council's Post Scheme Modelling Report for the Ings Beck and Gallow Syke Water Management Project and demonstrate that the proposed B1, B2 and B8 uses can be accommodated on land falling outside Flood Zone 3b.</p> <p>Object to MM26 and specifically the development principles which states that "access to the site will be gained from Ings Lane. A possible additional access point is via the Wyvern Park development scheme". It makes significantly more sense from a planning, accessibility, journey time, and highway safety perspective to identify the Wyvern Park link to the A629 as the primary access route for SK049 with Ings</p> | <p>If the Inspector considers it necessary in his final report to recommend a change to the proposed modification for the third development principle, the following change (in italics) is considered appropriate by the Council:</p> <p>Access to the site will be gained <u>via the Wyvern Park development scheme, which has consent for business/employment floorspace and residential dwellings to the south east of the site and from Ings Lane in order to achieve connectivity with Skipton town centre.</u> A possible additional access point is</p> |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Lane/ Engine Shed Lane the secondary option for local traffic.</p> <p>H Boot Developments Ltd would seek the following rewording of the second paragraph of MM26:</p> <p>‘Access to the site will be gained from the Wyvern Park development scheme which has consent for business/employment floorspace and residential dwellings to the south east of the site. A possible additional access point is via Ings Lane /Engine Shed Lane to the north.’</p> <p>Alternatively no preference/ primacy should be expressed in the plan with both access routes being identified as possible options.</p> | |
| | | | |
| MM27 (misquoted MM76 in rep) | Historic England 017 | <p>MM27 is unsound.</p> <p>This site adjoins the boundary of the Skipton Conservation Area. The Heritage Impact Assessment considered that a development of SK113 which ignores the presence of the canal and which simply backs on to it with a domestic rear gardens and/or a hard, blank boundary would have a Moderate Adverse impact on the current semi-rural setting of this part of the canal. Consequently, it recommended that any development should be set back from the canal by 15 metres. The deletion of a specific distance by which any buildings should be set back from the canal makes the Policy less clear and, therefore, less effective.</p> | <p>NB. The main modification referred to by Historic England has been identified incorrectly in the representation as MM76. The correct main modification reference relating to site SK113 is MM27.</p> <p>The issue of deleting the specified set back distance of 15m for any development was discussed during the examination hearing session on residential allocations, with the Inspector raising concerns that setting out a precise specified distance may be too prescriptive. However the representor has pointed out that the evidence for including this distance is set out at para 3.6.5 on page 43 of The Heritage Impact Assessment (Oct 2016) (Examination library ref: He020).</p> <p>If the Inspector considers it necessary in his final report</p> |

| | | | |
|------|---------------------|--|--|
| | | | <p>to recommend a change to the proposed modification of the first development principle, the following change (in italics) is considered appropriate by the Council:</p> <p>The site adjoins the Skipton Conservation Area and is in a prominent location on the Leeds & Liverpool Canal at an important gateway to the town. Therefore, the developer is required to carry out a detailed assessment of the likely impact of development on the character and appearance of area, including the conservation area and its setting, and to incorporate any necessary mitigation measures into the proposals. Special attention will be paid to the proposed siting, design, layout and landscaping of development to ensure that the character and appearance of the area is not adversely affected with <u>and</u> any buildings <u>should be</u> set back from the canal <u>by at least 15 metres.</u></p> |
| | | | |
| MM30 | Natural England 051 | Natural England notes and welcomes this modification to site SG021, SG066, SG080 which sets out the requirements for mitigating for recreational disturbance in line with the recommendations of the Habitats Regulations Assessment | No response required. |
| MM30 | K Hamflett 075 | The new map for site SG021, SG066, SG080 seems to suggest that it is now proposed that access to the houses within the development will now only be from Cammock Lane. Please can you confirm whether this is indeed correct? | <p>The representation has revealed a drafting error in the Publication Draft Local Plan and the Schedule of Main Modifications, both of which state that</p> <p>“Access to the site is to be gained from Penny Green.”</p> <p>As such, and if the Inspector considers it necessary in</p> |

| | | | |
|------|----------------------|---|--|
| | | | <p>his final report to recommend a change to the proposed modification, the following change (in italics) is considered appropriate by the Council:-</p> <p>“Access to the site is to be gained from <i>Cammock Lane.</i>”</p> |
| | | | |
| MM31 | Historic England 017 | <p>MM31 is unsound.</p> <p>The development of this site could affect the setting of the Grade II Listed Falcon Manor Hotel and the Settle-Carlisle Railway Conservation Area. The deletion from the Policies Map of the area at the centre of the site which is intended to be kept open has made the implementation of this Policy considerably less clear and, therefore, less effective.</p> <p>Without a clear spatial depiction of where the green infrastructure is required the Policy needs to be more specific about where these areas should be provided. It is also important to remember that the open area in the centre of the site was considered necessary to safeguard the setting of the Grade II Listed Building at the Falcon Manor hotel.</p> <p>Therefore, an amendment is needed to better-articulate where this open space is needed.</p> <p>Policy SP6, Site SK025, modification relating to the open space at the centre of the site amend to read:-</p> <p><i>“... including green infrastructure areas of approximately</i></p> | <p>NB. The site has been identified incorrectly in the representation as SK025. The site reference for the site specified in MM31 is SG025.</p> <p>If the Inspector considers it necessary in his final report to recommend a change to the proposed modification, the change suggested by the representor is considered appropriate by the Council in the interests of providing greater clarity to the description of green infrastructure on the site.</p> |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | <i>7.5ha in the following two areas – along the western edge of the site besides the B6480, and to the south of the Listed Falcon Manor Hotel linking with the approved ‘water meadow’ ...</i> | |
| MM31 | Natural England 051 | Natural England notes and welcomes this modification to site SG025 which sets out the requirements for mitigating for recreational disturbance in line with the recommendations of the Habitats Regulations Assessment | No response required. |
| MM31 (misquoted MM39 in rep) | P Cochrane, ROOTS 231 | <p>MM31 is unsound.</p> <p>There is concern over loss of trees, which provide valuable contribution to public health, take-up ground water (reducing the need for man-made surface water drainage solutions), and give their new their new urban settings character and year-round interest.</p> <p>The zoning on the draft plan respects the nature of the land with the lower, wetter area - the outfall of Lodge Gill - being designated as either Existing Green Infrastructure Commitment or Housing Allocation.</p> <p>The re-designation of this area as Green Infrastructure Provision on Housing Allocation actually threatens the loss of the existing green infrastructure. It allows the justification for potentially inconsiderate and inappropriate development with little regard to environmental realities of the land.</p> <p>The modification should be rejected.</p> | <p>NB. The representor has misquoted the main modification as MM39. Details of the representation seem to indicate that it relates to MM31.</p> <p>The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector’s attention is drawn to the Council’s view that no change is required.</p> |
| | | | |
| MM32 | Natural England | Natural England notes and welcomes this modification to site SG027, SG068 which sets out the requirements for | No response required. |

| | | | |
|------|--|--|---|
| | 051 | mitigating for recreational disturbance in line with the recommendations of the Habitats Regulations Assessment | |
| MM32 | Francmanis Properties (Planning Potential) 062 | <p>MM32 is Legally Compliant, Sound, and In Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>Principles in agreement: The representation supports the Council's intention to allocate the land to the South of Brockhole View and West of Brockhole Lane, Settle for residential development identified under site reference SG027 and SG068.</p> <p>The additional clarity regarding the extent and purpose of the Green Infrastructure is supported, as is the requirement for the accompanying suite of technical documents to ensure that any development proposals brought forward are suitable and acceptable with consideration given to all the site-specific considerations. This includes the requirement for an archaeological assessment as well as those put forward in the earlier iteration of the policy such as Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA); Biodiversity Appraisal; Flood Risk & Drainage Assessment; design cues and; and access being taken via Brockhole View.</p> <p>Comments for consideration: It is important that some flexibility is applied when assessing the extent of the Green Infrastructure towards the southwest and east extremes of site allocation SG027 and SG068. Whilst it is important that Green Infrastructure is provided and secured by policy to mitigate any impact on the surrounding views and the YDNP, it is necessary that its requirement is not applied so rigidly such that it prevents a viable and feasible scheme from coming forward (i.e. strictly</p> | In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |

| | | | |
|------|----------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>in accordance with that indicatively shown on the draft allocation).</p> <p>The representor would encourage and welcome the inclusion of supporting text, which states that flexibility is applied when assessing the extent of the Green Infrastructure towards the southwest and east extremes of site allocation SG027 and SG068.</p> | |
| | | | |
| MM34 | United Utilities 010 | <p>We are still very disappointed to see no reference to SuDS within the Development Principles for site SG035. The national ministerial statement on Sustainable Drainage is clear that major development sites such as this should include sustainable drainage. Even on brownfield and town centre sites, the inclusion of innovative approaches to sustainable drainage should be considered by the developer and encouraged by the local planning authority.</p> <p>At the very least we recommend that the development principle for SG035 outlines the need to consider sustainable surface water management in accordance with the principles of sustainable drainage within national planning practice guidance. This should include consideration of how site landscaping can contribute to a reduction in surface water flows and a reduction in flood risk. We request that this change is made to the respective Development Principle.</p> | <p>This issue was addressed in MIQs and at hearing sessions. It was agreed that the requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for any site over 1ha and the requirement for SuDS are standard development management requirements and, in terms of local plan policy, properly dealt with under policy ENV6. It was also agreed, therefore, that site allocation Development Principles (DPs) requiring FRAs and SuDS should only be necessary where the Council has identified specific fluvial or surface water hazards within an allocated site and that DPs should be clear about what and where those hazards are. The Council believes that the approach agreed at the hearings and the resulting modifications are appropriate.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| | | | |
| MM35 | Historic | MM35 is sound | NB. The site has been incorrectly identified in the |

| | | | |
|------|----------------------------|---|---|
| | England 017 | <p>This site adjoins the boundary of the Settle-Carlisle Line Conservation Area. Barrel Sykes Farm to the north is a Grade II Listed Building.</p> <p>We support the proposed Modifications relating to the green infrastructure which set out more explicitly where the landscape mitigation measures will be required and how the significance of the heritage assets in the vicinity of this site should be conserved.</p> | <p>representation as SK079. The site reference for the site specified in MM35 is SG079.</p> <p>No response required</p> |
| MM35 | Natural England 051 | Natural England notes and welcomes this modification to site SG079 which sets out the requirements for mitigating for recreational disturbance in line with the recommendations of the Habitats Regulations Assessment. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM36 | Historic England 017 | <p>MM36 is sound.</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).</p> <p>We support the proposed Modifications relating to these heritage assets which now sets out more explicitly the requirements regarding their conservation.</p> | <p>NB. The site has incorrectly been identified in the representation as SK042. The site reference for the site specified in MM36 is SG042.</p> <p>No response required.</p> |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|--|---|---|
| MM39 | Historic England 017 | <p>MM39 is sound.</p> <p>This site lies close to the boundary of the Settle-Carlisle Railway Conservation Area.</p> <p>We support the proposed Modifications relating to these heritage assets which now sets out more explicitly the requirements regarding their conservation.</p> | No response required. |
| MM39 | Natural England 051 | <p>Natural England notes and welcomes this modification to site SG064 which sets out the requirements for mitigating for recreational disturbance in line with the recommendations of the Habitats Regulations Assessment.</p> <p>As stated previously in their letter dated 13 February 2018 (NE ref. 234760) Natural England has an outstanding objection on a planning application coming forward on this site (Council ref. 62/2017/18064).</p> | <p>No response required.</p> <p>The planning application referenced by the representor has been approved by Planning Committee on 24th September 2018, subject to the signing of a S106 Agreement.</p> |
| | | | |
| MM40 HB024 | A Dickinson (Edwardson Associates) 013 | <p>Agrees that modifications to site area and approximate yield are effective and reflect evidence concerning site delivery.</p> <p>No changes required.</p> | No response required. |
| MM40 HB025 | T Marshall (Edwardson Associates) 022 | <p>Agrees that modifications to site area and approximate yield are effective and reflect evidence concerning site delivery.</p> <p>No changes required.</p> | No response required. |
| MM40 HB036 | T Marshall (Edwardson Associates) | <p>Agrees that modifications are effective and reflect evidence concerning site delivery – specifically that site no longer available. No changes required.</p> | No response required. |

| | | | |
|---------------|--|--|--|
| | 022 | | |
| MM40 HB038 | T Marshall (Edwardson Associates) 022 | Agrees that modifications to site area and approximate yield are effective and reflect evidence concerning site delivery. No changes required. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM41 | United Utilities 010 | <p>We are still very disappointed to see no reference to SuDS within the Development Principles for site HB011. The national ministerial statement on Sustainable Drainage is clear that major development sites such as this should include sustainable drainage. Even on brownfield and town centre sites, the inclusion of innovative approaches to sustainable drainage should be considered by the developer and encouraged by the local planning authority.</p> <p>At the very least we recommend that the development principle for HB011 outlines the need to consider sustainable surface water management in accordance with the principles of sustainable drainage within national planning practice guidance. This should include consideration of how site landscaping can contribute to a reduction in surface water flows and a reduction in flood risk. We request that this change is made to the respective Development Principle.</p> | <p>This issue was addressed at the examination hearing session on Matter 5. It was agreed that the requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for any site over 1ha and the requirement for SuDS are standard development management requirements and, in terms of local plan policy, properly dealt with under policy ENV6. It was also agreed, therefore, that site allocation Development Principles (DPs) requiring FRAs and SuDS should only be necessary where the Council has identified specific fluvial or surface water hazards within an allocated site and that DPs should be clear about what and where those hazards are. The Council believes that the approach agreed at the hearings and the resulting modifications are appropriate.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM41 | Historic England 017 | Supports the proposed modification of the Development Principle for site HB011 relating to the potential Conservation Area. | No response required. |

| | | | |
|------|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| MM43 | United Utilities 010 | <p>We are still very disappointed to see no reference to SuDS within the Development Principles for site HB024. The national ministerial statement on Sustainable Drainage is clear that major development sites such as this should include sustainable drainage. Even on brownfield and town centre sites, the inclusion of innovative approaches to sustainable drainage should be considered by the developer and encouraged by the local planning authority.</p> <p>At the very least we recommend that the development principle for HB024 outlines the need to consider sustainable surface water management in accordance with the principles of sustainable drainage within national planning practice guidance. This should include consideration of how site landscaping can contribute to a reduction in surface water flows and a reduction in flood risk. We request that this change is made to the respective Development Principle.</p> | <p>This issue was addressed at the examination hearing session on Matter 5. It was agreed that the requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for any site over 1ha and the requirement for SuDS are standard development management requirements and, in terms of local plan policy, properly dealt with under policy ENV6. It was also agreed, therefore, that site allocation Development Principles (DPs) requiring FRAs and SuDS should only be necessary where the Council has identified specific fluvial or surface water hazards within an allocated site and that DPs should be clear about what and where those hazards are. The Council believes that the approach agreed at the hearings and the resulting modifications are appropriate.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM43 | A Dickinson (Edwardson Associates) 013 | Supports the proposed modification to and implementation of the Development Principles for site HB024, and agrees that the modification clarifies and makes the policy effective. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM44 | T Marshall (Edwardson Associates) 022 | Agrees that the proposed modification to Development Principles for flood risk, drainage and the AONB clarifies and makes the policy effective. | No response required. |

| | | | |
|------|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| MM46 | T Marshall (Edwardson Associates) 022 | Agrees with the proposed modification to delete the allocation of site HB036, on the basis that the site is no longer available. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM47 | United Utilities 010 | <p>We are still very disappointed to see no reference to SuDS within the Development Principles for site HB038. The national ministerial statement on Sustainable Drainage is clear that major development sites such as this should include sustainable drainage. Even on brownfield and town centre sites, the inclusion of innovative approaches to sustainable drainage should be considered by the developer and encouraged by the local planning authority.</p> <p>At the very least we recommend that the development principle for HB038 outlines the need to consider sustainable surface water management in accordance with the principles of sustainable drainage within national planning practice guidance. This should include consideration of how site landscaping can contribute to a reduction in surface water flows and a reduction in flood risk. We request that this change is made to the respective Development Principle.</p> | <p>This issue was addressed at the examination hearing session on Matter 5. It was agreed that the requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for any site over 1ha and the requirement for SuDS are standard development management requirements and, in terms of local plan policy, properly dealt with under policy ENV6. It was also agreed, therefore, that site allocation Development Principles (DPs) requiring FRAs and SuDS should only be necessary where the Council has identified specific fluvial or surface water hazards within an allocated site and that DPs should be clear about what and where those hazards are. The Council believes that the approach agreed at the hearings and the resulting modifications are appropriate.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM47 | T Marshall (Edwardson Associates) 022 | Welcomes the proposed modification and confirms the potential for additional land to be made available for a school extension and, therefore, for the whole of site HB038 to be developed for housing. | No response required. |

| | | | |
|------|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| MM48 | A Dickinson (Edwardson Associates) 013 | The owner of site HB024 supports the proposed modification to Development Principles for site HB044. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM49 | A Dickinson (Edwardson Associates) 013 | The owner of site HB024 supports the proposed modification to Development Principles for site HB052. | No response required. |
| MM49 | Natural England 051 | Natural England notes and welcomes this modification which sets out the requirements for mitigating for recreational disturbance in line with the recommendations of the Habitat Regulations Assessment. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM50 | United Utilities 010 | <p>We are still very disappointed to see no reference to SuDS within the Development Principles for site LB012. The national ministerial statement on Sustainable Drainage is clear that major development sites such as this should include sustainable drainage. Even on brownfield and town centre sites, the inclusion of innovative approaches to sustainable drainage should be considered by the developer and encouraged by the local planning authority.</p> <p>At the very least we recommend that the development principle for LB012 outlines the need to consider sustainable surface water management in accordance with the principles of sustainable drainage within national planning practice</p> | This issue was addressed at the examination hearing session on Matter 5. It was agreed that the requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for any site over 1ha and the requirement for SuDS are standard development management requirements and, in terms of local plan policy, properly dealt with under policy ENV6. It was also agreed, therefore, that site allocation Development Principles (DPs) requiring FRAs and SuDS should only be necessary where the Council has identified specific fluvial or surface water hazards within an allocated site and that DPs should be clear about what and where those hazards are. The Council |

| | | | |
|------|----------------------|--|---|
| | | guidance. This should include consideration of how site landscaping can contribute to a reduction in surface water flows and a reduction in flood risk. We request that this change is made to the respective Development Principle. | believes that the approach agreed at the hearings and the resulting modifications are appropriate. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| | | | |
| MM52 | Natural England 051 | Natural England notes and welcomes this modification which sets out the requirements for mitigating for recreational disturbance in line with the recommendations of the Habitat Regulations Assessment. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM55 | Historic England 017 | MM55 is sound. This site lies within the Ingleton Conservation Area and there are several Grade II Listed Buildings in its vicinity. We support the proposed Modifications relating to these heritage assets which now sets out more explicitly the requirements regarding their conservation. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM56 | Historic England 017 | MM56 is sound. This site lies within the Ingleton Conservation Area and there are several Grade II Listed Buildings in its vicinity. | No response required. |

| | | | |
|------|----------------------|---|--|
| | | We support the proposed Modifications relating to these heritage assets which now sets out more explicitly the requirements regarding their conservation. | |
| MM56 | Natural England 051 | NE note the references to landscape buffering in some of the modifications regarding this sites but NE is disappointed to note that the modification MM56 makes no reference to the requirement for LVIA. | <p>The representation has revealed a drafting error in the Schedule of Main Modifications in that this issue was discussed at the examination hearing session on residential allocations relating to sites at Ingleton and it was agreed that the development principles for this site should be modified to include a requirement for an LVIA, given its proximity to the Yorkshire Dales National Park, but in error it was not included in the proposed schedule of Main Modifications.</p> <p>As such, and if the Inspector considers it necessary in his final report to recommend a change to the proposed modification, the following change (in italics) is considered appropriate by the Council:-</p> <p><u><i>A Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is required to assess the likely effects of change on the landscape as a result of the development, specifically on views into and out of the Yorkshire Dales National park. The LVIA will help locate and design the development so that negative landscape effects are avoided, appropriately reduced or offset</i></u></p> |
| | | | |
| MM57 | Historic England 017 | <p>MM57 is sound.</p> <p>This site lies within the Ingleton Conservation Area and there are several Grade II Listed Buildings in its vicinity.</p> | No response required. |

| | | | |
|------|---------------------|---|--|
| | | We support the proposed Modifications relating to these heritage assets which now sets out more explicitly the requirements regarding their conservation. | |
| MM57 | Natural England 051 | NE note the references to landscape buffering in some of the modifications regarding this sites but NE is disappointed to note that the modification MM57 makes no reference to the requirement for LVIA. | <p>The representation has revealed a drafting error in the Schedule of Main Modifications in that this issue was discussed at the examination hearing session on residential allocations relating to sites at Ingleton and it was agreed that the development principles for this site should be modified to include a requirement for an LVIA, given its proximity to the Yorkshire Dales National Park, but in error it was not included in the proposed schedule of Main Modifications.</p> <p>As such, and if the Inspector considers it necessary in his final report to recommend a change to the proposed modification, the following change (in italics) is considered appropriate by the Council:-</p> <p><u><i>A Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is required to assess the likely effects of change on the landscape as a result of the development, specifically on views into and out of the Yorkshire Dales National park. The LVIA will help locate and design the development so that negative landscape effects are avoided, appropriately reduced or offset</i></u></p> |
| | | | |
| MM58 | Natural England 051 | Natural England notes and welcomes this modification which sets out the requirements for mitigating for recreational disturbance in line with the recommendations of the Habitat | No response required. |

| | | | |
|------|----------------------|--|--|
| | | Regulations Assessment. | |
| MM58 | Natural England 051 | <p>NE note the references to landscape buffering in some of the modifications regarding this sites but NE is disappointed to note that the modification MM58 makes no reference to the requirement for LVIA.</p> | <p>The representation has revealed a drafting error in the Schedule of Main Modifications in that this issue was discussed at the examination hearing session on residential allocations relating to sites at Ingleton and it was agreed that the development principles for this site should be modified to include a requirement for an LVIA, given its proximity to the Yorkshire Dales National Park, but in error it was not included in the proposed schedule of Main Modifications.</p> <p>As such, and if the Inspector considers it necessary in his final report to recommend a change to the proposed modification, the following change (in italics) is considered appropriate by the Council:-</p> <p><i><u>A Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is required to assess the likely effects of change on the landscape as a result of the development, specifically on views into and out of the Yorkshire Dales National park. The LVIA will help locate and design the development so that negative landscape effects are avoided, appropriately reduced or offset</u></i></p> |
| | | | |
| MM59 | Historic England 017 | <p>MM59 is sound.</p> <p>There is a grade II Listed Building to the west of this site.</p> <p>We support the proposed Modifications relating to this heritage asset which now sets out more explicitly the</p> | No response required. |

| | | | |
|------|---------------------|---|--|
| | | requirements regarding their conservation. | |
| | | | |
| MM60 | Natural England 051 | NE note the references to landscape buffering in some of the modifications regarding this sites but NE is disappointed to note that the modification MM60 makes no reference to the requirement for LVIA. | <p>The representation has revealed a drafting error in the Schedule of Main Modifications in that this issue was discussed at the examination hearing session on residential allocations relating to sites at Ingleton and it was agreed that the development principles for this site should be modified to include a requirement for an LVIA, given its proximity to the Yorkshire Dales National Park, but in error it was not included in the proposed schedule of Main Modifications.</p> <p>As such, and if the Inspector considers it necessary in his final report to recommend a change to the proposed modification, the following change (in italics) is considered appropriate by the Council:-</p> <p><u><i>A Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is required to assess the likely effects of change on the landscape as a result of the development, specifically on views into and out of the Yorkshire Dales National park. The LVIA will help locate and design the development so that negative landscape effects are avoided, appropriately reduced or offset</i></u></p> |
| | | | |
| MM63 | Natural England 051 | NE note the references to landscape buffering in some of the modifications regarding this sites but NE is disappointed to note that the modification MM63 makes no reference to the | The representation has revealed a drafting error in the Schedule of Main Modifications in that this issue was discussed at the examination hearing session on |

| | | | |
|------|----------------------|--|--|
| | | requirement for LVIA. | <p>residential allocations relating to sites at Gargrave and it was agreed that the development principles for this site should be modified to include a requirement for an LVIA, given its proximity to the Yorkshire Dales National Park, but in error it was not included in the proposed schedule of Main Modifications.</p> <p>As such, and if the Inspector considers it necessary in his final report to recommend a change to the proposed modification, the following change (in italics) is considered appropriate by the Council:-</p> <p><u><i>A Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is required to assess the likely effects of change on the landscape as a result of the development, specifically on views into and out of the Yorkshire Dales National park. The LVIA will help locate and design the development so that negative landscape effects are avoided, appropriately reduced or offset</i></u></p> |
| | | | |
| MM64 | Historic England 017 | This site lies close to the boundary of the Gargrave Conservation Area and some 350m from the edge of a Scheduled Monument. Historic England supports the proposed Modifications relating to these heritage assets which now sets out more explicitly the requirements regarding their conservation. | No response required. |
| MM64 | G Southam 188 | <p>The respondent states that there is an insufficient equality assessment on site G2/4 (GA031 in local plan).</p> <p>Road closures on the A59 and A65 are common. Dog</p> | <p>The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>walkers frequently have issues with speeding traffic on Marton Road. There is a lack of safe access to Gargrave village centre for able bodied parishioners, due to insufficient pavement provision in place already on Marton Road. Marton Road is poorly lit and the respondent urges that a night time inspection is carried out. To enter the village from Marton Road, a person has to travel along Church Street over a grade 2 listed bridge which already exposes parishioners to a great risk and injury. Disabled parishioners (young and old) already struggle with safely travelling into Gargrave from Marton Road. Currently if a disabled person needs to get to Gargrave they cannot do this via train as the station is not accessible for people with disabilities. Sites that are not protected by EU Birds and Habitats Directives should still have consideration when endangered species reside at them. Green spaces are being utilised ineffectively, where more suitable sites are available and more accessible. In terms of designated heritage assets, the site GA031 runs along the side of the Pennine Way footpath. The Grade 2 listed building adjacent to GA031 was not considered. This is not an infill of existing building settlement. There are existing issues which reside with sewers overflowing into residents houses on Marton Road and into the drains which feed into the river. The respondent references Policy G11 which promotes and enhances location recreational facilities. There are no recreation facilities this side of the village where the site is situated, with all facilities on the far extreme of the other side of the village. The 'site sustainability' is car orientated which goes against the aims and objectives of national and local travel. Landscapes such as GA031 are worthy of long term preservation and kept for scenic and environmental value. The representor requires a full equality assessment to be conducted and requires a full biodiversity assessment to be conducted.</p> | <p>modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|------|------------------|---|--|
| MM64 | P Southam 189 | <p>The respondent states that there is an insufficient equality assessment on site G2/4 (GA031 in local plan).</p> <p>Road closures on the A59 and A65 are common. Dog walkers frequently have issues with speeding traffic on Marton Road. There is a lack of safe access to Gargrave village centre for able bodied parishioners, due to insufficient pavement provision in place already on Marton Road. Marton Road is poorly light and the respondent urges that a night time inspection is carried out. To enter the village from Marton Road, a person has to travel along Church Street over a grade 2 listed bridge which already exposes parishioners to a great risk and injury. Disabled parishioners (young and old) already struggle with safely travelling into Gargrave from Marton Road. Currently if a disabled person needs to get to Gargrave they cannot do this via train as the station is not accessible for people with disabilities. Sites that are not protected by EU Birds and Habitats Directives should still have consideration when endangered species reside at them. Green spaces are being utilised ineffectively, where more suitable sites are available and more accessible. In terms of designated heritage assets, the site GA031 runs along the side of the Pennine Way footpath. The Grade 2 listed building adjacent to GA031 was not considered. This is not an infill of existing building settlement. There are existing issues which reside with sewers overflowing into residents houses on Marton Road and into the drains which feed into the river. The respondent references Policy G11 which promotes and enhances location recreational facilities. There are no recreation facilities this side of the village where the site is situated, with all facilities on the far extreme of the other side of the village. The 'site sustainability' is car orientated which goes against the aims and objectives of national and local travel. Landscapes such as GA031 are</p> | <p>The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
|------|------------------|---|--|

| | | | |
|------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | worthy of long term preservation and kept for scenic and environmental value. The representor requires a full equality assessment to be conducted and requires a full biodiversity assessment to be conducted. | |
| MM64 | J Adams 204 | <p>The conditions of development only refer to conserving the significance of heritage assets and a conditional reference to SUDS. This should be widened to bring it in line with SP12 and INF7.</p> <p>The reference to SUDS should be changed from 'will' incorporate....unless this is not possible or feasible to 'must incorporate to ensure no detrimental impact on existing residents and the existing sewage system'. The paragraph should also include reference to 'highways and access to the centre of the village to be improved up to the required standards of the highways authority to ensure the safety of residents, sustainability, access to transport networks and inclusivity'.</p> | <p>The wording of the Main Modification relating to SUDS is considered by the Council to be appropriate. The wording change requested by the representor would be too prescriptive and inflexible and would result in the policy being less effective.</p> <p>The issues raised by the representor in respect of highways and access are addressed within new Policy INF7 : Sustainable Transport and Highways (MM120 and 121).</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM64 | A Wattam 216 | The representation states that there is an insufficient level of equality assessment conducted on site G2/4 (GA031 in local plan). Marton Road is a very badly lit road with very few street lights. There are also no pavements, so it is very dangerous when walking. The respondent walks down to work in the Masons Arms pub and always takes a torch to alert oncoming cars. The respondent recalls two occasions been narrowly missed by oncoming cars. There are cars parked on the road which forces the respondent to walk in the middle of the road. | <p>The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |

| | | | |
|------|------------------|--|---|
| MM64 | A White 217 | The representation states that there is an insufficient level of equality assessment conducted on site G2/4 (GA031 in local plan). Marton Road is a road that requires extreme care either walking or driving. There are no pavements above Walton Road and it is very dark. Traffic has difficulty seeing walkers at night. Speed limits are ignored and parked cars do not help. The pavement passing Walton Road is so narrow, and a person can only walk on it in single file. The representation states that significant investment needs to be made to infrastructure, equality assessment to be conducted with remediating actions put in place. The representation mentions the possibility of an alternative suitable site which will cater for all disadvantaged groups. | The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| MM64 | H Shaw 218 | The representation states that significant investment needs to be made to infrastructure, equality assessment to be conducted with remediating actions put in place. The representation mentions the possibility of an alternative suitable site which will cater for all disadvantaged groups. | The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| MM64 | S Coetzer 226 | The conditions of development only refer to conserving the significance of heritage assets and a conditional reference to SUDS. This should be widened to bring it in line with SP12 and INF7. The reference to SUDS should be changed from 'will' incorporate....unless this is not possible or feasible to 'must incorporate to ensure no detrimental impact on existing residents and the existing sewage system'. The paragraph should also include reference to 'highways and access to the centre of the village to be improved up to the required standards of the highways authority to ensure the safety of residents, sustainability, access to transport networks and | See response to representation 204 for MM64 above |

| | | | |
|------|--------------------|---|--|
| | | inclusivity’. | |
| MM64 | F Hall Coetzer 227 | <p>The conditions of development only refer to conserving the significance of heritage assets and a conditional reference to SUDS. This should be widened to bring it in line with SP12 and INF7.</p> <p>The reference to SUDS should be changed from ‘will’ incorporate....unless this is not possible or feasible to ‘must incorporate to ensure no detrimental impact on existing residents and the existing sewage system’. The paragraph should also include reference to ‘highways and access to the centre of the village to be improved up to the required standards of the highways authority to ensure the safety of residents, sustainability, access to transport networks and inclusivity’.</p> | See response to representation 204 for MM64 above |
| MM64 | A Steele 248 | <p>The representation states that Marton Road has no pedestrian or wheelchair pavement. With vehicles parked on the road bringing more traffic to the area, this will create a danger to the public. The sewer is not adequate for the area as it is, so building more properties will create major problems. The pavement down Marton Road too narrow for wheelchair access and with cars parked outside properties so they have to go to centre of road. It is also stated that a large variety of wildlife frequent the area.</p> <p>The representation states that significant investment needs to be made to infrastructure, equality assessment to be conducted with remediating actions put in place. The representation mentions the possibility of an alternative suitable site which will cater for all disadvantaged groups.</p> | <p>The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector’s attention is drawn to the Council’s view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM64 | H Paulger | The representation states that significant investment needs | The principle of allocating this site for new residential |

| | | | |
|------|-------------------|---|---|
| | 249 | to be made to infrastructure, equality assessment to be conducted with remediating actions put in place. The representation mentions the possibility of an alternative suitable site which will cater for all disadvantaged groups. | development is not subject to a main modification. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| MM64 | I Bradley 250 | There is concern over pedestrian and wheelchair facilities as bringing extra volume of traffic on Marton Road will create safety issues. On many occasions the representor has had to take to the grass verge to avoid traffic approaching from both directions. There is no play area for children so having to use the main road to go to the village playground would also be a safety issue. The proposed site for building on is a haven for wildlife with crested and common newts, frogs, toads, hares, rabbits and even deer. | The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| MM64 | J Downs 251 | Marton Road is dangerous. Traffic going too fast. No pavements. Tractors using the road all the time and going far too fast – never stop for anything. It is certainly not safe for children. Much traffic cuts through onto the Gisburn Road. | The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| MM64 | C Woodhead 252 | There is an insufficient level of equality assessment conducted on site G2/4 (GA031). Regarding an assessment of road usage, the respondent asks how would the extra traffic impact on the safety of Gargrave residents and pedestrians? The road is narrow in place, has an awkward turning onto Marton Road from Church Street. Many tractors use the road and other industrial vehicles. There is no lighting or pavement. There is a nursing home further down the road, wheelchairs are often on the road. Many people from the village walk along the road to get to the canal as a | The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |

| | | | |
|------|--------------------|---|---|
| | | circular route around the village. | |
| MM64 | P Wilson 253 | There is an insufficient level of equality assessment conducted on site G2/4 (GA031 in local plan). Accessibility to the village is poor or no footpaths. Over the bridge into the village is too narrow regarding accessibility. Gradient up the hill is too steep for older people. There is also the issue of road safety and traffic, especially tractors driving too fast. | The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| MM64 | T Meehan 255 | There is an insufficient level of equality assessment conducted on site G2/4 (GA031 in local plan). Accessibility for all abilities not discriminating against minority groups or individuals. Site is not inclusive and does not cater at all. It discriminates against minority group with disabilities. The site is not easy to access, the road is dangerous and there is significant deficiency in pavements. Disabled, parents with children, and walkers are put at significant risk by having to use the highway to travel on foot. There is an inherent issue with this site and its location, speeding cars, road visibility, safety of pedestrians. This rural location does not offer opportunities on foot to use recreational facilities, as it is car orientated which goes against sustainability objectives of national and local travel. The representation states that significant investment needs to be made to infrastructure, equality assessment to be conducted with remediating actions put in place. The representation mentions the possibility of an alternative suitable site which will cater for all disadvantaged groups. | The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| MM64 | D Aldersley 256 | There is an insufficient level of equality assessment conducted on site G2/4 (GA031 in local plan). Public consultation to main modifications is required to fully consider equality at this site, the surrounding area and safe | The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification. In considering whether to change the proposed |

| | | | |
|------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>access into Gargrave village. Road closures on the A59 and A65 are common practice and traffic gets diverted through to Marton Road. The local plan does not sufficiently cover the fundamental equality factors that need to be addressed prior to any site been selected that already infringes on disability rights and legislation. A person with disability is already been selected less favourably than others in the same situation as site GA031. This is insufficient pavement provision in place and where there are pavements they are not suitable for wheelchair access. There is already a known fundamental safety issue that needs to be addressed. Marton Road is poorly lit which is unacceptable, dangerous and is not a sustainable distance for people with lesser abilities. Gargrave train station – north bound does not have disabled access off the platform. There is no provision made for remediating this issue. The rural infrastructure is not in place for building additional houses without significant investment. The site does not contribute to sustainable development due to the distance of the site and the nearest bus stop been 800m away. The site's sustainability is car orientated which goes against the aims and objectives of national and local travel. The site requires a full equality assessment to be conducted with remediating actions put in place.</p> | <p>modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM64 | P Woodhead 257 | <p>There is an insufficient level of equality assessment conducted on site G2/4 (GA031 in local plan). A proposed development will increase traffic along Marton Road, and the junction with Church Street is already awkward. Significant danger to cyclists and pedestrians will result.</p> | <p>The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM64 | B Murdoch 258 | <p>There is an insufficient level of equality assessment conducted on site G2/4 (GA031 in local plan).</p> | <p>The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>The representor states that there are key issues which need to be addressed and remediated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe accessibility to village for all age groups and abilities; • Site location does not treat everyone with the same level of accessibility; • Gradient of hill makes it difficult for people with disability to access site; • Road safety of paramount importance; • Poor lighting and visibility needs to be significantly mitigated against; • Lack of suitable footpaths or limited footpaths; • Distance from site to nearest bus stop in village centre 800m; • Rural infrastructure needs significant investment; • Site does not contribute to sustainable development due to the distance of site and the nearest bus stop 800m away; • Site extends the village boundary and is a green field site extending the village form further out; • No recreation facilities on this side of the village. To use recreational facilities from G2/4 (GA031) it will require a car; • Site sustainability being car orientated which goes against the aims and objectives of national and local travel. <p>The representor says that the site G2/4 (GA031) requires a full equality assessment to be conducted with remediating actions put in place. The other option is to choose an alternative suitable site, which will not have a detrimental impact on a minority group which are not being catered for or considered.</p> | <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|------|---------------|---|--|
| MM64 | O Wild 259 | <p>The representor notes the following: ‘hilly, paths (none), not safe for prams’, ‘traffic’, ‘lights’ and ‘speed’.</p> <p>The representor believes there should be significant investment made to infrastructure, an equality assessment to be conducted with remediating actions put in place, or an alternative suitable site which will cater for all disadvantaged groups.</p> | <p>The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector’s attention is drawn to the Council’s view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM64 | C Wild 260 | <p>There is an insufficient level of equality assessment conducted on site G2/4 (GA031 in local plan). the representor mentions the following in point form: ‘access to village’, ‘road safety’, ‘poor lighting and visibility’, ‘no foot paths’, ‘steep hill’ and ‘distance to village from site’.</p> <p>The representor believes there should be significant investment made to infrastructure, an equality assessment to be conducted with remediating actions put in place, or an alternative suitable site which will cater for all disadvantaged groups.</p> | <p>The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector’s attention is drawn to the Council’s view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM64 | N Wild 261 | <p>There is an insufficient level of equality assessment conducted on site G2/4 (GA031 in local plan). The representor mentions phrases and words such as ‘no foot paths’, ‘lighting’, ‘dangerous road’, and ‘traffic (tractors/farmers)’.</p> <p>The representor believes there should be significant investment made to infrastructure, an equality assessment to be conducted with remediating actions put in place, or an alternative suitable site which will cater for all disadvantaged groups.</p> | <p>The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector’s attention is drawn to the Council’s view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM64 | M Reynolds | There is an insufficient level of equality assessment | The principle of allocating this site for new residential |

| | | | |
|------|---------------------|---|--|
| | 262 | <p>conducted on site G2/4 (GA031). There are no footpaths on Marton Road and it is extremely dangerous. When the houses are built there will be more traffic and the representor feels it will not be safe. The representor states there is planning permission at Dodgson's Farm further down Marton Road for an animal incinerator and this will increase the volume of farm traffic such as tractors and wagons and a very unpleasant smell.</p> <p>The representor believes there should be significant investment made to infrastructure, an equality assessment to be conducted with remediating actions put in place, or an alternative suitable site which will cater for all disadvantaged groups.</p> | <p>development is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM64 | P Murgatroyd 263 | <p>The respondent states that there is a dangerous road present, there is no footpath and that it is dark.</p> <p>The representor believes there should be significant investment made to infrastructure, an equality assessment to be conducted with remediating actions put in place, or an alternative suitable site which will cater for all disadvantaged groups.</p> | <p>The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM64 | J Simpson 271 | <p>There is an insufficient level of equality assessment conducted on site G2/4 (GA031 in local plan). The representor mentions the problems with the local footpath, drainage problems onto the road, and a ditch blocked. The sewage from proposed site will cause problems.</p> | <p>The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM64 | S Simpson 272 | <p>There is an insufficient level of equality assessment conducted on site G2/4 (GA031 in local plan).</p> | <p>The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification.</p> |

| | | | |
|------|----------------|--|--|
| | | <p>The representor states that the country road already has speeding traffic from Bank Newton - large sewage wagons, straw wagons and no footpath – a danger to walking pedestrians. Over development for our village with lots more cars and access at the corner – Mason's Arms would be a problem. A danger for children walking to school and people horse riding. Already have problems with water blocking the drain with water running down the road.</p> <p>The representor believes there should be significant investment made to infrastructure, an equality assessment to be conducted with remediating actions put in place, or an alternative suitable site which will cater for all disadvantaged groups.</p> | <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM64 | M Whitwell 287 | <p>Insufficient level of equality assessment conducted on site G2/4 Gargrave (off Walton Close/Marton Road). Under the Equalities Act – as the representor understands it, consideration must be given to the following impacting on people: parking and sewerage & drainage.</p> | <p>The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM64 | D Whitwell 288 | <p>Traffic increase on a narrow road already used by a significant amount of traffic including large agricultural vehicles. Consequently there would be an increase in risk of accidents and injury to road users including pedestrians, cyclists, wheelchair users etc. If development goes ahead there should be a requirement to include two parking spaces at each residence to avoid overspill parking on Marton Road. Any overspill parking near Marton House Residential Home would create a safety issue in the vicinity.</p> | <p>The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |

| | | | |
|------|-----------------------|---|---|
| MM64 | J A Pickles 289 | Any development on this site, the representor believes, would be discriminatory against people with physical disabilities/reduced or limited mobility. Any individuals with such limitations would be deprived of their fundamental right to access social or affordable housing, due to the accessibility issues, it would be denying their right to live independently. If access adjustments following and impact assessment cannot be implemented. This would be a breach of the Equality Act 2010. The representor is a disabled person, already living on Walton Close and the representor is already unable to live independently, and to access the village amenities using a motorised mobility aid is not possible. There are no pavements wide enough until after the river bridge. There are no pavements at all on the hill of Marton Road with cars parked. Accessible low cost housing is in demand, another site must be found, this one is entirely inappropriate. | The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| MM64 | J D Tattersall 290 | Site not easily accessible for people with disabilities. Very little pavements and does not include minority groups. This deprives individuals with disabilities their chance to be independent. Significant access amendments will need to be made. The road is dark, dangerous, and high speeding farm traffic, the A65 and A59 diversions are causing major issues for this site and the surrounding area. | The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| MM64 | I Gridgeman 291 | As a resident at current address for over 40 years, I have been very fortunate to survive the inadequate conditions of Marton Road: poor street-lighting, spasmodic and ill-considered walkways, dangerous vehicular access etc. Any further development would add greatly to the above situations. | The principle of allocating this site for new residential development is not subject to a main modification. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| MM64 | J Aldersley | Insufficient equality assessment made on site G2/4 Gargrave | The principle of allocating this site for new residential |

| | | | |
|------|----------------------|---|--|
| | 292 | <p>(off Walton Close/Marton Road) which will have a negative effect on minority group.</p> <p>The equality legislation should be considered irrespective of timing and any other comments seen to be cut of time or late. Everyone deserve the right to be treated fairly. Government housing policies are impacting rural locations by insufficient infrastructure being available. Building in rural locations causes intense local impacts. The secretary of State, Mr James Brokenshire, has recently communicated with the representor and notes that Craven District Council does not have a CIL in place. CIL was established on the principle that those responsible and benefiting from new development can and should make a contribution to the additional infrastructure to fund the provision of improvement, replacement and additional infrastructure.</p> | <p>development is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| | | | |
| MM66 | Historic England 017 | <p>The former Richard Thornton's CE Primary School is a Grade II Listed Building and the development of this site could also impact upon the significance of the Scheduled Monument at Castle Hill. Whilst we support the proposed Modifications relating to these heritage assets (which now sets out more explicitly the requirements regarding their conservation), the site also lies within the Burton-in-Lonsdale Conservation Area. In line with the approach adopted elsewhere, therefore, this designated heritage asset also needs to be included in this part of the Policy.</p> <p>Policy SP11, Site BU012, modification relating to the Scheduled Monument and Listed Buildings amend to read:</p> | <p>If the Inspector considers it necessary in his final report to recommend this change to the proposed modification, the following change (in italics) is considered appropriate by the Council:</p> <p>"Conversion of the school and siting and design of development on the site to conserve the significance of heritage assets (listed buildings and scheduled ancient monuments) on <u>and adjacent to</u> the site and their settings (<u>Burton-in Lonsdale Conservation Area, Grade II Listed Burton Endowed First School , Schoolmaters House, garden wall ans gate piers, Scheduled ancient Monument Castle Hill Motte and Bailey castle, Tranquil</u></p> |

| | | | |
|------|----------------------|---|---|
| | | “...and their settings (Burton-in-Lonsdale Conservation Area, Grade II Listed...etc.)” | <u>Vale.”</u> |
| MM66 | Historic England 017 | <p>The former Richard Thornton’s CE Primary School is a Grade II Listed Building. The Heritage Impact Assessment considered that development to the northeast and south of these buildings would have a large adverse impact upon their setting. The Submitted Policies Plan identified the area in front of the Listed Buildings as being excluded from the developable area. The deletion from the Policies Map of the area to the east of the school which is intended to be kept open has made the implementation of this Policy considerably less clear and, therefore, less effective. Without a clear spatial depiction of where the green infrastructure is required, the Policy needs to be more specific about where this area of open space should be located. Therefore, an amendment is needed to better articulated where this open space is needed.</p> <p>Policy SP11, Site BU012, modification relating to the green infrastructure amended to read: “Approximately 0.3 ha of green infrastructure shall be provided to the southeast of the Listed Building in order to protect its setting.”</p> | <p>If the Inspector considers it necessary in his final report to recommend this change to the proposed modification, the following change (in italics) is considered appropriate by the Council:</p> <p><i>“Approximately 0.3 ha of G green infrastructure shall be provided on the site <u>to the southeast of the Listed Building in order</u> to protect the <u>its</u> setting. of the Grade II Listed Building”</i></p> |
| | | | |
| MM69 | Historic England 017 | This site lies adjoins the boundary of the Cononley Conservation Area and is prominent in several of the key views across the Conservation Area. We support the proposed Modifications relating to these heritage assets which now set out more explicitly the requirements regarding their conservation. | No response required |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|------|-------------------------|---|--|
| MM70 | J Adams 204 | MM70 is unsound because at paragraph 4.67 it includes 'provision of the following broad types of infrastructure', but doesn't include highways. | The representation is commenting on the Publication Draft Plan wording and not the wording proposed in the modification. This is outside the scope of the consultation. In any event, the paragraph does refer to 'transport' infrastructure which includes highways. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| MM70 | S Coetzer 226 | MM70 is unsound because at paragraph 4.67 it includes 'provision of the following broad types of infrastructure', but doesn't include highways. | See response to representation 204 on MM70 above |
| MM70 | F Hall Coetzer 227 | MM70 is unsound because at paragraph 4.67 it includes 'provision of the following broad types of infrastructure', but doesn't include highways which is critical. | See response to representation 204 on MM70 above |
| | | | |
| MM71 | United Utilities 010 | UU are pleased to see the addition of the following wording in relation to Policy SP12 Infrastructure Strategy and Development Delivery: 'proposals for the necessary maintenance, upgrading and expansion of utilities infrastructure will be supported in principle'. This will enable UU to carry out necessary works to operational infrastructure to ensure that the growth, development aspirations of the district can be met, and will enable UU to respond to changing environmental agendas in accordance with their obligations. | No response required. |
| MM71 | J Adams | Policy SP12 is unsound. Its reference to 'will work to | This policy is a strategic policy which provides the |

| | | | |
|------|----------------------|---|---|
| | 204 | mitigate and minimise adverse impacts that may arise from delivery of the local plan in terms of infrastructure provision' is too general and needs modifying to bring in line with Policy INF7. | plan's strategic approach to the delivery of infrastructure, with cross reference to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the detail on infrastructure requirements. Furthermore, Policies INF1 to INF7 provide the detailed policy approach to the most important infrastructure types such as education, open space and transport including highways. Therefore, in considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| MM71 | S Coetzer 226 | Policy SP12 is unsound. Its reference to 'will work to mitigate and minimise adverse impacts that may arise from delivery of the local plan in terms of infrastructure provision' is too general and needs modifying to bring in line with Policy INF7. | See response to representation 204 on MM71 above. |
| MM71 | F Hall Coetzer 227 | Policy SP12 is unsound. Its reference to 'will work to mitigate and minimise adverse impacts that may arise from delivery of the local plan in terms of infrastructure provision' is too general and needs modifying to bring in line with Policy INF7. | See response to representation 204 on MM71 above. |
| | | | |
| MM74 | Historic England 017 | Supports the proposed modification, which now clearly sets out 'exceptional circumstances' and reflects the NPPF. | No response required. |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| MM75 (misquoted as MM74 in rep) | C Nash, Craven Walkers 241 | Supports the proposed modification to add part a) v) to the policy. | NB The representor has misquoted the main modification as MM74. Details of the representation seem to indicate that it relates to MM75. No response required |
| MM75 (misquoted as MM74 in rep) | L Gould 194 | Supports the proposed modification to add part a) v) to the policy. | NB The representor has misquoted the main modification as MM74. Details of the representation seem to indicate that it relates to MM75. No response required |
| MM75 | Historic England 017 | Supports the proposed modification to add part a) v) to the policy, which is wholly appropriate and supported by evidence from the conservation area appraisal. | No response required. |
| MM75 | Historic England 017 | Supports the proposed modification to part b) of the policy, which now more-closely reflects the NPPF. | No response required. |
| MM75 | S Wilton 118 | Supports the proposed modification to add part a) v) to the policy. | No response required. |
| MM75 | Cllr Dawson 203 | Supports the proposed modification to add part a) v) to the policy. | No response required. |
| MM75 | L Primmer 275 | Supports the proposed modification to add part a) v) to the policy. | The representor's comments appear to support the proposed modification, although not explicitly. No response required |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|------|---------------------------|--|--|
| MM77 | United Utilities 010 | UU are content with the change to Policy ENV3 Good Design, Part (f), which states that 'development proposals should be able to demonstrate that they will secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings'. | No response required. |
| MM77 | HBF, J Harding 028 | Supports the proposed modification to delete part m) of the policy and the reference to Lifetime Homes and to amend part u) which adds clarity. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM78 | Natural England 051 | NE note the update to the policy and policy text for policy ENV4 Biodiversity in MM78 and MM79 regarding recreational disturbance and internationally designated sites and welcome these modifications more broadly. | No response required. |
| MM78 | J Adams 204 | <p>MM78 is unsound.</p> <p>Supporting text to Policy ENV4 Paragraph 5.45:</p> <p>Reference is made to Bio-diversity with an emphasis placed on 'internationally, nationally and local designated sites'.</p> <p>Many developments are on green field sites of a known rich diversity of protected species and all such sites should be subject to an 'appropriate assessment'</p> <p>The last sentence referring to 'development proposals likely to have a significant effect on a European site.....' should be widened to include 'greenfield site, or a site of known biodiversity'when considered alone.</p> | <p>The first sentence of paragraph 5.45 is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>The last paragraph of MM78 is in relation to the protection of European sites only.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |

| | | | |
|------|-----------------------|--|---|
| MM78 | S Coetzer 226 | <p>MM78 is unsound.</p> <p>Supporting text to Policy ENV4 Paragraph 5.45:</p> <p>Reference is made to Bio-diversity with an emphasis placed on 'internationally, nationally and local designated sites'.</p> <p>Many developments are on green field sites of a known rich diversity of protected species and all such sites should be subject to an 'appropriate assessment'</p> <p>The last sentence referring to 'development proposals likely to have a significant effect on a European site.....' should be widened to include 'greenfield site, or a site of known biodiversity'when considered alone.</p> | See response to representation 204 for MM78 above |
| MM78 | F Hall Coetzer 227 | <p>MM78 is unsound.</p> <p>Supporting text to Policy ENV4 Paragraph 5.45:</p> <p>Reference is made to Bio-diversity with an emphasis placed on 'internationally, nationally and local designated sites'.</p> <p>Many developments are on green field sites of a known rich diversity of protected species and all such sites should be subject to an 'appropriate assessment'</p> <p>The last sentence referring to 'development proposals likely to have a significant effect on a European site.....' should be widened to include 'greenfield site, or a site of known biodiversity'when considered alone.</p> | See response to representation 204 for MM78 above |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|------|----------------------------------|---|--|
| MM79 | Natural England 051 | NE note the update to the policy and policy text for policy ENV4 Biodiversity in MM78 and MM79 regarding recreational disturbance and internationally designated sites and broadly welcome these modifications. | No response required. |
| MM79 | Wilman family (Carter Jonas) 008 | <p>MM79 and MM81 Policy ENV4 and ENV5: These two amendments seek to address concerns raised and discussed at the Examination about the specificity of Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure requirements in the Local Plan. At the Examination it was determined that a more generic approach to site principles was required, which are broadly agreed.</p> <p>The two policies list as part of their provisions the approximate land area required for Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity. It is important when reading across the two policies (ENV4 and ENV5) that there is clarity. If reading the two policies it is not clear if the two requirements are the same or comprise a cumulative requirement, in this case for SK089/SK090, approximately 4.0has. This would seem to be the case for all of the sites listed. On the face of it this will simply further reduce the residential yield of Site SK089 and SK090.</p> <p>To address this concern we would suggest that the land area requirements in ENV 5 are deleted, and that a reference is made that Green Infrastructure (as set out under Policy ENV4) is also utilised to achieve a net gain in biodiversity.</p> | <p>Main Modification MM79 as it relates to criterion f) of Policy ENV4 provides sufficient clarity that the requirements for biodiversity and green infrastructure are within the same land area.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM79 | TRCPR (Youngs RPS) 054 | <i>Although representation form states that representation relates to MM79 the content of the representation only refers to MM17 (site SK081,082,108), not MM79 (Policy ENV4.), so the representations have been summarised and responded to at MM17</i> | See response to representation 054 on MM17 |

| | | | |
|------|------------------|--|---|
| MM79 | J Adams 204 | <p>MM79 is unsound.</p> <p>Policy ENV4 Bio-diversity Part a) and f)</p> <p>Refers to 'growth in housing.....will be accompanied by improvements in bio-diversity. This means that a) where possible....'</p> <p>This is too open and needs amending.</p> <p>'wherever possible' should be replaced with 'development will be required to'</p> <p>And later 'i) Ensure that there is no adverse impact on any internationally designated sites integrity' should include 'or a site of known bio-diversity or inhabited by protected species'</p> | <p>Part a) of ENV4 is not subject to a main modification.</p> <p>Part i) is in relation to international sites only.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM79 | S Coetzer 226 | <p>MM79 is unsound.</p> <p>Policy ENV4 Bio-diversity Part a) and f)</p> <p>Refers to 'growth in housing.....will be accompanied by improvements in bio-diversity. This means that a) where possible....'</p> <p>This is too open and needs amending.</p> <p>'wherever possible' should be replaced with 'development will be required to'</p> <p>And later 'i) Ensure that there is no adverse impact on any internationally designated sites integrity' should include 'or a site of known bio-diversity or inhabited by protected species'</p> | <p>See response to representation 204 on MM79 above</p> |

| | | | |
|------|--|---|--|
| MM79 | F Hall Coetzer 227 | <p>MM79 is unsound.</p> <p>Policy ENV4 Bio-diversity Part a) and f)</p> <p>Refers to 'growth in housing.....will be accompanied by improvements in bio-diversity. This means that a) where possible....'</p> <p>This is too open and needs amending.</p> <p>'wherever possible' should be replaced with 'development will be required to'</p> <p>And later 'i) Ensure that there is no adverse impact on any internationally designated sites integrity' should include 'or a site of known bio-diversity or inhabited by protected species'</p> | See response to representation 204 on MM79 above |
| | | | |
| MM81 | Wilman family (Carter Jonas) 008 | <p>MM79 and MM81 Policy ENV4 and ENV5:</p> <p>These two amendments seek to address concerns raised and discussed at the Examination about the specificity of Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure requirements in the Local Plan. At the Examination it was determined that a more generic approach to site principles was required, which are broadly agreed.</p> <p>The two policies list as part of their provisions the approximate land area required for Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity. It is important when reading across the two policies (ENV4 and ENV5) that there is clarity. If reading the two policies it is not clear if the two requirements are the same or comprise a cumulative requirement, in this case for SK089/SK090, approximately 4.0has. This would seem to be</p> | See response to representation 008 to MM79 above |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>the case for all of the sites listed. On the face of it this will simply further reduce the residential yield of Site SK089 and SK090.</p> <p>To address this concern we would suggest that the land area required for the 38-43 remnants in ENV5 are deleted, and that a reference is made that Green Infrastructure (as set out under Policy ENV4) is also utilised to achieve a net gain in biodiversity.</p> | |
| | | | |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 (misquoted as MM154 in rep) | Halton Homes (Waltons & Co) 007 | <p>We support the deletion of “HE-LGS1 Land to the west of Hellifield (Hellifield Flashes)” in Policy ENV10 as proposed in MM154. The proposed designation was plainly unsound for the reasons set out in Matter Statement 21 and expanded on at the hearing sessions.</p> | <p>NB The representor has misquoted the main modification as MM154. Details of the representation clearly indicate that it relates to MM87.</p> <p>No response required</p> |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | CPRE North Yorkshire 009 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>The LGS designation should be given to the areas covering and immediately surrounding Little Dunbar’s Flash and Dunbar’s Flash at Land to the west of Hellifield.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is a unique site with an abundance of rich biodiversity. <p>Designation of the two smaller areas would further reiterate their importance to nature conservation within the area especially as they were previously recommended for a SINC designation.</p> <p>Without the LGS designation, there is a danger that the two</p> | <p>The representations received during public consultation in the Main Modifications provide clear evidence that that site HE-LGS1 is demonstrably special to the local community and holds a particular local significance in terms of the requirements of paragraph 77 of the NPPF (2012).</p> <p>Residents attach great importance to Hellifield Flashes. The site is highly valued as a recreation space, as an important wildlife habitat, particularly for birdlife, and as a place of beauty and tranquillity that improves the physical and mental wellbeing of residents. It also has historical significance, for both its physical points of interest within the site and its importance to the social</p> |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>smaller flashes will be detrimentally impacted upon by any development immediately adjacent to the Flashes. Site HE-LGS1 should be modified further to include the designation of Little Dunbar's Flash and Dunbar's Flash as LGS.</p> | <p>history of the villages.</p> <p>Moreover, it is considered that the Flashes function as a network of interconnected ponds, which vary in size depending on rainfall. Wildlife moves across the site between the Flashes ponds, and the site is part of a habitat network across the wider area, supporting the biodiversity of nearby SSSI's, as reported by representations.</p> <p>Representations also show that the site serves residents of both Hellifield and Long Preston, which changes the relative scale of the Local Green Space.</p> <p>It is the Council's view that HE-LGS1 is not an extensive tract of land considering it relates to these two communities which it serves, and its role as an important site for wildlife.</p> <p>If the Inspector considers it necessary in his final report to recommend a change to the proposed modification, the following options are considered appropriate by the Council:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The whole of site HE-LGS1 to be designated as Local Green Space, as in the Submission draft Craven District Council Local Plan. • If the Inspector's initial conclusion that this site is an extensive tract of land remain, then the Council would support the designation of three smaller areas of Local Green Space, identified as HE-LGS7, HE-LGS8 and HE-LGS9. |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | Cllr Brown 071 | <p>Object to the restriction of the LGS designation at Hellifield Flashes to a small area. MM87 is unsound.</p> | <p>See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1</p> |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has significant wildlife value as a wetland site; • Provides a refuge for migrating birds; • Forms a network of pond habitat for great crested newts, which need freedom of movement between different ponds; • Forms habitat for a rare and threatened population of eels; • Is valued by walkers and wildlife specialists. <p>The original designation is in line with the intentions of the act.</p> <p>The whole of site HE-LGS1 should continue to be designated as LGS as it is in the submission draft Craven Local Plan.</p> | |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | S Gordon 084 | <p>Support for the designation of Hellifield Flashes as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is of archaeological significance, having six identified sites including a ring ditch & potentially the remains of Iron Age & Roman homesteads; • Has significant wildlife value, particularly for bird life; • Has recreational value for the local community. | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | R Eccles 109 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is valued by the local community as an amenity space for walking and playing; • Is valued by the local community for its tranquillity; • Has Marl mounds that date back millennia; • Has significant wildlife value for migratory and | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>resident bird and animal life, including deer.</p> <p>The Flashes serve both Hellifield and Long Preston villagers.</p> <p>The modified site is not reasonably close to the village.</p> <p>The complete site of the Flashes should be designated as LGS.</p> | |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | B Moore 111 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>The Flashes are local in character and do not form an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is close to the village; • Has significant value for wildlife; • Has significant value as a recreation space; • Provides an attractive approach to the village; • Forms as essential feature of the Hellifield community. <p>Site HE-LGS1 should continue to be designated as LGS as it is in the submission draft Craven Local Plan. If the whole site is not designated, sites HE-LGS1 Gallaber Pond, HE-LGS8 Dunbar Flash and HE-LGS9 Little Dunbar Flash should all be designated as LGS.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | D Alderson 113 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>The area is not extensive.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has significant wildlife value, for migratory birds in particular. <p>The site would provide protection from the possible ribbon development on A65 towards Long Preston.</p> <p>The area in and around Gallaber pond should be classified</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|--|---|
| | | as Local Green Space. | |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | P & P Howes 114 | Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes. The site holds local significance for its beauty and value for wildlife. | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | I Roberts 115 | Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes. Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is valued by the local community as a recreation space, providing an accessible area for walking; • Is valued by the local community for its tranquillity and wide, uninterrupted view; • Provides a peaceful space to escape to, which can have a positive effect on the wellbeing of residents, lifting their spirits; • Has significant wildlife value, particularly for bird life; • Is an established wet area, which forms a nursery for many invertebrates and other creatures. The three flashes and associated wet areas function as a whole unit. If some is taken away, there is a risk that they will all be degraded. The flashes contribute greatly to the biodiversity of the countryside. The area is not extensive. It may seem big but this is the way it is formed. The whole area of the Flashes should be designated as Local Green Space. | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | P Bolton 116 | Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes. Strongly support the designation of Hellifield Flashes as | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>Local Green Space.</p> <p>The site fulfils the tests under para 77 of the NPPF , specifically in the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area is bounded by housing on the east side (Station Road), partially on the south side (Kendal Road/A65) and the Railway Station on the north side. This demonstrates that it is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves. • The site is of local significance for its recreational value for walkers and bird watchers, and its wildlife value, particularly for bird life. <p>The whole area of the Flashes should be designated as LGS. If the whole site is not designated, the Flash Ponds should be designated as LGS as a minimum.</p> | |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | G Petrucci 117 | <p>Support the designation of Hellifield Flashes as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Object to the recent planning application for a holiday park on the Flashes.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | T Sharp 120 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>Gallaber Pond is not close to the village, yet is the only area designated as LGS under the proposed modification.</p> <p>The LGS designation should be given to the two other ponds: Little Dunbars and Large Dunbars, which are nearest to the village, form the main breeding area for the Great Crested Newt and are teaming with birdlife.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An area of peace & tranquillity. • A wildlife haven. <p>The area is a beautiful asset to the village.</p> <p>The LGS designation should cover all three of the ponds in</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | the Flashes site | |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | D Statt 121 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>Support the designation of all of the Hellifield Flashes as Local Green Space, as proposed by Craven District Council in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It borders the houses on Midland Terrace / Kendal Rd. • It is of recreation value, used for sledging, walking and watching the wildlife. <p>The whole of site HE-LGS1 should be designated as LGS.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | P Laycock 122 | <p>Object to the proposed holiday park on fields to the west of Hellifield.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An area rich in wildlife and of particular value for relaxation and exercise to its residents. • An area which plays host to migrating birds and others of significance. <p>Object to the recent planning application for a holiday park on the site.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | A McGregor 125 | <p>Support the designation of Gallaber Pond and Hellifield Flashes as LGS.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is close to the village and therefore visited regularly; • Is rich in wildlife; • Provides a vital habitat for waders and other birds; • Provides a valuable recreation space for residents. | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>Access to the Flashes for walking and birdwatching are important to the health and wellbeing of residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is significant in terms of its tranquillity. | |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | Beresford 126 | <p>Support the designation of Hellifield Flashes as LGS. The area is not just an extensive tract of land. Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is special for wildlife; • Used by residents and people from further away as an area of peace and quiet for walking and enjoying the wildlife. <p>Hellifield Flashes should be kept as an area of LGS.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | J Mathew 130 | <p>Support the modification MM87 to reduce the area of LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>The Inspector's comments are justified.</p> <p>The only lake between Long Preston and Hellifield is manmade so what's wrong with making 2 more?</p> <p>We need more employment in the area and this development would provide it.</p> <p>Long Preston Deeps provide plenty of natural habitats for birds and animals.</p> | No response required |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | P J Lister 131 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>Protest the proposed modification of the inclusion of this land in the local plan.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is close to the village; • Is a valued tranquil area; • Is rich in wildlife, some of which is endangered. <p>The criticism of the inspector that it is too extensive seems to</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | be invalidated by the fact that a goodly portion is under water for most of the year so can hardly be considered green land. Should not chop the area up and interfere with areas used by wildlife. | |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | P Jones 132 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>Support the designation of Hellifield Flashes as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forms an integral part of the community, valued for its tranquillity and as a barrier between Midland Terrace and a major highway. • Has recreational value, used by children as a playground, where they can enjoy varied habitats, fields, ponds, mud and woodlands. In winter the steep slopes left by the mining are used for sledging; • Supports varied birdlife, including waders and waterfowl, songbirds, birds which flit from the built environment (house martins, swallows, swifts), raptors and owls, which in turn attracts birdwatchers. • Is a home to fauna including red deer, brown hares, hedgehogs, rabbits, foxes, toads, frog, great crested newts and bats. Some of these species are struggling and need protecting. • Is important for the health and mental wellbeing of residents, providing an accessible link to the great outdoors, allowing gentle exercise in a tranquil oasis. <p>The Flashes contribute to the community of Hellifield.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | Anon, Midland Terrace 139 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | holds local significance as it: Helps ease flooding; Is used daily by dog walkers and hikers Supports wildlife, which is enjoyed by residents. | |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | P and S Emsley 140 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>Object to the recent planning application for a holiday park at the Flashes.</p> <p>There is a risk of Hellifield losing many of its green, recreation spaces to development.</p> <p>Development on the area surrounding Gallaber Pond would make access to the remaining LGS more difficult.</p> <p>The two additional green spaces at the Flashes should be re-classified as LGS. Their loss would have a detrimental environmental effect on residents at the western edge of Hellifield.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces the carbon footprint of Hellifield Station; • Provides valued recreation space for walkers and children playing. <p>The two additional areas of green space should be included in the LGS designation.</p> <p>All three of the Hellifield Flashes ponds should be designated as LGS.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | D Gooch 142 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>The site meets the requirements of para 77 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is rich in wildlife, particularly important for birdlife and | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | <p>amphibians;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has areas of historical significance, containing remnants of early occupation by man; • Is in very close proximity to the community it serve; • Is used daily by residents for recreation; • Is appreciated for its beauty and tranquillity. <p>The site should be considered as a whole, rather than piecemeal as the whole site is within full view of the Grade II Listed Hellifield Train Station and surrounding properties, and has clearly defined boundaries. Therefore it is not considered to be extensive.</p> <p>Designating three separate areas, as proposed by CDC is not ideal for preserving wildlife, or for recreation and historical value.</p> <p>If designated alone, HE-LGS7 is more distant from the local community.</p> <p>The whole of Site HE-LGS1 should continue to be designated as LGS as it is in the submission draft Craven Local Plan.</p> <p>If the whole site is not designated, The proposal submitted by CPRE on 11th January 2019 to designate a smaller area as LGS should be given serious consideration as an acceptable compromise.</p> <p>The proposal put forward by CDC to designate HE-LGS7, HE-LGS8 and HE-LGS9 is not ideal, but would be preferable to the proposed modification.</p> | |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | L Gooch 143 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has mental health benefits, providing clean air, peace and tranquillity; | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is rich in wildlife, particularly birdlife and amphibians, including Great Crested Newts; • Is used recreationally by walkers; • Has historical value (remnants of early man); • Is enjoyed as a natural space where residents can watch and appreciate the changing of the seasons. <p>HE-LGS7 is rich in biodiversity but more remote from the village. HE-LGS8 and HE-LGS9 are just as rich in wildlife and used more regularly by villagers.</p> <p>The whole of Site HE-LGS1 should continue to be designated as LGS as it is in the submission draft Craven Local Plan.</p> <p>If the whole site is not designated, The proposals submitted by CPRE on 11th January 2019 to designate a smaller area as LGS, or by CDC to designate HE-LGS7, HE-LGS8 and HE-LGS9 should be given consideration.</p> | |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | R Boothman 144 | <p>Support for CDC's proposal to designate HE-LGS1 as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is used recreationally for walking, providing a traffic-free route between Hellifield and Long Preston; • Is in close proximity to both Hellifield and Long Preston; • Is a tranquil space where residents can experience nature at close quarters; • Is a valuable upland wetland resource which should be conserved; • Is an important link for native and migrating wetland bird species. <p>Development on the site would exacerbate the effects of climate change and lead to a loss of habitat for numerous</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | species. | |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | G Rittman 145 | <p>The Hellifield Flashes, both Gallaber and Dunbar are demonstrably special to the local community and hold local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is used recreationally, with the footpaths being in constant use by residents and visitors; • Is rich in wildlife; • Is an area of beauty, and a lovely natural area. <p>The Flashes should be protected for future generations. The whole of the Hellifield Flashes site should continue to be designated as LGS.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | A Hartley 146 | <p>Object to the loss of LGS at the Flashes. Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is used recreationally for walking • It is rich in wildlife. • Residents enjoy seeing the animals grazing. <p>Object to the recent planning application for a holiday park.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | James Woodward- Nutt 147 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes. Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is accessible for walking, being an area of peace and quiet adjacent to the residential area of the village, which is important for people with more limited mobility; • Extensive flocks of birds and animals are attracted to the water in the flashes. <p>The area is not extensive. The area should be retained in its present form as a green space.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | J Dickinson 148 | <p>Support for the proposal to designate Hellifield Flashes as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The beauty and tranquillity of the place in its natural state; • The richness of the birdlife in this area and its significance for migrators; • The archaeological significance of the site which remains to be explored. | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | S Wolfenden-Smith 149 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>Resident of Long Preston.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance for its:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beauty • Historic significance • Recreational value • Tranquillity • Richness of wildlife (it is especially important to birdlife). | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | I Evans 151 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>The whole site is unusual and integral to the village.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An important area of natural wetland, which is unusual in Craven; • An important area on bird migration routes. About 12 species on the RSPB 'red list' use the area; • A self-contained area of undulating fields and flashes, | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>which retains a unique wildlife site;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An area of natural tranquillity and wilderness adjacent to the built environment; • It is well used recreationally by walkers and people watching the wildlife. Provides a footpath link to Long Preston away from the road and railway; • Views from the National Park of the site (and Pendle Hill beyond) help define Hellifield. | |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | G and E Croll 152 | <p>Object to the proposed development of Hellifield Flashes. Residents of Long Preston.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is used recreationally by locals and visitors for walking, relaxation and enjoyment of the wildlife,; • Is an accessible amenity, within walking distance; • Is unique in the landscape, providing contrast to the fells and dales; • The Flashes and their wildlife provide an important educational asset; • Provides a haven to escape from an increasingly stressful world and must be protected for future generations. | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | P & C Johnston 166 | <p>Object to the proposed development of Hellifield Flashes. The loss of green space at Hellifield Flashes is a cause of concern and anxiety to residents.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is one of the most attractive natural features of Hellifield and Long Preston; • Is enjoyed by residents of Hellifield and Long Preston as an area of open space, and a 'lung' within walking distance of both villages; | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is important for wildlife; • Has ancient archaeological features; • Is an area of tranquillity and relaxation. | |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | L Ball 167 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes, and the possible development of the site. Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is valued by the community, who feel lucky to have it; • It is home to all sorts of wildlife; • Has been enjoyed by many generations, giving access to, and teaching them about, the natural world. | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | Mr & Mrs Whitaker 170 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The footpaths are constantly in use by both residents and visitors. • A natural phenomenon which attracts a richness of wildlife, including deer. • A tranquil place. <p>All of Hellifield Flashes should be designated as Local Green Space.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | M & S Holden 172 | <p>Object to the recent planning application and proposed development of Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A beautiful, natural wildlife reserve; • They are important for the wellbeing of people and wildlife. | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|--|---|
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | G Jones 177 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is a unique space, with the three ponds and open green spaces having a well-established wildlife population; • Is important for migratory birds • Provides a large, natural space between Hellifield and Long Preston, uniting the villages with the adjacent National Park; • Provides an accessible recreation area, with 2 definitive footpaths; • Contains archaeological evidence of early human use. <p>Development of the area would change the character of Hellifield.</p> <p>The Local Green Space designation should be extended to include the entire site.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 . |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | M Wilcock 179 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is used by and wholly relevant to enhancing the lives of residents; • Offers unique wild life experience in the local area; • Is an area of natural beauty and tranquillity; <p>The area is valued by residents as a special place and should be protected for future generations.</p> <p>The Local Green Space designation on the Flashes should be extended from just the lake area to include the entire site.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|--|---|---|
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | Cllr Moorby 180 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is used recreationally by residents of Hellifield and Long Preston for walking and the enjoyment of wildlife; • Is home to an enormity of wildlife; • Is accessible, adjacent to residents houses; • Is an educational resource which can be used for nature studies by Hellifield primary school; • Is an area of peace and tranquillity; • Has been identified as having historical significance. <p>Site HE-LGS1 should continue to be designated as LGS as it is in the submission draft Craven Local Plan.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | M E Gray 181 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has been enjoyed recreationally for many years; • Is a diverse and unique wildlife habitat. <p>Green spaces should be saved for future generations.</p> <p>Gallaber Flashes should be designated as a Local Green Space.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 . |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | Long Preston Heritage Group 190 | <p>Object to the reduction of the area designated as LGS at Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is an important area of open countryside, both for wildlife and humans; | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has a well-established wildlife population, and is on the migratory route of many bird species; • Contributes to a wider network of wildlife sites, being of particular importance to the nearby SSSI's at Long Preston Deeps and Pan Beck Fen; • Is a well-used recreationally by walkers and is accessible to both Hellifield and Long Preston residents; • Maintains and complements the individual identities of both Hellifield and Long Preston; • Has evidence of 6 identified archaeological features, including a ring ditch, potential Iron Age and Roman homesteads and field systems. <p>The Flashes site is a defined area and should be considered in its entirety.</p> <p>The designation of a local green space for the area of the Flashes is appropriate and important. Site HE-LGS1 should continue to be designated as LGS as it is in the submission draft Craven Local Plan.</p> | |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | F Wells 195 | <p>Support for the designation of Hellifield Flashes as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A valued recreation space, used by residents of Hellifield and Long Preston as a safe place to walk, play and for the enjoyment of wildlife; • It is a beautiful and tranquil place • Is of archaeological importance • Is home to a great variety of wildlife and is of particular importance to migratory birds • Is a vital green space, loved by residents for many generations. | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|---|---|
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | J Goodall 196 | <p>Support for the designation of Hellifield Flashes as Local Green Space.</p> <p>It is not extensive as it serves two communities, and is accessible on foot from both Long Preston and Hellifield Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A recreational area, with local footpaths in constant use. Gentle terrain makes the site accessible to those with limited mobility. • An important wildlife site, enjoyed by residents and visitors • They act as a natural flood plain helping to ameliorate flooding in the lower Ribble. • A tranquil space which allows residents to feel close to nature. <p>Residents value the site as a priceless asset.</p> <p>The whole of the Hellifield Flashes site should be given protection through a designation of Local Green Space.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | B Franco 197 | <p>Support for the designation of Hellifield Flashes as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Site holds special memories personally.</p> <p>It is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is in close proximity of the villages and is a well-used recreation space for walking, running and as a safe place to play; • It is rich in wildlife, particularly important for migratory birds. The wildlife is enjoyed by residents and visitors; • It is a place of beauty and tranquillity, benefiting the well-being of residents. | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|---|---|
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | A Holden 199 | <p>Support for the designation of Hellifield Flashes as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is within close proximity to the community. The area of land known as Dunbars and Little Dunbars lies on the very edge of the village and is available to the residents at all times of the year; • It is covered by a network of public footpaths, used regularly and enjoyed by locals; • Provides access to open views and nature, which positively affect the wellbeing of residents and visitors; • The site harbours many species of birds some of which are "red and amber list" species. Important for the declining wild bird population; • The water-holding nature of the site acts as a natural flood break which prevents flash flooding downstream; • It is local in character, being an area of agricultural land that works well for farming, nature and the local people. <p>The site is not considered to be an extensive tract of land; its size allows people to enjoy the site without disturbing the nature.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | N & A Soper 201 | <p>Support for the designation of the area known as Hellifield Flashes as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a site of ecological diversity; • It is a haven for numerous bird species and other wildlife; | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is a great asset to the local community for the enjoyment of wildlife and for its peaceful atmosphere. Hellifield Flashes should be given the added protection of being a Local Green Space. | |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | J M Wilson 205 | <p>Object to the recommended reduction in size of Local Green Space HE-LGS1.</p> <p>The proposed area of LGS at Gallaber Pond, as set out in the modification, is not connected to Hellifield Village and is less accessible.</p> <p>Site HE-LGS1 is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is much used by the local community for recreational and health reasons, both physical & mental, as it is easily accessible by footpath. It is a tranquil area. It is a haven for wildlife. There are at least 150 different bird species on the Flashes, many of them endangered. <p>The area of the other 2 flashes (Dunbars) and the rest of the area to the east of the main public footpath should be included as another area of Local Green Space.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | B Wright 207 | <p>Support for the designation of the area known as Hellifield Flashes as Local Green Space.</p> <p>The whole site area is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is used recreationally for walking and as a safe place for children to play and enjoy nature all year round; The proximity to residents makes it accessible for those with limited mobility. Also give a chance for social interaction; | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They provide an opportunity to get close to nature, and give a sense of peace and freedom which is beneficial to mental well-being; • They are important for wildlife. | |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | J Smith 208 | <p>Support for the designation of the area known as Hellifield Flashes as Local Green Space.</p> <p>The site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is used regularly for recreation purposes: walkers enjoy the peace, tranquillity and wildlife; • It is home to unique wildlife, particularly wetland birds. There are no other areas nearby that are accessible to view such bird life; • It is an important educational facility for the local primary school. <p>The added protection of green space designation for the area around Hellifield Flashes is important.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | C Emmott 219 | <p>Support for the designation of the area known as Hellifield Flashes as Local Green Space.</p> <p>The Flashes site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are greatly valued by residents for their beauty; • They provide feedings stops for thousands of birds, and are home to other wildlife including deer and Great Crested Newts; • They are a vital, tranquil and peaceful community asset; • They are regularly enjoyed by walkers, bird and wildlife enthusiast and children; • They are an educational asset for Hellifield Community Primary school | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>The area brings many social and environmental benefits to the community.</p> <p>Hellifield Flashes should be allocated as local green space.</p> | |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | V Sharpe 221 | <p>Object to the recommended reduction in size of Local Green Space HE-LGS1.</p> <p>The Flashes site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The footpaths past both little Dunbar & Large Dunbar Flashes are used daily and are easily accessible; • They support much wildlife and birdlife, including Great crested Newts. A rare bio-diverse part of Craven, which is valued and enjoyed by residents; • It has been loved by the village for generations <p>Gallaber Pond is detached from the village and therefore less accessible.</p> <p>All three Flashes ponds should be included in the Local Green Space allocation. Little Dunbar & Large Dunbar Flashes are very important and should be given the same status as Gallaber Pond.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | S & J Turner 222 | <p>Object to the recommended reduction in size of Local Green Space HE-LGS1.</p> <p>The Flashes site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is of biodiversity value, particularly important for birdlife, and should be protected; • It is used regularly by residents and visitors for walking and birdwatching. • It is valued as one of Hellifield's biggest assets. <p>The Local Green space designation should be extended to cover the whole of the Hellifield Flashes area.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | J Emmott 230 | <p>Support for the designation of the area known as Hellifield Flashes as Local Green Space.</p> <p>The Flashes site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is close to the village, easily accessible and enjoyed frequently by residents; • It is abundant in wildlife, including a great variety of birdlife, Great Crested Newts and deer. • It is a beautiful part of the village which should be protected. <p>This area of land brings many social and environmental benefits to the village.</p> <p>The Hellifield Flashes area should be allocated as local green space.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | P Cochrane, ROOTS 231 | <p>Object to the recommended reduction in size of Local Green Space HE-LGS1.</p> <p>MM87 is unsound.</p> <p>The Flashes site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A rare wetland environment of regional importance that supports the biodiversity that our ecology depends upon. • It has a high amenity value exactly as it is, is treasured by the local community and draws tourists to the area. <p>Object to the recent planning application for a holiday park on the site.</p> <p>The designation of land as <i>Tourist Development Commitment</i> is only appropriate on the sites <i>surrounding</i> the Flashes, the redundant railway sidings and Gallaber Park.</p> <p>The Flashes itself should be preserved as a Local Green Space.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|---|---|
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | I Toms 269 | <p>Support for the designation of the area known as Hellifield Flashes as Local Green Space.</p> <p>The Flashes site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gallaber Pond is a rare and valuable “Ephemeral Pond” ecosystem, which more than merits its being designated a SSSI; • They are a breeding area for Great Crested Newts and support a great variety of birdlife; • The Flashes ponds function as part of a wider nature corridor between the Dales and Trough of Bowland; • It provides valuable, accessible green space to Hellifield residents, who enjoy views across the Flashes; • Little Dunbars & Large Dunbars are very important and much nearer to residential areas; • It is a beautiful asset to the village, an area of peace and tranquillity away from traffic; • Is used recreationally by children as a safe place to play. <p>The revised plans for three smaller areas of Local Green Space was not extensive and covered the most important and well-used areas of the site.</p> <p>The Site Bounded by Waterside lane, A65, Midland Terrace and Railway should be designated as a Green Space.</p> <p>The Local Green Space designation should at least cover the three smaller areas shown on the revised plans.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |
| MM87 HE-LGS1 | D Hawkins 294 | <p>Object to the recent planning application for tourism development on Hellifield Flashes.</p> <p>The Flashes site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as a site of wildlife value and important flood plain Nature Reserve.</p> | See response to representation 009 on MM87, HE-LGS1 |

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | Skipton Civic Society 044 | <p>Object to deletion of site SK-LGS64 as proposed by MM87. MM87 is unsound.</p> <p>The removal of Local Green Space Designation for the whole of SK-LGS64 is unjustified because a reasonable alternative is possible. Part of the area of land defined as SK-LGS64, known locally as Park Hill, does fulfil all the criteria for Local Green Space Designation as stated in paragraph 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019).</p> <p>Park Hill is in close proximity to the community it serves, adjoining Skipton to the north of the town. Its southern entrance off Chapel Hill/Mill Bridge is less than 300m (a 5 minute walk) from the High Street, is within a reasonable walking distance from almost all residential areas of the town.</p> <p>Skipton Civic Society strongly suggests that the area of Park Hill defined by the Society in this representation should not be regarded as extensive. It is a well-defined area of countryside and all parts of it are visible from the stile at the footpath's highest point.</p> <p>Park Hill is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has significant recreational value: a footpath runs up and over Park Hill from Chapel Hill to Short Lee Lane, connecting with footpaths both to the north of the A59 bypass and within Skipton Woods, providing opportunities to improve health and wellbeing of both residents and visitors. • The 360 degree views from the top of Park Hill are splendid. | <p>The representations received during public consultation on the Main Modifications provide clear evidence that site SK-LGS64 is demonstrably special to the local community of Skipton and holds a particular local significance in terms of the requirements of paragraph 77 of the NPPF (2012).</p> <p>The community response provides clear evidence that this area of land is well used and highly valued for its historic significance, its beauty and tranquil setting, as a space for recreation and an important resource for the health and well-being of residents, and as an important site for wildlife.</p> <p>Representations also support the Council's view that SK-LGS64 is not an extensive tract of land considering the role and function of the site as a whole in relation to the size of the community it serves.</p> <p>If the Inspector considers it necessary in his final report to recommend a change to the proposed modification, the following options are considered appropriate by the Council:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The whole of site SK-LGS64 be designated as Local Green Space, as in the Submission draft Craven District Council Local Plan. • If the Inspector's initial conclusion that this site is an extensive tract of land remain, then the Council would support the designation of a smaller area of Local Green Space, to the west of Skipton Woods which includes Park Hill, |

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has local and national historical significance. Its name refers to part of the hunting park of the Clifford family at Skipton Castle. There is a Scheduled Monument (List Entry Number: 1004878, Historic England) on the crest of the hill, which is the site of a Parliamentary Civil War battery. • Given Park Hill's historical and environmental significance, it could be used as an educational resource for schools and Pupil Referral Units. • The local character of Park Hill comprises pasture for sheep and cattle, a typical farming practice for this part of North Yorkshire. Its character has probably changed little during the last three hundred years. This green hill is visible from many areas of the town and is a highly valued component of the local townscape. <p>Further modification to MM87 suggested to designate an area known locally as Park Hill or Battery Hill as LGS as the area of land on the west side of Skipton Woods, bounded by Short Lee Lane to the north, Skipton Woods to the east, Chapel Hill to the south and Grassington Road to the west. In order to protect its character as a country lane and footpath, Short Lee Lane should be included within the proposed Local Green Space. (Figure 1 included within the representation illustrates this suggested area of LGS).</p> | <p>Short Lee Lane, Little Wood and the land to the north of Short Lee Lane. Map appended to this Schedule to show smaller area of Local Green Space referenced SK-LGS65.</p> |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | Cllr Brown 071 | <p>Object to the deletion of the full extent of Park Hill as LGS. MM87 is unsound.</p> <p>Park Hill is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is an important piece of green space that is accessed from the town centre and is integral to one of the | <p>See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64</p> |

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>most important heritage and tourism walks that Skipton has to offer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is an area of major historical importance having been the prime site of importance in the siege of Skipton Castle. • Is an area of land is important in its own right as a wildlife refuge. • Is not large and it is not unreasonable to designate it as a Green Space. <p>Full extent of the Park Hill area should be designated as LGS in line with every previous version of the plan that went out to public consultation.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | K Spracklen 073 | <p>Object to deletion of site SK-LGS64 as proposed by MM87. There is clear evidence that green spaces improve social and psychological wellbeing. Building on Park Hill would be a scandal for town that depends on people visiting it as an unspoilt town on the edge of the countryside. Building on it would ruin the wellbeing of local residents. Designation of LGS is the best and only way to ensure it is not built on.</p> <p>Park Hill must be protected by defining it in the Plan as Local Green Space, as the Council originally suggested.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | J Houlton 074 | <p>The deletion of SK-LGS64 Skipton (Park Hill and area) is not sound, because the deletion does not comply with national planning policy.</p> <p>This space is one which is reasonably close to the community it serves and although extending over a range of fields, the site has integrity, and does not form an extensive tract of land.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>The Park Hill area is demonstrably special to the local community, is local in character and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is important historically, not just for the reported archaeological site of a Civil War battery, but in the part it plays in the topography of a market town, surrounded by countryside. • Is significance in terms of landscape and views as evidenced in the Skipton Conservation Area Appraisal (SCAA) 2008. • Is important, highly valued and well used by both residents and visitors. <p>Site SK-LGS64 should continue to be designated as it is in the submission draft Craven Local Plan</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | L Devenish 076 | <p>Oppose the deletion of the designation of Park Hill (SKLGS64) as safeguarded local green space. MM87 is not legally compliant, is unsound and does not comply with the Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>I understand that its status was changed as the landowner made representations for the land to be developed for housing on the basis that it is not valuable to the community.</p> <p>This area of green space fulfils National Planning Policy criteria of LGS as the site is within close proximity to the local community.</p> <p>The area is demonstrably special to the local community, is local in character and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides recreation opportunities for short walks from the town along a green loop. The area provides recreation opportunities for people with limited | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>mobility & fitness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides long distance views from the top of Park Hill along the Aire Valley. Has historic significance – the location of a Civil War battery – and its inclusion in long-distance walking paths – Lady Anne’s Way and the Dales High Way. <p>Retain SK-LGS64 as proposed in the submission draft Craven Local Plan</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | D Chadwick 077 | <p>Object to deletion of site SK-LGS64 as proposed by MM87. MM87 is unsound as deletion of site is not justified.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is close to the community it serves as it is accessible by most of Skipton residents. Is special to the community, as evidenced at a local community engagement event held in 2013 for the local plan that showed that this site was overwhelmingly rejected as a development site. Many positive comments were made about its special character including the historic and amenity value of the site. Holds special local significance. Site houses a scheduled local monument – a civil war battery. Significant views of Skipton Castle, Church, High Street, Skipton Woods, The Dales and Embsay Crag from the top of the hill. Historic England, Skipton Civic Society and CDC all support this area as LGS. Is local in character. Site is mainly open farmland, bordered by hedgerows & stone walls. Is not a large tract of land. Large areas of LGS have been designated in other areas e.g. South Downs, Harrogate and Knaresborough. CDC proposed to | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | <p>designate a smaller area (site SK LGS50). The Inspector acknowledges in his letter (EL5.003) that the area is locally important and historically significant. Sites SK-LGS46, SK-LGS47, SK-LGS49 & SK-LGS51 are similar sized pieces of farm land on approaches to Skipton, are very similar in nature to SK-LGS50 and are not recommended for deletion. There is no clear evidence of local historic significance, recreational amenity or community support for these LGS designations, yet they were allowed to stay in the plan. The only difference is that there was no objection from the landowner of these sites. It can be argued that the inaccurate and misleading objection (EL5.087) could have unfairly influenced the Inspector.</p> <p>Retain SK-LGS64 as proposed in the submission draft Craven Local Plan or designate smaller site proposed by CDC SK-LGS50 in the Council's Response to Inspector's letter dated 13.11.2018 on Further Main Modifications to the Craven Local Plan re: Local Green Space Sites Refs SKLGS64 and HE-LGS1 (EL5.008b).</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | K Payne 078 | <p>Object to deletion of site SK-LGS64 as proposed by MM87. MM87 is unsound.</p> <p>Strongly argue that this piece of land is reasonably close to the community, demonstrably special to the community, holds a particular local significance, local in character and not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>Whilst recognising the need for controlled growth to reflect the growing, and ageing, population of Craven, the proposal to remove the designated green space of the area of land known as Park Hill appears contrary to several of the key</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>objectives set out in the spatial objectives and referred to in the SA Policies (in relation to the preferred Option E). For example:</p> <p>SO12: To conserve and enhance the historic environment and heritage asset. The proximity of the land to Skipton Woods (to support the protection if a key habitat), the historical associations with the Castle, and its inclusion of historic walking paths are important to this objective.</p> <p>SO13: To protect biodiversity, protected habitats and species: Its proximity to Skipton Woods as noted above is important to protect and preserve a precious environment.</p> <p>SO14: To protect and enhance the open countryside and landscape character</p> <p>SO5: To promote physical, mental and social wellbeing: the green space prominently stands over the town and is clearly visible to the town, promoting a feeling of wellbeing and beauty, appreciated by locals and visitors – important for the local economy</p> <p>SO16: Minimise air, noise and light pollution: Development of the land would absolutely affect the environment given its prominence, height and proximity to the town</p> <p>SO11: Ensure the prudent use of land resources:</p> <p>SO10: To protect the natural and agricultural conditions to maintain soil quality and grow food: the quality of the land appears prime agricultural and grazing land to support the local agriculture and economy.</p> <p>This parcel of land is central to the fabric and charm of the town and the loss of its green character would be absolutely detrimental from historical, wellbeing and economic</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | <p>perspectives.</p> <p>Reinstatement of the proposed area as Local Green Space.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | C Hawley 079 | <p>Object to deletion of site SK-LGS64 as proposed by MM87. Deletion does not comply with national planning policy as it is close to the community and is not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is very special to our community for historic, heritage, landscape, social health and tourist/business reasons, • It holds a particular local significance in terms of the view from Park Hill is one of the best of the church tower and town behind, • Park Hill is a historic site connected with the Castle and Civil War, • It is local in character (in aesthetics, landscape and wildlife) • The whole area including Short Lee Lane pedestrian access to Skipton Woods is important for tourism and identified as number 2 out of 25 things to do in Skipton on TripAdvisor. The 90 mile Dales High Way tourist walking route also uses Short Lee Lane. Park Hill has been recommended as a walk in the Yorkshire Post (Sept 2016), • The site offers recreation opportunities for visitors and resident as well as being important for the health and well-being of locals. <p>Site SK-LGS64 should be permanently protected and continue to be designated as it is in the submission draft Craven Local Plan</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | Cllr Solloway 080 | <p>Object to deletion of site SK-LGS64 as proposed by MM87.</p> <p>Site is very close to the community it serves. Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is crossed by several public rights of way. • Is very much part of a bio-diverse landscape that provides recreational facilities. • Has a rich diversity of wildlife. It is currently the subject of regional media attention due to it being the location of a large starling murmuration. <p>Site SK-LGS64 should continue to be designated as it is in the submission draft Craven Local Plan</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | A Forman 081 | <p>Object to the possibility of Park Hill ever being developed.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it is an asset to the town of historical, visual, cultural & recreational significance. There is a long distance footpath across the site which would become a nonsense if the area was developed.</p> <p>The area of Park Hill should be designated as LGS.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | Dr M Stead 082 | <p>Object to the deletion of site SK-LGS64. MM87 is not legally compliant, is unsound and does not comply with the Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>This area of land is extremely close to the community which it serves. There is little other accessible greenspace is on offer for the resident and visitors of Skipton.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is regarded this area as a prime area for recreational activity and is considered by the residents of Skipton as a special place. • Given the proximity to Skipton Castle, and being adjacent to the “Gateway to the Yorkshire Dales”, this area is of huge local significance. • Such areas are even more important today than ever, with the need for people to have the benefit of outdoor space for both mental a physical wellbeing. <p>Site SK-LGS64 should be maintained as a designated green space in the local plan.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | V Preston 083 | <p>Request the removal of Site Sk-LGS64 land north of Skipton from the Local Plan.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance for its historical, recreational and visual amenity.</p> <p>As a resident born in Skipton I have a special regard for Park Hill as do my children and grandchildren, all born in Skipton.</p> <p>Site SK-LGS64 Skipton should be designated as LGS.</p> | <p>The first sentence of the representation requests the removal of site SK-LGS64 from the Local Plan, however it is clear that the intention of the rest of the representation is that site SK-LGS64 is demonstrably special to the local community and that the site should be designated as LGS in the adopted Craven Local Plan.</p> <p>See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64</p> |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | S Fattorini 085 | <p>MM87 is unsound</p> <p>Disagree with total deletion of this site but would agree to a modification of designating two areas either side of Skipton Woods as LGS. Area to west known as Park Hill and area to east known as The Show Field.</p> <p>These two proposed LGS sites are in close proximity to the community they serve and are demonstrably special to the local community and hold local significance as:</p> | <p>See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64</p> |

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They have significant recreational value as the existing public footpaths link from the town to woods and the Yorkshire Dales National Park. • They are essential in the protection and survival of the rich and unique diversity of wildlife in this area. • Are of historic importance. 'Old Park' (Park Hill with hunting ground and Battery) with view to and from the castle. Show Field shown as Storam or Further Storam on Crows Map 1757 (enclosed with rep), an ancient field used for corralling deer during medieval times later known as Skipton Agricultural Show Field since 1855. • Significant vistas from public footpaths within Skipton Woods of both Park Hill and The Show Field. <p>Accept deletion of The Bailey Car Park from site SK-LGS64 but with modifications to the boundary (plan submitted with rep)</p> <p>Further modification to MM87 suggested to designate the following sites as LGS:</p> <p>Site SK-LGS64/A (Park Hill): Land North of Skipton, West and North of Skipton Castle Woods bounded by by-pass and Raikes Road.</p> <p>Site SK-LGS64/B (The Show Field): Land North of Skipton, East of Skipton Castle Woods and to the West of Embsay Road.</p> <p>(Map submitted illustrating these two areas of proposed LGS)</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | S Goodman 086 | Strongly oppose deletion of site SK-LGS64. MM87 is unsound and does not comply with the Duty To Cooperate. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>The site is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves.</p> <p>The site is not an extensive tract of land as it is bounded by the woods, the bypass, Mill Lane/Chapel Hill, Grassington Road and Raikes Road. The Council should take up again with the Inspector, the question as to whether Park Hill alone is an extensive tract of land or not.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as Park Hill is of historical significance, cultural significance and is important to local fauna given its proximity to Skipton Castle Woods. The area at the top of Park Hill is shown on the map as somewhere where there was an ancient gun emplacement, may go back to Cromwellian times and is the last surviving parliamentarian cannon battery from the civil war. It is/was classed as a protected ancient monument.</p> <p>Park Hill is the starting point for Lady Anne's Way and is also stopping off point for the Dales High Way route. Walking and tourism and consequently the business it generates for local shops, restaurants, hotels and B&Bs is crucial to keeping the unique character of Skipton.</p> <p>Site SK-LGS64 Skipton should be designated as LGS.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | S Goodman & S Hill 086, 087 | <p>Strongly oppose deletion of site SK-LGS64.</p> <p>The site is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves.</p> <p>The site is not an extensive tract of land as it is bounded by the woods, the bypass, Mill Lane/Chapel Hill, Grassington</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Road and Raikes Road. The Council should take up again with the Inspector, the question as to whether Park Hill alone is an extensive tract of land or not.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as Park Hill is of historical significance, cultural significance and is important to local fauna given its proximity to Skipton Castle Woods. The area at the top of Park Hill is shown on the map as somewhere where there was an ancient gun emplacement, may go back to Cromwellian times and is the last surviving parliamentarian cannon battery from the civil war. It is/was classed as a protected ancient monument.</p> <p>Park Hill is the starting point for Lady Anne's Way and is also stopping off point for the Dales High Way route. Walking and tourism and consequently the business it generates for local shops, restaurants, hotels and B&Bs is crucial to keeping the unique character of Skipton.</p> <p>Site SK-LGS64 Skipton should be designated as LGS.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | Knox 088 | <p>Concerns regarding the recent decision of the Planning Inspectorate to deny the designation of Local Green Space to a tract of land on the northern edge of Skipton (site SK-LGS64).</p> <p>The land considered as a single unit is indeed 'large' (75 hectares), however it is not an homogeneous area in that it comprises Park Hill, Skipton Woods, Skipton Castle and agricultural land to the west of Embsay Road. In grouping these disparate areas together a ruling has been applied which, if they were assessed individually, would not be</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>justified.</p> <p>Park Hill is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is of local recreational importance being the largest green area accessible from town. It is also crossed by 2 significant walking paths the Dales Highway and Lady Anne's way. • It is of considerable historical importance as the site of a Civil War battery and its proximity to Skipton woods. It is a regular walk for local people and tourists both of which enjoy the beauty, historical significance, recreational value, tranquility and richness of its wildlife. • Aesthetically it provides a wonderful view across town and of Skipton Castle - something that Turner appreciated on his visits to Skipton. | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | R Anderson 089 | <p>Opposed to the removal of Park Hill as a protected green space</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has recreational value – part of a circular walk next to the woods • It is beautiful • It adds character to Skipton <p>Please oppose this removal of protection as it truly adds something to Skipton.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | J Wilkinson 090 | Objection to the status of "Park Hill" as a Local | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Protected Green Space being changed.(Protection removed)</p> <p>I and many others use the public footpaths. I would not like to see this area developed into a building project</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | S Teale 091 | <p>Concern about the removal of Park Hill from the Local Plan. It should not be removed as it fulfils all the criteria needed for it to be protected.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adds to the character of Skipton, providing wonderful views that should be enjoyed by all • It helps to extend the enjoyment of the Woods and the wildlife <p>Protect this area from potential future development.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | W Sanderson 092 | <p>Opposed to losing the area of Park Hill as a designated LGS in north Skipton.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It easily accessible from Skipton and offers circular walks incorporating Skipton woods for residents and visitors alike and access to walks further afield as well as The Golf Club. <p>An alternative walking route leading to an increase in pedestrians would be along Grassington Road, which would not be either safe or enjoyable.</p> <p>Skipton has seen an excessive amount of development. Please do not think that Park Hill is another space suitable for residential development, achieving a quick profit.</p> <p>The area of Park Hill in the north of Skipton should be</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------|---|--|
| | | designated as LGS. | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | J Knox 093 | <p>Concern regarding the recent decision of the Planning Inspectorate to deny the designation of Local Green Space to a tract of land on the northern edge of Skipton (MM87 – sub item SK-LGS64).</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is of local recreational importance being the largest green area accessible from town • Is also crossed by 2 significant walking paths the Dales Highway and Lady Anne's way • Is in close proximity to Skipton woods and is a regular walk for local people and tourists (circular walk) • Has historical significance (civil war battery, artist Turner appreciated this area on his visits to Skipton) • Is rich in wildlife. • Has an impressive view across town and of Skipton Castle. <p>The land that was considered as a single unit is indeed 'large' (75 hectares). However the area is not a homogeneous area in that it comprises Park Hill, Skipton Woods, Skipton Castle and agricultural land to the west of Embsay Road. By grouping these disparate areas together a ruling has been applied which, if they were assessed individually, would not be justified. If Park Hill were to be judged on its own then it would tick every Local Green Space criteria.</p> <p>Potential future development could lead to huge flooding risk to the whole historic conservation area of Mill Bridge,</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Raikes Road, and Water Street when heavy rain comes down Chapel Hill, Eller Beck and Springs Canal off the steep Park Hill.</p> <p>The impact of another housing estate in Skipton on the infrastructure must be considered.</p> <p>The decision to remove the Green Space status should be rejected and this tract of land should remain as it is for current and future generations to enjoy.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | K Birks 094 | <p>Concern about the decision of a government inspector to remove the protected Local Green Space Designation of Park Hill.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeps the countryside close by and offers easy walks for all Skipton residents and visitors • Is reasonably close to the community it serves (next to the High Street) • Is demonstrably special, the site of an ancient monument • Has fabulous views • Is tranquil • Is local in character, with its sheep farming and dry stone walls. <p>The site is not extensive, owing to the A road behind. Skipton must hold on to this special green space.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | A Allen 095 | <p>Object to deletion of site SK-LGS64 and suggestion of a reduced area for consideration as LGS.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Suggested reduced LGS area proposed is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it has recreational value and offers peace and tranquillity leading to improved wellbeing for the people of Skipton.</p> <p>Further modification to MM87.</p> <p>Suggested reduced area as LGS to the west of Skipton Woods containing earthworks and Civil War Battery ancient monuments, two long distance footpaths (the Dales High Way and the Lady Anne Clifford Way), a footpath running northwest from The Pinfold to Short Lee Lane close to its junction with Grassington Road and Little Wood which contains the site of an old limekiln which is of historical interest.</p> <p>(Suggestive reduced LGS area is descriptive and no map provided to show site area)</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | M Keighley 096 | <p>Object to the exclusion of historic Park hill as a protected LGS in the draft local plan. This would leave it open to future development. Skipton already bursting at the seams. More development would increase pressure on infrastructure.</p> <p>Reconsider and designate Park Hill as a LGS to help protect it in the future.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | R Beck 097 | <p>With respect to SK-LGS64 the Inspector has erred in his interpretation of the advice in National Planning Policy Guidance (February 2019), when deciding not to designate Park Hill (SK-LGS64) as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>Site (Park Hill) is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is an elevated and imposing open area of land abutting the community it serves | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has historical significance (SAM Civil War Battery) • Forms a backcloth and an extremely important setting to the Skipton Parish Church and to the Grade 1 Listed Skipton Castle. • Is well-used by local people due to a Public Footpath over the hill • Has fantastic views over the whole of Skipton. • Is located within the designated Skipton Conservation Area • Constitutes an extremely important setting to the town, especially Skipton High Street. <p>Reconsider and reinstate Park Hill as a Local Green Space (SK-LGS64). It clearly satisfies all the criteria in paragraph 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019).</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | I Connell 098 | <p>MM87 is unsound and not in compliance with the Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>Objection to the removal of the area to the north of Skipton SK-LGS64 as LGS. This land is the last large open green space inside Skipton's bypasses. Potential for future development if protection lost.</p> <p>SK-LGS64 should remain as LGS as proposed in original local plan. Remove deletion of SK-LGS64.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | R Davey 099 | <p>Object to the proposal to reject the Green Space designation from Park Hill, Skipton.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has historical significance (gun battery used to bombard the castle into surrender in 1645 during the | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | <p>English Civil War)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has recreational value – tobogganing • Is easily accessible on foot • Provides a tranquil setting from which to enjoy the wildlife (curlew, screech owls, barn owls, murmuration of starlings) <p>It is not an extensive tract of land and provides a key amenity to Skipton Town.</p> <p>There is every reason to allow the Green Space Designation for Park Hill. There is no good reason to reject it.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | J Ledwon 100 | <p>MM87 is unsound.</p> <p>This land should be designated as Local Green Space as it meets all the required criteria. As town expands outwards in future years, this site should remain as a pocket of green space, in addition to Aireville Park, within the town.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is in close proximity to the community it serves • Is local in character • Has historical significance – both local and national significance with its connections to the Civil War and Skipton Castle • Has natural connections – essential to retain the open land around Skipton Woods to provide wildlife corridors and ecological balance • Has recreational connections - two PROWS running through it • Adds to the appeal as a tourist destination, benefits to local economy. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | <p>With regards to size, Skipton Woods is already designated as a nature conservation area so the "extra" area of green space would be in the region of 44 hectares. This is less than The Stray in Harrogate which is around 55 hectares (West & South of A61). It is not a vast area.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | S Clark 101 | <p>Object to removal of Park Hill LGS designation. Site is in close proximity to the community it serves. Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a vital green space to the setting of the historic market town. • Top of Park Hill commands a spectacular view of the town and its setting and the River Aire valley. • Park Hill has an historic scheduled Battery on it. • Park Hill is part of The Dales High Way and Lady Anne Way distance footpaths enjoyed by local and visiting walkers, with access from the town centre. • Adjacent to Skipton Woods is the historic waterworks comprising the leat to the Corn Mill, once powered by its still extant waterwheel, dams and sluices whose water powered mills down to and along Broughton Road. <p>The hardstanding of any development on this site would create a huge flood risk to the whole Conservation Area. 6 green fields in the town have been are about to be built on. Plus Park Hill? Where are all the jobs for these residents? Who did the required wildlife assessment of the area? Park Hill should never have had its protected LGS removed.</p> <p>Separate Park Hill from the field to the east of Skipton Woods. It is a special place, not too big, with a variety of flora and fauna.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | L Liggett 102 | <p>Objection to the proposed removal of Local Green Space Designation for Park Hill in Skipton.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has recreational value – walking • It is close to the community which it serves • It is the only land, without tree cover, that exists close to the town centre, thus providing fresh air away from the traffic. • Provides a central open space (parkland, not a play-park) in growing town • Has local historical significance in the Civil War, overlooking the castle and town • The distant views from the hill are wonderful • It is rich in wildlife – tawny owls, field voles, curlews, lapwings and oystercatchers <p>This relatively small area of land thus reflects the character of the Yorkshire Dales.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | D Webb and S Lennon 103, 104 | <p>Reconsider the proposed removal of Park Hill as a Local Green Space from the Local Plan for Skipton.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has an ever changing view, from livestock in the summer and children sledging in the winter • Has wildlife value – beautiful trees, starling murmurations • Has recreational value – walk connecting to Skipton Woods, sledging • Is an attractive approach to the town for residents and tourists | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Park Hill acts as a vital porous surface that helps prevent rainfall causing worse flooding to our street than that which we already experience in bad weather.</p> <p>Please consider local residents' views as well as our local wildlife and preserve Park Hill's status as a Local Green Space</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | H Longbottom 105 | <p>Concern that the protection of Park Hill's status as a Protected Local Green Space was removed. Should reinstate that protection.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is very close to the important historical areas of Skipton including the Castle, Holy Trinity Church, and the old but still working Corn Mill. The Battery in the middle of Park Hill (used in the Civil War) is an important feature being sited in a very elevated position. • Has recreational value – two long distance footpaths, 'The Lady Anne way' and 'A Dales High Way' which run across the top of Park Hill which locals use as well to gain access to Short Lee Lane. • The views from the top are magnificent. • It is linked to Skipton Woods by footpaths, the woods being within the town Conservation Area. <p>It is important to reinstate Park Hill's Local Green Space designation for future residents to enjoy and respect.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | C Naylor 106 | <p>Challenge to the soundness of MM87 based on its removal of green space designation from SK-LGS64.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | <p>There has been little attempt to break up the tract of land, despite its complex and multi-functional nature. If the tract of land is deemed too extensive to warrant LGS designation attempts should be made to break down the land into smaller, specific areas, rather than downgrade the tract totally and without nuance.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it provides important recreational space. There is a part of SK-LGS64 between A59 and Short Lee Lane which is unused by locals and has been used exclusively for grazing livestock.</p> <p>In order to improve the soundness of MM87, green space designation should be maintained for, if not all, at least the parts of SK-LGS64 which benefit the surrounding community. In particular, green space designation should be preserved for the woodland adjacent to Grassington Road and both sides of Park Hill.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | B Rawson 107 | <p>Concerned that Park Hill will lose its LGS status in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Park Hill is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local historic significance. This area of green space overlooks the Castle and forms a backcloth to this very important historical building. During the Civil War the Roundheads chose this hill, upon which to site their battery during the siege of the Castle. This site is still discernible and must be preserved. The area also has visual significance to Skipton and gives direct access pedestrian access from centre of the town to Yorkshire Dales National Park to the north.</p> <p>The area of Park Hill should be designated as LGS.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | P Freeman 108 | <p>MM87 is unsound</p> <p>This modification fails to take account of the beauty, historic significance and recreational value of the green space, which is in close proximity of the town.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic significance – Park Hill, also known as ‘Battery Hill’ was once part of Skipton Castle’s hunting park. Area provides context for the listed Skipton Castle and Holy Trinity Church. • Recreation value – Lady Anne’s Way crosses Park Hill providing a circular walk to and from the centre of Skipton for both visitors and residents. • Splendid views of Skipton and Sharpaw have been drawn by artists including Turner. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | M Woronowski 110 | <p>MM87 would result in Park Hill losing its designation as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>Park Hill seems to meet all the criteria for Local Green Space:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not allocated for alternative use and no incompatible planning permission has been granted. • It is close to the community it serves. The route through Park Hill is used by the local community for both short walks, linking up with Skipton Woods and/or Grassington Road, and for access to longer walks such as Sharpaw Fell. • It is local in character; it is comparative in size to other sites, such as LGS-SK33 which the Inspector has not deemed to be an extensive tract of land • It is special to the local community in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Beauty: The views from Park Hill are spectacular ○ Historic Significance: the site is a Scheduled Ancient Monument | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recreational Value: the site is used by the local community as part of various walking routes. • The site is clearly capable of enduring beyond the Local Plan period. <p>I would therefore like to propose that the area bounded to the north by Skipton By-Pass, to the east by Skipton Woods and to the west by Grassington Road be designated as Local Green Space.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | Friends of Lady Anne's Way 112 | <p>MM87 is not legally compliant, is unsound and does not comply with the Duty To Cooperate.</p> <p>Park Hill should be designated as LGS to save it from any future development.</p> <p>The view from the top of Park Hill is unique both looking towards Skipton and Embsay Crag.</p> <p>Help to support and maintain Lady Anne's Way, which is a long distance trail up Park Hill and the golf course.</p> <p>Park Hill should be designated as LGS.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | S Wilton 118 | <p>Oppose deletion of site SK-LGS64.</p> <p>MM87 is unsound</p> <p>Site is reasonably close to the community it serves. The summit of Park Hill being within 15 minute walk of the top of the High Street (see also response under b) below).</p> <p>The site is local in character and not an extensive tract of land. The fact that Park Hill virtually starts at the top of the High Street and can be seen from most parts of the town makes it geographically local in character. While the tract of land in question provides a sense of open space which greatly enhances its recreational value it cannot be described as 'extensive' as the entire area to the west of Skipton Castle Woods can be viewed from the summit of the Hill and is clearly defined by the Woods, the By-Pass and Grassington</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Road.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It forms part of the backdrop of hills that surround the town centre. This is one elements that combine to create the sense of well-being experienced by Skipton residents that was identified in a recent poll. • Park Hill has historic significance as it was the site of one of the Parliamentary batteries during the siege of Skipton Castle in the Civil War. • Park Hill's recreational value arises not only from the fact that two long distance footpaths, the Dales High Way and Lady Anne's Way, run over the top of Park Hill from Chapel Hill to Short Lee Lane but also from its popularity as view point affording a stunning roof-scape of Skipton and the hills to the south and north. <p>Reinstatement in the final version of the Craven Local Plan of Skipton-LGS64 'Land to the north of Skipton, bounded to the north by Skipton Bypass, to the East by Embsay Road & The Bailey; and to the west by Grassington Road, Skipton'.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | E Pyrah 119 | <p>We are disgusted and very concerned that the Local Green Space status of Park Hill should be removed for possible financial gain by the landowner.</p> <p>Considerable large scale building has taken place on many greenfields close to all roads leading to Skipton. Park Hill is one of the last remaining green area threatened by development and should be protected as LGS.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park Hill is a significant recreational open space which is historically important. Two long distance | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------|---|--|
| | | paths run over the hill, and the area is in constant use by walkers on their way through Skipton Woods, owned by The Woodland Trust. | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | Anonymous 123 | <p>Horrified to hear that Park Hill could lose its LGS status. Park Hill is close to the town centre.</p> <p>Park Hill is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is part of Skipton's history and heritage. • It has recreation value as it provides circular walks and access through Skipton Woods onto Golf Links Lane and towards Sharpaw for both visitors and residents. • Park Hill provides a 360 panoramic view of Skipton • Is one of the greatest assets of the town. <p>This area should never be built on or used for anything other than pasture land.</p> <p>Park Hill should be reinstated as LGS in the local plan.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | J Hunt 124 | <p>Concerned that Park Hill, Skipton, once designated in the towns Conservation Area as a protected LGS has had this protection removed.</p> <p>Park Hill is close to the community it serves.</p> <p>Park Hill is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is integral to the outskirts of Skipton Woods it adjoins. • View from its highest point give spectacular view of Skipton and the Aire Valley. <p>Strongly ask to reconsider this decision and once again protect this space.</p> <p>Separate issue – Representor notes that 2 areas of land once grazed by sheep are being built on. One at junction with Harrogate Road & Embsay Road and other is part of The Raikes near Raikeswood Drive. These are not social</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------|--|--|
| | | housing and do nothing to enhance the area. | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | D Langham 127 | <p>Astonished that Park Hill has been removed, as a protected LGS, from the Local Plan. Removal of this protection makes Park Hill vulnerable to development. The loss of this site to housing would be a tragedy.</p> <p>Park Hill is close to the community it serves, is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>Park Hill is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has historic importance. The view from the Civil War Battery site is a breath taking historic site, • It is rich in wildlife, • It has scenic and recreation value and provides walking routes from Grassington Road towards the town. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | J Kendrew 128 | <p>Object that Park Hill has been removed from the March 2018 Local Plan as protected LGS.</p> <p>Park Hill is close to the centre of Skipton, is an area of unique character and is not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>Park Hill is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides recreation opportunities for local people and visitors. Dales High Way and Lady Anne's Way provides long distance walking routes via Park Hill. • It has historic significance. <p>Park Hill should still be protected as LGS.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | L & A Taylor 129 | <p>Green fields near Park Hill should remain as open country. Oppose any future plans to develop the area for housing, business or industry.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park Hill is part of ancient woodland that once belonged to Skipton Castle. • Existing woodland has recently being enhanced and this woodland is accessed via the adjacent open land. The site is important in terms of providing opportunities for recreation and is valued for its wildlife. <p>Park Hill should be protected from any future development.</p> <p>The area of Park Hill should be designated as LGS.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | V G Edy 133 | <p>Feel very strongly that the Inspector was wrong in his decision to remove the Local Green Space designation from Park Hill, and that this decision should be reversed. Site is not especially extensive.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is adjacent to the centre of the town, and to the Grassington Road. • It is a beautiful, tranquil and natural addition to the town's attractiveness and is regularly used as a walking route by tourists and locals coming from the town via Skipton Woods and back into town. • Has historic significance as the site of a Civil War battery during the siege of Skipton Castle. <p>The proposal to designate merely the small field alongside the bypass and a tract from Short Lee Lane along the Grassington Road is inadequate, for these areas are neither</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>special, historic nor of recreational value.</p> <p>Site SK-LGS64 Skipton should be designated as LGS.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | J Edy 134 | <p>Comment on the removal of the Local Green Space designation for Park Hill, Skipton.</p> <p>Park Hill is not considered an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>Park Hill is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is in close proximity to Skipton; • It is of great importance to residents and visitors as a tranquil, green setting for the town; • It is used recreationally for walking and for the enjoyment of views; • It is of historical significance, being the site of the Civil War battery. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | K Thomson-Barker 135 | <p>Object to the removal of the Local Green Space designation for Park Hill, Skipton.</p> <p>Park Hill is not considered an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>Park Hill is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is used recreationally for walking and jogging. It forms part of a circular walk, linking Skipton Woods back to Skipton; • It is an important green space in close proximity to residents; • It is an area of beauty, particularly enjoyed for its views across to Park Hill, with Skipton Woods beyond; • It forms part of the local character of Skipton. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------|---|--|
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | F Protheroe 136 | <p>Express concern about the removal of the Local Green Space designation for Park Hill, Skipton. Park Hill is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is well used recreationally as an accessible place to walk, run and play; • It is enjoyed for its wonderful views, both from the site and of the site. It provides a green and rural aspect to visitors entering Skipton from Grassington road; • It is appreciated by residents and visitors as a green space to breath clean air, relax and as a refuge from noise. Important for physical and mental well-being; • It is very close to Skipton Town Centre and within walking distance of the majority of Skipton residents; <p>It's a much valued part of the community. The area should remain protected as Local Green Space in its entirety.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | K Hillery 137 | Objection to the removal of the Local Green Space designation for Park Hill, Skipton. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | I Benjamin 138 | <p>Object to the removal of SK-LGS64, Park Hill, as a Local Green Space from The Local Plan. Park Hill fulfils the Government guidelines for the designation of Local Green Space. It is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is in close proximity to the whole of Skipton; • It is the only Green Space of natural character left in town, and is not an extensive tract of land; • It is within the town's Conservation Area. • The footpaths are well used by residents and visitors, who enjoy views over Skipton from the top of Park Hill. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | I and D Kernot 141 | It is an error to remove the Local Green Space designation from Park Hill. The site is within close proximity to the town and has major visitor features. The designation should be reinforced, not removed. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | M Spencer 150 | Object to the removal of the Local Green Space designation for Park Hill, Skipton. Park Hill is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a natural hill, visible from various points in Skipton, which prevents the town from feeling 'hemmed in'; • It is used recreationally for walking and playing; • Residents value the view of the site from the Town Centre; It is not an extensive tract of land. The Local Green Space designation at Park Hill should be reinstated. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | L Palmer 153 | Express concern about the removal of the Local Green Space designation for Park Hill, Skipton. Park Hill is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is used recreationally for walking, with two popular walks passing over the Hill; • The views over Skipton on the approach to the town from the site are special and should not be underestimated. Important to the setting of Skipton; • It is an historic & hence sensitive area that should be protected from urban sprawl. The site meets the Government guidelines for the designation of Local Green Space. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------|---|--|
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | M Bewes 154 | <p>Object to the decision to remove Park Hill from the Local Plan as a designated LGS. Will leave this unique open area open to future development.</p> <p>Park Hill is visible from many parts of the town and should be preserved as it is for everyone to enjoy in the future.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | J Harris 155 | <p>Objection to the proposed removal of the Local Green Space Designation for Park Hill from the Local Plan.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is close to the community it serves – close to the middle of Skipton so it is a good starting/finishing point for a walk, without need for a car • Has recreational value – walking, unique and extensive views, “Dales High Way” and “Lady Anne’s Way” • Is rich in wildlife – deer on boundary between hill and Skipton Woods • Is tranquil • Has historic significance – proximity to Skipton Castle, civil war battery on top of hill • Is in the Conservation Area. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | V Cartman 156 | <p>Object to deletion of Park Hill as proposed by MM87. Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides opportunities for walking for both residents and visitors from the town, • Is part of the towns history, • Can be seen from many places and belongs to the community. <p>Park Hill, Skipton should be designated as LGS.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------|---|--|
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | J & W Nixon 157 | <p>Support for the re-instatement of Park Hill as a LGS.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is close to Skipton town centre and adds to its charm and character • Has recreational value – two long distance footpaths used by residents and visitors, majestic views from the top, sledging, good for health and appreciation of open spaces • Has historic significance dating back to the Civil War and siege of Skipton Castle. • Compliments the improvements made to Skipton Wood • Rich in wildlife – deer <p>If protection is not re-instatement, concern over the possibility of future development.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | M Benson 158 | <p>Object to removing protected status from Park Hill</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to the community it serves – right on edge of town centre • Enhances the setting of the castle and Skipton Woods • Rich in flora and fauna <p>Allowing this land to be built on will add chaos to our groaning infrastructure and increase flood risk.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | G Carter 159 | <p>Concern that Park Hill area of Skipton, bounded by Grassington Road, Short Lee Lane, Skipton Woods and Chapel Hill could be deleted as a LGS from the local plan.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has particular beauty • Has historic significance • Is the area where the 'Gateway to the Dales' starts • Is tranquil • Has a vast assortment of wildlife • Is used for recreation – dog walkers, ramblers, birdwatchers <p>The local plan has allocated sufficient land for future housing needs without having to adopt the Park Hill area for development. The Park Hill area needs to have protection.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | C Wright 160 | <p>Park Hill should be re-instated as a protected LGS in the local plan for Skipton.</p> <p>Park hill is a local piece of land, close to Skipton town, with historical significance (part of long established footpaths, a site of a Civil War battery). It is a quiet, open space overlooking Skipton giving the town great character and enjoyments for its inhabitants as well as for visitors.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | Friends of Raikes Road Burial Ground 161 | <p>MM87 is unsound.</p> <p>This representation sets out extensive historical and ecological information with regards to Raikes Road Burial Ground which forms part of the area SK-LGS64. It also sets out its value to the local community and its European recognition as an approved member of the Association of Significant Cemeteries in Europe (this carries no special protection for the site).</p> <p>Raikes Road Burial Ground by itself meets all the criteria for</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>designation for LGS (close to the community it serves, is demonstrably special, holds particular local significance, is local in character and not an extensive tract of land).</p> <p>Site is surrounded now by development, except for the land to its north and partly to the east, all forming part of SK-LGS64. Development of this land would leave the Burial Ground vulnerable to added pressure on its nature, fabric and ecology. At present Park Hill and its environs in SK-LGS64 soak up considerable rainfall and delay water through-flow to the local watercourses, and is essential to protect this community resource and ecology.</p> <p>The whole of SK-LGS64 should be designated as LGS.</p> <p>If this is not possible then as a minimum the area indicated by a broken black line (map attached to representation) be designated as LGS as it would be close to the community, would feed into the historic environment of the area, and provide for a green corridor allowing for ecological connection with Skipton Woods and the copse and land on Grassington Road.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | P Hadfield 162 | <p>MM87 is unsound.</p> <p>The proposal to remove the designation of LGS from SK-LGS64 contradicts many of the Objectives as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal in relation to the preferred Option E (i.e. SO12, SO13, SO14, SO5, SO16, SO11, SO10)</p> <p>This parcel of land is central to the fabric and charm of the town and the loss of its green character would be detrimental from ecological, cultural, well-being, historical and economic perspectives.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| | | This tract of land fits the criteria in the NPPF. The plan should reinstate the proposed area as LGS. | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | G Hutchinson 163 | <p>Park Hill should be reinstated as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is adjacent to a community and local • Is a visible green space from miles • Contains a popular marked footpath with views over Embsay Crag and Pendle Hill, and back drop to Skipton Woods walk. <p>Much development already happening in Skipton which provides increased strain on the infrastructure.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | J Berry 164 | <p>Objection to the proposed re-designation of an area of land noted as SK-LGS64 to the north of town, adjacent to Grassington Road, known locally as Park Hill or Battery Hill, from green belt to potential development land.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The hill at the rear of Grassington Road, accessed via Chapel Hill is one of Skipton's gems. • It has recreational value, walking and sledging. • It has great views of Skipton • Has historical significance (Cromwell's battery of the Castle and how the siege went on for so long) <p>SK-LGS64 should be designated as LGS.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | E Cowan 165 | Objection to the removal of Park Hill as a protected space from the Skipton Local Plan. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK- |

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It holds a prominent position in Skipton (views or surrounding area) • Has recreational value • The hills that surround Skipton, where livestock graze, are essential in maintaining the historic market town of Skipton and preserving it for generations to come. • It has historic and cultural significance <p>Skipton is known as the Gateway to the Dales - purely because it currently feels like it borders the National Park. By potentially allowing building on Park Hill you would be ruining that importance.</p> <p>Park Hill, Skipton should be designated as LGS.</p> | LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | M Rook 168 | <p>Objection to the deletion of SK-LGS64 as LGS.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unique and beautiful and has historical and cultural significance • It is good for walking, just 5 minutes from the very busy Grassington Road • It is a huge attraction for both tourists and locals <p>If this space were to be used for housing the infrastructure would suffer.</p> <p>SK-LGS64 should be designated as LGS.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | A Fletcher 169 | <p>Objection to the deletion of Park Hill as LGS.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK- |

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | <p>holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides green space for the enjoyment for residents and visitors around Skipton, significantly Park hill with its close proximity to Skipton Wood and the castle alike • Has historical value linked to the history of the town (during the Civil War, Park hill was the site of the battery which was aimed at the castle) • Has recreational value (walking, running, sledging, enjoying wildlife and fresh air) <p>Park Hill, Skipton should be designated as LGS.</p> | LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | J Towers 171 | <p>Concern that the area known as Park Hill (or Battery Hill) in Skipton has had its designation as a Local Green Space removed from the latest version of the Local Plan for Craven.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community, holds local significance and fulfils all the criteria set out by the government in the National Planning Policy Framework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is close to the town, • It has historic significance (the Civil War battery) • It has recreational value (with accompanying health benefits), • It is a highly attractive space • It is local in character. • Park Hill (i.e. the fields lying between Short Lee Lane, Skipton Woods, Chapel Hill and Grassington Road) is a well-defined area of land and cannot reasonably be regarded as an “extensive tract of land”, given that this term has no governmental or legal definition. • It is an integral component of Skipton’s tourist package. <p>Reinstate Park Hill as a Local Green Space for Skipton.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------|---|--|
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | C Hawkins 173 | <p>Concern that the status of this land may be changed allowing part of it to be developed in the future. I understand this land was given to the residents of Skipton to enjoy and have some much needed green space preserved for future generations. This is even more important today with development going on at a fast pace. Research has proved open green spaces are vital for our mental health. I am strongly against any change in status and trust my view and that of others will be considered carefully.</p> <p>SK-LGS64 should be designated as LGS.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | D Griffiths 174 | I'd like to lodge my objection to the development of Park Hill which for so many reasons seem to be one step too far for a town already growing beyond its present levels of sustainability. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | C Kennedy 175 | <p>Support for Park Hill in Skipton being saved as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is green space near to home • Is a good introduction to Skipton • Provides opportunities for dog walkers to access the wood from the footpath <p>Reconsider the proposed removal of green space designation for Park Hill as it is so important to the local community.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | L Kirkbride 176 | <p>Support for Park Hill in Skipton being saved as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it :</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is close to the community it serves • Is readily accessible green space • Has beautiful views • Is home to wildlife and habitats • Has important features unique to the local community • Has strong historical significance. <p>Reinstate Park Hill as a Local Green Space for Skipton.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | J A Machell 178 | <p>Objection to the removal of the LGS designation for Park Hill from the Local Plan</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational value (walking by locals and ramblers) • Beautiful views into Skipton and across the Dales • Historical importance (location of Roundhead Batteries in Civil War which held siege on Skipton Castle) • Is local in character and close to the local community <p>Reconsider decision to protect and preserve this well-loved part of the heritage of Skipton</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | C Hoole 183 | <p>Objection to the removal of the LGS designation for Park Hill from the Local Plan</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational value (walking, jogging) • Historical value • Wildlife value as runs beside Skipton Wood <p>No development should take place on this site.</p> <p>Reinstate Park Hill as a Local Green Space for Skipton.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | J Baines 184 | <p>Park Hill, Site SK-LGS64, land north of Skipton should be kept as protected local greenspace in the Local Plan.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK- |

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational value (walking) • Peaceful setting • Interesting viewpoints of Skipton • Historical importance <p>Reconsider any proposal to remove the site as listed greenspace, and instead protect this area for the enjoyment and education of future generations.</p> | LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | L Perkins 185 | <p>MM87 is not legally compliant, is unsound, and is not in compliance with the Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>The removal of SK-LGS64 is unacceptable as it is not compliant with government guidelines for LGS designation.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is local to Skipton town centre and castle • Has recreational value (site is adjacent to Skipton wood and used for walking) • Has spectacular views of the town <p>The site is also not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>SK-LGS64 should be reinstated.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | M Bramley 186 | <p>MM87 is unsound.</p> <p>Oppose deletion of SK-LGS64 and keep Park Hill as green space. I agree it is an extensive tract of land. An extensive tract of land that is integral to the character of the town.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Epitomises the green heart of Skipton. The walk through the woods and back over battery hill is the epitome of the town's healthy inspiring worth. • Promotes health and well-being. Removing the green space acts against the health of the town. People who do not habitually drive become limited in exercise and health. • Promotes the environment. Paving over more land runs counter to the longer term needs of our local and national ecosystem. <p>Protect all of Park Hill</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | B Nelson 187 | <p>Objection to the removal of the LGS designation for Park Hill from the Local Plan, as if it not given this status of a protected green space, there might be a threat of housing development on it or part of it.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates the impact of landscape as part of the streetscape. In Skipton, one is constantly aware of the surrounding hills, they are part of the town's character. Sightings of sheep grazing on hills from the town centre, hence the town's name and the important image that sheep have for the town. <p>Such a juxtaposition of town and countryside must be a rare feature matched by few towns in the country. To destroy it would be to lose a fine piece of townscape.</p> <p>Reinstate Park Hill as a Local Green Space for Skipton.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------|---|--|
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | V Jackson 191 | <p>Object to the removal of Park Hill as a Local Green Space. Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has recreational value - Park Hill is a pleasant place to walk • Is close to the community it serves – it can be easily reached from Chapel Hill and Short Lee Lane and connects with other footpaths. In addition, it connects with the paths in Skipton Woods, the openness of Park Hill making a contrast with the woods. • Provides extensive view of the town and neighbouring countryside. • Has potential to make a useful educational resource for local schools. • Is a place of historical interest being the site of the Civil War battery, as well as being a resource for geography, geology and agriculture. <p>It is an uplifting amenity with a peaceful rural atmosphere but is nevertheless in close proximity to the town. It is therefore within easy walking distance for exercise and fresh air without the need to use cars or buses. I would not wish this amenity to be lost.</p> <p>Reinstate Park Hill as a Local Green Space for Skipton.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | G Dean 192 | <p>Objection to the removal of the designated 'Local Green Space' status of Park Hill in Skipton.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is close to the community it serves - It is accessible directly from the town either via Chapel Hill or Short Lee Lane. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remains a special place for local walkers and walking groups, with footpaths from it connecting through to Skipton Castle Woods. • Is local in character - Park Hill sits at the head of the town alongside the Castle and woods. It is a clearly visible focal point from many parts of the town, a backdrop to the castle and an important part of Skipton's English civil war history. • Is a key part of what makes Skipton so special, not only for local residents but also for the tourism on which so many of our local businesses, and certainly our enviable High Street, rely upon. <p>We want to add our voice to the many others that feel as strongly as ourselves and wish to see the Local Green Space Designation re-instated.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | G Davies 193 | <p>Strong objection to the removal of the Local Green Space Designation for Park Hill in Skipton.</p> <p>Park Hill is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has historical importance as the hill can be defined as part of "The Historic Castle Complex." (the castle, the adjacent woods, Skipton's early industrial and residential buildings near to Mill Bridge and Chapel Hill, where John Wesley once preached, 350-year-old battery, used by Oliver Cromwell's Roundheads during their 3-year siege of Skipton Castle, a Royalist stronghold during the English Civil War) • It has recreational value as the hill provides a unique viewpoint, leisure-space and walking-paths for locals, (views of Aire Valley, Pendle, Sharp-haw, Embsay Crag and the Dales). Also includes designated tourist | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | <p>pathways "Dales High Way" and "Lady Anne's Way." Also recreational value from sledging.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home to wildlife, including wild deer, which use the hill as a pathway between Castle Woods and the Dales towards Rylstone. • Is an integral part of Skipton's brand as "The Gateway to the Dales." <p>I sincerely hope these comments help to re-instate the protection of Park Hill as a Local Green Space.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | L Gould 194 | <p>Objection to the deletion of SK-LGS64 Land to north of Skipton, bounded to the north by Skipton Bypass, to the east by Embsay Road & The Bailey; and to the west by Grassington Road, Skipton.</p> <p>The area has legal protection under the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) updated Feb-19. Section 8, i.e. the footpath over Park Hill, a public right of way, carries Lady Anne's Way (named after Lady Anne Clifford) and A Dales Highway, a 90 mile long footpath linking Saltaire and Appleby-in-Westmoreland.</p> <p>The sites is close to the community it serves, is demonstrably special and local in character and not an extensive tract of land, as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can be at the edge of Park Hill from town centre within five minutes. • The area has historic significance (encompasses the earthworks of the Civil War battery and is adjacent to the grounds and medieval hunting park of Skipton Castle, a Grade 1 listed building and of national importance) • The area has environmental importance (Roe deer, curlews, Skipton Wood is an ancient woodland) • The area has a lot of importance within the local community (recognised by the 2013 consultation in | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>preparation for the Local Plan. The Park Hill area had the most objections and the least in favour ratio of all the sites in Skipton)</p> <p>The Council should take up again with the Inspector, the question of whether Park Hill alone is an extensive tract of land or not (it is bounded by the woods, the bypass, Mill Lane/Chapel Hill, Grassington Road and Raikes Road).</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | Cllr Solloway on behalf of L Gould 194 | <p>This green space is very close to the community it serves. This green space is special to the local community for the following reasons:-</p> <p>It is crossed by several public rights of way.</p> <p>It is very much part of a bio-diverse landscape that provides recreational facilities.</p> <p>It has a rich diversity of wildlife . In fact it is currently the subject of regional media attention due to it being the location of a large starling murmuration.</p> <p>I would like this area to continue to be designated as it is in the Local Plan</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | D Blackwell 198 | <p>MM87 is unsound.</p> <p>Objection to the removal of the LGS designation SK-LGS64 from the Local Plan</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has recreational importance – walking, sledging, enjoyment of open space and views • Has access to PROWs and enhances of public's use of these • Has been identified locally – locals have been part of the planning making process, inspector's removal of this LGS site is made without appreciation of local issues. • Has special circumstances – default position in guidance suggests locals should be able to designate special sites | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------|-------|---|---|
| | | <p>as LGS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is in close proximity to the community it serves - it is a green space resource which projects into the historic heart of the town within easy walking distance for nearly everyone • Is demonstrably special – beauty and tranquillity (open, peaceful vistas), historic significance (nearby castle, Raikes Road Burial Ground), richness of wildlife (deer, birdlife, provision of buffer zone for Skipton Castle Woods and Raikes Road Burial Ground). Flooding would be an issue to surrounding areas if this area developed in future. • Is local in character and not an extensive tract of land – as there are no hard and fast rules with regards to the definition of ‘extensive’, then the nature of the area and its interaction with other neighbouring areas has to be judged locally, with an appreciation and understanding of the areas importance. The land may be a ‘tract’, but not extensive, It is not an attempt to give blanket designation to an area with considerable variety within it. If it were smaller it would be difficult to perform the functions outlined above. This designation can be considered as trying to achieve a new Green Belt or protect one that exists. <p><u>Option 1</u> This modification should be removed entirely, and the designation of this area (SK-LGS64) as Local Green Space be restored.</p> <p><u>Option 2</u> If the appeal to restore designation to the whole area is unsuccessful, then I would propose that the following area (shown in pink on the map – attached to rep) be designated as a priority.</p> | |
| MM87 | R & A | MM87 is not legally compliant and is unsound. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK- |

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|---|--|
| SK-LGS64 | Whelan-Smith 202 | <p>Objection to the removal of the LGS designation from Park Hill in Skipton.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historical significance (battery for civil war on top of hill) • Cultural significance • Wildlife significance – gives local fauna access to Skipton Castle Woods • Close to the community – entrance is roughly 280m from the top of the High Street. • It is a distinctive feature of Skipton and visible from many parts of the town. • Has recreational value (starting point for 'Lady Anne's Way' PROW, and stopping of point for Dales High way routes) • Has tourism value (walkers and tourists generates business for local shops) <p>The site is not an extensive tract of land – Park Hill is bounded by the woods, the bypass, Mill Lane/Chapel Hill, Grassington Road and Raikes Road. Designation would ensure that the area is preserved as a whole would remove the chance or inappropriate use of any of the land resulting in detriment to the whole community and landscape.</p> | LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | Cllr Dawson 203 | <p>Policy ENV10 on Local Green Space should continue to include Land at SK-LGS64 as such local green space.</p> <p>The Inspector did not take account of or was not aware of the importance of this area of land at Park Hill to the people of Skipton. This could be because, as the land was proposed to be designated as local green space in the submitted Plan, there was little comment from residents as they thought effectively the job was done with such a designation.</p> <p>Now residents have become aware of the modification, they</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>have expressed their views. As Ward Councillor, I have had over 50 emails or letters on this one issue and I have replied to them all.</p> <p>The key issues are that this land is of great importance to the people of Skipton as it is close to the centre and dominates this part of town. It is widely used for walking and leisure activities but, most of all, it is of huge historical significance. The Castle was subject to a long siege during the English Civil War and all this surrounding land is relevant to those events.</p> <p>Para.77 of the NPPF clearly states that the designation as local green space should only be used when it is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance for various reasons including its beauty, historic significance and recreational value. This land meets all these tests. Further it is in reasonably close proximity to the Skipton community it serves and it is local in character. I do not consider it an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>Hence, I ask that the land be reinstated as local green space.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | Harvey 206 | <p>Object to the updated local plan and the removal of the Protected Local Green Space allocation of the historic location Park Hill, as this would have a significant and dramatic impact on our property, the local community and visitors to Skipton</p> <p>The removal of this classification would make it easier for this land to be developed in the future and therefore must be challenged to ensure the Local Protected Green Space allocation is reinstated as per the original plan.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | Embsay with Eastby PC | <p>MM87 is unsound.</p> <p>The Parish Council acknowledges that SK-LGS64 is too</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | 209 | <p>large to qualify within the criteria for Local Green Spaces. Whilst the whole area has the integrity of history, natural history, recreation and amenity, of particular concern to the Parish Council and parishioners of Embsay with Eastby is the land bounding onto Cross Bank, Skipton Woods and the Skipton / Embsay Road.</p> <p>This latter parcel of land effectively:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates a green 'buffer' maintaining a clear green division between the primarily rural parish of Embsay with Eastby and the extending urbanisation of Skipton. • Has high landscape value from the heavily and regularly used footpath flanking the north western edge of Skipton Road to the northern horizon • Further enhances the amenity aspects of access from Skipton Woods and the nationally recognised Lady Anne's Way. <p>The Parish Council is of the opinion that the whole tract of land is related, given that its major significance is that it forms part of the site from which a 3-year siege was made by Cromwell, during the Civil War, and has remained virtually undisturbed for over three hundred and fifty years.</p> <p>The Parish Council considers that the necessary change is the reinstatement of the original reference for the reasons stated above, namely MM87 - Policy ENV10 Local Green Space - SK LGS64, but would suggest a division into three separate parcels, as put forward by Craven District Council in its revised submission of the 22nd January 2019, following the rejection of SK LGS 64 in its entirety, by the Inspector.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | G Vernon 212 | Objection to the removal of the LGS designation from Park Hill in Skipton (area bounded by Grassington Road to the west, Skipton Woods to the east, and the Skipton Bypass to | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>the north).</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has recreational value (PROWs including track from Grassington Road to the woods and Lady Anne's Way, walkers, runners, birdwatchers for curlews, goldfinch, blue tit, green tit, wren, blackbird, dunnoek) • Has historical significance (battery) • Emerges very close to the town centre. Possible to walk to hill in minutes. • Is tranquil • Its attractiveness adds to tourist potential of the town • Will provide accessible open green space for new families who live in new developments around the town. <p>Can accept that the entire proposed areas (SK-LGS64) is an extensive tract of land, but Park Hill (as identified above) should be designated at LGS.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | H Morag Lambson 213 | <p>Objection to the deletion of SK-LGS64. The whole site should remain as LGS</p> <p>With respect to Park Hill the site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has recreational value – running, walking, Skipton Woods, Lady Anne's Way, A Dales High Way. • Is close in proximity to the town which helps maintain tourism • Is not an extensive tract of land, rather a modest one • Has wildlife value - provides space for the plants and wildlife in nearby Skipton Woods to flourish (kingfishers, otters, herons, deer) <p>If Park Hill was to lose its protected status it would open the possibility of buildings some point risking the destruction of these precious places.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | Cllr C Rose 214 | <p>This section of the local plan is unsound. The area SK-LGS64 is, beyond all reasonable doubt, a designated Local Green Space. Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves • Has historic significance which is extensive • Is beautiful with stunning views • It is tranquil and contributes to the general health and well-being of the community • Has recreational value (long distance footpaths which cross Park Hill, The Dales Highway and Lady Anne's Way) • Has wildlife value <p>The area is local in character and not a significant tract of land. It is an invaluable addition to the unique mixture of urban and rural character of the town of Skipton. In order to make this particular Main Modification sound, it is necessary to designate – in perpetuity - the area SK-LGS64 - Local Green Space.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | S Laycock 215 | <p>MM87 is unsound. Oppose deletion of SK-LGS64. Park Hill is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helps to preserve the tranquillity of nearby Skipton Wood and its wildlife. • Is visible from many parts of Skipton and would have a detrimental effect on the look and appearance of the town if it ceased to be a green space. • Has recreational value (residents and tourists) • Is part of a conservation area • Has historic importance. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>It is not “extensive tract of land” and should remain as a whole in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>The Council should object strongly to this proposal and challenge the Inspector - not least because the land is bounded by the woods, the bypass, Mill Lane/Chapel Hill, Grassington Road and Raikes Road which makes the definition of Park Hill as an extensive tract of land definitely questionable.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | D Chalishika 220 | <p>Objection to the removal of Park Hill from LGS status. Park Hill is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has recreational value as part of the circular walk through Skipton Woods • Has wildlife value – need to maintain a variety of ecosystems around Skipton Woods to help support the flora and fauna found there. • It is a refuge for both humans and another animals, in a town that seems to be growing at an alarming rate • Has historical significance • Has a fantastic view of the town for all to enjoy | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | P Norman 223 | <p>Object to the removal of local green space designation for this location.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is readily accessible from the town (few minutes walk) • Has an amazing panoramic view from the stile on Park Hill • Has historical importance (scheduled ancient monument, Storems Laithe as part of Skipton Castle’s hunting grounds, and the Castle) • Has recreational value – PROW across Park Hill which is also the route of two long distance footpaths, ‘Lady Anne’s Way’ and the ‘Dales Highway’. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wildlife value - adjacent to Skipton Woods Development would be detrimental to the ecology of the area <p>If the green space was lost to development there would be increased risk of flooding in the area on the map (attached to rep)</p> <p>This is not a large site but extremely lovely and of great amenity value to the local community and visitors. Not being green space would be a tragic loss.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | R Pearson 224 | <p>MM87 is unsound.</p> <p>Objection of the removal of the LGS designation for the whole of SK-LGS64 and particularly the area known as Park Hill under MM87. This runs contrary to the opinion of the District Council whose draft local plan has gone through many years of gestation and public consultation.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is more than reasonably close to the community it serves Has historical significance (as context to the castle, Park Hill has battery which is a SAM) Has recreational value – PROW over Park Hill is part of a circular walk, and connects town to Dales Has attractive views of the Aire Valley from the battery Helps preserve the setting and survival of nearby Skipton Wood, and its tranquillity Local in character – extension to the Gateway to the Dales down into the town centre and is as much a part of the town as it's built form <p>No clear definition of 'extensive tract of land', this decision is purely subjective. The area west of Skipton Woods is a well-defined field system setting with boundaries and bisected from other fields north by the by-pass.</p> <p>The loss of this area of land (which forms a natural sump of rainwater) to potential hard surface will be significant and</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>undermine recent alleviation works in the Skipton Flood Alleviation system.</p> <p>Option 1: Preference is to retain the whole of SK-LGS64 at LGS</p> <p>Option 2: Land designated as LGS would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park Hill and its approaches off Chapel Hill so that the Battery summit and green hill are left as open space elevated above the town and the Right of Way across retained as a green route. • A significant open space barrier from Skipton Castle Wood set boundary to the boundary of Grassington Road including the copse adjoin the road but not the land north of Short Lee Lane. | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | T Thompson 225 | <p>MM87 is unsound.</p> <p>Object to the removal of SK-LGS64 as LGS.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is reasonably close to the community it serves - only agricultural and natural green space easily reached from the town centre without the need for a car or need to cross a busy transport link • Is local in character and not an extensive tract of land – this site is the last remaining areas which represents the traditional farming way of life in Skipton. This site cannot be considered extensive given it is smaller than the total area now given over to housing. • Does not appear to have planning permission based on the plan or have been allocated for housing. As such this means that under Test 2 this land could be allocated as LGS. • Is valued for its beauty: accessible views of Skipton town, the castle, church, woods, Barden and Embsay Crag, • Has historic significance: (part of the ancient hunting | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>grounds of Skipton castle, contains a SAM.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has recreational value: Circular walk, significantly different experience to walking in open agricultural land. regularly used by the local community for Rrecreation and leisure. • Is tranquil: A causal visit to Park Hill will show this is a tranquil area, 10 minutes from the town centre. • Is rich in wildlife: A number of priority species named in the local Biodiversity Action Plan utilise this area (bats, owls, deer, and native UK bird species). The recent Starling murmuration could often be seen landing on Park Hill in large numbers • Contains two long distance paths with extensive views of the countryside. • There is huge evidence of local support <p>The proposed modification is for SK-LGS64 to be reinstated into the plan. This will ensure that the plan is sound given SK-LGS64 meets the test for inclusion as an LGS.</p> <p>It will also offer protection for this historic and valuable area for future generations and while allowing the town of Skipton to grow - will protect and preserve a valuable local asset.</p> <p>The proposed revised wording is to include the text with strikethrough on page 103 specifically relating to SK-LGS64 is included as part of the plan.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | V Wilkinson 229 | <p>Objection to Park Hill being included in the local plan as possible building land. This is a valuable asset to the town as an open space. Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local schools and groups use the land for varied events. • Rambling groups along with families and individuals can be seen making use of the footpath at all times of the year. • The Ancient Monument site has been used on occasions | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | <p>by re-enactment groups.</p> <p>The Stapleton family have had the tenancy (Agricultural tenancy which is for I believe 3 generations of which only 1 generation has been used) for the land for quite a number of years. Suitable alternative land would be required by them to allow them to sustain their family farming business. If any of this land was really needed for housing then it should be kept well to the West of the public footpath.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | C Potter 233 | <p>Objection of the removal of Park Hill at LGS. Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational value – running, walking, enjoyment of beautiful views, sledging, picnicking <p>Park Hill should be protected forever from any future development.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | P J Eva 234 | <p>Objection to recent removal of Park Hill's Local Green Space status. Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such a dominant high feature over the north part of Skipton, a lovely historic green space next to the Woods, <p>Failure to protect this space as LGS would leave the land open for sale by a greedy landowner to a greedy property developer at the expense of the town's heritage which will be lost for all time. To cover it over with yet more stone brick tile and asphalt will be a shameful tragedy.</p> <p>Ensure Park Hill's Local Green Space status is restored to protect this most important aspect of the town's heritage.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | P & C Crangle 235 | <p>Objection, in the strongest possible terms to the removal of the land at Park Hill, Skipton (comprising the fields to the north of the High Street between Grassington Road and Skipton Woods.) as Local Green Space designation</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has recreational value – the long distance public footpaths "A Dales Highway" and Lady Anne's Way run over the top of Chapel Hill to Short Lee Lane and hold spectacular views over the town and long distance vistas towards the Yorkshire Dales. • Is in close proximity to the centre of town • Holds a special place in the lives of many residents who use it to access the countryside and the Dales affording them spectacular and beautiful views as they walk. • Has historical significance (medieval battery at the top of the hill) • Is rich in wildlife providing habitat for several species of ground nesting birds all of which return to the area year after year. • The area is regarded as a jewel in the crown of Skipton as the Gateway to the Yorkshire Dales. <p>For these reasons it is imperative that the whole of the green space behind Grassington Road including Park Hill be protected in order to preserve it for future generations.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | P Foley 236 | <p>Objection to the removal from the Local Plan of Park Hill's status as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is accessible on foot by the majority of residents who may otherwise need to resort to travelling to open fields | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>by car, thereby, increasing traffic and air pollution.</p> <p>Michael Portillo saved the Ribbleshead Viaduct and is respected for having the wisdom and foresight to protect what has increasingly become an important and essential structure. Please re-instate Park Hill as a protected Local Green Space. Park Hill is our heritage and an important asset for the residents and future generations of Skipton.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | I Wilcock 237 | <p>Objection to the removal of LGS designation for Park Hill, Skipton.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides important green, natural, recreational and aesthetic qualities to Skipton enjoyed by locals and visitors alike • Meets all the government guidelines for LGS designation <p>If left unprotected it would inevitably be the subject of property development.</p> <p>Petition with 49 signatures on it attached to letter.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | C & R Allen 238 | <p>Objection to the deletion of the proposed local green space designation of SK-LGS64 from the draft Craven Local Plan and suggestion of a reduced area for consideration as local green space.</p> <p>The original tract of land designated SK-LGS64 amounts to over 75 hectares. Skipton Woods and the Old Cemetery are already protected under INF3 and Skipton Castle and grounds are of such historical and cultural significance they do not need to be included in the local green space classification. The land to the east of Skipton Woods (Storems Laithe) comprises agricultural fields with no historical or recreational significance. Whilst these areas have been demonstrated to pass many aspects of tests 1,2</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>and 3 in the LGS assessment in the draft local plan they could arguably be excluded from the blanket SK-LGS64 LGS classification on the above basis. Therefore we propose the land to the west of Skipton Woods as LGS. It passes all the LGS tests 1,2 and 3 and would be less than half the area of SK-LGS64 of the draft plan of March 2018 and as such may well not then conflict with paragraph 77 of the 2012 National Planning Framework.</p> <p>This reduced site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has historic significance – contains the earthworks and Civil War Battery ancient monuments • Has recreational value – local walkers, ramblers, tourists (includes two long distance, well-used footpaths, the Dales High Way and the Lady Anne Clifford Way, a footpath running northwest from The Pinfold to Short Lee Lane close to its junction with Grassington Road, and a circular walk around Skipton Wood and Park Hill), wildlife exploration, tobogganing, • Is rich in wildlife (Ecological Data Centre) – includes a large rookery. • Is easily accessible from Skipton Town centre (the entry to the footpaths via The Pinfold at the bottom of Chapel Hill is just 160 metres, 3 minutes walk from the top of the High Street opposite Holy Trinity Church). • Uses sustainable farming practises with unimproved grassland containing many sensitive plant species • Has historical importance – old limekiln in Little Wood (which stretches about 80m into the area from Grassington Road) • Has outstanding long distance views • Is readily accessible to all residents of Skipton <p>We are hopeful that residents will be heard, objections taken</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------|---|--|
| | | seriously and that the Local Green classification will be maintained. | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | S Wrathmell 239 | The representation sets out a statement of significance and is written in support of the re-instatement of the western section of the area referred to as SK-LGS64 known as Park Hill, as Local Green Space. It provides extensive information relating to the natural environment, land use, and heritage of this area. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | M Mercer 240 | <p>MM87 is unsound Removal of SK-LGS64 from list of Local Green space is not justified. Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is an important green space that connects other areas of countryside and is included in two long distant walks with a public footpath running across it (improve health and well being – walking, running, dog walking) • The eastern end of the land (nearest to and to the west of Skipton Woods) is visible from many parts of the town and if not preserved by designation of green space would potentially be available for development. • The land adjoins the most historic part of Skipton and is the site of a historical feature <p>If the land designated SK-LGS64 cannot be designated Green Space, could the eastern portion adjacent to and to the west of Skipton Woods and the most visible from the town be designated Green Space? The whole space could not be treated as one.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | C Nash, Craven Walkers 241 | <p>The Development Plan as proposed clearly identified Park Hill a valued landscape by giving it LGS designation. It is a locally and regionally (in the 2002 Landscape Study) valued landscape and should remain as such.</p> <p>Park Hill alone is not an extensive tract of land. Craven Walkers works with local surgeries and caters for walkers with physical or mental health problems, and our group can walk across it in 10 minutes (meets weekly).</p> <p>The proposal to remove the Green Space designation makes the Plan unsound because it fails to protect a valued landscape as per the NPPF 170.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | M A Mills 242 | <p>Appalled that Park Hill has had its LGS designation removed and. Designation should be reinstated.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has recreational value – walking through it to Castle Woods • It is of vital importance as a green space. • It has great historic value (site of battle during the civil war) <p>Please revoke this decision.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | D Frank 245 | <p>Concern about the reduction of the green space SK-LGS64. Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is easily accessible from Chapel Hill • It has recreational value – walking, views of local landmarks, sledging, dog walking • It has a tranquil setting, even though close to bustling High Street • Sheep and cows graze, adding to the market town image. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Footpaths on site (Lady Anne's Way) could be further incorporated with the Skipton Wood trails to publicise unique historical importance of area (many historical connections to area). • It has wildlife value – rookery in Little Wood, starling murmurations over last few months, woodpeckers etc <p>Chipping away at the green space would have a considerable effect on the whole space.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | W Feather 247 | Support for your policy that Park Hill maintains special status to prevent any future development. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | H McAdam 254 | <p>Objection to the removal from the Local Plan of Park Hill's status as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is close to the community it serves - a little patch of countryside only a few steps from the High Street. • Has recreational value – playing, walking, sledging • Has historical importance (provides greater understanding of civil war) <p>We desperately hope that it will be allowed to continue undeveloped to give much to many generations to come.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | Woodland Trust 268 | <p>MM87 is unsound.</p> <p>The Woodland Trust objects to the deletion of this site from Local Green Space designation.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It adds to the beauty of Skipton Castle and Skipton Castle Woods, and has beautiful views of Skipton • It is a tranquil haven • It has recreational value – walking for visitors and locals | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has historic significance as it encompasses a former royal hunting ground and a Civil War era battery. • It has special value from a Woodland Trust perspective is its interplay with Skipton Castle Woods, how it adds to the tranquillity and ecological significance as well as the rich wildlife of this ancient woodland. Local Green Space designation helps to ensure a valuable buffer for the Woods, enhancing landscape character and wider biodiversity connectivity for the benefit of people and wildlife alike. <p>Development adjacent to Skipton Castle Woods would seriously detract from this and could have serious impacts including ecological disturbance, noise and light pollution, reduction in woodland capacity and threat to longer term retention of trees near new buildings, human disturbance to adjacent woodland (dumping garden waste), changes to hydrology, altering the quality and quantity of surface and groundwater</p> <p>A minimum requirement would be re-designating two important local green spaces on either side of Skipton Castle Woods: one to the West - known as Park Hill - and the other to the East - known as Show Field. This would create an adequate buffer for the ancient woodland (important for rich wildlife and tranquillity); protect the site's beauty, recreational and historic value; and therefore no longer result in an "extensive tract of land" being designated. (Map attached to representation).</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | D Grant 270 | I wish to protest most strongly against any proposal to change the Green Space Designation for Park Hill. As a citizen of Skipton for over 40 years, a published local historian, and former head of the history department at the grammar school here I am well aware of the historical and recreational importance of the area. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|--|---|--|
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | Ramblers Association Craven Group 273 | <p>Objection to the proposed removal of a Local Green Space Designation for Park Hill. Removal of its protected status opens the way for its future sale for development</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any diversion or closure of the two long distance footpaths run over the top of Park Hill - 'The Dales Highway' and 'Lady Anne's Highway' - with long distance views over Skipton to the Dales beyond would be unacceptable. In particular, 'Lady Anne's Highway' starts on Park Hill and we would not want the ambience of the beginning of this superb long-distance walk destroyed by urban development. <p>Park Hill is important to the locality, and fully meets Government guidelines on Local Green Space Designation. Its removal would be a serious blow to local people and visitors alike.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | W Carmichael 274 | <p>Objection to the removal of Park Hill as a protected Local Green Space from the Craven District Council local plan.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is a beautiful green space very close to the town centre offering superb views of Skipton It has recreational value – part of two long distance footpaths – A Dales High Way and Lady Anne's Way It is part of the Conservation area. It has historical significance in that it was the site of a battery during the English Civil Wars of the 17th Century. <p>It is not an extensive tract of land as it consists of not more than a couple of fields closely bounded by Skipton Woods</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>and Grassington Road.</p> <p>For the reason highlighted above Park Hill unquestionably fulfills government requirements for LGS.</p> <p>Due to the strength of local feeling and the value attached by local people to Park Hill, the decision to remove its designation as a protected Local Green Space should be reversed.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | L Primmer 275 | <p>MM87 is unsound.</p> <p>Objection to the removal of Local Green Space designation status for SK-LGS64 Land to north of Skipton, bounded to the north by Skipton Bypass, to the east by Embsay Road & The Bailey; and to the west by Grassington Road, Skipton.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is close to the community it serves (known locally as Park Hill) • Has historical significance – ancient monument, battery • Has recreational value – walkers, sledging • Has much wildlife – curlew (endangered), owl, deer • Is a beautiful setting for the ancient Skipton Woods <p>The area is not an extensive tract of land. The area is bounded by Skipton Bypass, Grassington Road, Chapel Hill and Skipton Woods and thus has its fixed limits. It is a green space for nearby urban Skipton, the extent of the land is just sufficient for use by wild life (which may abandon it if it is reduced).</p> <p>Draft policy ENV2 pays particular attention to the conservation of this site. NPPF 2012 and 2019 recognise the need for such green spaces.</p> <p>Site should be re-designated as Local Green Space in the draft Craven Local Plan.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | H Nicholas 276 | <p>MM87 is unsound. Objection to the removal of LGS designation for SK-LGS64 Site is recognised in draft policy ENV2.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area, known locally as Park Hill, is clearly close to the community it serves. • It has historical significance – shown by the archaeological remains of the battery which was used to bombard Skipton Castle in the Civil War; • It has recreational value – walking, sledging • It has wildlife value – an abundance of bird life, curlew (now an endangered species) owls, deer this area is a beautiful setting for the ancient Skipton Woods, which would be affected badly by any future possible change of use here. <p>The site is not an extensive tract of land (definition of 'extensive' is subjective and does not apply here). The area is bounded by Skipton Bypass, Grassington Road, Chapel Hill and Skipton Woods and thus has its fixed limits. It is on the doorstep of urban Skipton, thereby providing a green space for healthy enjoyment and appreciation. Although it is not a large area, the extent of the land is just sufficient for use by wild life, and any future diminution in extent would certainly cause the wild life, especially the Curlew, to abandon it.</p> <p>The area needs to be protected by the status of a Local Green Space and it should be re-designated as such in the draft Craven Local Plan.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | C Mercer 277 | <p>Objection to Park Hill losing its status as Local Green Space. Site is demonstrably special to the local community and</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | <p>holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a tranquil area with great views over the town • It is close to the community - just 5 minutes from the town centre. • It has recreational value – exploring, walking, footpaths across it <p>Concern about the impact that any development might have on the wildlife in neighbouring Skipton Wood.</p> <p>Reconsider the decision to remove Park Hill from the plan.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | C Walton 278 | <p>Concern about the removal from the Local Plan of Park Hill's status as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is very close to the centre of town • It is visible from many areas of Skipton - the sight of an open green space has a beneficial calming effect on people reducing their stress. • It has outstanding views over the town and down the Aire Valley. • It has recreational value - two long distance footpaths run over the top of Park Hill which tie in with popular local circular walk through Skipton Woods. Also kids playing ball and sledging. • It is a historic site with its Civil War battery connections. <p>Building on Park Hill would have a detrimental affect on the landscape of the town and the well being of its residents.</p> <p>Park Hill should be re-instated as a Local Green Space.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 | S Allen | Object to the removal of Park Hill as a Protected Green | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK- |

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| SK-LGS64 | 279 | <p>Space.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is of unique importance to Skipton. It is the only natural open area adjacent to the town centre • It is easily accessible from and close to the High Street • It is an area full of history containing a civil war battery and 2 long-distance footpaths (one being the famous Lady Anne's Way) • It is a peaceful area with impressive views over Skipton • It has recreational value - walking there offers a welcome relief from the stresses of modern life. | LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | A McAdam 280 | <p>Object to the removal of Park Hill as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unique in that the countryside of Park Hill comes down almost to Mill Bridge and was visible from the High Street • It has recreational value – picnicking, sledging, spacious and peaceful • It has historical importance as the site of a significant battle – a battle re-enacted several times over the years • It has wildlife value - provides an important ecosystem to enhance that of Skipton Woods. • It forms part of the long distance footpaths of Dales High Way and Lady Anne's Way. <p>Park Hill is a relatively small green space of importance because it is near the town and impinges on Skipton Woods. It needs to be protected as a Local Green Space - as open countryside beside the town.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 | M & E Butler | Object to the removal of the Local Green Space Designation | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK- |

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------------|---|--|
| SK-LGS64 | 281 | <p>for Park Hill in the recent changes to the Local Plan.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has recreational value – walking, part of a good circular route • One of only places to get a good bird's-eye view of the town without doing a hike, so it is valuable as a walk for those who cannot access more remote areas • It is within easy walking distance from the town <p>Removal of the Local Green Space Designation will leave Park Hill at risk of development which would ruin this area of countryside and the enjoyment of people in and around Skipton.</p> | LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | A Lewer 282 | <p>Concern that Park Hill no longer has Local Green Space status in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has recreational value – walking, spectacular views • It is easily accessible from the town, but feels very rural and open. <p>The Local Green Space designation should be reinstated.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | T & E Butcher 283 | <p>Object in the strongest possible terms to any houses being built on Park Hill, on the north edge of Skipton.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is the gateway to the dales | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has recreational value – part of a walk around Skipton Forest, and start of the Dales Highway, <p>Protect the natural beauty we have, so that future generations can enjoy it. Skipton is the Gateway to the Dales and Park Hill is what physically connects Skipton to it.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | K A and H Lindsay 284 | <p>Land north of Skipton – SK-LGS64 is very important to the local community and must be safeguarded by being designated as local green space as part of the emerging Local Plan for Craven.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has recreational value - walking and running (many members of the community use this area of land) It is visually beautiful It has views across and into Skipton It has historic significance in terms of its association with Skipton Castle <p>The land is special in terms of its landscape character and for the reasons set out above the whole area should therefore be protected as part of the emerging Local Plan.</p> | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | A Allen 285 | <p>Objection to the removal of protected green space status for Park Hill. This protection should be reinstated.</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has recreational value – walking, playing (no other designated green space play areas within a reasonable walking distance for residents of the area), sledging It has historical importance due to its role as the Battery location for Parliamentary Forces It vital in retaining the semi-rural nature of the northern part of Skipton. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It, alongside Skipton Woods, is an important habitat for wild life - many birds including tawny owls, herons <p>Local residents feel genuinely connected to these rural areas. They make Skipton such a fulfilling place to live. Reinststate the Local Green Space protection to Park Hill.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | J Clayton French 286 | <p>Park Hill should not be removed as protected Local Green Space from the designated Local Plan (March 2018). Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has recreational value - walks over Park Hill • It is a beautiful place enriched by interesting flora and fauna • It has outstanding views • It has historical significance: Park Hill earthwork - Civil war battery. Historic England, scheduled monument list entry no: 1004878 | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | K Jackson 293 | <p>Object to the removal of Park Hill, Skipton from the proposed Local Plan</p> <p>Site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is in close proximity to the community it serves, adjoining Skipton to the north of the town • It has significant recreational value - footpaths through site and connecting to paths in Skipton Wood • It has splendid 360 degree views from the top of Park Hill • It has local and national historical significance - hunting park of the Clifford family at Skipton Castle, SAM Parliamentarian Civil War battery (List Entry Number: 1004878, Historic England) | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It historical and environmental significance could be used as an educational resource for school children. • The local character of Park Hill (typical farming practice for this part of North Yorkshire) has probably changed little during the last three hundred years; • It is visible from many areas of the town and is a highly valued component of the local townscape. <p>Together with Skipton Castle, Skipton Woods, the Deer Park off Embsay Road, the High Street, the Leeds and Liverpool Canal and Holy Trinity Church, the presence of Park Hill as a green hill overlooking the town acts to strengthen the community's sense of pride in its surroundings.</p> | |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | D Hawkins 294 | Objection to the change of status application with regard to Castle Fields, Skipton. This application sounds as if it is a pre requisite to a further application for a house building project. This land is not suitable for this purpose and I strongly hope the Council will turn down this application for change of status in order to protect the land in its present status into the future. | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |
| MM87 SK-LGS64 | P Longbottom 295 | <p>Express concern over the removal of the Local Green Space designation for Park Hill, Skipton.</p> <p>Park Hill should be protected from future development as an historic part of Skipton town. Suspicion that the removal of the LGS designation is the first step in obtaining planning permission on the land.</p> <p>Park Hill is demonstrably special to the local community and holds local significance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has historical significance as a drumlin, visible from Skipton High Street and important to the historic setting of the High Street; • It is reasonably close to the community it serves; | See response to representation 044 on MM87, SK-LGS64 |

| | | | |
|------|------------------------|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is local in character, being a Drumlin Hill typical of the Aire Valley • It is close to historically important areas of Skipton and contains important historic features (the Battery) • It has recreational value, with two long-distance footpaths crossing the site, and paths linking Park Hill to Skipton Woods; • It provides wide-ranging views over Skipton and the Aire Valley. <p>It is a single field, not a large area.</p> | |
| | | | |
| MM90 | McCarthy and Stone 265 | <p>McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd did not make representations on the publication Draft of the Local Plan as it was content that its representations made on the Draft Local Plan in 2017 had been considered. It did not therefore appear at or hear the Examination.</p> <p>MM90 introduces definitions of what it refers to as “Age Restrictive-Exclusive/Sheltered /Retirement Housing” and “Assisted Living/Extra Care/Very Sheltered Housing” and refers to these as C3 uses. As evidenced by the proposed modifications that follow, the whole purpose of doing is to enable the proposed affordable housing policy to be applied.</p> <p>With reference to the Council’s policy Response Paper on Matter 9 and the Representations made to the Local Plan, there was no catalyst or requirement for this Modification. Whilst the Council suggests that it is made in the interests of clarity, it, in fact introduces entirely new requirements and expectations into the Local Plan. To do so, runs contrary to the purpose and remit of a Main Modification and should</p> | <p>The representation draws attention to the Inspector’s Matter 9, Specialist Housing for Older People (Policy H1), along with the Council’s and participants responses to the questions under this matter. The representation indicates that these questions and responses did not raise issues that appeared to prompt the subsequent modifications.</p> <p>However, there is a close relationship between Policy H1 and Policy H2 regarding affordable housing and the modification to Policy H1 was prompted by the discussion at the hearing on the Inspector’s Matter 3, Affordable Housing Need (Policy H2), Issue 2, Affordable Housing Need, Question 4 - Is the 30% affordable housing requirement viable for all types of housing, supported by viability evidence?</p> <p>As well as discussion on viability evidence for the different types of housing in the plan, including specialist housing for older people, the discussion also picked up on the clarity of the wording of Policies H1</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>therefore be withdrawn as a matter of procedure.</p> <p>Additionally, too, the determination of the modification that “there are two main types of this specialist C3 housing for older people” is entirely erroneous. It is well established that Assisted Living/Extra care proposals (NB Very Sheltered Housing is generally considered to be an outdated term) can fall within either use Class C2 or C3 dependent on the level of care it provides. Self-containment is not the determining factor as to Use Class though this principally informs the modification proposed by the repeated references to it.</p> <p>For the purposes of precision, a, full statement is not presented here but as evidence of its error, the Housing Learning and Improvement Network (HLin) Fact sheet “Extra Care Housing – What is it in 2015 set out the “Core Ingredients” of Extra Care, which includes:</p> <p><i>Fully self-contained properties where occupants have their own front doors, and tenancies or leases which give them security of tenure and the right to control who enters their home</i></p> <p>And then goes on to discuss the proper considerations that should be applied to determine Use Class. The modification rather determines that if apartments are self-contained then they must fall within Use Class C3 but a “Core ingredient” is just that and it is well established that EC can fall within C2 or C3 based on the correct assessment, which is the care and support provided. The approach of the Modification is therefore wholly wrong.</p> <p>Appeal proposals cited by the representation all determine that the form of accommodation that most Extra Care development takes (that is a single block of apartments with</p> | <p>and H2. This discussion on the clarity of policy wording highlighted that whilst the Publication Draft Plan Policy H1 cross refers to the need for proposals for specialist housing for older people to comply with Policy H2 on affordable housing, it was not clear what types of specialist housing for older people this would be. Hence, the Inspector advised the Council to consider making this clear in the supporting text to Policy H1.</p> <p>MM90 merely clarifies that the Council will only be seeking affordable housing contributions for Use Class C3 residential specialist housing for older people. MM90 continues to explain that there are two main types of specialist housing for older people that can be classified as Use Class C3. It does not discuss non-Class C3 accommodation, because that is not relevant to the matter being discussed (which is the relationship with affordable housing provision). However, the Council recognises that some specialist housing for older people is provided in a format which makes it a Class C2 Use, and some is provided in a format which is outside the Use Classes and so is sui generis. The modification does not seek to define what is or is not C3 residential use, nor is it suggesting that all specialist housing for older people fall within Use Class C3. The Council understand that Assisted Living/Extra Care can fall within either Use Class C2 or C3 or may be sui generis dependent upon the characteristics of the scheme and that this will have to be determined on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The Housing LIN factsheet “Extra care housing – what is it in 2015” referred to in the representation, emphasises this point stating that <i>“the planning classification of extra care housing is far from</i></p> |
|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>on-site care and as principally provided by McCarthy & Stone) falls within Use Class C2.</p> <p>MM90 should be deleted in its entirety in order to make the Plan sound and to avoid the potential for a procedural challenge.</p> <p>Modification MM92 for paragraph 6.11 should delete <i>“ A definition of the two types of specialist housing for older people set out in this policy is provided in the supporting text to Policy H1 of this plan”</i></p> <p>Modification MM93 for policy H2 should delete sections (b) iii and iv in their entirety</p> | <p><i>straightforward Whether it is seen as primarily housing or as a proxy for a care home depends on the nature of the scheme and the services provided” (Section 5.3).</i></p> <p>Similarly, the Inspector also considered that, to make Policy H2 clear and effective, the main types of specialist housing for older people should be referred to within this policy and for it to set out a viable policy level requirement for their affordable housing contributions.</p> <p>Therefore, MM90, 92 and 93 are reasonable and appropriate changes to the plan which have emanated from the Examination hearings and seek to clarify those types of specialist housing for older people where affordable housing contributions should be made.</p> <p>A final point to make regarding this representation is that the last sentence of the paragraph 6.2 of the supporting text to Policy H1 in MM90 states:</p> <p><i>“the Council will publish additional practical guidance on the provision of affordable housing for this and general open market housing in the form of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). In consultation with stakeholders, this SPD will set out more detail on how Policy H2 will operate and be administered.”</i></p> <p>This SPD, with the input of stakeholders such as McCarthy and Stone, will be able to provide more detail on the factors to consider when ascribing a use class to</p> |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|------|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>individual proposals.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| | | | |
| MM91 | HBF, J Harding 028 | The HBF generally supports the amendments to part (b) to remove reference to 'lifetime homes'. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM92 | Skipton Properties (Addison Planning) 005 | <p>The proposed MM to Paragraph 6.18 does not reflect the general discussions with the EIP Inspector which indicated that the inclusion of text requiring 'very exceptional circumstances' for a local planning authority to review the viability of individual sites is unsound. It effectively sets a higher bar as to the circumstances where the testing of viability will be accepted by the Planning Authority. It is also imprecise because it fails to specify what those circumstances might be. As drafted, it enables the Planning Authority simply to refuse to consider a viability case. This is contrary to paragraph 57 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Proposed paragraph 6.18 should be deleted and replaced with the following:</p> <p><i>"In some circumstances, development proposals may seek to include a lower proportion of affordable housing. Where developers seek to reduce affordable housing requirements, the financial viability of developments should be assessed on</i></p> | <p>The proposed MM to Paragraph 6.18 has responded to the concerns expressed by participants during the examination hearing session on Matter 7 about the reference in this paragraph to the Council only reviewing individual sites in terms of scheme viability in very exceptional circumstances. The proposed MM has deleted the first sentence of this paragraph containing this reference and does reflect the outcome of discussions with the Inspector at the examination hearings. However, following these discussions, the Inspector did not request any change to the Council's use of the words 'exceptional circumstances' in the policy and supporting text; seeking only that the supporting text gave examples of the exceptional circumstances when a lower than the policy requirement for affordable housing might be appropriate. These examples are stated in the proposed MM to Paragraph 6.18 as the following <i>"unusual and wholly unexpected/unforeseen</i></p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p><i>a scheme by scheme basis having regard to individual circumstances and planning guidance as set out in the NPPG.”</i></p> | <p><i>development costs which affect scheme viability, or where there are clear and overriding reasons to meet other planning objectives, such as the restoration of heritage assets”. This is considered an appropriate level of precision, taking into account the difficulty of establishing a definitive list for this purpose.</i></p> <p>The Council argued at the examination that the robustness of the evidence provided on development viability and the high level of need for affordable housing which was unable to be fully met during the plan period, meant that a strong policy position was appropriate on the level of affordable homes that should be provided for in the usual circumstances that exist in site development across the plan area.</p> <p>Nevertheless, unusual or exceptional circumstances may exist which justify a lower level of affordable housing to that contained in the policy requirement. The Council explained at the examination that these circumstances could probably be divided into two categories. The first might be that competing planning objectives in a schemes development, such as the restoration of heritage assets, could be judged by the decision maker as more important to meet than the policy level of affordable housing. These circumstances will be exceptional. The second category where a lower level of affordable housing could be appropriate, is where scheme viability is adversely affected by unusually high and unexpected development costs. The plan viability assessment, having taken into account the particular circumstances of costs and values for housing development in the plan area (including normal ‘abnormals’ for Craven e.g.</p> |
|--|--|---|---|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>constructing on sloping sites), and recommending a policy level for affordable housing with a 'healthy' viability margin, indicates to the Council that the situations where scheme viability issues might be so significant as to justify lowering the policy level requirement will be exceptional.</p> <p>It is therefore considered reasonable to maintain the Council's approach to describing the circumstances when a reduced affordable housing contribution is appropriate as 'exceptional'</p> <p>As regards the issue of conformity with the NPPF, the position is complicated by the fact that the plan has been examined against the provisions of the 2012 NPPF and the representation has quoted from the 2019 NPPF. Nevertheless, it is the Council's view that paragraph 6.18, as proposed to be modified, conforms with both versions of the NPPF. As stated above the proposed policy requirement for affordable housing has been determined to ensure a healthy 'viability margin/buffer' exists between it and a point which could threaten land being brought forward for housing over the plan period. Hence this is in conformity with Paragraphs 50 and 205 of 2012 NPPF. The plan's careful attention to viability and costs, means that paragraphs 173 and 174 of the 2012 NPPF have also been complied with.</p> <p>Whilst not being examined against the 2019 NPPF, it is helpful to see that the proposed plan approach on providing a strong policy lead for the level of affordable housing at plan level is reflected in the 2019 NPPF. Paragraph 34 states that '<i>Plans should set out the</i></p> |
|--|--|--|---|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p><i>contributions expected from development'</i> This wording reflects the government's desire to see a plan led affordable housing requirement that can be relied on for the majority of individual proposals, reducing the need for viability assessments on a site by site basis. Indeed, this objective is specifically set out in part of the NPPG Paragraph 002 Reference ID: 10-002-20180724 as follows: <i>"Policy requirements, particularly for affordable housing, should be set at a level that takes account of affordable housing and infrastructure needs and allows for the planned types of sites and development to be deliverable, without the need for further viability assessment at the decision making stage."</i> Paragraph 57 of the 2019 NPPF continues this plan led approach to viability by stating that <i>"it is up to the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage."</i> The combination of Paragraphs 34 and 57 of the 2019 NPPF, and the NPPG, clearly puts the onus on the applicant to demonstrate what particular circumstances justify the need for a site specific viability assessment at the application stage, taking into account the development plan policy requirements are what is expected.</p> <p>Hence the Policy H2 approach in the Craven Local Plan is considered by the Council to be consistent with both the 2012 and 2019 NPPF's.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|------|---|---|---|
| MM92 | Skipton Properties (Addison Planning) 005 | <p>The proposed main modifications to Paragraph 6.20 do not resolve the previous representations made or adequately respond to the EIP hearing discussions. It remains unsound because it sets out ‘the basis’ of a methodology for calculating off site contributions in lieu of affordable housing being provided on site. The paragraph is describing a broad policy approach and is not a justification for a policy, nor does it set out enough detail of how the calculation might work and be applied in practice. Indeed, this is explicitly acknowledged in the proposed modification to the last sentence.</p> <p>The content of Paragraph 6.20 is clearly designed to establish strict parameters for a commuted sum calculation by using a ‘transfer value’ as the basis for the calculation. There is no evidence to justify the use of a ‘transfer value’ in such a calculation or indeed what an appropriate ‘transfer value’ might be. The Council has simply carried over a previous ‘policy approach’ which was found to be unlawful. The representation refers to the court’s decision in 2017 to quash the Council’s document entitled ‘Negotiating Affordable Housing Contributions’: August 2016. The representation also refers to a decision by the court in 2017 to quash an SPD of Charnwood Borough Council which strayed into Development Plan Document (DPD) territory. In this case, Craven District Council is avoiding the scrutiny of the DPD process by seeking to put into SPD that which should be in Policy H2.</p> <p>The approach is thoroughly flawed and unsound. For example, a 70 sq m (2 bedroom) dwelling would have a transfer value of £70,000 and an estimated open market sales value of say £180,000 equals a commuted sum of £110,000. The rather simplistic premise is that the on-site dwellings will be sold on the open market and that the entire</p> | <p>Discussion of the role of transfer prices in the viability of housing development and the content of Paragraph 6.20 of the supporting text took place during the Examination hearing sessions on Matters 3 and 7 and participants put forward their views on the matter. The Inspector considered these views and then requested the Council to consider how the plan could make it clearer when off-site provision of affordable housing might be preferable for larger sites and for the plan to reference that the amount of any commuted sum financial contribution will be based on ‘equivalent’ provision of on-site affordable housing, subject to viability. As a result of this request, the relevant changes to the publication draft plan in MM 92 (Policy H2 supporting text) and MM93 (Policy H2) are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An additional policy criteria, Policy H2 c) which sets out when, rarely, off-site financial contributions in lieu of on-site contributions will be supported and that the financial contribution will be expected to be equivalent to the on-site provision. • Additional wording to the supporting text at Paragraph 6.20 which refers to when, rarely, off site provision of affordable housing might be preferable to on-site. • Viability is dealt with in the revised Policy H2 d) and the supporting text at paragraph 6.18. The Council has explained above why the circumstances when viability is likely to justify a lower than policy level of affordable housing should be exceptional. The modified version of paragraph 6.18 describes examples of what these exceptional circumstances |
|------|---|---|---|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>profit should then be paid to the Council in lieu of affordable housing on site. This premise is fundamentally flawed because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence to justify the use of a 'transfer value' in such a calculation or indeed what an appropriate 'transfer value' might be. • The transfer value used is insufficient to cover even the basic construction cost of the unit. Previous evidence submitted by SPL to the EIP suggests the unit construction should be £1134/sqm – equating in this example to £79,380 (£9,380 more than the transfer value) • The calculation also makes no allowance for the costs of external works, site infrastructure, site abnormal costs, contingency, acquisition and disposal costs. <p>The Council's basis for a calculation expects the developer to acquire a site, finance the development, assume the developer's risk, build out the equivalent of affordable houses on site, sell them on the open market with no allowance whatsoever for any land value, and pay the Council the full profit achieved plus a significant element of the cost of construction. The proposed calculation is fundamentally flawed: it's application significantly impacts on land value and acts as a disincentive to land owners to bring forward small sites under the 10 dwelling threshold. The basis for the Calculation Methodology creates an unfair and unreasonable commuted sum requirement and directly conflicts with NPPG and is therefore unsound. The representation cites the Council's calculation methodology as being in conflict with Paragraph 004 Ref ID: 23b-004-</p> | <p>might be, as requested by the Inspector.</p> <p>The Inspector did not request the Council to look again at the use of transfer values in the calculation of off-site financial contributions and it is important to note that the part of Paragraph 6.20 which refers to the use of this approach remains as it was in the Publication Draft Plan. It is not the subject of a main modification. The use of transfer prices in the manner described in the plan is a method of calculating 'equivalent' provision and is used by other local planning authorities, including Harrogate, Stockton and Cornwall.</p> <p>Alongside the Publication Draft Plan, the Council published a Local Plan Background Paper on Affordable Housing Transfer Prices. It is Examination document Ec001. This document has provided the Examination with the evidence that is necessary to justify the level at which the transfer prices have been set. It confirms, that transfer prices/values are not intended to cover build costs, but rather they are set so that Registered Providers (RP's) can afford to purchase the homes from the developer at prices which mean they can then be passed onto local people on local incomes at rental and sales prices that are within their financial reach. This is a necessary condition to achieve the objective of delivering affordable homes in an area with a high level of need for such homes. The impact of transfer prices, as well as other costs, on the viability of bringing forward housing sites have been taken into account in the plan's viability assessment and the affordable housing policy requirements adjusted accordingly to ensure a healthy viability margin.</p> <p>The representation references the Council as having</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>20150326 of the NPPG.</p> <p>The calculation is not justified and should therefore be deleted from the Local Plan. Paragraph 6.20 should be deleted in its entirety. Alternatively, the Council should state that commuted sums for off-site contributions will be calculated on a site by site basis subject to viability; or through a methodology that is formulated on evidence, set out in an SPD and subject to consultation and testing through Examination.</p> | <p>‘simply carried over a previous ‘policy approach’ which was found to be unlawful.’ This statement is referring to the Council’s document entitled ‘Negotiating Affordable Housing Contributions’ (NAHC) published in August 2016 and it’s quashing by the high court in March 2017. The decision to quash this document turned on whether its’ contents, as a whole, was that of a Development Plan Document. In short and in the Council’s view, the judgement was that the document contained policies that made it a DPD and without the Council able to show that it had followed the appropriate legislative and regulatory requirements for preparing a DPD, it was quashed.</p> <p>The judgement makes no comment on either the ‘status’ of the methodology provided on the use of transfer prices in calculating off-site commuted sum contained in the NAHC (e.g. it’s appropriateness to a DPD or SPD), its lawfulness or its robustness.</p> <p>The proposed Policy H2 of the Draft Craven Local Plan and its supporting text; and the preparation process that the plan has undergone, seek to remedy the deficiencies associated with the NAHC.</p> <p>The representation states that “Craven District Council is avoiding the scrutiny of the DPD process by seeking to put into SPD that which should be in Policy H2”. This is not the case and there is sufficient detail in Paragraph 6.20 on the use of transfer prices in calculating off site financial contributions to be the subject of scrutiny at this examination. Indeed this representation, and representations submitted at Publication stage on the same matter are testament to that scrutiny being undertaken as part of the DPD process. Nevertheless, it is considered that further</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>explanation, in an SPD, of how the calculation is to work would be helpful additional guidance. Hence, the proposed change of wording in MM92 at the end of Paragraph 6.20 reflects this position. The content of the suggested SPD is not the subject-matter of the Local Plan Examination (it has not yet been produced). When the SPD is produced it will be for the Council to ensure, having regard to the case law referred to in the representation, that the guidance in the SPD does not include any new development management policies or other matters that should properly be included in a local plan/DPD. The Council envisages that the guidance will be a 'how to' document, explaining how to apply the Local Plan's approach to off-site financial contributions. The Council does not consider that the case law precludes the preparation of guidance in a SPD, provided that the guidance does not trespass into matters which are properly for a localplan/DPD.'</p> <p>The representation suggests the Council's approach is in conflict with NPPG Paragraph 004 Ref ID: 23b-004-20150326. This paragraph of the NPPG as copied in the representation details how local planning authorities need to justify its requirements for planning obligations. It appears to have been recently deleted from the NPPG, but the principles of when planning obligations can be sought have been established for some time. The Council consider its approach to planning obligations for affordable housing is consistent with these principles. Furthermore, the Council's approach to seeking financial contributions to support off site affordable housing for provision of an equivalent value to on-site provision has taken its lead from the 2012 NPPF (paragraph 50). The difference between open market value and the relevant affordable housing</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>transfer values multiplied by the number of dwellings which would have been required on-site is a simple but reasonable method of calculating the equivalent value to on-site provision. Throughout the local plan process, including two specific stakeholder engagements on plan viability, no alternative methods of calculating 'equivalent provision' have been put forward to the Council.</p> <p>The representation suggests that the 'calculation' should be deleted from the plan as should be paragraph 6.20 as a whole. Alternatively, the representation suggests the plan should state that commuted sums for off-site contributions will be calculated on a site by site basis subject to viability; or through a methodology that is formulated on evidence, set out in an SPD and subject to consultation and testing through Examination. Site by site negotiations on affordable housing provision is not considered appropriate and the participant's response to Question 2 of Matter 7 of the Inspector's MIQ's also stated that this was not appropriate. It is assumed the representation should have referred to a DPD rather than SPD.</p> <p>It is the Council's view that the approach proposed for calculating off-site financial contributions in lieu of on-site provision through the use of transfer prices has been evidenced, reflects the policy requirements of the NPPF and NPPG in relation to the 'principle of equivalence', has been tested through the examination and should remain in the plan. The supporting text on this proposed approach is as it stood at Publication Draft Plan stage and is not being put forward for modification.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|------|--------------------|--|--|
| | | | In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| MM92 | HBF, J Harding 028 | <p>The HBF continues to have concerns in relation to the proposed amendments to paragraph 6.18 which still looks for circumstances to be 'exceptional' for development proposals to provide a lower proportion of affordable housing. Whilst the use of examples is beneficial, the HBF still have concerns that this requirement is overly onerous on the applicant and may lead to the Council refusing to consider viability evidence and homes not being delivered if some circumstances are not deemed 'exceptional' enough.</p> <p>Reference to exceptional circumstances should be deleted and potentially amended to directly refer to viability of development.</p> | <p>The Council argued at the examination on Matter 3 that the robustness of the evidence provided on development viability and the high level of need for affordable housing which was unable to be fully met during the plan period, meant that a strong policy position was appropriate on the level of affordable homes that should be provided for in the usual circumstances that exist in site development across the plan area.</p> <p>Nevertheless, unusual or exceptional circumstances may exist which justify a lower level of affordable housing to that contained in the policy requirement. The Council explained at the examination that these circumstances could probably be divided into two categories. The first might be that competing planning objectives in a schemes development, such as the restoration of heritage assets, could be judged by the decision maker as more important to meet than the policy level of affordable housing. These circumstances will be exceptional. The second category where a lower level of affordable housing could be appropriate, is where scheme viability is adversely affected by unusually high and unexpected development costs. The plan viability assessment, having taken into account the particular circumstances</p> |

| | | | |
|------|------------------------|--|---|
| | | | <p>of costs and values for housing development in the plan area (including normal 'abnormals' for Craven e.g. constructing on sloping sites), and recommending a policy level for affordable housing with a 'healthy' viability margin, indicates to the Council that the situations where scheme viability issues might be so significant as to justify lowering the policy level requirement will be exceptional.</p> <p>It is therefore considered reasonable to maintain the Council's approach to describing the circumstances when a reduced affordable housing contribution is appropriate as 'exceptional'</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM92 | McCarthy and Stone 265 | <p>McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd did not make representations on the publication Draft of the Local Plan as it was content that its representations made on the Draft Local Plan in 2017 had been considered. It did not therefore appear at or hear the Examination.</p> <p>MM90 introduces definitions of what it refers to as "Age Restrictive-Exclusive/Sheltered /Retirement Housing" and "Assisted Living/Extra Care/Very Sheltered Housing" and refers to these as C3 uses. As evidenced by the proposed modifications that follow, the whole purpose of doing is to</p> | See response to representation 265 on MM90 |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>enable the proposed affordable housing policy to be applied.</p> <p>With reference to the Council's policy Response Paper on Matter 9 and the Representations made to the Local Plan, there was no catalyst or requirement for this Modification. Whilst the Council suggests that it is made in the interests of clarity, it, in fact introduces entirely new requirements and expectations into the Local Plan. To do so, runs contrary to the purpose and remit of a Main Modification and should therefore be withdrawn as a matter of procedure.</p> <p>Additionally, too, the determination of the modification that "there are two main types of this specialist C3 housing for older people" is entirely erroneous. It is well established that Assisted Living/Extra care proposals (NB Very Sheltered Housing is generally considered to be an outdated term) can fall within either use Class C2 or C3 dependent on the level of care it provides. Self-containment is not the determining factor as to Use Class though this principally informs the modification proposed by the repeated references to it.</p> <p>For the purposes of precision, a, full statement is not presented here but as evidence of its error, the Housing Learning and Improvement Network (HLin) Fact sheet "Extra Care Housing – What is it in 2015 set out the "Core Ingredients" of Extra Care, which includes:</p> <p><i>Fully self-contained properties where occupants have their own front doors, and tenancies or leases which give them security of tenure and the right to control who enters their home</i></p> <p>And then goes on to discuss the proper considerations that should be applied to determine Use Class. The modification rather determines that if apartments are self-contained then</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>they must fall within Use Class C3 but a “Core ingredient” is just that and it is well established that EC can fall within C2 or C3 based on the correct assessment, which is the care and support provided. The approach of the Modification is therefore wholly wrong.</p> <p>Appeal proposals cited by the representation all determine that the form of accommodation that most Extra Care development takes (that is a single block of apartments with on-site care and as principally provided by McCarthy & Stone) falls within Use Class C2.</p> <p>MM90 should be deleted in its entirety in order to make the Plan sound and to avoid the potential for a procedural challenge.</p> <p>Modification MM92 for paragraph 6.11 should delete <i>“ A definition of the two types of specialist housing for older people set out in this policy is provided in the supporting text to Policy H1 of this plan”</i></p> <p>Modification MM93 for policy H2 should delete sections (b) iii and iv in their entirety</p> | |
| | | | |
| MM93 | Skipton Properties (Addison Planning) 005 | <p>The proposed modifications to Criterion a) I and II change the phraseology from a minimum requirement to ‘not less than’ a 30% affordable requirement on greenfield sites and 25% on brownfield sites. The modification does not change the meaning of the Policy which is to apply a minimum requirement for affordable housing provision. This is not</p> | <p>The reasons why the Council is proposing a strong position on the level of affordable housing required has been explained in the Council’s response above to Skipton Properties representation on MM92. The high level of need and the healthy viability margin that is associated with the proposed policy requirements are</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>reflective of the participant's recollection of the EIP hearing discussions that the %age requirement should not be expressed in such absolute terms without acknowledging that viability (and individual site circumstances) can impact on the level of affordable housing sought. In fact the deletion of all reference to viability in these criteria has made the modified policy worse than the Publication Draft in terms of soundness and completely contrary to the NPPF/NPPG related to consideration of viability matters.</p> <p>The viability issue is now proposed to be dealt with in Criterion d). However, this wording along with the supporting text seeks to limit the consideration of viability to unspecified 'exceptional circumstances' contrary to NPPF/NPG guidance. The policy as worded sets a 'higher bar' as the circumstances where viability can be considered in the development management process and can be interpreted by the local planning authority in a way which could restrict the deliverability of development.</p> <p>The proposed change to Criterion g) is unsound because it is unclear, ineffective and unnecessary. The criterion appears to be designed to retrospectively seek affordable housing on sites where earlier phases may have had a reduction in affordable housing negotiated through a financial viability appraisal. For example, on a phased scheme, a development may incur higher infrastructure costs for the first phase which justifies a reduction in the affordable housing contribution to make the first phase viable. This criterion is designed to enable the Council to try and retrospectively claw back any discount in affordable housing in the first phase of development by adding that level of discount as an additional requirement (on top of normal policy requirements) on a subsequent phase. The purpose of the criterion has no basis in evidence or national planning policy. In practice, any</p> | <p>key to justifying this position. Furthermore, the change of policy wording to refer to the %age affordable housing as a target rather than an expected figure, could result in many more planning application negotiations than is either necessary or desirable. This would not assist in the efficient determinations of planning applications for housing development.</p> <p>The use of the wording 'exceptional circumstances' sets the 'bar' at which viability should be negotiated on individual sites at an appropriate level, based on the evidence provided by the Council on plan viability.</p> <p>The wording of Criterion g) is the same as used in the Criterion d) in the Publication Draft Plan. There is no proposed change to what the plan is saying about this issue in the Main Modifications. Its purpose is to ensure, for example, that if an allocation site for housing (which as a whole is above the appropriate threshold for an affordable housing contribution) came forward in the form of smaller phased developments below that threshold, this would not release the applicant from an appropriate level of affordable housing contribution for the smaller development. In the interests of maximising the opportunities for the delivery of affordable housing in an area of high need, this criterion should be retained.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
|--|---|---|

| | | | |
|------|-------------|--|---|
| | | <p>affordable housing requirement on a phase of a development will be assessed in accordance with the policy requirements and financial viability at the time the application is made.</p> <p>The %age requirements could be expressed as targets subject to consideration of viability.</p> <p>Criterion d) should be deleted and replaced with the following wording:</p> <p><i>“Development proposals that seek to provide a lower level of affordable housing contribution will require testing through consideration of a Financial Viability. Developers will be expected to conduct negotiations on a transparent and ‘open book’ basis. The local planning authority will apply vacant building credit in all appropriate circumstances, in accordance with the NPPF and the PPG and will reduce on-site and/or financial contributions accordingly.”</i></p> <p>Criterion g) should be deleted.</p> | <p>NB. In preparing responses to representations on MM93, it has come to the Council's attention that there is a grammatical drafting error (missing comma) in the first sentence of Criterion a) II immediately after "...11 dwellings or more..." The comma should be inserted within the sentence at this point to give clarity within the policy that the number of dwellings threshold and the floor space threshold are independent tests and reflect the punctuation in NPPG Paragraph:031 Reference ID: 23b-031-20161116 accompanying the 2012 NPPF. The Inspector is therefore requested to further modify the first sentence of Policy H2 a) II accordingly.</p> |
| MM93 | Gladman 012 | <p>Remain concerned with the Council's approach to affordable housing and the general absence of flexibility provided within Policy H2. The term "Exceptional Circumstances" sets a bar which is too high to be considered to be flexible where the Council's affordable housing requirements are not deliverable. Where it can be demonstrated by an applicant that the policy requirements of the plan cannot be achieved (unless this would make the scheme unsustainable), the Council should be open to discussion and a relaxation of policy requirements where necessary. This flexibility does not undermine the policy and its requirements. It does however provide room for manoeuvre for applicants and decision</p> | <p>The Council argued at the examination on Matter 3 that the robustness of the evidence provided on development viability and the high level of need for affordable housing which was unable to be fully met during the plan period, meant that a strong policy position was appropriate on the level of affordable homes that should be provided for in the usual circumstances that exist in site development across the plan area. Nevertheless, unusual or exceptional circumstances may exist which justify a lower level of affordable housing to that contained in the policy requirement. The Council explained at the examination</p> |

| | | | |
|------|--------|--|--|
| | | <p>makers to come together and agree as solution in order to promote the delivery of housing.</p> <p>The word “exceptional” should be removed from the policy.</p> | <p>that these circumstances could probably be divided into two categories. The first might be that competing planning objectives in a schemes development, such as the restoration of heritage assets, could be judged by the decision maker as more important to meet than the policy level of affordable housing. These circumstances will be exceptional. The second category where a lower level of affordable housing could be appropriate, is where scheme viability is adversely affected by unusually high and unexpected development costs. The plan viability assessment, having taken into account the particular circumstances of costs and values for housing development in the plan area (including normal ‘abnormals’ for Craven e.g. constructing on sloping sites), and recommending a policy level for affordable housing with a ‘healthy’ viability margin, indicates to the Council that the situations where scheme viability issues might be so significant as to justify lowering the policy level requirement will be exceptional.</p> <p>It is therefore considered reasonable to maintain the Council’s approach to describing the circumstances when a reduced affordable housing contribution is appropriate as ‘exceptional’.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector’s attention is drawn to the Council’s view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM93 | HBF, J | The HBF consider the wording ‘not less than’ in relation to | The Council argued at the examination on Matter 3 that |

| | | | |
|--|----------------|--|---|
| | Harding 028 | <p>the affordable housing requirement is not necessary and should not be added to the policy.</p> <p>As set out in the HBF's representation on MM92, the HBF continues to have concerns in relation to part (d) which states that <i>'development proposals that seek to provide a lower level of affordable housing contribution, will not be acceptable unless it can be demonstrated that exceptional circumstances exist'</i>. The HBF has concerns that the Council will limit the circumstances within which viability evidence will be considered and this will lead to homes not being delivered.</p> <p>Reference to 'not less than' and exceptional circumstances should be deleted and potentially amended to directly refer to viability of development.</p> | <p>the robustness of the evidence provided on development viability and the high level of need for affordable housing which was unable to be fully met during the plan period, meant that a strong policy position was appropriate on the level of affordable homes that should be provided for in the usual circumstances that exist in site development across the plan area. Nevertheless, unusual or exceptional circumstances may exist which justify a lower level of affordable housing to that contained in the policy requirement. The Council explained at the examination that these circumstances could probably be divided into two categories. The first might be that competing planning objectives in a schemes development, such as the restoration of heritage assets, could be judged by the decision maker as more important to meet than the policy level of affordable housing. These circumstances will be exceptional. The second category where a lower level of affordable housing could be appropriate, is where scheme viability is adversely affected by unusually high and unexpected development costs. The plan viability assessment, having taken into account the particular circumstances of costs and values for housing development in the plan area (including normal 'abnormals' for Craven e.g. constructing on sloping sites), and recommending a policy level for affordable housing with a 'healthy' viability margin, indicates to the Council that the situations where scheme viability issues might be so significant as to justify lowering the policy level requirement will be exceptional.</p> <p>It is therefore considered reasonable to maintain the Council's approach to describing the circumstances</p> |
|--|----------------|--|---|

| | | | |
|------|------------------------|---|--|
| | | | <p>when a reduced affordable housing contribution is appropriate as 'exceptional' and that the 'not less than' wording in the policy be retained.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM93 | McCarthy and Stone 265 | <p>McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd did not make representations on the publication Draft of the Local Plan as it was content that its representations made on the Draft Local Plan in 2017 had been considered. It did not therefore appear at or hear the Examination.</p> <p>MM90 introduces definitions of what it refers to as "Age Restrictive-Exclusive/Sheltered /Retirement Housing" and "Assisted Living/Extra Care/Very Sheltered Housing" and refers to these as C3 uses. As evidenced by the proposed modifications that follow, the whole purpose of doing is to enable the proposed affordable housing policy to be applied.</p> <p>With reference to the Council's policy Response Paper on Matter 9 and the Representations made to the Local Plan, there was no catalyst or requirement for this Modification. Whilst the Council suggests that it is made in the interests of clarity, it, in fact introduces entirely new requirements and expectations into the Local Plan. To do so, runs contrary to the purpose and remit of a Main Modification and should therefore be withdrawn as a matter of procedure.</p> <p>Additionally, too, the determination of the modification that "there are two main types of this specialist C3 housing for</p> | <p>See response to MM90 representation by McCarthy and Stone (265) above.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>older people” is entirely erroneous. It is well established that Assisted Living/Extra care proposals (NB Very Sheltered Housing is generally considered to be an outdated term) can fall within either use Class C2 or C3 dependent on the level of care it provides. Self-containment is not the determining factor as to Use Class though this principally informs the modification proposed by the repeated references to it.</p> <p>For the purposes of precision, a, full statement is not presented here but as evidence of its error, the Housing Learning and Improvement Network (HLin) Fact sheet “Extra Care Housing – What is it in 2015 set out the “Core Ingredients” of Extra Care, which includes:</p> <p><i>Fully self-contained properties where occupants have their own front doors, and tenancies or leases which give them security of tenure and the right to control who enters their home</i></p> <p>And then goes on to discuss the proper considerations that should be applied to determine Use Class. The modification rather determines that if apartments are self-contained then they must fall within Use Class C3 but a “Core ingredient” is just that and it is well established that EC can fall within C2 or C3 based on the correct assessment, which is the care and support provided. The approach of the Modification is therefore wholly wrong.</p> <p>Appeal proposals cited by the representation all determine that the form of accommodation that most Extra Care development takes (that is a single block of apartments with on-site care and as principally provided by McCarthy & Stone) falls within Use Class C2.</p> <p><u>Suggested changes to the main modification</u></p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|-------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>MM90 should be deleted in its entirety in order to make the Plan sound and to avoid the potential for a procedural challenge.</p> <p>Modification MM92 for paragraph 6.11 should delete <i>“ A definition of the two types of specialist housing for older people set out in this policy is provided in the supporting text to Policy H1 of this plan”</i></p> <p>Modification MM93 for policy H2 should delete sections (b) iii and iv in their entirety</p> | |
| | | | |
| MM101 | Halton Homes (Waltons & Co) 007 | The representor puts forward two alternative modifications (these are set out in the full copy of the representation provided separately), which are consequential to alternative modifications put forward in relation to MM105, below. | <p>The representor’s alternative modifications do not reflect discussion and agreement at the hearings and are consequential to those put forward with respect to MM105, below, which the Council does not support.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector’s attention is drawn to the Council’s view that no change is required.</p> |
| MM101 | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust 047 | The Trust is pleased to see the modifications to the supporting text for Policy EC4 in relation to tourism development at Hellifield, and the changes to the map of the tourism development area. | No response required. |

| | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| MM101 | Natural England 051 | NE notes the modifications to policies EC4A and EC4B regarding tourism related development at Hellifield in modification MM101 but they have no specific comment to make. | No response required. |
| MM101 | SOCC 210 | Covered by the SOCC (210) representation on MM105, below. | See response to the SOCC (210) representation on MM105, below. |
| MM101 | N Stedman, Friends of the Dales 246 | <p>Supports MM101 and related modifications MM105, MM106 and MM107.</p> <p>The representor welcomes the expansion, clarification and strengthening of the policy, in particular the requirement that proposals must promote sustainable development, as well as protecting landscape character, biodiversity and archaeological interest. The policy and supporting text now reflect more accurately the situation at Hellifield Flashes, which are an important asset for the area and have biodiversity value, evidenced by the numbers and range of wetland bird species recorded there. It is a valued asset for walking and birdwatching, and provides a setting for Hellifield, the Yorkshire Dales National Park and the Settle-Carlisle Conservation Area.</p> <p>Amendments to New diagram EC4B are supported. The representor acknowledges the extant permission for part of the area, but the new diagram makes clear the biodiversity and archaeological interest of adjacent areas, thus providing clear parameters for future proposals. Designation of part of the Flashes as Local Green Space is welcomed, although it is disappointing that it is not more extensive, to more accurately reflect the value of the area for local residents.</p> | No response required. |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|-------|---------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| MM102 | Natural England 051 | NE notes the modifications to policies EC4A and EC4B regarding tourism related development in modification MM102 but they have no specific comment to make. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM103 | CTS (Rural Solutions) 046 | Supports the proposed modification, which makes the supporting text (para 7.27) clearer insofar as development will be supported subject to a comprehensive strategy and masterplan for the Core Visitor Area being produced to the satisfaction of CDC and the YDNPA (as local planning authorities) in liaison with other key stakeholders. | No response required. |
| MM103 | Natural England 051 | NE notes the modifications to policies EC4A and EC4B regarding tourism related development in modification MM103 but they have no specific comment to make. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM104 | Historic England 017 | Supports the proposed modification to the first paragraph of the policy, which clarifies the intentions of the policy and improves its clarity. | No response required. |
| MM104 | CTS (Rural Solutions) 046 | Supports the proposed modification, which makes the policy itself clearer insofar as development will be supported subject to a comprehensive strategy and masterplan for the Core Visitor Area being produced to the satisfaction of CDC and the YDNPA (as local planning authorities) in liaison with other key stakeholders. This reflects changes discussed during the examination hearing. | No response required. |
| MM104 | Natural England 051 | NE notes the modifications to policies EC4A and EC4B regarding tourism related development in modification MM104 but they have no specific comment to make. | No response required. |

| | | | |
|-------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | |
| MM105 | Halton Homes (Waltons & Co) 007 | <p>The representor objects to the ‘in principle’ restriction in Policy EC4B, which is unsound for a number of reasons (these are explained in detail in the full copy of the representation provided separately) and would prevent sustainable tourism development coming forward on a site which has long been recognised as being an appropriate location for tourism, and which already benefits from extant tourist-related use rights. In order to ensure that Policy EC4B is sound, it should be modified so that the in principle support for sustainable tourism development on the site applies to the entire Tourism Development Commitment area (namely all of that within the red-dashed line). Two alternative modifications are suggested (these are set out in the full copy of the representation provided separately).</p> <p>The representor objects to part VI) of Policy EC4B, which is not needed for reasons of soundness, is not justified and goes beyond what is required by national policy (these points are explained in detail in the full copy of the representation provided separately).</p> <p>The representor objects to the addition of the requirement in the final sentence of Policy EC4B, which was not included in the submission local plan, is not needed for reasons of soundness and is self-evident. There is no reason for it to be included in relation to Policy EC4B alone.</p> <p>In order that MM105 is sound, part VI) of Policy EC4B and the final sentence of the policy should be deleted.</p> | <p>The Council does not support the representor’s alternative modifications and believes that MM105 properly reflects the outcome of the hearing discussions and will ensure soundness.</p> <p>As previously stated by the Council, in response to Matter 15, Issue 2, Q.6 (EL3.015), the commitment with respect to land at Hellifield is the only such commitment within the plan area. Notwithstanding the statement at paragraph 4e of the representation, there are no comparable “other sites”. The one example cited by the representor, which relates to extension of a caravan park, is not comparable to the Hellifield commitment and only serves to confirm that no “other sites” exist.</p> <p>Part VI) of Policy EC4B requires preservation <u>or</u> enhancement, not preservation <u>and</u> enhancement of the character and appearance of the local area. This is not inconsistent with the Framework or Policy ENV1 and its inclusion was discussed and agreed at the examination hearings.</p> <p>The final sentence of Policy EC4B <u>was</u> included in the submission local plan as part of Policy EC4. It remains in Policy EC4 and has been carried through into new Policy EC4B. Therefore the sentence does not apply to EC4B alone.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector’s attention is drawn to the Council’s view that no change is required.</p> |

| | | | |
|-------|----------------------------|--|--|
| | | | |
| MM105 | Historic England 017 | <p>Objects to the proposed modification, which is unsound. Inset Map 13 identifies a 'Key Location For Tourism Development' by means of a red triangle. However, this triangle is shown as lying outside the area denoted as a 'Tourism Development Commitment' within the Settle-Carlisle Railway Conservation Area and adjacent to the Listed Hellifield Station. This new addition to the Policies Map is neither clear nor does it make the Policy more effective. Indeed, it gives the impression that that the station area is now identified as a key location for future tourism development. In a similar manner to that adopted for the Bolton Abbey Policy, the triangle should be located in the centre of the dashed red lines.</p> | <p>The proposed modifications relating to tourism policies EC4, EC4A and EC4B (MM101 to MM107) and associated Policy Map changes do not affect, in principle, the Local Plan's intention to establish two separate tourism designations at Hellifield, namely the Tourism Development Commitment (TDC) and the Key Location for Tourism Development (KLTD), which are described at paragraphs 7.18, 7.19 and 7.33 of the Local Plan. The KLTD notation (now a red triangle) had previously appeared on the main (plan area) Policies Map only. At the hearing session, it was discussed and agreed that the notation should also be shown on Inset Maps, in the interests of clarity and effectiveness. The Council believes, therefore, that the objection may result from a misunderstanding and does not consider the proposed modification to be unsound or in need of further modification.</p> |
| MM105 | Natural England 051 | <p>NE notes the modifications to policies EC4A and EC4B regarding tourism related development in modification MM105 but they have no specific comment to make.</p> | <p>No response required.</p> |
| MM105 | SOCC 210 | <p>At meetings, the communities of Hellifield and Long Preston were supportive of MM105, but confused that the Tourism Development Commitment on New Diagram EC4B (MM107) seemed to potentially conflict with the policy and possibly be exploited, threatening the local plan.</p> <p>In the current saved local plan (1999), paragraph 11.1 under Policy EMP11 (p.109) describes the identification of Tourist Development Opportunity Sites, but does not confirm that the</p> | <p>The Council believes that MM105 and related modifications MM101 and MM107 reflect the outcome of hearing discussions and will ensure clarity, effectiveness and soundness. However, as explained in its response to representations on MM87, HE-LGS1, the Council would support the designation of further Local Green Space, as suggested by the representor.</p> |

| | | | |
|-------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | <p>sites were specifically allocated. As the original reasons for the TDOS identification on the Flashes site are no longer deliverable (Long Preston / Hellifield Bypass and Railway Heritage Centre) it was questioned why areas not subject to built elements of an extant permission needed to be identified as a Tourist Development Commitment.</p> <p>The representor understands the plan must be sound and compliant with the NPPF, but asks on behalf of the two communities that further consideration is given to the suggestions for 3 smaller areas of Local Green Space previously submitted by the Council or the area suggested by residents. Further LGS would be an important addition to the requirements of MM105, adding further clarity for communities, planners and developers about what is acceptable and perhaps avoiding lengthy and expensive planning time.</p> | |
| MM105 | A & M Lynch 228 | <p>Part III) of Policy EC4B states "Conservation of Biodiversity value". Suggest this is changed to "Should provide net gains in biodiversity" as stated in MM78, which refers to NPPF requirements.</p> <p>EC4B shows a much reduced area of Local Green Space around Gallaber Pond. It is accepted that the original area was too large. However, the amended LGS is now too small and ignores the significance and benefits to the local area of the other Dunbar Flashes, which are even closer to the village and just as important due to their beauty, historic significance, biodiversity, archaeology, recreational value and tranquillity. Suggest that the LGS and EC4B are expanded to include the Dunbar Flashes in addition to Gallaber Pond. This increased LGS should be limited to the Flashes as shown on New Diagram EC4B.</p> | <p>The Council believes that MM105 and related modifications MM101 and MM107 reflect the outcome of hearing discussions and will ensure clarity, effectiveness and soundness. However, as explained in its response to representations on MM87, HE-LGS1, the Council would support the designation of further Local Green Space, as suggested by the representor.</p> |

| | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| MM105 | P Cochrane, ROOTS 231 | This site is a rare wetland environment of regional importance that supports biodiversity and ecology. The ponds cannot be recreated elsewhere. The Flashes has a high amenity value as it is, is treasured by the local community and draws tourists to the area. The Tourist Development Commitment designation is only appropriate on the sites surrounding the Flashes, the redundant railway sidings and Gallaber Park. The Flashes itself should be preserved as Local Green Space. | The Council believes that MM105 and related modifications MM101 and MM107 reflect the outcome of hearing discussions and will ensure clarity, effectiveness and soundness. However, as explained in its response to representations on MM87, HE-LGS1, the Council would support the designation of further Local Green Space in this area. |
| MM105 | N Stedman, Friends of the Dales 246 | Support. Covered by the N Stedman, Friends of the Dales (246) representation on MM101, above. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM106 | N Stedman, Friends of the Dales 246 | Support. Covered by the N Stedman, Friends of the Dales (246) representation on MM101, above. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM107 | Halton Homes (Waltons & Co) 007 | <p>There are a number of factual errors on the “New Diagram EC4B”, as follows.</p> <p>The grey hatched areas do not accurately represent the full extent of the areas of operational development permitted on the site. First, at the north west of the site, an area of hardstanding was permitted. Second, there are existing buildings on the site, which should be included. (These are shown in a diagram, plan 1, which is attached to the full copy of the representation provided separately).</p> | Although the areas of ‘Approved operational development’ have not been modified, the Council can provide the following response. The extent of approved operational development is shown on the approved plans, which were reproduced in the Council’s response to Matter 15, Issue 2, Q.8 (EL3.015). No hardstanding is shown in the area at the north west of the site and the area is outside the red-line boundary of the reserved matters application. Approved areas of hardstanding are clearly shown on the approved plans |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>There is no public right of way to the north of Gallaber Pond. (This is highlighted in a diagram, plan 2, which is attached to the full copy of the representation provided separately).</p> <p>The 'Potential public right of way' is not justified nor a requirement of the policy and should be deleted.</p> <p>The "biodiversity value" symbol on Little Dunbar's Flash is not justified and should be rejected. There is insufficient ecological evidence to include biodiversity value anywhere other than Gallaber Pond.</p> | <p>and are within the reserved matters boundary. It was discussed at the hearing that the outline permission may authorise use of the area at the north west of the site as, for example, a grassed area for overspill car parking. It is not appropriate to include areas of pre-existing development, such as the A65, Waterside Lane and Waters View House, as 'Approved operational development'. These are not authorised by the relevant planning permission.</p> <p>Although the 'Existing public right of way' notation has not been modified, the Council can provide the following response. Notwithstanding public use for many years, the representor is correct that a PROW does not yet exist along Waterside Lane to the north of Gallaber Pond. However, Waterside Lane was built to adoptable standard and with public money, as explained in paragraph 2.3 of the representor's response to Matter 15, Issue 2, Q.6 (EL2.015a(i)). Waterside Lane provides access to the TDC, potential access to Hellifield Station and the KLTD, and is likely to become a PROW within the plan period. Therefore, the Council would support a further modification to correct Diagram EC4B, so that it shows Waterside Lane as a 'Potential public right of way' rather than an 'Existing public right of way'.</p> <p>Although the 'Potential public right of way' notation has not been modified, the Council can provide the following response. The Council does not support the representor's suggested deletion of the 'Potential public right of way' notation. Part V) of Policy EC4B requires preservation and enhancement of the existing public rights of way network. The Council believes that inclusion of the 'Existing public right of way' and</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | <p>‘Potential public right of way’ notations on Diagram EC4B is a clear and effective way of illustrating how this requirement could be met.</p> <p>The ‘Biodiversity value’ symbol appeared in the original Diagram EC4. In New Diagram EC4B, the symbol has been split into two and applied to Dunbars Flash and Little Dunbars Flash, which are no longer contained within a single area of Local Green Space. The Council believes that this improves the clarity and effectiveness of New Diagram EC4B. The Council cannot understand the representor’s statement that there is insufficient evidence of biodiversity value outside Gallaber Pond, especially as it is known that the three flashes operate together to support birdlife, both on-site and at the nearby Long Preston Deeps SSSI. It was the acknowledgement of such biodiversity value that led the representor to propose significant off-site compensatory mitigation measures to support their recent planning application (Ref 42/2016/17496), which had generated objections from Natural England, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and the RSPB.</p> |
| MM107 | Natural England 051 | NE notes the modifications to policies EC4A and EC4B regarding tourism related development in modification MM107 but they have no specific comment to make. | No response required. |
| MM107 | SOCC 210 | Covered by the SOCC (210) representation on MM105, above. | See response to the SOCC (210) representation on MM105, above. |
| MM107 | N Stedman, Friends of the Dales 246 | Support. Covered by the N Stedman, Friends of the Dales (246) representation on MM101, above. | No response required. |

| | | | |
|-------|----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | |
| MM108 | Natural England 051 | Natural England states that they note the modifications to policies EC4A and EC4B regarding tourism related development in modification MM108 but they have no specific comment to make. | No response required. NOTE: MM108 relates to EC5, rather than EC4A and EC4B as mentioned in this response. |
| | | | |
| MM117 | Historic England 017 | Policy INF5, Footnote for Part(c) and (e). Sound. The proposed Modification clarifies which parts of the District are to be regarded as 'sensitive' for the purposes of this Policy. This greatly assists the interpretation and understanding of this Policy. | No response required. |
| | | | |
| MM118 | Wilman family (Carter Jonas) 008 | A series of modifications are included within the text to both Policy INF6 and the supporting text at Para 8.55. These reflect discussions with the District Council, the LEA and the Examination Hearing sessions and address a number of the concerns raised in representation. M118 in particular refers to the identification of land and the Council, LEA and ESFA (Education and Skills Funding Agency) approach to safeguarding land for educational needs in Skipton (and Bentham). It is recognised that such an approach is an important element of achieving sustainable communities. We have no specific comments upon the policy wording or the narrative and welcome that a mechanism is included to review the need for the school sites. It would be helpful if a timeframe for undertaking that review and any changes to the Local Plan through a Review | The request to provide a timeframe for undertaking a review of the need for the school is noted. It is not considered that this requires additional wording to the supporting text. The Council will, prior to publication of its Authority Monitoring Report consult with the education authority on the position on this matter and report accordingly on an annual basis. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |

| | | | |
|-------|--|---|---|
| | | or a detailed SPD is set out. | |
| MM119 | Wilman family (Carter Jonas) 008 | <p>A series of modifications are included within the text to both Policy INF6 and the supporting text at Para 8.55. These reflect discussions with the District Council, the LEA and the Examination Hearing sessions and address a number of the concerns raised in representation.</p> <p>M118 in particular refers to the identification of land and the Council, LEA and ESFA (Education and Skills Funding Agency) approach to safeguarding land for educational needs in Skipton (and Bentham). It is recognised that such an approach is an important element of achieving sustainable communities. We have no specific comments upon the policy wording or the narrative and welcome that a mechanism is included to review the need for the school sites. It would be helpful if a timeframe for undertaking that review and any changes to the Local Plan through a Review or a detailed SPD is set out.</p> <p>For M119, consistent with our comments elsewhere, it would be appropriate for the policy wording at provision (b) to be amended to include the phrase “up to” (1.8 hectares of land).</p> | See response to representation 008 on MM20 above |
| MM119 | P Brewer 232 | <p>At a time when there is an existing primary school in Skipton which is being allowed to close by the education authority, it is unacceptable to plan or approve a new primary school in the town. Clearly the requirement for primary education is currently being met. If there is a firm future requirement for additional school places the existing primary school numbers should be re-allocated within the town to maintain Broughton Road primary school up to the time when new housing raises the pupil numbers.</p> <p>It makes no commercial or practical sense to close one</p> | <p>The purpose of the plan is to assess both current and future needs for land uses such as housing, employment, retail, sport and education. The plan has assessed these needs up to the year 2032 and has identified the number of primary school places needs up to this point taking into account the likely increases in population and pupil numbers.</p> <p>It is appropriate therefore for this plan to safeguard land for primary education which reflects the estimated need for new primary schools.</p> |

| | | | |
|-------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>primary school only to build a new a new school at a different location at some point in the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Delete point b) i) in the plan and replace it with a description/process to maintain the Broughton Road Primary School in the plan.</p> | <p>The above assessment has taken into account the school number capacity at Broughton Road school.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |
| | | | |
| MM120 | Wilman family (Carter Jonas) 008 | <p>It is appropriate that traffic arising from new development can be accommodated upon the local and strategic highway network. Preliminary modelling suggests the need to make improvements to various junctions along the A65. It is appropriate that each site allocation meets the costs of such growth in accordance with the number of residential units. However, the potential impact should also be considered. We would suggest that the potential impact of SK090 upon the Gargrave Road/ A65 roundabout junction would be minimal (or nil) given its location upon the opposite side of the town, and also as a consequence of the anticipated yield of the site. With our concerns about potential yield we would also question whether the Council has appropriately addressed the viability issue, a lower yield would simply increase the cost (contribution) per unit.</p> | <p>The issue of how the cost of the necessary highway mitigation measures for the whole town of Skipton would be split was discussed at the examination hearing and the appropriate wording for the plan has been provided in this modification.</p> <p>The different housing proposals may have less impact on one of the major junctions where mitigation is required than another, and vice versa. Perhaps a matter of 'swings and roundabouts'. In this plan led approach to infrastructure provision it is appropriate to split the total costs by the number of homes proposed on each of the five named development sites.</p> <p>The Council consider that the plan's estimated yield for the number of homes on each of these sites is realistic and that the estimated financial contributions and viability have been demonstrated as robust.</p> <p>In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required.</p> |

| | | | |
|-------|--|--|--|
| MM120 | J Adams 204 | Refers to supporting text for new Policy INF7 “The provision of a safe, suitable and convenient access to new development sites should also be agreed with the local highway authority during pre-application discussions.” Replace ‘should’ with ‘must’. | The use of the word ‘should’ in this sentence is considered sufficiently clear and of sufficient strength for the purposes of encouraging an appropriate outcome from pre-application discussions by applicants with the local highway authority. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector’s attention is drawn to the Council’s view that no change is required. |
| MM120 | S Coetzer 226 | Refers to ‘The provision of a safe, suitable and convenient access to new development sites should be agreed’ the word ‘should’ is too ambiguous. The proposed site GA031 Walton Close, Gargrave does not even meet the most basic needs as set out in this section. | See response to representation 204 on MM120 above. |
| MM120 | F Hall Coetzer 227 | Refers to ‘The provision of a safe, suitable and convenient access to new development sites should be agreed’ the word ‘should’ is too ambiguous. The proposed site GA031 Walton Close, Gargrave does not even meet the most basic needs as set out in this section. | See response to representation 204 on MM120 above |
| | | | |
| MM121 | Wilman family (Carter Jonas) 008 | It is appropriate that traffic arising from new development can be accommodated upon the local and strategic highway network. Preliminary modelling suggests the need to make improvements to various junctions along the A65. It is | See response to representation 008 on MM120 above. |

| | | | |
|-------|------------------|--|---|
| | | appropriate that each site allocation meets the costs of such growth in accordance with the number of residential units. However, the potential impact should also be considered. We would suggest that the potential impact of SK090 upon the Gargrave Road/ A65 roundabout junction would be minimal (or nil) given its location upon the opposite side of the town, and also as a consequence of the anticipated yield of the site. With our concerns about potential yield we would also question whether the Council has appropriately addressed the viability issue, a lower yield would simply increase the cost (contribution) per unit. | |
| MM121 | J Adams 204 | e) 'providing safe, suitable and convenient access to all development sites...' is too site specific and misses the point that much of a sites impact will probably be between the site itself and the centre of the conurbation it is located alongside. After 'to all development sites' include 'and from the sites to the centre of the conurbation' | This policy wording is considered appropriate as it stands. Criterion c) seeks to ensure that all developments maximise opportunities to travel by non-car modes of transport, through for example developer contributions for off-site transport facilities. Furthermore, under criterion d), the local highway authority will, subject to the individual circumstances of a proposal, require sustainable transport assessments which will, amongst other matters, determine how a proposal might contribute to creating accessible, connected and inclusive communities. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| MM121 | S Coetzer 226 | e) 'providing safe, suitable and convenient access to all development sites...' is too site specific and misses the point that much of a sites impact will probably be between the site itself and the centre of the conurbation it is located alongside. | See response to representation 204 on MM121 above. |

| | | | |
|-------|--|---|---|
| | | After 'to all development sites' include 'and from the sites to the centre of the conurbation' | |
| MM121 | F Hall Coetzer 227 | e) 'providing safe, suitable and convenient access to all development sites...' is too site specific and misses the point that much of a sites impact will probably be between the site itself and the centre of the conurbation it is located alongside. After 'to all development sites' include 'and from the sites to the centre of the conurbation' | See response to representation 204 on MM121 above. |
| | | | |
| MM123 | Wilman family (Carter Jonas) 008 | This modification sets out the mechanism for the application Policy INF6. Whilst the clarity is welcomed, we would query the level of detail enclosed and whether this may be better contained in an SPD. This reflects our concerns about the on-going review for school places. Although the premise is supported for the provision of a new school east of Skipton and land is provided and safeguarded, it would be appropriate if the requirement for education provision could be clarified and the timetable for the on-going review set out to give some certainty. On this basis the Local Plan is unclear and in our view potentially unsound. Some guidance from the LEA and CDC would be welcomed. This could be achieved through the forthcoming pre-application process. | The request to provide an SPD and within it a timeframe for undertaking a review of the need for the school is noted. It is not considered that this is necessary to make the plan sound. The Council will, prior to publication of its Authority Monitoring Report consult with the education authority on the position on this matter and report accordingly on an annual basis. In considering whether to change the proposed modification in response to this representation, the Inspector's attention is drawn to the Council's view that no change is required. |
| | | | |
| MM124 | Wilman family (Carter Jonas) | It is appropriate that the IDP is removed from the Local Plan and added as an evidence base document. This improves | No response required. |

| | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| | 008 | the soundness of the Plan. | |
| | | | |
| N/A | The Coal Authority 011 | No comment | No response required |
| N/A | NYCC, M Rushworth 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, M Collins 200 | No comment | No response required |