

# All Representations Received by Policy or Section of the Publication Draft Craven Local Plan

Respondent ID	040	Organisation	Cononley Parish Council		
Section or Policy		APPC		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Section 15, page 58-59		Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Cononley			Representation Reference	040/03/APPC/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Appendix C ‘Consultation Documents’ page 58  
Section 15  
Parks and Gardens Current Provision  
Table 14 - Current Provision of Parks and Gardens

The Parish Council seeks clarification as to why the Cononley Playing Fields have been excluded from this table.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Please include the Cononley Playing Fields in this table.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      040      Organisation      Cononley Parish Council

Section or Policy      APPC

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Section 15, para 15.29, page 66-67

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Cononley

Representation Reference      040/01/APPC/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Appendix C, Table 15 - Current Provision of Allotments - Craven

The Parish Council seeks clarification as to:

- what do the poor and average scores represent on the Cononley Meadow Lane and ‘Church Road’ allotments respectively; and
- Why are the Crosshills Road allotments excluded from this table; and
- Why are the allotments on ‘Church Road’ referred to by this name? This is not a name the Parish Council is familiar with and is not a name in common usage within the village. It is assumed that Church Road allotments refers to those allotments next to the Primary School?

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

- 1.Please refer to the ‘Church Road’ allotments as the allotments next to the Primary School.
- 2.Please include the Crosshills allotments in the Local Plan.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	059	Organisation		
Section or Policy		APPC	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Table 13	Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	059/22/APPC/CN

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Appendix C/ Table 13  
Other - Cost appears to be for 7 (not one) additional classroom(s)?

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	059	Organisation		
Section or Policy		APPC	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Section 13	Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	059/23/APPC/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Appx C/ Section 13

Object - There is no mention of Castleberg Hospital, the future of which is under review.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      039                      Organisation      North Yorkshire County Council

Section or Policy	APPC	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph	Table 5 pages 21-22	Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Representation Reference	039/23/APPC/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

A number of highway schemes have been identified within the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) these are listed in Table 5 of the document. These include schemes in Skipton identified by the highway modelling work and schemes in the wider district. The LHA has previously discussed and will continue to advise CDC on the highway infrastructure improvements required to mitigate the cumulative impact of development within Skipton. The other improvements Table 5 identifies are:

- Sutton Lane and Holme Lane junction improvements
- Bentham Station Road and Main Street junction, Bentham
- Hellifield and Long Preston mini roundabout
- Falcon Manor junction, Settle mini-roundabout

The delivery mechanism of some highway schemes has suggested potential funding sources through LTP. NYCC do not have proposals within the plan period to deliver a number of schemes highlighted and as such the LHA would welcome further discussions over the listed schemes and identified delivery mechanisms.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?    ☐    Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	059	Organisation		
Section or Policy		APPC	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Table 16	Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	059/24/APPC/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Appx C/ Table 16 Transport

Object - The table does not include the creation of a comprehensive train service through Hellifield and Clitheroe, in both directions, 7 days/week which it should.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	059	Organisation		
Section or Policy		APPC	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Table 16	Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	059/25/APPC/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Appx C/ Table 16 Transport

Object - The timescale for Skipton - Colne reopening should be MUCH shorter than 20 years, e.g. 5 years (maximum)

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      039      Organisation      North Yorkshire County Council

Section or Policy      APPC

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      9.14

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      039/12/APPC/CN

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Children and Young People's Services

Infrastructure Plan Appendix C

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

In para 9.14, 'Basic Capital Funding' should read 'Basic Need Capital Funding' and please remove the reference to Capital Receipts as these are unlikely to be available.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID	043	Organisation		
Section or Policy		APPC, SP12	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		3.4	Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	043/01/APPC/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

I consider the Local Plan is not sound in the following respect:

At paragraph 3.4, it is acknowledged that the Council “has commissioned highway modelling work to examine the strategic cumulative traffic effects on surrounding local highway network of the Council’s future options for housing in Skipton where most growth will be delivered. This work is complete and is taken account of in the IDP”.

The same exercise should also have been undertaken in relation to Bentham (a Tier 2 housing site and key Service Centre) given that there are likely to be significant effects arising from the additional traffic generated as a result of the planned development on a local road network that, in places (such as the High Bentham to Ingleton road), is ill-equipped to cope with present-day vehicular traffic, let alone any increase.

No planned road improvements are listed for the Bentham area at paragraph 3.25 other than in the centre of High Bentham.

The summary at paragraph 3.30 acknowledges that the list is not exhaustive and that “further improvements may be identified through transport modelling and over the lifetime of the plan”. However, given the strategic highway network improvements needed to enable Bentham to adequately function in future as a key Service Centre, it should not be left to “Planning applications for individual development proposals (to be) accompanied by a transport assessment or transport statement and travel plan where appropriate... (including) a detailed assessment of the transport impacts of the development such as accessibility, highway design and safety.”

Adequate road connections with the A65 at Ingleton \* and via the B6480 to Wray and Lancaster need to be clearly assessed as significant factors that need to be improved if the planned housing development is to take place, not just improvements to the entrances to individual sites.

- In places this road is not wide enough for two vehicles to pass. There is also a section where major erosion regularly occurs as the road slips further down a steep bank.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

I would like to see paragraph 3.19 amended to include references to the B6480, this being a cross-boundary route with many residents of Bentham travelling to Lancaster daily for work.

I would also like to see inclusion of a scheme of improvement of the Bentham - Ingleton road in paragraph 3.25.

Even if neither of these amendments are made, I consider the Local Plan should offer a degree of certainty that the local highway network in the Bentham area will be adequately (and independently from any specific development) assessed; I suggest that paragraph 3.4 is amended by adding “A similar exercise will be commissioned for

Bentham”, preferably with a realistic timetable attached.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	052	Organisation		
Section or Policy		CON	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		2.11	Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	052/01/CON/CN

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Local Plan – Section 2 – Context – paragraph 2.11 – Page 14

A typographical error:

Section 2.11 (Page 14) reads “There is a diverse mix of business sectors within Craven, with concentrations scattered around the authority area. However, the principal employment area within Craven is the area in and around the south of the plan area (encompassing Skipton but also Cross Hills and Sutton-in-Craven, in addition to Gargrave)

I think this reference to Sutton-in-Craven should actually read “Glusburn” as Glusburn and Cross Hills are the associated settlements and have been classed as Tier 3 Local Service Centres.

Sutton-in-Craven is categorised, correctly as a Tier 4A village with basic services, and is considered separately from Glusburn/Cross Hills.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Section 2.11 (Page 14) should read “There is a diverse mix of business sectors within Craven, with concentrations scattered around the authority area. However, the principal employment area within Craven is the area in and around the south of the plan area (encompassing Skipton but also Cross Hills and Glusburn , in addition to Gargrave)

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      CON

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Paragraph 2.28 et seq

Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      017/01/CON/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

This section provides a good summary of the rich heritage of the Plan area. These assets make an important contribution to the distinctive character of Craven’s towns, villages and countryside, to the quality of life of its communities and to the economy of the area.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      001      Organisation      C/O Richard Turner & Sons

Section or Policy      CON      Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Key Issues, paragraph 2.41 and Plan Objectives 4, 5 and 6 P.27      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      HB028      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      High Bentham      Representation Reference      001/01/CON/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

My client owns part of site HB028 identified in the draft Local Plan and is concerned that it has now been removed whereas earlier versions of the plan indicated that it could be allocated for housing.

This response is written as a result of the removal of that site and also in relation to the numbers and nature of the housing requirement. With regard to the Key Issues section of the Plan, under paragraph 2.41, a number of issues have been identified for the plan to address. The points identified are intrinsically linked but there is a very strong relationship between the first key issue of a falling resident workforce and affordable housing needs, where house prices are high relative to local incomes. This results in a considerable affordable housing need. However, I would comment that the purpose of the Plan is to provide the objectively assessed needs for housing, and not just affordable housing. The supply of open market as well as affordable should be identified as one of these key issues given the scenarios and options that have been set out in the Plan.

The Plan objectives are set out at page 27 of the Plan with planning objective 4 relating to maintaining a continuous supply of housing land to meet housing needs throughout the plan period, with the further of objective emphasising choice in terms of house type, size, tenure, price and location.

Planning objective 6 specifically looks at enhancing the vitality of market towns and larger village centres, and also looks at improving the provision of local community services and facilities in smaller settlements.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Supply open market and affordable housing to be identified as a key issue under paragraph 2.41.

Allocate reduced site HB028 for residential development to fulfil plan objectives 4, 5 and 6 (Page 27).

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation      To ensure that my client's site is fully considered as part of the examination process.

Respondent ID      008      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy      CON

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      2.41, page 23

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      008/06/CON/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

## SECTION 2: CONTEXT

5.4 Setting out the prevailing position for the Local Plan, this section identifies the key issues and challenges facing the area. It may be appropriate that this part of the plan should include an improved set of diagrams to indicate Craven’s location and the main settlements.

5.5 Without repeating the matters the key issues across the Plan area appear to be:

Falling resident Workforce – An attractive location to live combined with limited new housing stock has resulted in existing housing stock being under occupied. New housing is required to encourage younger families to improve the supply of labour to local businesses and to enable older household to downsize and free up larger housing units.

Affordable housing need – connected with the above there has been a disjoint between local wage growth and increases in house prices and rents.

Need for green field development – Previous patterns of development have consumed underutilised and vacant brownfield sites and premises, requiring the release of green field sites to meet objectively assessed need for housing and employment development, along with the necessary infrastructure

High quality environment – Within the District are high quality natural and historic assets which require an appropriate level of protection;

Transport and connectivity – the District has relative proximity to major urban centres for jobs and services and there are opportunities to improve economic links by road and rail, including public transport.

5.6 We are in general agreement with these issues.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		CON		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Paragraph		Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	017/02/CON/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We would endorse the conclusion that one of the biggest issues that the plan has to address is how to reconcile meeting the assessed development needs of the area with the appropriate protection of its outstanding environment.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      024      Organisation      Lancaster City Council

Section or Policy      DtC

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      024/01/DtC/DtC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Thank you very much for your email, notifying Lancaster City Council of the publication of the Local Plan for Craven.

As you may know, I have been the main duty to co-operate officer link between the two councils for the last few years, and most of my dealings have been with Matthew Collins. These meetings are all well documented with agreed minutes/actions. The tone of the discussions has been positive and constructive and raised no matters that require the reconsideration/adjustment of either council's planning policy approaches in preparing their respective Local Plans. In that sense I am satisfied that the two councils' plans are compatible.

I have reviewed the Publication Draft of Craven's Local Plan. In particular I have reviewed the sections on Housing Need, Spatial Strategy, Infrastructure, Countryside and Landscape, and the Rural Economy. I have found no matters contained in the text of the Local Plan that would cause Lancaster to make a formal submission to the examination. You may use this email as further evidence that the two councils have continued in dialogue through the duty to co-operate.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Section or Policy	DtC	Plan is Legally Compliant?	No
Paragraph		Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		Plan is DtC Compliant?	No
Settlement Comment Relates to		Representation Reference	012/02/DtC/DtC

## 2 DUTY TO COOPERATE

2.1.2 Whilst Gladman recognise that the Duty to Cooperate is a process of ongoing engagement and collaboration as set out in the PPG, it is clear that it is intended to produce effective policies on cross boundary strategic matters. In this regard, the Craven Local Plan must be able to demonstrate that it has engaged and worked with neighbouring authorities, especially South Lakeland, Richmondshire and the YDNP Authority, alongside their existing joint working arrangements, to satisfactorily address cross boundary strategic issues and the requirement to meet any unmet housing needs. This is not simply an issue of consultation but a question of effective cooperation.

2.1.4 The Government proposes that all Councils will have a Statement of Common Ground (its draft form in place in six months) in place twelve months from the publication of the revised NPPF (anticipated in 2018). If any Statements of Common Ground are prepared, Gladman Developments may wish to submit further comments on the Council's legal compliance with the Duty.

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------



Respondent ID      028      Organisation      Home Builders Federation

Section or Policy      DtC

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      No

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      028/02/DtC/DtC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Duty to Cooperate

The Council have prepared a Cross-boundary Strategic Issues and Duty to Cooperate Statement, this details the cross-boundary issues and the bodies that the Council have worked with. Appendix 1 contains the MoU between the Council and the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority, this provides a level of agreement on the housing figure for Craven, it is does not however provide details on how the full OAN will be met across the housing market area. The key concerns of the HBF relate to housing need and delivery, and the need for the authorities of the housing market area to work together to ensure that the need is met, and homes are delivered. The HBF consider there is still further work to do on this issue.

The Government proposes that all Councils will have a Statement of Common Ground (its draft form in place in six months) in place twelve months from the publication of the revised NPPF (anticipated in 2018). If any Statements of Common Ground are prepared the HBF may wish to submit further comments on the Council's legal compliance with the Duty.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	To debate the comments made within our representations further and in greater detail. To ensure that the industry can respond to any additional evidence provided by the Council or others following submission of the plan.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID      009      Organisation      Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)

Section or Policy	DtC	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference		Plan is DtC Compliant?	No
Settlement Comment Relates to		Representation Reference	009/01/DtC/DtC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Having had the opportunity to read the Duty to Cooperate (DtC) Statement for the first time as part of the Publication Local Plan Regulation 19 Consultation, CPRENY have a number of concerns relating to the evidence presented.

The Statement sets out correctly who the ‘duty bodies’ and partners are that the Council must have on-going engagement with to adequately address cross boundary issues and matters of significance within the wider area.

Section 5 of the Statement sets out the engagement that the Council has had with the relevant bodies and organisations, briefly explaining what issues may have arisen.

Section 6 leads on to give a score of significance against certain issues which may have arisen, and Section 7 sets out how certain issues may have influenced the Plan preparation.

However, CPRENY are primarily concerned that there has been no presentation of evidence in the Statement to detail where and when any of the ‘ongoing’ meetings and communication took place over a number of months or years. This has been a requirement and been demonstrated to date within DtC Statements for Local Planning Authorities within the other districts of North Yorkshire. The evidence presented in the appendices set out a MOU between the Council and the National Park Authority (NPA), which, while helpfully agreeing to housing numbers within their respective areas, does nothing to show how other issues have been adequately addressed between the two authorities including matters of landscape, setting and encroachment of allocations within the Park boundaries. Indeed, it is noted that the NPA have objected to a number of allocations on the border of the National Park which they believe may impact on its setting – these have been detailed with responses in the Council’s December 17 Response Forms to the previous consultation. If these had been discussed under the DtC surely the NPA would have been satisfied and not needed to object?

The evidence presented in letters from Bradford Metropolitan District Council, Pendle Council and the Local Nature Partnership appear to be statutory responses to the 3rd pre-publication draft local plan consultation in July 2017 and do not offer any evidence that they have been consulted with on previous drafts or regarding matters arising in any other format other than during this statutory consultation period.

Whilst the email correspondence evidences that there have been some meetings between Lancaster Council and Craven District Council updating each other on plan progress, it is not clear that this has been an on-going matter and not merely undertaken prior to publication of the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan and the first publication of the Duty to Cooperate Statement.

Whilst CPRENY understand that Craven District Council may well have had on-going engagement with organisations and Duty Partners under the Duty to Cooperate for a number of years and therefore could meet the requirements of section 20 (5) (c) of the Act, the lack of evidence to support this presented within the Statement does not lead one to conclude that this has been the case.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID 050 Organisation Environment Agency

Section or Policy DtC

Plan is Legally Compliant? Yes

Paragraph

Plan is Sound? Yes

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant? Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference 050/01/DtC/DtC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Thank you for consulting us on the publication stage of your draft local plan document and revised statement of community involvement (SCI) which were received 21 December 2017.

We are pleased to see that our comments made regarding the previous revision of the draft local plan have been addressed. As such, insofar as those matters within our remit are concerned, we consider the document to be legally compliant and sound. We also believe that it complies with the duty to co-operate.

We have no comments to make on the content of the statement of community involvement (SCI).

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      046      Organisation      Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Bolton Abbey

Section or Policy      DtC

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      Bolton Abbey

Representation Reference      046/14/DtC/DtC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Section 7: Comments relating to the Duty to Co-operate (as it relates to the policy approach to Bolton Abbey)

Whole plan (as it relates to Bolton Abbey)

CST considers that the approach taken by the PDCLP reflects a positive and cogent approach to cross-boundary working in this part of the plan-area. It is very clear that the duty to cooperate (as it relates to this part of the plan area) has been met.

CST has attended numerous meetings at which representatives of both CDC and the YDNPA were present, to discuss the policy approach to Bolton Abbey.

CST supports CDC for including Bolton Abbey in the Local Plan's settlement hierarchy in line with the inclusion of the settlement as a service village in the adopted Yorkshire Dales Local Plan.

In relation to policy EC4a CDC has fully consulted with and considered the views of the YDNPA in creating this policy and it is noted that the policy requires a masterplan to be produced in collaboration with the YDNPA as a 'key stakeholder'.

CST comments on the duty to co-operate only in so far as it relates to Bolton Abbey - and in doing so considers that CDC has fully discharged its duty.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      008      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy	DtC	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph	DUTY TO COOPERATE PARA 1.11	Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference	SK089 & SK090	Plan is DtC Compliant?	No
Settlement Comment Relates to	Skipton	Representation Reference	008/02/DtC/DtC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Duty to Cooperate (DTC)

4.2 Within Craven it is clear that there are a number of competing matters and key issues dependent upon cross boundary co-operation to inform the Local Plan process. There are numerous political organisational and service relationships apparent across many levels. These comprise the Yorkshire Dales National Park to the north (which is a distinct plan making authority), along with the Metropolitan District of Bradford to the south; Lancashire planning authorities of Lancaster City, Pendle and Ribble Valley adjoin to the west. North Yorkshire County Council is also an important factor in the provision of services such as education, social care and highways. The catchments of infrastructure, service and utility providers also generate crossboundary issues.

4.3 A Paper on “Cross Boundary Strategic issues and Duty to Co-operate Statement”, dated December 2017 sets out the Council’s obligations on this matter. Correspondence and responses from adjoining authorities explain the extent to which there has been consultation, joint working and on-going engagement on a variety of matters. That correspondence suggests that on many of the key strategic and cross-boundary issues that the Council has undertaken appropriate consultation and responded accordingly

4.4 Within the conclusions of the Paper Craven Council considers that its obligation on this matter are satisfied. We would generally agree with this position with the exception of some minor matters:

4.5 An MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) has been signed with the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority on a number of matters, agreeing on the housing figure for the Housing Market Area (HMA), and suggesting a high degree of self-containment within the HMA. It does not however provide details on how the full objectively assessed housing need will be delivered, nor does it set out how the two authorities will work together to ensure the need is met. It is considered that further work is required on this issue.

4.6 City of Bradford Council to the south is ahead of Craven with an adopted Core Strategy in place. That said, their ambitious housing and employment growth strategy is dependent upon the review and roll back of the Green Belt, a process which may become embroiled in politics, with a consequent delay to the Plan making process. CDC will need to keep this issue under review if Bradford Council do not achieve their numbers, as it may add to pressures in South Craven.

4.7 Furthermore, a series of proposed amendments in the Housing White Paper (September 2017) suggest the requirement for a Statement of Common Ground following changes to the Framework. These may emerge over the next six months and we reserve our right to submit further comments on this issue.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.

Respondent ID      047      Organisation      Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

Section or Policy      EBB

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      047/01/EBB/LC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Habitat Regulations Assessment overall

The Trust is happy with the contents of the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) and the thorough approach.

The Trust would like to see within the HRA a table showing the development sites which could potentially have an impact on European sites and what avoidance, mitigation or compensation will be provided. The information is to a certain extent present in the text but would benefit from being focused on the individual sites.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Inclusion of a table in the HRA showing allocated sites which may impact on European sites and how this can be avoided, mitigated or compensated for.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      051      Organisation      Natural England

Section or Policy      EBB

Plan is Legally Compliant?      No

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      051/02/EBB/LC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Habitats Regulations Assessment

Natural England is broadly content with the conclusions of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) however we consider that further clarification is required with regards to the assessment of air quality impacts, loss of functionally linked land for Special Protection Area (SPA) birds, recreational disturbance and hydrology.

#### Air quality

We broadly welcome the data and assessment provided, although we advise that you ensure that the traffic modelling methodology is in line with the industry standard, however we do not consider that sufficient certainty is provided that the plan will not lead to significant increases in traffic on roads in close proximity to European designated sites. Natural England notes that para 7.4 identifies that the A65 passes in close proximity to the Ingleborough Complex Special Area of Conservation (SAC), the A59 in close proximity to the North Pennine Moors SAC and SPA and the A6068 in close proximity to the South Pennine Moors SAC and South Pennine Moors Phase 2 SPA but data has not been provided to demonstrate that the plan will not lead to significant increases in traffic on these roads.

Natural England would expect the plan to follow the process and thresholds set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges 2007 (particularly Volume 11, Section 2, Part 1) this sets out criteria for assessment including the 200m distance threshold for impacts on designated sites from road traffic and the daily traffic flow change of 1000 Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) or Heavy Duty Vehicle flow of 200 AADT thresholds.

We would expect the HRA to determine which roads affected by the plan lie within 200m of designated sites (European Sites for the HRA and SSSIs for the Sustainability Appraisal) which we understand has been done and concludes that the A65, A59 and A6068 may be affected. We would then expect the Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) flow to be calculated to determine whether the plan will, either alone or in-combination with neighbouring plans or projects, lead to an increase of 1000 AADT or 200 Heavy Duty Vehicle AADT.

Should this analysis show any exceedance of the thresholds set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges then detailed modelling of traffic emissions will need to be undertaken to determine the impact of increased traffic in the context of the existing background levels.

Link to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges:

<http://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/ha/standards/dmr/vol11/section3.htm>

#### Loss of supporting feeding sites to development

Natural England is broadly satisfied with the assessment undertaken but would welcome clarity on the distance criteria used, particularly in the context of the findings of the Habitats Regulations Assessment accompanying the neighbouring Bradford Core Strategy. Assuming that a 2.5km distance has been adopted in this case we note that the majority of allocations lie outwith this distance. The exception to this is SC085 which lies within 2.5km of the South Pennine Moors Phase 2 SPA. However we consider this site

very unlikely to host SPA birds due to the nature of the habitats and constraints present.

We advise that you include a table of sites within or around 2.5km (or whatever distance is selected for this issue) and describe the habitats and constraints for SPA birds present. Should this analysis show that SPA birds may be using the site, in the context of the data collected from the local RSPB representatives, then bird surveys may be necessary to determine whether development of these sites will lead to an adverse effect on the integrity of the South Pennine Moors Phase 2 SPA or the North Pennine Moors SPA.

#### Recreational disturbance

Natural England is broadly content with the assessment undertaken however, as with the above issue regarding loss of supporting feeding sites, we consider that the assessment should include a table which clearly sets out the mitigation measures for each relevant allocation. In addition we advise that it is clarified as to what screening distance is being applied and thus which allocations are relevant. For instance, is Bradford's 7km being applied to all sites and is this considered proportionate?

#### Hydrology

Natural England notes para 8.6 and advise that the Local Authority satisfies themselves that this consultation with United Utilities and Yorkshire Water is sufficient to rule out impacts on designated sites from water abstraction and waste water treatment capacity issues.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      020      Organisation      RSPB Northern England

Section or Policy      EBB

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      020/03/EBB/LC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

North Pennine Moors SPA

We welcome the acknowledgement in the Habitat Regulations Assessment – Appropriate Assessment Report (December 2017) of the potential loss of important foraging sites to development. We also welcome the recommendation for preferred development sites in the Skipton area to undergo review in relation to potential foraging areas for Golden plover (a qualifying SPA citation species) and Curlew (a species that meets the qualifying criteria but is not formally notified as an SPA citation species).

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	021	Organisation	Education and Skills Funding Agency		
Section or Policy		EBED		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	021/04/EBED/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Evidence Base

7. It would be useful if a Planning for Schools topic/background paper could be produced setting out clearly how the forecast housing growth at allocated sites has been translated (via an evidence based pupil yield calculation) into an identified need for specific numbers of school places and new schools over the plan period. This would help to demonstrate more clearly that the approach to the planning and delivery of education infrastructure is justified based on proportionate evidence. If required, the ESFA can assist in providing good practice examples of such background documents relevant to this stage of your emerging Plan.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	036	Organisation			
Section or Policy		EBHE		Plan is Legally Compliant?	No
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Carleton in Craven			Representation Reference	036/01/EBHE/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

This representation relates mainly to the 2016 Conservation Area Appraisal in relation to the village of Carleton in Craven and in particular a field called Grundy. It is one of the documents which will make up the new Local Plan.

It also covers what was said about development in the village in the “2018 Site Response Papers,” as this is in total contrast to what the Head of Planning told the Planning Committee at a recent meeting (23/10/17). Both cannot be right and the matter needs addressing before the plan is adopted.

Moreover, the ‘holistic’ approach that the plan proposes in terms of affordable housing is diametrically opposed to the current stance taken by the head of planning on that exact issue and so that too needs looking into before the plan is adopted. Is it a total ‘u turn’ on policy, and if so I would ask the inspector to be kind enough to consider if it is “sound and lawful”.

#### Section 4

I wish to object to the adoption of the new local plan. This on the grounds that given the following facts it is not legally compliant, and /or not sound. I do not wish to contend that the Duty to cooperate has not been complied with as I have no wish to hold up the adoption of the local plan so long as the minor amendments set out below are considered by the inspector.

I will simply present the facts and leave it to the inspector to decide which, if either, of the above reasons for objection apply in the context of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended.

#### Section 5

##### Problems with the local plan

##### 1.“DOCTORED” CONSERVATION AREA REPORT

[REDACTED]

Please refer to s 5.28 of the Cross Boundary Strategic Issues and Duty to Cooperate Statement December 2017.

It is 100% clear that somebody made the independent experts from Alan Baxter Limited (Conservation Area experts) paid by the Council and Heritage England to undertake the 2016 CA appraisal (which is part of the new local plan), write something that they did not agree with. The bracketed bit says “\*NOTE THIS IS NOT THE OPINION OF ALAN BAXTER LTD AND ITS SUBCONSULTANTS”. Two of the reports authors have independently confirmed this to be true on the telephone to me. This is in connection with a field called Grundy, in the village of Carleton, which worryingly is still the subject of an ongoing undetermined planning application. A footnote later added to the report shows that the authors of the report were made to downgrade the CA status of part of the field from “strong” contribution to just “some” contribution. This when infact their expressed desire (in the recommendations section of the report) was to upgrade the whole of the field to full CA status ASAP. The relevant sections are pages 15 and 25 of the appraisal and I have attempted to attach them below.

SCREEN SHOT OF RELEVANT PAGES INCLUDED IN REPRESENTATION. SAVED ON SYSTEM.

I have studied the agenda and minutes of the meeting when the document was put to the Council for acceptance and it is clear that there was no mention of this important and fundamental divergence of opinion. It may or may not be considered relevant that one of the other 2 sites where the Conservation Area status of a field was downgraded against the Consultants expressed wishes was owned by the same developer and that it has already had planning permission passed.

THIS DOWNGRADING OF THE CONSERVATION AREA STATUS OF THE FIELD AT GRUNDY OCCURED PRIOR TO ANY PUBLIC CONSULTATION. WE ARE TOLD THAT WE WILL GET A CHANCE TO COMMENT ON THE APPRAISAL BUT NOT UNTIL AFTER THE LOCAL PLAN HAS BEEN ADOPTED. AS PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IS SUPPOSED TO UNDERPIN PLANNING (ACCORDING TO THE NPPF), I WOULD ASK THE INSPECTOR TO CONSIDER IF THIS MEANS THAT THIS DOCUMENT IS “SOUND” AND “LEGALLY ACCEPTABLE”.

Surely the Council should have either accepted the experts recommendation or at the very least should have left the field as it was, with all of it either in the existing Conservation Area or making a “strong” contribution to it, until the public get their chance to have a say.

MAKING PAID INDEPENDENT EXPERTS DOWNGRADE THE STATUS OF THE FIELD WHEN THEY ACTUALLY WANTED TO UPGRADE IT, PRIOR TO THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION, WHICH FORMS A VITAL PART OF THE PROCESS, GOES BEYOND WHAT IS ACCEPTABLE. IS IT NOT ULTRA VIRES ? IT IS CERTAINLY DIAMERTICALLY OPPOSED TO THE COUNCILS SUPPOSED STANCE OUTLINED IN THEIR “STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT for Planning,” which forms part of this review.

Should Craven District Council pay an independent expert for advice and then tell him what to write as part of the local plan production process ? I think not. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I would respectfully suggest that it needs changing before the local plan is adopted.

The need to amend this small part of the local plan before its adoption is exacerbated by what else is going on in respect of this particular field (Grundy) and what recently went on in connection with a related planning application by the same developer in the same village (Carla Beck). [REDACTED]

## 2.CARLA BECK

At Carla Beck (17/2017/18073) a recently passed application for the same developer in the same village where unbelievably (given planning policy and the need for housing) permission has recently been granted effectively reducing the number of houses that will be built on a brownfield site (which just happens to be opposite the applicants home) from 24 to 4. The applicant is in negotiations with CDC to build the extra 20 homes lost on this brownfield site in the green field at Grundy. The Council deny being in negotiations but clearly they are given that their legal duty to determine the application has expired and they have not declined it. It was submitted almost a year ago. CDC

have failed to respond adequately to a freedom of information request made by the objectors to see details of the meetings that they have had with the developers and Highways/Heritage experts.

[REDACTED]

Despite the applicant stating 5 times in his supporting documents that he wished to build the 20 houses lost at Carla Beck at Grundy, I was told by the Chair of the meeting and the CDC lawyer present at the meeting that I would not be allowed to speak in objection to the reduced numbers application, if I linked the 2 sites. The Head of Planning assured the committee that the 2 sites were not linked, despite what the applicant said. ACCORDING TO THE LATEST LOCAL PLAN DOCUMENTS WHICH WERE PUBLISHED AFTER THAT MEETING THE 2 SITES ARE INFACIT LINKED AFTER ALL. The latest draft states that if houses are lost at Carla Beck the planners will look at amending the local plan. I refer to page 167 of the Craven Local Plan Site Response Papers of January 2018. It says and I quote "in regards to the Land at Carla Beck Lane, as this site already has planning permission for 24 houses the Council have based our housing numbers on the information that we have in front of us. If this application was quashed and a new planning application submitted then the Council could take the new proposed numbers for the site into consideration and make the necessary amendments". [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

If the local plan is wrong, then I would ask that it is amended before being adopted. And that the fact that the Grundy field is not a preferred option for housing in the village be made 100 % clear.

Please note that the Council, faced by a formal complaint about what was going on, said they felt that it would be "inappropriate to comment" [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I told the truth to the planning committee in connection with the Carla Beck application when I suggested that the Committee should not even be considering it because the applicant had lied about his ownership of the plot when filling in the planning application. Remarkably the Council chose to redact what I said from the tape. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Both cannot be right. I really would appreciate the inspectors comments and views on this. The Chief Exec of CDC and the Ombudsman seems to have no interest in what is going on.

3.GRUNDY

Worryingly, the green field at Grundy is (after almost a year) still the subject of an ongoing planning application (17/2017/17886). This despite Highways and the Councils own Heritage Consultants condemning the scheme around 6 months ago. The planners refuse to decline or even determine it for some reason that has the 100 or so objectors in the village baffled and wondering if there is a link to the “doctoring” of the Conservation Area report. [REDACTED]

The applicants are for some reason being allowed multiple “material” changes to the proposals without having to pay another fee and get revised reports done. This is in complete contrast to how other villagers have been treated in the recent past. One objector to the Grundy scheme, Mr Hall, was recently made to restart his own planning application from scratch when he wanted to move an already approved bungalow by 2 m. This on the basis that there had been an objection. Yet there have been around 100 objections to Grundy and the applicants are allowed to carry on making what most people would see as material amendments to the original scheme. Something is not right.

Moreover, the Grundy application was validated in March 17 and remains undetermined, yet the application to reduce the number of houses at Carla Beck was not validated until September 17 and has already been passed. The evidence would suggest that I am correct in thinking that the planners would like to see this field passed for some form of development before the local plan is adopted ? Is that why they initially failed to consult with Heritage England despite Listed property and a Conservation Area being involved ?

#### 4.IN SUMMARY

Whilst Grundy is not one of the 3 preferred sites in the background of the emerging local plan for good planning reasons, it concerns myself and many other residents that the Conservation Area status of the field was altered by [REDACTED] that. It all begs the question what is going on and what motives lie behind the facts.

To make matters worse it seems that the same developer has been granted 3 permissions adjacent to the Grundy site for a total of 11 houses, which it transpires are unachievable for Highways and or Heritage reasons. Other people, as well as myself, have asked the Council to clarify what is going on, but to date have been ignored.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Section 6 Proposed modifications.

On the face of it, it may seem disproportionate to hold up the adoption of the local plan for what is in the scheme of things a small issue. The “doctoring” of an independent experts Conservation Area Appraisal prior to any public consultation. But there is a bigger principle here. What is going on in CDCs planning department is unacceptable and yet they get away with it. They have refused to progress my formal complaint and the Chief Exec has refused to look into the matter until it is too late (if at all). To tell me that its “inappropriate to comment” [REDACTED], switching documents and [REDACTED] Someone need to be held accountable.

Until progress is made in sorting out the existing mess I would respectfully ask the inspector to refuse to adopt the local plan. I guess that if the Conservation Area is extended to cover the whole of the Grundy field or at least the Grundy field is returned to “strong contribution” so a principle is established and somebody with planning knowledge in the Ombudsman’s office promises to look into what is going on sooner rather than later, I will withdraw my objection.

Thank you for your time.

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation I would appreciate the chance to talk briefly to the Planning Inspector.

Respondent ID 023 Organisation

Section or Policy EBHE

Plan is Legally Compliant? Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound? Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant? Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to Carleton

Representation Reference 023/01/EBHE/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Please consider the following as part of your latest consultation

#### 1.CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL

It is apparent from the footnote in the 2016 Conservation Area Appraisal that someone told the independent experts from Alan Baxter what to say about the Carleton Conservation Area. They were made to downgrade the status of part of the Grundy field from “strong contribution” to “some contribution”. This when they actually expressed a desire to upgrade the whole field to full Conservation Area status. And this was before any public consultation which is supposed to underpin the planning system. Not only do we as a village find that unacceptable, but for the avoidance of doubt we want to put on record that when the public get chance to comment on the Appraisal we will ask CDC to respect the independent experts views and bring the whole of Grundy field into an extended Conservation Area. In the meantime please consider my view that the whole field does at the very least make a “strong contribution” to the character and setting of the Conservation Area.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      039      Organisation      North Yorkshire County Council

Section or Policy      EBHI

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      039/22/EBHI/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Highways

The following comments are made on behalf of the Local Highway Authority (LHA). Individual high level site assessments have been undertaken by the LHA to ascertain whether access can be gained from sites onto a publically maintained highway. Any impact on the surrounding local road network of site allocations will need to be assessed through the provision of a transport statement/ transport assessment and a travel plan where applicable. The LHA would seek to be involved in scoping discussions for the preparation of these documents.

CDC has commissioned Jacobs to assess the cumulative impact of site allocations within Skipton, the district's principal town. This has been undertaken through the use of an existing strategic transport model for Skipton, which has been subject to both industry standard validation as well as sensitivity checks though local knowledge. The LHA has provided comments to CDC on the outputs of this modelling work and the LHA is aware that the majority of these comments have been taken on board. The LHA is in discussions with the LPA over the details and deliverability of the identified mitigation measures to address the cumulative impact of development in Skipton. The LHA seeks to continue to work closely with Craven District Council on this matter.

NYCC as LHA do consider the junction mitigation measures identified through the Skipton modelling work as critical to development.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID	051	Organisation	Natural England		
Section or Policy		EBL		Plan is Legally Compliant?	No
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		SG064		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	051/06/EBL/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

**Development Principles**  
Natural England notes and broadly welcomes the evidence base document titled Landscape Visual Impact Assessment, however we advise that the title is slightly misleading as the document is not carried out in line with the principles set out in the Landscape Institutes Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment version 3 (GLVIA3) 2013. We advise that you consider revising the name of the document to something along the lines of Landscape Study. Nevertheless we consider the evidence provided adequate at this stage. Although we disagree with the conclusions regarding site SG064.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      EC1

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      First paragraph, criterion c

Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      017/55/EC1/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy EC1, first Paragraph, Criterion c

We support the requirement that new employment development will be supported where the proposals do not adversely affect the significance of a designated heritage asset.

This will assist in ensuring that development to meet the employment needs of the community is delivered in a manner which also conserves its heritage assets.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      029      Organisation      Henry Boot Developments Ltd

Section or Policy      EC1      Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      SK049      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      029/01/EC1/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

EC1 Employment and Economic Development

It is considered that future development proposals on site SK049, Land East of Skipton by Pass, Skipton, under policy SP5, for B1, B2, B8 uses will be able to accord with the provisions of this policy and the other polices listed taking into account the site specific Development Guidelines listed in Policy SP5

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      030      Organisation      Glusburn Holdings Ltd

Section or Policy      EC2

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      Glusburn and Crosshills      Representation Reference      030/03/EC2/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Further to our representations in response to Draft Policies SP4 and SP8 - including with regard to our client's site at Hayfield Mills - it is noted that Inset Map 2 shows both the active employment site at Hayfield Mills and the land that is surplus to requirements (and thus not currently used for employment purposes), to the south and west of Hayfield Mills (i.e. Site SC014) and an Existing Employment Area to which Draft Policy EC2 applies.

As set out in our representations in relation to Draft Policies SP4 and SP8 we consider that the land to the south and west of Hayfield Mills should be allocated for housing development and excluded from any land safeguarded by Policy EC2 accordingly. Indeed, the land in question is readily available for redevelopment for alternative uses, hence our promoting it for allocation for residential purposes (as confirmed elsewhere in our representations).

However even in the event that the Local Plan is not modified to allocate our client's land to the south and west of Hayfield Mills for housing development, we assert that this land should be excluded from the designated employment land to be safeguarded by Draft Policy EC2 as it is surplus to requirements and has been for some time (as detailed in the supporting documentation with planning application reference 32/2010/11224, submitted in December 2010 and so over 7 years ago).

Removing the land in question from the Existing Employment Area designation would enable the site to be allocated for residential development, or at least facilitate it coming forward as a windfall site on previously developed land should it not be allocated for residential development (subject to demonstrating that the proposed development is acceptable from a flood risk perspective - and in all other respects - at the time of a future planning application).

With reference to the test of soundness, it is submitted that Draft Policy EC2 combined with Inset Map 2 is:

1. Not positively prepared - as it's inclusion of land to the south and west of Hayfield Mills that is surplus to requirements within the 'Existing Employment Area' is inappropriate and would present an unnecessary policy 'hurdle' to bringing the land in question forward for housing development as part of the sustainable growth of Glusburn/Crosshills.
2. Not justified - as it is considered that inclusion of the land to the south and west of Hayfield Mills that is surplus to requirements within the 'Existing Employment Area' is not justified.
3. Not effective - as the inclusion of the land in question within 'Existing Employment Area' stymies the potential to bring this land forward for housing development as part of the sustainable growth of Glusburn/Crosshills.
4. Not consistent with national policy - as it does not take the opportunity to enhance the potential to deliver sustainable development including a sustainable pattern of growth in the district, including by way of encouraging the beneficial redevelopment of the previously developed land at Hayfield Mills that is surplus to requirements and readily available for redevelopment.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

It is considered that Inset Map 2 should be amended to exclude our client’s land to the south and west of Hayfield Mills the designated employment land to be safeguarded by Draft Policy EC2.

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Given the nature of our representations in response to Draft Policies SP4, SP8, EC2 and Inset Map 2, we consider that it would be beneficial to have the opportunity to explain and expand on our comments in relation to this proposed development site - and for related discussions to take place on the range of issues involved and the Council’s justification for excluding the site from its proposed housing allocations despite its clear sustainability credentials and the Council’s own support for the site earlier in the Local Plan preparation process - as part of the oral examination.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID      046      Organisation      Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Bolton Abbey

Section or Policy      EC3

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      046/11/EC3/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### DRAFT POLICY EC3: RURAL ECONOMY

The policy states in relation to the rural economy that:

Craven's rural economy will be supported, so that it may grow and diversify in a sustainable way to provide long term economic, environmental and social benefits for local communities. This will be achieved in the following ways:

(non-relevant bullet points omitted)

c) Helping existing and new rural businesses, including tourism related businesses to succeed, grow and expand, by working with them co-operatively and proactively, so that development proposals can be supported wherever possible; (text in bolds is that which has been amended or added to the policy in the current draft).

CST SUPPORTS the inclusion of the highlighted text which provides further recognition of the benefits of tourism (and its diversification) to the rural economy of Craven.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	007	Organisation	Ballan Ltd and Halton Homes Ltd		
Section or Policy		EC3		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Hellifield			Representation Reference	007/02/EC3/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

6.2 Draft Policy EC3: Rural Economy

6.2.1 Draft Policy EC3 of the Draft Local Plan aims to support Craven’s rural economy to provide long term economic, environmental and social benefits for local communities. This will be achieved in the following ways:

- a) Enabling enterprise, welcoming innovation and supporting economic development proposals that will benefit the local economy, environment and quality of life, including culture and community proposals;
- c) Helping existing and new rural businesses, including tourism related businesses to succeed, grow and expand, by working with them co-operatively and proactively, so that development proposals can be supported wherever possible

6.2.2 The general concept of Draft Policy EC3 to encourage the growth of the rural economy is supported. As demonstrated in the Sustainability Statement submitted with the current Planning Application, development of the whole of the Site will help to achieve sustainable development:

- ☑ Economic – The scheme will provide employment during its construction, and once complete, will support the wider growth agenda, by supporting local employment growth including a mixture of employment provision relating to tourism. The proposal will help to sustain the vitality and viability of the area.
- ☑ Social – The scheme would provide high quality holiday lodges which will promote tourism in the region and create an expected 500-550 jobs associates with the leisure village. The type of jobs created will encourage younger aged workers to stay in the area and potentially encourage migration into the area of these age groups. Further to this, as a leisure orientated facility, the proposal encompasses various sporting and leisure activities for the health and wellbeing of visitors. The location of this development is in close proximity to existing key local services such as public transport which provide access to numerous tourist attractions and historic towns and villages.
- ☑ Environmental – The scheme has incorporated various environmental considerations in order to limit adverse effects on the existing environment, improving it where possible. The proposal includes mitigation of significant impacts on the environment. The development is highly accessible by public transport.

6.2.3 In addition to the broad encouragement and support of sustainable tourism across the plan area, the Draft Local Plan also proposes two specific tourism designations: a Tourism Development Commitment and Key Locations for Tourism Development.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      EC4

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      7.20 to 7.24

Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Bolton Abbey

Representation Reference      017/56/EC4/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Paragraph 7.20 to 7.24

This Paragraph provides a good overview of the multiple significances of Bolton Abbey, the challenges it faces and the contribution that this area might play in the economic wellbeing of Craven and the National Park.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID	046	Organisation	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Bolton Abbey		
Section or Policy		EC4		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Bolton Abbey			Representation Reference	046/06/EC4/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

DRAFT POLICY EC4: TOURISM  
p.193-196

CST has 450,000 visitors per annum to its CVA, which acts as a southern gateway for many of the 3.5 million visitors per year to the National Park, and wishes to SUPPORT the introduction of a policy that provides general support for multiple types of tourism development. The tourism sector and economy covers many areas including holiday cottages, day visitor attractions, eating and drinking establishments, countryside access etc., as reflected at Bolton Abbey, and as needed in the interests of rural diversification and regeneration. In CST’s view an over-arching tourism policy is needed in the Local Plan, as proposed by CDC.

Of particular relevance to Bolton Abbey, the policy states that:

‘Tourism will grow in a sustainable way, so that it helps to improve the economy, environment and quality of life. Such growth will be achieved by:  
...  
g) Supporting, in principle, proposals for tourism development and for achieving synergies of co-location, in the following key locations for tourism development identified on the policies map: Bolton Abbey/Bolton Abbey Railway Station” (our emphasis)’

The wider policy has seen amendments and additions since the second draft pre-publication draft Local Plan although not in a way which has impacted on the above reference.

CST therefore supports the policy and its reference to Bolton Abbey during the last consultation, only going on to object to the lack of inclusion of any additional more detailed policy guidance relating to Bolton Abbey. This is now addressed by the inclusion of policy EC4a, in the current draft Local Plan.

CST SUPPORTS the positively framed tourism policy EC4 as it relates to its interests in, and contribution to, the tourism sector.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?



Reason for Participation



## WILDLIFE AND COUNTRYSIDE ACT 1981 (AS AMENDED)

### Request for further information

This application is in close proximity to Pan Beck Fen SSSI and River Ribble (Long Preston Deeps) SSSI. Natural England requires further information regarding this development on the grounds that the application, as submitted, makes it unclear as to whether it is likely to damage or destroy the interest features for which Pan Beck Fen SSSI and River Ribble (Long Preston Deeps) SSSI has been notified. Our concerns are set out below:

☐ Natural England is concerned about the potential for this proposal to impact upon birds connected to River Ribble (Long Preston Deeps) SSSI which are using Hellifield Flash.

While we welcome the assessment provided by the updated Avian Addendum we do not consider that the mitigation set out is adequate to address the potential impacts identified in the report. We consider that the proposal will require a specific and detailed mitigation and compensation scheme which clearly sets out at outline application stage how impacts on SSSI birds will be addressed. We do not consider that the measures set out in section 3.4.2 of the report provide sufficient detail nor certainty that impacts on River Ribble (Long Preston Deeps) SSSI birds will be avoided.

☐ The site has a hydrological link to Pan Beck Fen SSSI via Kell Well Beck and the updated information does not appear to address our concerns with regards to hydrological linkages.

☐ As stated previously, the application form states that it is 'unknown' how they will dispose of foul sewage, it should be demonstrated that this disposal should have no impact on the SSSI.

☐ The surface water strategy for the site primarily focuses water quantity, however, no consideration has been given to water quality. The development is likely to lead to an increase in pollutants (hydrocarbons, heavy metals etc.) entering the watercourse and potentially effecting Pan Beck Fen SSSI. We would like more information regarding how these impacts will be avoided or mitigated, particularly during 'first flush' events. If the applicant plans to use SuDS to mitigate for these effects, we recommend they use the CIRCA SuDS Manual 2015. It is likely that for a development of this size, a treatment train of at least 3 components would be required to adequately mitigate for any effects.

☐ Some of issues have not been fully explained or resolved (e.g. dewatering of the hotel and/or leisure complex area), therefore it is unclear whether the development will impact on the eco-hydrology of Pan Beck Fen SSSI. We require a higher level of certainty regarding potential changes to the hydrology (through changes in water volume, discharge rate and runoff frequency) of Pan Beck Fen SSSI.

The applicant should seek to make the argument (backed by appropriate levels of information) that it can be determined at this stage in the process and before the outline planning application is approved.

If your Authority is minded to grant consent for this application contrary to the advice relating to Pan Beck Fen SSSI and River Ribble (Long Preston Deeps) SSSI contained in this letter, we refer you to Section 28I (6) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), specifically the duty placed upon your authority, requiring that your Authority;

☐ Provide notice to Natural England of the permission, and of its terms, the notice to include a statement of how (if at all) your authority has taken account of Natural England's advice, and

☐ Shall not grant a permission which would allow the operations to start before the end of a period of 21 days beginning with the date of that notice.

Should the application change, or if the applicant submits further information relating to the impact of this proposal on the SSSI aimed at reducing the damage likely to be caused, Natural England will be happy to consider it, and amend our position as appropriate.

## NATIONAL PARKS AND ACCESS TO THE COUNTRYSIDE ACT 1949 THE COUNTRYSIDE AND RIGHTS OF WAY ACT 2000

### Request for further information

Natural England welcomes the clarification provided by the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) addendum and the inclusion of photomontages as requested.

However we find it difficult to assess the impact of the proposal from the photomontages and viewpoints provided. Firstly this is due to the resolutions of the photomontages provided, we would welcome a large format version in order to assess the impact more easily.

In addition we note that neither of the photomontages show the hotel and leisure complex which is our major concern. We note that, to a certain extent, this may reflect the siting of the complex however we do not consider that it is screened from all angles. We note, for instance, that the first photomontage is cropped from viewpoint 4 of the original LVIA and that the full panoramic view may give a better impression of the impact of the proposal. Although we recognise that the station house itself offers screening to the proposal. We advise that a photomontage location which shows the hotel and leisure complex is included with the application.

In addition we would like the assessment to include consideration of how the screening will appear during the winter months when there are no leaves on deciduous trees and what variations in the colour of the green roofs may be expected. The photomontages are all illustrated for the summer period and the green roofs are shown as exactly the same colour as the surrounding fields. We are concerned that this may not be representative of the visual impact of the proposal year round.

#### Conditions

As set out previously, if the outline planning application is approved, we recommend the following conditions are applied in order to protect the setting of the Yorkshire Dales National Park:

- ☐ The proposed screening needs to be at least as effective as that at Galloper Park. We recommend that a thorough screening plan and advanced planting is carried out prior to construction works.
- ☐ A substantial challenge for the development will be to demonstrate how the design and layout will be in keeping with the local character of the area (e.g. new houses in Hellifield have been built in local stone). We recommend this is resolved prior to construction.
- ☐ The development has the potential to impact upon the 'dark skies' of the Yorkshire Dales National Park. As stated in the mitigation section of the LVIA, a plan should be produced on how to minimise light pollution from the development.

#### Landscape advice

The proposed development is for a site close to a nationally designated landscape namely, the Yorkshire Dales National Park. Natural England advises that the planning authority uses national and local policies, together with local landscape expertise and information to determine the proposal. The policy and statutory framework to guide your decision and the role of local advice are explained below.

Your decision should be guided by paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework which gives the highest status of protection for the 'landscape and scenic beauty' of AONBs and National Parks. For major development proposals paragraph 116 sets out criteria to determine whether the development should exceptionally be permitted within the designated landscape.

Alongside national policy you should also apply landscape policies set out in your development plan, or appropriate saved policies.

The landscape advisor/planner for the National Park will be best placed to provide you with detailed advice about this development proposal. Their knowledge of the site and its wider landscape setting, together with the aims and objectives of the park's management plan, will be a valuable contribution to the planning decision. Where available, a local Landscape Character Assessment can also be a helpful guide to the landscape's sensitivity to this type of development and its capacity to accommodate the proposed development.

The statutory purposes of the National Park are to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the park; and to promote opportunities for the

understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the park by the public. You should assess the application carefully as to whether the proposed development would have a significant impact on or harm those statutory purposes. Relevant to this is the duty on public bodies to ‘have regard’ for those statutory purposes in carrying out their functions (section 11 A(2) of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as amended)). The Planning Practice Guidance confirms that this duty also applies to proposals outside the designated area but impacting on its natural beauty.

THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE) (ENGLAND) ORDER 2015

Soils and Land Quality – request for further information

Please see our previous comments. This issue does not appear to have been addressed in the updated information.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      047                      Organisation      Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

Section or Policy                      EC4

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph                      7.19

Plan is Sound?                      No

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?              Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      047/02/EC4/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

DRAFT POLICY EC4: TOURISM, Inset map number 13

The Trust is concerned that the inclusion of a Tourist Development Commitment on land west of Hellifield has potential to have serious impacts on biodiversity and on bird populations which are important for the nearby Long Preston Deepes SSSI. There are outstanding objections and concerns on wildlife and biodiversity grounds to the more recent application on the site 42/2016/17496 including an objection from the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust. It appears that without compensation habitat outside the Hellifield development site there will be impacts on biodiversity which will be contrary to national policy and also in particular Policy EC4 h) III) Conservation of biodiversity value. A Tourist Development Commitment on the land west of Hellifield without policy support for compensation being provided for impacts on biodiversity risks making the plan unsound.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Revised wording for the inclusion of the Hellifield Tourist Development Commitment area to ensure that if the development should go ahead there will be sufficient compensation habitat provided so that there is no net loss of biodiversity.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      059      Organisation

Section or Policy      EC4

Paragraph      7.34

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      059/18/EC4/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Support - The development of the Skipton - Embsay - Bolton Abbey rail connection reinstatement.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID	059	Organisation		
Section or Policy		EC4	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	059/19/EC4/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Support - Sustainable development of tourism; including availability of facilities to local residents. Developments should be proportionate; that at Hellifield is NOT.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      EC4

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Criterion g and paragraph 7.28 to 7.34

Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      017/57/EC4/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy EC4, Criterion (g) and Paragraph 7.28 to 7.34

All of the places which have been put forward as areas where the Council will support, in principle, proposals for future tourist development could also assist in encouraging investment into and, therefore, conservation of the District's heritage assets.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		EC4		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Criterion (h)(ii)		Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	017/58/EC4/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy EC4, Criterion (h)(II)

We support the requirement that alternative tourism developments on the site at Hellifield and Long Preston conserve heritage assets (including the Long Preston Conservation Area and the Settle-Carlisle Conservation Area).

This will help to ensure that the future tourism development in this area is delivered in a manner consistent with the conservation of the historic environment.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	007	Organisation	Ballan Ltd and Halton Homes Ltd		
Section or Policy		EC4		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Policies Map 13 and Diagram EC4		Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Hellifield			Representation Reference	007/03/EC4/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

### 6.3 Draft Policy EC4: Tourism

6.3.1 Draft Policy EC4 aims to help tourism grow in a sustainable way by supporting, in principle, proposals for tourism in key locations. It is noted that the Hellifield Railway Station area is identified as a “key location” however, this is not illustrated on the policy map for the Hellifield area (policy map 13).

6.3.2 Furthermore, Draft Policy EC4 designates a small parcel of land in the centre of the Site as a Tourism Development Commitment (as shown below on Figure 1), provided that the following broad requirements under EC4(h) are met:

- “I) Conservation of the landscape and of the setting and special qualities of the Yorkshire Dales Nation Park
- II) Conservation of heritage assets, including archaeological remains, the Long Preston Conservation Area and the Settle-Carlisle Conservation Area
- III) Conservation of biodiversity value
- IV) Preservation or enhancement of Local Green Space, including its open character, local significance and value to the community
- V) Preservation and enhancement of the existing public rights of way network.

Proposals that include the development of non-designated land (shown in white on Diagram EC4) for the purposes of sustainable tourism will be supported, in principle, provided that the land adjoins the designated Tourism Development Commitment and the proposals are sensible in scale and meet the requirements of I) to V) above.

Figure 1 - Diagram EC4 of the Draft Local Plan SAVED ON SYSTEM

6.3.4 The current TDOS allocation in the Craven Local Plan (1999) under saved Policy EMP11 (see Figure 2 below) includes Hellifield Railway Station and land to the south-west of the Site.

Figure 2 – Craven Local Plan 1999 Policy Map – Hellifield SAVED ON SYSTEM

6.3.5 The current allocation was considered to be a suitable location for tourism development in the adopted Local Plan, particularly as it is likely to encourage visitors to make greater use of the railway to visit attractions. The allocation therefore contributes towards objectives to promote sustainable development.

6.3.6 The Planning Application proposes development of part of the existing Local Plan (1999) allocation. As demonstrated above and within the Sustainability Statement, the proposal constitutes a sustainable development in line with Draft Policy EC3.

6.3.7 The Planning Application demonstrates how a larger tourism allocation would comply with the Council’s broad requirements set out in Draft Policy EC4 in addition to providing further benefits which the proposed smaller allocation could not. The following documents have been submitted as part of an Environmental Statement in support of the Planning Application:

6.3.7.1 A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA): Impacts upon the YDNP have been assessed within the LVIA. The LVIA concludes that effects on the YDNP are not significant and any effects could be mitigated via tree planting, bunding, reduced lighting and the use of appropriate materials.

6.3.7.2 Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment: The assessment concludes that there is no evidence to indicate the presence of remains which would preclude development. In addition, the use of screening along the northern boundary and western boundary would reduce visual intrusion on the setting of the Settle – Carlisle Railway Line CA and Long Preston CA. Overall, the heritage assets could be preserved through mitigation.

### 6.4 Need for Tourism Development in response to Draft Policy EC4 Allocation

6.4.1 The Government Tourism Policy (2011) outlines the UK Government's approach to visitor economy as a whole. One of its aims is to "increase the proportion of UK residents who holiday in the UK to match those who holiday abroad."

6.4.2 Visit Britain's Tourism Survey January 2018 illustrates that the Yorkshire and Humberside region saw a 9% increase in trips during 2017 compared to 2016, resulting in a 9% increase in spend.

6.4.3 When specifically looking at the Craven and YDNP areas, the monitoring trends in visitor numbers and the amount they spend is carried out through the Scarborough Tourism Economic Activity Monitor ("STEAM") model. The data is published on the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority's website. The 2010 – 2016 report shows that "in 2016, the Yorkshire Dales National Park received 3.8 million visitors, made up of 3.3 million day trippers and 0.48 million overnight visitors. Between them, day and staying visitors combined to produce 4.97 million tourist days. These visitors brought in £252 million to the region's economy and provided employment for 3,583 full time equivalent (FTE) posts".

6.4.4 Between 2015 and 2016, there was an increase of 5.2% in tourist days, 4.3% in tourist numbers and 6.3% in tourist revenue within the National Park. The Yorkshire Dales National Park Management Plan (revised 2016) sets out the vision and ambitions for the area from 2013 to 2018. Policy E4 of the Management Plan states:

"Improve the quality, variety and marketing of the tourism 'offer' within the National Park to extend the season and get more visitors to stay overnight so as to increase the value of tourism by 20% in real terms by 2020."

6.4.5 A recent news article informed that visitor numbers in Skipton are rising by around 6% on 2016 alongside increasing tourism in the YDNP.

6.4.6 Taking the above into consideration, there is an increasing demand for tourism facilities in Craven and the Yorkshire Dales National Park and in particular, serviced accommodation to facilitate short breaks.

6.4.7 The reason for allocating the whole Site for tourism in the Local Plan 1999 has not changed. On the contrary the reasons which underpinned the original allocation have been strengthened. The sustainability credentials of the Site located adjacent to the railway station remain completely unaltered. The "de-allocation" of the whole Site and replacement with Local Green Space is therefore completely unsound and without any evidence to support the conclusion that tourism has diminished.

6.4.8 Paragraph 014 of the PPG1 provides that appropriate and proportionate evidence is essential for producing a sound Local Plan. The lack of evidence surrounding the tourism industry and future requirements is of considerable concern at this stage of a Draft Local Plan. The Council have failed to provide any sufficient evidence to support its "de-allocation" of the tourism Site when studies show (as discussed below) the increasing demand for accommodation.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

8.3 Page 187, paragraph 7.19 of the Draft Local Plan addresses the Tourism Development Commitment. We propose that the following changes should be made to this paragraph (deletions = strike through and additions = underlined) - N.B FORMATTING IN ORIGINAL HAS NOT TRANSFERRED. CHANGES HAVE BEEN PUT IN BRACKETS WITH NOTES ATTACHED (LW)

Tourism Development Commitment. Land to the west of Hellifield (shaded grey in Diagram EC4) already benefits from planning permission for construction of a rural environmental centre (comprising tourism, exhibition, training, equestrian and livestock buildings, a hotel and nature conservation area), but proposals for alternative sustainable tourism development may come forward in the future. The local plan will support such proposals, in principle, provided that they fully address important matters of landscape, heritage, archaeology, biodiversity, (delete -local green space) and public rights of way, in accordance with local plan policies ENV1, ENV2, ENV4, (DELETE - ENV10) and ENV12.

8.4 Page 191, paragraph 7.33 identifies Hellifield Railway Station as a 'Key Location'. Key Locations are described as "offering particularly good opportunities for sustainable tourism and for harnessing synergies of co-location". The identification of Hellifield Railway Station as a Key Location is supported however, this is not illustrated on the relevant Policy Map (Policy Map 13) or Diagram EC4. The Policy Maps and relevant Diagrams should be amended to illustrate the Key Location in this area.

8.5 Policy EC4(h) should be amended as follows to reflect the removal of the Local Green Space designation and retained tourism allocation (deletions = strike through and additions = underlined): - N.B FORMATTING IN ORIGINAL HAS NOT TRANSFERRED. CHANGES HAVE BEEN PUT IN BRACKETS WITH NOTES ATTACHED (LW)

h) Supporting alternative sustainable tourism development of land designated as a Tourism Development Commitment, provided that the broad requirements set out below and illustrated on Diagram EC4 are met:

- I) Conservation of the landscape and of the setting and special qualities of the Yorkshire Dales National Park
- II) Conservation of heritage assets, including archaeological remains, the Long Preston Conservation Area and the Settle-Carlisle Conservation Area
- III) Conservation of biodiversity value
- (DELETE - IV) Preservation or enhancement of Local Green Space, including its open character, local significance and value to the community)
- IV) Preservation and enhancement of the existing public rights of way network.

Proposals that include the development of non-designated land (shown in white on Diagram EC4) for the purposes of sustainable tourism will be supported, in principle, provided that the land adjoins the designated Tourism Development Commitment and the proposals are sensible in scale and meet the requirements of I) to IV) above.

8.6 Page 196 contains Diagram EC4 which defines the proposed tourism allocation at Hellifield. Diagram EC4 should be amended to remove the Local Green Space designations and replace this with the Tourism Development Commitment (currently shown grey) to reflect the area of the extant outline planning permission.

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	009	Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)		
Section or Policy		EC4		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	009/19/EC4/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy EC4 sets out the Council’s priorities for tourism.

It references the Tourism Development Commitment (to the Land to the west of Hellifield which incorporates the Hellifield Flashes) at point H. It is noted that the other key location for tourism development (Bolton Abbey) has its own policy EC4A and it is proposed by CPRENY that the Hellifield site also has its own, in the interests of clarity – thus would keep both sites separate from the Council’s general tourism policy.

CPRENY do not understand where the reference to ‘alternative tourism development’ for the land designated as a Tourism Development Commitment has come from? This site was originally allocated in the Council’s Local Plan (adopted 1999) in Policy EMP11 which is set out in italics in full below:

EMP11. TOURIST DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY SITES

The following development opportunity sites are acceptable in principle, for tourist related development (Class D1 uses)\*

- Hellifield Station site.
- Bolton Abbey Station site.
- Embsay Station site.

Applications for planning permission will be assessed against other relevant policies in the plan and against the Development Briefs, to be provided for these sites.

\* From the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 Use Class D1 is specifically mentioned within the policy (not any other Use class) and refers to public services including centres for education and exhibition space which is why the planning permission which was granted in outline form in 2000, renewed in 2003 and subject to Reserved Matters in 2005 were approved. There does not appear to be any evidence to support this change in use or commitment. It is the CPRENY opinion that as this commitment has been carried forward from the 1999 Local Plan, the original use class should also carry forward.

The new policy also seems to support the development of non-designated land (shown in white on diagram EC4) for the purposes of sustainable tourism providing that it adjoins the designated tourism development commitment. The land shown in white appears to adjoin the Local Green Space Commitment and not, as directed to by the policy, the Tourism Development Commitment shown in grey. An existing Public Right of Way exists across the site which segregates an area of white land to the north east of the site with a small area shaded in grey away from the main central committed area.

This area also forms part of a wider area which is included within the Long Preston Conservation Area and is within close proximity of two Grade II Listed Buildings which CPPRENY believe should also be given reference in the policy. It is unclear why this area of land, within the Conservation Area, outwith any settlements and adjacent to the Local Green Space Designation is needed for additional tourism related development. The reference in point J to sports, leisure, recreational and shops do not form part of use class D1 and therefore are also at odds with the original policy allocation.

It is therefore considered that parts of this policy are not justified.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY believe an additional policy dealing with the Tourism Development Commitment would be beneficial for clarification purposes.

CPRENY believe there is no justification for the support for ‘alternative’ tourism uses within the policy and are of the opinion that the original use class that the site was previously allocated for should be maintained.

Point H)2) should include reference to the 2 Grade II Listed Buildings adjacent to the Conservation Area.

It is also considered development should not be supported for the development of nondesignated land (shown as white land on diagram EC4) adjacent to the Local Green Space Designation, SSSI’s and Conservation Area.

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	The Tourism Development Commitment has a controversial planning history that CPRENY has been involved in and therefore would like to be able to contribute to any discussions surrounding this allocation.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID	009	Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)		
Section or Policy		EC4		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		7.19		Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Hellifield		Representation Reference	009/18/EC5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Paragraph 7.19 references the Tourism Development Commitment to the Land to the west of Hellifield which incorporates the Hellifield Flashes – a series of natural ponds which are recognised for their importance to migratory birds and other wildlife. The flashes both provide a direct link to the Long Preston Deepes SSSI and the Pan Beck Fen SSSI.

CPRENY acknowledge the complex planning history of this site. It is imperative that any application on this site respects the original planning permission and does not stray beyond the use class that it is permitted for. For example, a cinema or a park and ride facility at this location would not be suitable.

Because of the type of development proposed and the location of the site (which was recommended to be designated as a Site for Importance to Nature Conservation (SINC) and is recognised for its importance for migratory birds and proximity to the 2 SSSI’s), CPRENY believe that to be consistent with national planning policy, the Local Plan should, in addition to those policies already suggested, also state that any proposal for development on this site should be in accordance with additional local plan policies: ENV3 (Good Design; ENV6 (Flood Risk); ENV7 (Land and Air Quality); ENV8 Water Resources, Water Quality and Groundwater) and ENV9 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy) – should any future eco-hotel be proposed for the site who wish to be self-sufficient etc.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY propose that the final sentence be reworded to incorporate the above list of policies to read:  
[...], in accordance with local plan policies ENV1, ENV2, ENV3, ENV4, ENV6, ENV7, ENV8, ENV9, ENV10 and ENV12.

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	The Tourism Development Commitment has a controversial planning history that CPRENY has been involved in and therefore would like to be able to contribute to any discussions surrounding this allocation.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--



Respondent ID      059      Organisation

Section or Policy      EC4

Paragraph      7.30, 7.33

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      059/17/EC4/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Support - The maintenance and enhancement of the L & L Canal area and the Hellifield railway station area.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	051	Organisation	Natural England		
Section or Policy		EC4A		Plan is Legally Compliant?	No
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	051/05/EC4A/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Draft Policy EC4A Tourism Led Development at Bolton Abbey

Natural England welcomes the landscape capacity evidence provided in the Bolton Abbey Development Options Appraisal Study and advise that this evidence is included in the Local Plan evidence base in relation to this policy. We advise that the Sustainability Appraisal should make reference to the findings of this study, particularly in relation to the very constrained nature of the development options. We are broadly content with the policy text, which reflects the findings of the capacity studies, however we would like it to be clear that any development proposals will need to be accompanied by a detailed landscape and visual impact assessment in order to ensure that unacceptable impacts on the Yorkshire Dales National Park can be avoided or mitigated affectively.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      046      Organisation      Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Bolton Abbey

Section or Policy      EC4A

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Bolton Abbey

Representation Reference      046/07/EC4A/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

DRAFT POLICY EC4A: TOURISM–LED DEVELOPMENT AT BOLTON ABBEY  
p.196-197

CST STRONGLY SUPPORTS this policy which was first introduced into the draft Local Plan at the third pre-publication draft consultation stage.

CST’s comments on the second pre-publication draft in 2016 included an objection to the lack of certainty that the plan provided for development at Bolton Abbey. The response dated May 31st 2016 stated:

‘While CST supports draft policies SC4 and EC4 as they relate to the identification of the village as a suitable location to receive development, CST strongly objects to the failure of the Local Plan draft to provide plan led certainty on how this development will be delivered and to identify the Bolton Abbey Village Masterplan site for development.’

In response CDC introduced policy EC4a in the third pre-publication draft local plan.

The policy positively addresses many of the weaknesses and threats identified in the Bolton Abbey Tourism Development Strategy 2014 which followed on from a wider review of the Bolton Abbey operation by CST in 2012. These weaknesses and threats are more comprehensively identified in the BADOAS report (2017) as follows:

‘Weaknesses: lack of sense of arrival (and departure); visitor operation dependent on weather and school holidays; brief trips with little or no secondary spend; major planning constraints limit growth; high maintenance costs; loss-making entities (e.g. Post Office); staff cannot afford local house prices (i.e. long journeys to work); limited visitor accommodation; the CVA therefore has a limited and low value offer to visitors

Threats: wetter summers; limited staff/other accommodation; increased competition; rising costs; planning constraints; listed buildings at risk.’

CST considers that the introduction of the policy (in the draft CDLP 2017 and maintained in the PDCLP 2018) fully responds to the issues raised in the consultation response on the Local Plan in May 2016 and reflects its engagement with CDC since the review of the visitor operation at Bolton Abbey since 2009. The policy wording of CDC has been the subject of input from CST, HE, YDNPA and all organisations are in general agreement in relation to it.

An addition to the Publication draft Local Plan is the inclusion of a footnote at p.188 which directly references the BADOAS report:

‘48 A map showing the boundary of the Bolton Abbey Core Visitor Area (CVA) is provided in the Bolton Abbey Development Options Appraisal Study (BADOAS), which has been prepared by the Bolton Abbey Estate in liaison with local and external stakeholders. The CVA extends from Bolton Bridge to Barden Bridge, includes Bolton Abbey Station and is bisected by the boundary of the Yorkshire Dales National Park. That part of the CVA falling within the Craven Local Plan area is shown on the Policies Map (Inset Map No. 24).’

CST SUPPORTS the introduction of this reference in the plan to the BADOAS which forms an integral part of the evidence base for policy EC4a.

CSTs only remaining comment on policy EC4a relates to the reference in the policy that:

‘Before any development takes place, a comprehensive strategy and Masterplan for the Core Visitor Area, including detailed development and design principles, shall be produced in collaboration with, and to the satisfaction of, the local planning authority and other key stakeholders, including the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority, Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency.’

It is CST’s view that the requirement to seek ‘the satisfaction’ (difficult to measure) of five different authorities could ultimately act as a constraint to the delivery of the development which the policy seeks to facilitate, especially given that the need for such development is now pressing.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CST acknowledges the importance of collaboration with all of the stakeholders listed. However in order to ensure the effectiveness of the policy suggests that the policy is reworded to refer to ‘the satisfaction’ of the local planning authority (Craven District Council) only. The satisfaction of CDC as the LPA can of course be measured based on the input and feedback of the key stakeholders listed (ie CDC would seek the views of other stakeholders before deeming it was satisfied accordingly). As such, an amendment would not dilute the approach proposed by CDC but simply make the policy more effective; it would also make it far simpler for a Development Management Officer assessing a development proposal to come to a clear conclusion regarding the extent to which the policy has been complied with.

We therefore recommend that the above wording is amended to state:

‘Before any development takes place, a comprehensive strategy and Masterplan for the Core Visitor Area, including detailed development and design principles, shall be produced to the satisfaction of the local planning authority in collaboration with key stakeholders, including the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority, Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency.’ (our emphasis)

CST is currently advancing work that will inform and underpin the detailed masterplanning process required by this draft policy EC4a, including a stone study and feasibility study. The stone study , as requested by Historic England as an important item, will establish: the type and quality of stone and slate used at Bolton Abbey; the type and quantum of stone and slate needed for related new build and repairs; where such stone and slate can be sourced from. The feasibility study will establish the exact mix and quantum of development to be taken forward in the Masterplan process, which as draft policy EC4a notes, is to involve the collaboration of various stakeholders (including CDC and Historic England).

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      EC4A

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Bolton Abbey      Representation Reference      017/59/EC4A/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Policy EC4

The Bolton Abbey Estate contains some of the most important heritage assets in the plan area, it is one of the key attractions of this part of North Yorkshire, and makes a considerable contribution to the tourism economy of the surrounding area. However, as Paragraph 7.22 notes, this area is underperforming. In order to help ensure the long-term conservation of this area and its assets, it is also important that the economic potential of this area is also realised.

This Policy provides an appropriate framework in which to consider future development proposals. As such it will help to ensure that proposals for future tourism and mixed-use development in this area not only support a sustainable future for Bolton Abbey itself but are delivered in a manner which will also conserve the numerous significances of this area that are set out in Paragraph 7.20.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      046      Organisation      Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Bolton Abbey

Section or Policy      EC4A

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Bolton Abbey      Representation Reference      046/13/EC4A/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Section 6: Comments on the Soundness of the PDCLP (as it relates to the policy approach to Bolton Abbey)

Whole plan (as it relates to Bolton Abbey)

As well as STRONGLY SUPPORTING draft policy EC4a, CST CONSIDERS the policy (and the approach of the CDCLP to delivering development at Bolton Abbey) is sound.

In relation to the tests of soundness incorporated in the NPPF at paragraph 182 we note as follows:

“● Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;”

The policy and approach to delivering development at Bolton Abbey has been positively prepared following years of engagement between CST and CDC (and the YDNPA as neighbouring planning authority) following an internal review of the Bolton Abbey visitor operation since 2009. The development and management requirements of Bolton Abbey have been assessed via numerous surveys and assessments which have been produced and shared with CDC and other stakeholders. These include:

1. The Bolton Abbey Heritage Capacity Assessment (by FAS)
2. The Bolton Abbey Landscape Capacity Assessment (by Gillespies)
3. The Bolton Abbey Transport Statement (by Arup)
4. The Bolton Abbey village Masterplan (by CST)
5. The Bolton Abbey Visitor Accommodation Needs Assessment (by Frey Consulting)
6. The Bolton Abbey Staff Accommodation Needs Assessment (by Frey Consulting)
7. The Bolton Abbey Ecological Statement (by BLE)
8. The Preliminary Bolton Abbey Heritage Assessment (by ArcHeritage)
9. The Preliminary Bolton Abbey Landscape Appraisal (by Gillespies)
10. The Bolton Abbey Estate Tourism Development Strategy (by CST)
11. Bolton Abbey Heritage Landscape Management Plan (by English Nature et al).

Furthermore, all of these documents have informed the BADOAS document by Lichfields (2017), and some have informed the earlier Bolton Abbey Village Masterplan 2015 by Rural Solutions.

- Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;

CDC has been presented with various strategies for delivering development at Bolton Abbey including a large site allocation. It has determined that a specific policy based route is the most appropriate route. Liaison with CDC has also led to CST: increasing the number of strategic development options considered; reducing the scale of its development aspirations; adjusting the proposed layout so as to respect medieval features; increasing the amount of planting to screen development from sensitive views (including some in the YDNP).

The SA of the policy by CDC has identified no reasonable alternatives. This is the view also of the BADOAS report which considered four development options and found only one realistic option to accommodate development.

CST considers that CDC has justified why the policy based approach outlined in EC4a is the most appropriate strategy for delivering development at Bolton Abbey.

- Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities;

Proposals for delivering development at Bolton Abbey have been brought forward via an indicative Development Masterplan which has formed the basis of discussion with CDC, YDNPA, HE and other organisations. The policy wording incorporated within EC4a has been the subject of informal consultation with CST, YDNPA and HE prior to its inclusion for public comment. The policy wording is broadly or entirely supported by all consulted and it therefore presents an effective framework for the delivery of development over the plan-period.

Furthermore, the BADOAS includes a specific section (eight) on how development will be delivered in the CVA in terms of Design, Delivery Mechanisms, and Phasing, thus demonstrating the effectiveness of the policy.

The SA of the policy identifies that the policy will be effective when considered against a number of objectives of the CDCLP.

CST considers that the general policy approach to development at Bolton Abbey is sound but considers that amendment to the wording of policies SP4 and SP11 is required, as set out in this response, in order to make it clear that some housing development will be acceptable as part of the development to take place in this location.

- Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

The policy approach to BA is considered to accord with national policy. It is positively framed and gives importance to tourism development, the rural economy and protection of heritage and environmental assets, all of which are given importance in the Framework. Both CDC and HE have accepted that heritage, as confirmed by the NPPF, is only one factor in providing for sustainable development and the policy reflects this balance. The SA of the policy notes that there will be Major Positive Effects in terms of heritage interests in Bolton Abbey.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      044                      Organisation      Skipton Civic Society

Section or Policy	EC5	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph	7.58	Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Skipton	Representation Reference	044/03/EC5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Frontages policy not clearly stated as a policy.

#### VITALITY OF TOWN CENTRE and FRONTAGES

The Council has over the past few years been unable to defend decisions not to allow changes of use from retail to leisure or other non-retail uses because its former Frontages Policy went out of date and it had no new Local Plan. Now it has a new plan, but apparently without a clear Frontages Policy.

Policy EC5 says: “Within the primary retail area of Skipton as identified on the proposals Map, the primary retail function of the area will be safeguarded.” Our question is - Will this policy enable the planing authority to reject applications for non-retail uses on ground floors, in favour of retaining retail uses, where it wishes to do so?

The covering text says that the council will aim in Skipton for “The distinct balanced mix of main town centre uses at ground floor level along primary shopping frontage with the majority of each primary frontage section on the local plan maps being in retail use.” But this is in the covering text, and not backed up by a Frontages Policy.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Modifications:

It should be clearer that this is a Frontages Policy and stated as a Policy not just in the covering text.

Plymouth has a Frontages Policy for the smaller towns in its area, which clearly states that it will support proposals which:

- i.Result in the loss of ground floor premises in retail use (Use Class A1) within primary frontages to uses within Use Class A2 and A3 only where they do not create a continuous frontage of more than two non Class A1 uses and would not result in more than 15m of continuous frontage in non-Class A1 use.
- li.And iii. Do not result in more than 35% (or in some places, 25%) of the overall number of units within the defined Primary Shopping Frontage being in non-Class A1 uses
- iv. Provide uses outside Classes A1, A2 or A3 in ground floor premises within primary frontages only where the use would achieve a significant improvement in the vitality and viability of the centre.
- V. Result in the loss of ground floor premises in retail use (Use Class A1) within secondary frontages to other main town centre uses only where they encourage footfall within the centre and support the main functions of the rest of the centre.

Modification:

We would like to see the inclusion of a Plymouth-style Frontages policy that avoids continuous frontage for non-retail uses.



Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID 033 Organisation Friends of Upper Ribblesdale (FOUR)

Section or Policy EC5

Plan is Legally Compliant? Not Specified

Paragraph Plan is Sound? No

Site Reference Plan is DtC Compliant? Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to Settle Representation Reference 033/01/EC5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### DRAFT POLICY EC5: TOWN, DISTRICT AND LOCAL CENTRES

We do not believe that the plan is sound/justified, i.e. that the plan is the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence, in the following regard:

With reference to the Town Centres in Craven (page 198) we disagree fundamentally with the assessment made regarding Settle in Key Settlement Specific Challenges (page 201). The analysis indicates in the table that Settle has no challenge with respect to Environmental quality suffers from traffic movements and road layout.

Settle has a major issue with Heavy Goods Vehicle movements. The independent Settle town study published by START in 2012 and the petition of over 600 signatures collected by Friends of Upper Ribblesdale (FOUR) clearly demonstrate that the volume and nature of traffic through Settle Town Centre (a conservation area) is detrimental to the local visitor economy. There is also a detrimental effect on buildings through chemical erosion of stonework from vehicle emissions and undermining of foundations caused by repeated vibration.

We would like to see this Plan include the recommendation that the centre of Settle should be an HGV free zone (except for access/off-loading).

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We would like to see this Plan include the recommendation that the centre of Settle should be an HGV free zone (except for access/off-loading).

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation To ensure that the inspector is fully aware of the scale and severity of the problem. We have video evidence which we would be happy to submit

Respondent ID	059	Organisation		
Section or Policy		EC5	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		7.55	Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	059/20/EC5/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Other - While this paragraph recognises the need for service provision in villages the policy EC5 does not address the majority of villages (unnamed).

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		EC5A		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	017/60/EC5A/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy EC5A, final Paragraph

We support the encouragement given to residential use of the upper floors of properties within the District’s primary shopping areas. Making better use of vacant or underused floorspace within Craven’s town centres can assist in not only meeting the District’s housing needs but also, through encouraging more activity for a longer period in these areas, can improve the vitality and viability of its retail areas. Given that the Market Towns are all Conservation Areas each containing many historic properties, such an approach can also help ensure that these historic properties remain in use and encourage continued investment in their repair and maintenance.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      ENV1

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      017/47/ENV11/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy ENV1

We support this Policy which should help to ensure that development proposals not only safeguard the distinctive landscapes within the Local Plan area but also those beyond its boundaries. We particularly welcome the:-

- Support for proposals that secure the restoration of degraded landscapes in ways that also help achieve heritage objectives
- Support for proposals which secure the appropriate restoration, preservation and enhancement of historic features
- A requirement that settlements grow in a way that respects their form and landscape setting.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	044	Organisation	Skipton Civic Society
---------------	-----	--------------	-----------------------

Section or Policy ENV1

Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
----------------------------	---------------

## Paragraph

Plan is Sound?	No
----------------	----

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
------------------------	---------------

### Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference 044/01/ENV1/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Unsound because it is not clear that most of Craven is a valued landscape and an area of great landscape value requiring landscape assessments for potential development and a Landscape Management Plan.

ENV1 fails to adequately take into account that all the countryside around Craven outside the then built-up part of Skipton was identified as “highly valued” Valued Landscape in the 2002 Study.

ENV1 makes no mention of valued landscapes or landscape sensitivity, but refers to the Craven Landscape Appraisal of 2002, rather than updating it.

The West Riding Development Plan designated the whole of Craven outside the then built-up limit of Skipton as an Area of Great Landscape Value and of county importance. The 2002 study shows a 'Special Landscape Area' across the whole Plan Area of Craven District Council.

[https://www.cravendc.gov.uk/media/3091/lca\\_figure\\_4\\_landscape\\_character\\_types.pdf](https://www.cravendc.gov.uk/media/3091/lca_figure_4_landscape_character_types.pdf)

Other authorities have looked more closely at both valued landscapes and at landscape sensitivity as part of their Local Plan process. Craven has not revised its designation of the whole area as a Special Landscape Area, and the Plan does not refer to the 2002 document.

NPPF allows authorities to protect valued landscapes and to give damage to a valued landscape as a reason for refusal of planning permission (para 109). Local Authorities can designate Areas of Great Landscape Value and can elevate other sites to the status 'valued landscape' either in response to planning applications or in a more formal way. The whole of Craven outside certain excluded areas (including the built-up limits of Skipton) was shown to be a highly valued landscape by the 2002 study and should continue to be an Area of Great Landscape Value.

Damage assessment requires not only valuation of the landscape - provided by the 2002 Study and including 'highly valued' sites now designated in the Local Plan as for housing - but also sensitivity valuation, which measures potential harm.

The whole setting of Skipton around its 2002 limits fall within the NPPF valued landscape provisions, and yet some of it has now been designated for housing presumably on the grounds that the harm is outweighed by the need. This requires sensitivity evaluation of the harm of the valued landscape.

We have not seen the explicit evaluations and are concerned that Craven may have failed to carry out adequate sensitivity evaluation of sites within the Special Landscape Area identified in the 2002 Study in order to assess damage. Other authorities such as Plymouth have carried out explicit sensitivity evaluations.

We believe that such sensitivity evaluation would have identified the Haw Bank site, and perhaps others, as highly sensitive landscape as highly valued.

Sensitivity is “about the degree to which the landscape in question is robust, in that it is able to accommodate change without adverse impacts on character. This involves making decisions about whether or not significant characteristic elements of the landscape will be liable to loss... and whether important aesthetic aspects of character will be liable to change.”

We do not think the Plan makes it clear where and whether the Landscape Management Strategies and Plans of the 2002 document still apply to the designated housing sites within the 2002 Special Landscape Area, and if not why not, and whether the new Local Plan is consistent with the 2002 document which it cites  
[https://www.cravendc.gov.uk/media/3092/lca\\_figure\\_5\\_landscape\\_management\\_strategies.pdf](https://www.cravendc.gov.uk/media/3092/lca_figure_5_landscape_management_strategies.pdf)

We object to the plan not making or clear that the designation of all countryside around Skipton is valued landscape as both the 2002 Study and the previous West Riding Plan did.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

h) Support proposals which recognise that all countryside in Craven Plan Area is part of a Valued Landscape.

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	009	Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)		
Section or Policy		ENV1		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	009/10/ENV1/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY fully endorses draft Policy ENV1 and particularly welcomes reference to the need to wherever possible ‘restore and enhance’ the landscape character of the area. All too often throughout the district members have witnessed areas of open countryside degraded prior to the submission of a planning application which in some cases have been refused but thee land has not been restored. It is hoped that this policy will enable the planning authority to enforce restoration of sites and areas of the countryside to protect its special character.

CPRENY also welcome the recognition that the protection and promotion of dark skies are valued.

It is considered that this policy would be further strengthened by reference to tranquillity which often goes hand in hand with the protection of the countryside and dark skies. This would be in conformity with paragraph 123 of the Framework.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	009	Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)		
Section or Policy	ENV1		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified	
Paragraph	5.4		Plan is Sound?	No	
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified	
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	009/09/ENV1/TS	

#### Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Paragraph 5.4 sets out that currently the Craven Landscape Appraisal (2002) and the Forest of Bowland Landscape Character Assessment (2009) are the relevant landscape appraisals used in decision making – it goes on to state that appraisals may be updated, and successor documents will be used at that time. However, CPRENY note that the Council have published alongside the draft Local Plan its ‘Landscape Visual Impact Assessment prepared as part of the Evidence Base for the Craven District Council Local Plan, 2012-2032’ by the Planning Policy Team for Natural England in October 2017. This appears to assess the sites that have been allocated near 5 settlements within closest proximity to either the YDNP or the Forest of Bowland AONB. IS this to be treated as a successor document?

CPRENY are unsure as to the status of this document – which does not set out why it has been prepared for Natural England and for what purpose. CPRENY are also unsure as to the ability of the Planning Policy Team to undertake this activity as no information has been provided about the authors in terms of qualification to undertake a full LVIA and thus question whether the draft Local Plan, if it is based on this evidence, is justified?

CPRENY are aware that developers will wish to utilise material published by the Local Planning Authority when assessing sites for potential planning applications and are concerned as to whether this document should be considered as appropriate evidence.

#### Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      008                      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy                      ENV1

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?                      No

Plan is DtC Compliant?              Not Specified

Representation Reference      008/17/ENV1/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### SECTION 5: ENVIRONMENT

5.46 This section sets out a series of specific policies and requirements. Below we set out initial comments which may evolve over the coming months.

##### DRAFT POLICY ENV1: COUNTRYSIDE AND LANDSCAPE

5.47 At present we have no comment upon this policy requirement but wish to register our interest given Provision d) which suggests great weight should be given to the setting of the National Park. A more detailed commentary is provided in Section 5.0 of this representation. However, we reserve our right to comment upon this policy if necessary.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID	059	Organisation		
Section or Policy		ENV1	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	059/06/ENV1/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Support - Restoration of degraded landscape, restoration of natural and historic features, enhancement of PROW network.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	059	Organisation		
Section or Policy		ENV1	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		5.12	Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	059/05/ENV1/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Support - Dark skies and reduction of obtrusive light, and management of floodlighting.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      002      Organisation      North Yorkshire Local Access Forum

Section or Policy      ENV10

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      002/02/ENV10/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

2. Local green spaces. The LAF was impressed by the Plan's commitment to the creation and protection of green spaces with public access. Obviously, existing public parks will be protected, but the idea of creating entirely new green spaces is ambitious. We hope that the plan succeeds and that the public will enjoy the sort of rights of access to these green spaces that they already enjoy in public parks or commons.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	044	Organisation	Skipton Civic Society		
Section or Policy		ENV10		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		5.91, page 155		Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference		SK-LGS64		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Skipton		Representation Reference	044/04/ENV10/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

5: Environment 5.91 pg 155  
ENV10  
GS64

We wish to support the designation of Park Hill as a protected green space. It is an outstanding and highly valued part of our local landscape, part of the Conservation Area and of heritage interest.

We also support other designations as Green Space including Massa Flatts woodland area.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      042      Organisation      Gargrave Poor's Lands Charity

Section or Policy      ENV10

Plan is Legally Compliant?      No

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      HE-LGS5      Plan is DtC Compliant?      No

Settlement Comment Relates to      Hellifield      Representation Reference      042/01/ENV10/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

ENV10

Designation of Proposed Local Green Spaces

Inset Map 13 site HE-LGS5

Paragraph 4.8 of Craven D.C's Local Green Space Assessment as amended for publication in December 2017 states that between 21st October and 2nd December 2015 the Council contacted individuals/organisations who had been identified as landowners in each submitted LGS application to inform them of the LGS process, to ask them to complete a questionnaire relating to ownership and management of sites. Where known landowners were given notification that their site has been submitted for consideration as Local Green Space.

The Trustees of Gargrave Poor's Land Charity hold the freehold of site HE-LGS5 and have received no such communication from Craven DC as set out in paragraph 4.8 and therefore believe that the draft designation of this site as Local Green Space is invalid and we hereby formally object to that decision.

This is in spite of the Trustees having been invited to respond to a Strategic Housing Land Availability Questionnaire in 2013 and holding discussions at some length with the Planning Department of Craven DC which led to our submission of concept statement to Craven DC's Planning Department in August 2014. That concept statement responded fully to the concerns of the Planning Department about preserving the line of sight towards St. Aidan's Church from the A65. Craven DC's Planning Department was therefore fully aware of the Trustees' position as the owner of the freehold of the land.

For the avoidance of doubt, the Trustees fully respect the importance of the preservation of the line of sight towards St. Aidan's Church and, whilst we have no immediate wish to develop the site, would wish any such eventual development to be restricted to that part of the site previously identified by Craven DC as not being detrimental to the line of sight in question. We would also wish to make available for community use that part of the site not developed for housing.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The removal of Draft Local Green Space status from site HE-LGS5 on the grounds that the process by which it has been included was incomplete and therefore invalid.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		ENV10		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	017/52/ENV10/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy ENV10

We welcome the inclusion of a Policy to protect Local Green Spaces and endorse the criteria by which such areas have been identified. Many of the areas which are identified on the Policies Maps contribute to the special architectural or historic interest of the District’s Conservation Areas, the landscape setting of its settlements, or the setting of its heritage assets. The safeguarding of these areas, therefore, will also assist in ensuring that the distinctive character of Craven’s settlements are retained and that the Plan’s objectives for the historic environment are realised.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	045	Organisation		
Section or Policy		ENV10	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference		EM-LGS11	Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Embsay		Representation Reference	045/01/ENV10/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Local Green space Call for Sites Consultation - Objection to the inclusion of land east of Kirk Lane, Embsay with Eastby, EM-LGS11

### 1.0 Introduction

I am writing to you on behalf of the owner of the above site, Mr. Brewster, who strongly objects to the proposal to allocate the site a 'Local Green Space' in the upcoming Local Plan.

The site is within an area designated as Special Landscape Character Area and is protected by policy relating to open countryside under this designation. The site is also on the edge of the Yorkshire Dales National Park.

Figure 1: Extract from the Draft Craven Local Plan showing the site as a proposed Local Green Space. The plan is not to scale and is for identification purposes only (PLAN SAVED ON SYSTEM)

### 2.0 NPPF Paragraph 77

"The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:

- where green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
- where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquility or richness of its wildlife; and
- where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land."

The site needs to meet the above criteria in order to be considered appropriate for designation as a Local Green Space. The site does not meet the criteria set out in point 2 of NPPF Paragraph 77 as is demonstrated below in sections 2.1 to 2.5 of this letter.

The sites allocation is also contrary to point 3 of Paragraph 77 as the site is an extensive piece of land relative to the density and scale of development in the area, especially when considering that the proposed site is a similar size to Eastby. Compared to the Local Green Space proposed in Embsay it is very large in size and considering that Embsay is a larger settlement with denser development, it seems a very disproportionate proposed allocation.

### 2.1 Beauty

The site is agricultural land and is not significantly beautiful in respect to its own appearance. Equally the site does not need to be protected to safeguard views of and through



the site as they are already protected by the allocation of the site within the Special Landscape Area meaning it is protected by policy relating to development in the open countryside in the Craven Local Plan.

Planning Practice Guidance on Local Green Space states:

"Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 37-011-20140306

What if land is already protected by designations such as National Park, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Site of Special Scientific Interest, Scheduled Monument or conservation area?

Different types of designations are intended to achieve different purposes. If land is already protected by designation, then consideration should be given to whether any additional local benefit would be gained by designation as Local Green Space."

The site is already protected from development by open countryside policy. The site is also on the border of the Yorkshire Dales National Park and so any proposed development would be considered within the context of the National Park and the impact it would have on it. Therefore the site is already protected by existing policy from harmful development and so its allocation as a Local Green Space would not achieve any additional local benefit to protect the beauty of the site.

## 2.2 Historic Significance

There is no archaeological interest in the site and the site has no current significance to Embsay with Eastby. This is confirmed by the site not being included within the proposed conservation area for Embsay with Eastby in the draft local plan, which stops at Kirk Lane.

## 2.3 Wildlife

The site has no significant wildlife on it. It is agricultural land grazed by livestock.

## 2.4 Tranquility

This is a farmed site and livestock are present on site and farm machinery is used in the management of the land. The site is located adjacent to Kirk Lane which is a well-used road which generates traffic noise. The site is therefore not tranquil and cannot be considered as a tranquil place to be.

## 2.5 Recreational Value

The proposed site has a public footpath along the south east edge of its northern section. There is no public access into the remainder of the site. The allocation of the site as Local Green Space would not add any benefit to protecting views from the footpath as they are already protected by existing policy.

## 3.0 Conclusions on the sites suitability as a Local Green Space

The site doesn't meet the necessary criteria as outlined in sections 2.0 to 2.5 above. The site is therefore not a suitable Local Green Space.

The landowner strongly objects to the proposed inclusion of the site in the Local Plan as Local Green Space as it is an extensive piece of land which is protected by existing policy and therefore the site is not suitable for a Local Green Space Allocation and would also be an unnecessary allocation as the site is protected by existing policy.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID 027 Organisation Giggleswick School

Section or Policy ENV10

Plan is Legally Compliant? Not Specified

Paragraph Plan is Sound? No

Site Reference SG004

Plan is DtC Compliant? Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to Giggleswick

Representation Reference 027/09/ENV10/OS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Appendix 1: Representations regarding the proposed Local Green Space designation at The Glebe Field  
Briefing, Local Green Space Designation, November 2015  
Turley

#### Introduction

1. This Note has been produced on behalf of Giggleswick School to provide an overview of Local Green Space designations, to inform the proposed approach to dealing with the prospect of such a designation in respect of Glebe Field (“the site”).

#### What is it?

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) introduced the ability to designate land as Local Green Space. It enables local communities, through the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan process, to identify areas of green space which are “...of particular importance to them...” (NPPF, paragraph 76) and which should therefore be provided with “...special protection...” (Planning Practice Guidance, reference ID: 37-005-20140306).
3. The development of land designated as Local Green Space will only be appropriate under “...very special circumstances...” (NPPF paragraph 76). The designation of land as Local Green Space therefore affords it a level of protection which is consistent with that of Green Belt. In addition, the Framework outlines that the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development does not apply to land designated as Local Green Space. Put simply, the development of Local Green Space is considered to be inappropriate.

#### What is the process for designation?

##### National Requirements

4. The NPPF states that Local Green Spaces should “...only be designated when a Local Plan is prepared or reviewed...” (paragraph 76). Craven District Council (CDC) is currently preparing a new Local Plan – this will include policies which designate land as Local Green Space. CDC currently anticipates that the draft Local Plan will be published for consultation in early 2016 and that, subject to it being found “sound”, it will be adopted in early 2017.
5. The NPPF specifies that local communities should be able to identify green areas which are of particular importance to them and request that they are designated as Local Green Space by the local planning authority. As such, CDC is currently undertaking a 6-week consultation period (between 21st October and 2nd December) in which it has encouraged local communities to submit applications for land to be designated as Local Green Space.
6. The NPPF informs that a Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space; land should only be designated as Local Green Space if it accords with all of the following criteria (NPPF paragraph 77):
- Where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
  - Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and

- Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

#### Local Requirements

7. Whilst the NPPF establishes the concept of Local Green Space designation and provides some guiding principles (see above), local planning authorities have relative flexibility in implementing it at the local level. CDC has produced a methodology for assessing land for Local Green Space designation. It identifies the following four tests against which land will be assessed:

- Test 1 – Does the site already have planning permission for an incompatible alternative use or is it allocated for an incompatible alternative use in the adopted Local Plan (1999)?

- Test 2 – Is the site reasonably close to the community they serve?

- Test 3 – Is the site local in character and not an extensive tract of land?

- Test 4 – Can the site be shown to be demonstrably special to a local community? To meet this requirement an area must fulfil one or more of the following criteria:

Beauty – The site holds a local significance because of the visual attractiveness and aesthetic value of the site, and its contribution to townscape, landscape, character and/or setting of the settlement;

Historic Significance – The site is viewed to be of local significance because of its historic importance to the local community, including its role in providing the setting for heritage assets or locally value landmarks;

Recreational Value – The site holds a local significance for recreation providing an important asset for the community for a particular recreation activity or for a range of activity (formal or informal).

Tranquillity – The site submitted is viewed to be of importance to the local community because of the tranquillity it provides, offering a place for reflection and peaceful enjoyment.

Richness of wildlife – The site is viewed to be of local significance because of the wildlife it is home to.

Other Reason – The proposed site has a particular local significance for the community for reasons other than those identified above.

#### Implications and Actions

8. We understand that three local residents have contacted CDC via email to formally request that Glebe Field is designated as Local Green Space in the emerging Local Plan. CDC is unwilling to share the email correspondence, but informs that each request is bespoke (i.e. it does not appear to be a coordinated effort on the part of a local community group). We understand that no formal evidence has been submitted alongside the requests, but that the local residents have referred to, inter alia:

- the “beauty” of the land;
- the site’s tranquillity, including its value as a “calm attractive oasis”;
- the historical significance of the land; and
- the recreational value of the land for activities such as dog walking and children’s ball games.

9. CDC has not yet undertaken an assessment of the land against the tests referred to above, but will do so in advance of a consultation on the draft Local Plan (in early 2016).

10. Giggleswick School should complete the ‘landowner questionnaire’ which has been provided by CDC by the 2nd December deadline and should resist the designation of Glebe Field as Local Green Space. It will be necessary to provide an accompanying justification as to why it is considered that the land does not meet the tests referred to above. Mindful that the site a) does not have an extant planning permission for development and is not allocated for development (Test 1), b) is located in the centre of Giggleswick (Test 2), and c) is relatively small in scale (Test 3), the justification should focus upon Test 4 and should seek to demonstrate that the land is not demonstrably special to the local community. The response should be relatively high level at this stage, mindful that there will be an opportunity to provide further representations in due course when CDC’s assessment of the site is available. Nevertheless, it will be useful to include information about the extent to which the land accords with the various criteria, including how the School has controlled access to and use of the land by the local community.

11. We highlight our initial view that demonstrating that Glebe Field does not meet any of the criteria set out under Test 4 is likely to be a significant challenge. In particular,

we are mindful that:

- The ‘tranquillity’ and ‘beauty’ criteria are subjective in part and local residents have already set out their view that the land does have value in respect of these issues. These views will be taken into account by CDC; and
- Turley’s heritage appraisal (April 2015) identified that the land contributes to the setting of designated heritage assets, including the setting of the Giggleswick Conservation Area and the Church of St. Alkelda (Grade I listed).

12. We therefore consider that there is considerable risk that Glebe Field will be identified as “demonstrably special” by CDC and will be selected for a Local Green Space designation. As such, following the submission of the initial response, Giggleswick School should consider the merits of alternative options in respect of this issue, such as:

- The submission of an early planning application. When the draft Local Plan is submitted for examination in mid-2016 it will carry substantial weight in the determination of planning applications. There may, however, be a short-term opportunity to consider the submission of a planning application for the development of the site in advance of the Local Plan submission, assuming that an acceptable form of development can be identified in the context of the identified constraints (particularly in respect of a highways access). The prospects of success would be dependent upon the ability to secure an approval from CDC, given that – based on the current timescales – there is unlikely be sufficient time to pursue a planning appeal before the draft Local Plan is submitted for examination. In this context, we highlight that the planning application would likely be highly contentious with local residents and viewed as an attempt to circumvent designation of the land as Local Green Space by CDC; and/or
- Discussions with Officers regarding the impact of the potential designation on the operation of the School (as a registered charity). If an acceptable form of development cannot be achieved at the site, there may be merit in using the land as leverage to maximise the prospects of success for other proposals, such as for Eshton’s playing field and Lord’s Close.

13. Turley would be happy to undertake further discussions with Giggleswick School in respect of this issue.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      009      Organisation      Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)

Section or Policy      ENV10

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      009/13/ENV10/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY wishes to endorse and support the above policies which are all consistent with national policies regarding the protection of the countryside, gaps between settlements and promotion of sustainable access (by means other than the private vehicle) to the countryside.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      012      Organisation      Gladman Developments Limited

Section or Policy      ENV10

Plan is Legally Compliant?      No

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      No

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      012/12/ENV10/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### 4.8 Draft Policy ENV10: Local Green Space

4.8.1 Draft Policy ENV10 seeks to designate 32 parcels of land as Local Green Space. Gladman are encouraged that the criteria for designating a Local Green Spaces generally accord with the guidance set out at Paragraph 76 and Paragraph 77 of the Framework.

4.8.2 Once again Gladman remind the Council that the Framework makes clear at Paragraph 76 that designation of land as LGS should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development for the area. Paragraph 76 states that:

‘Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Identifying land as Local Green Space should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.’

4.8.3 Further guidance is provided at Paragraph 77 which sets out three tests that must be met for the designation of Local Green Spaces. Paragraph 77 states that:

‘The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:

- Where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
- Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreation value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and
- Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.’

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      040      Organisation      Cononley Parish Council

Section or Policy      ENV10

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Page 154

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Cononley

Representation Reference      040/04/ENV10/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The Parish Council seeks clarification on the following point:  
Page 154 Table entitled 'Draft Policy ENV10: Local Green Space'

•The entry for Cononley states:  
Local Green Space (LGS) - sites assessed as part of Neighbourhood Plan preparation

There are no LGS entered for Cononley and the Parish Council asks if this is a result of it progressing with its own Neighbourhood Plan?

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Please include the following in the new Local Plan. They have all been assessed as LGS in the current work undertaken for the Cononley Neighbourhood Plan:

Madge Bank  
Yorkshire Water Site  
Cononley Delph  
Dead Eye Pond  
Piper Croft  
Cononley Sports Club  
Cononley Playing Fields  
Allotments

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID	059	Organisation		
Section or Policy		ENV10	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	059/12/ENV10/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Support - Identification of LGSs, particularly those in the Gargrave Neighbourhood Plan.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	025	Organisation		
Section or Policy		ENV10	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		CA-LGS6	Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Carleton		Representation Reference	025/01/ENV10/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

ENV10 – Specifically the inclusion of site ‘CA-LGS6 - North of Vicars Row, Carleton’ within that policy.

The land identified as site CA-LGS6 on the proposals map and by policy ENV10 should not be designated as Local Green Space.

In December 2017, the Council published its Local Green Space Assessment. This document sets out the methodology that the Council has used to decide on whether to designate land as Local Green Space. Application of the Council’s own methodology would suggest that this site should not be designated as Local Green Space.

It is accepted that the site passes Test 1 and Test 2 of the Council’s methodology. Test 1 seeks to ensure a site is reasonably close to the community it serves (which it is), and Test 2 looks to ensure that the site is local in character and not an extensive tract of land (it is not).

Test 3 is not however passed. The test assesses the significance or value of the land to the local community. The outcome of the Council’s Assessment of the value of site CA-LGS6 (as assessed against Test 3) is quoted below: -

‘The submitted site provides some contribution towards the character and appearance of the area, as identified within the Conservation Area Appraisal.

Information obtained from the Ecological Data Centre indicates that this site is not significantly rich in wildlife. (below established species threshold).

It is considered that this site is valued for its beauty as it provides an area of openness in the centre of the settlement.

CPRE Tranquillity maps identify areas in red as having the lowest tranquillity scores and areas in green the highest. This site is identified as orange.’

The croft that comprises part of CA-LGS6 is enclosed on all sides by existing development, principally residential dwellings. Public views into and out of the site are essentially not available, or at best extremely limited. Furthermore, planning permission has recently been given for a new dwelling on the eastern side of the croft (Planning Ref. 2017/18190/FUL). This new dwelling will further obscure any public views that are available into the croft.

It is recognised that the occupants of dwellings that enclose the field currently enjoy uninterrupted views across the land owners well maintained croft. However, the purpose of the planning system is to protect public amenity and not the private views and vistas of individual interests. In terms of the public amenity benefits that the croft provides its contribution is extremely minimal.

The croft is identified in Carleton’s Conservation Area Character Appraisal as an area of open space that makes ‘some contribution’ to the character and appearance of the area. The appraisal identifies the vast majority of all other open space in and around Carleton as making a more significant ‘strong contribution’ to the character and appearance of the area. Limited value is given to the croft in the Conservation Area Appraisal compared to the majority of other land in and around the village. This limited value is presumably due to the limited public views of the site, and therefore the limited contribution to public amenity that it provides.

The benefits of designating the site, as stated by the Council in terms of the contribution to the Conservation Area and the fact that it is valued for its natural beauty, are wrong. Due to its very limited visibility, the contribution that CA-LGS6 makes to the local community is very minimal.

Furthermore, the Council’s Assessment of the value of site CA-LGS6 specifically states that there is no local support for the designation of this site as Local Green Space. The Council’s statement that the site is valued for its beauty is not correct. The site is virtually invisible from public viewpoints and there is no evidence of support for its designation as Local Green Space.

Comments are also made in the Council’s Assessment that ‘the Ecological Data Centre indicates that this site is not significantly rich in wildlife’, and that the land does not score highly on CPRE tranquillity maps. These findings are not disputed and are further reasons why the land should be designated as Local Green Space.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The designated Local Green Space site CA-LGS6 should be deleted from the proposals map and the site left as unallocated ‘white land’. Policy ENV10 should be amended to delete reference to ‘CA-LGS6 North of Vicars Row, Carleton’.

For reasons explained above, this modification is considered necessary to ensure the proposed new Local Plan for Craven is sound / appropriate.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	007	Organisation	Ballan Ltd and Halton Homes Ltd		
Section or Policy		ENV10		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Policies Map 13 and Diagram EC4		Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Hellifield			Representation Reference	007/04/ENV10/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

## 6.5 Draft Policy ENV10: Local Green Space

6.5.1 The Draft Local Plan proposes to allocate a substantial amount of land across the Site as ‘Local Green Space’ under Draft Policy ENV10. This proposed allocation is in addition to one other large Local Green Space proposal and 7 Open Space allocations in Hellifield. In addition, it is noted that the level of proposed Local Green Space on the Site has increased since the previous local plan consultation in summer 2017.

6.5.2 The purpose of Local Green Space, as defined by paragraph 76 of the NPPF, is as follows:

“Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances.

Identifying land as Local Green Space should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Space should only be designated when a plan is prepared or renewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.”

6.5.3 Furthermore, paragraph 77 of the NPPF provides a criteria for designating areas of land as Local Green Space:

“The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:

☐ Where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;

☐ Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and

☐ Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.”

6.5.4 The Council produced its own methodology for selecting sites to be allocated as Local Green Space. The ‘Local Green Space Assessment’ document was originally produced in January 2017 and later amended in December 2017 for publication. The assessment forms part of the evidence based used to produce the Draft Local Plan.

6.5.5 Section 4 of the Council’s assessment sets out its methodology for allocating local green space sites. The following tests were carried out:

1. Is the site reasonably close to the community it serves?

2. Is the site local in character and not an extensive tract of land?

(In addition each site was assessed in terms of current planning permissions – Does the site already have planning permission for an incompatible alternative use or is it allocated for an incompatible alternative use in the adopted Local Plan (1999))

Where sites failed to meet the above tests, they were not taken forward in the assessment for LGS designation.

Sites that did meet the above tests were then assessed against test 3, which makes an assessment of sites to determine if the site is demonstrably special to the local community and holds particular local significance:

3a. Can the site be shown to be demonstrably special to a local community?

3b. Evidence of Local Support

6.5.6 The Site at Hellifield was assessed under reference HE-LGS1. The Site passed test 1 above as it lies adjacent to the settlement of Hellifield.

6.5.7 With regards to test 2 the Council acknowledged that the Site is a large area of land but determined that the Site passed test 2 as it had clearly defined edges. However, we consider this assessment to be flawed as the Council has introduced a criterion into its assessment methodology for which no support can be derived from either the NPPF or the Planning Practice Guidance (“PPG”).

6.5.8 As stated above, paragraph 77 of the NPPF provides that a Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space and should only be used where the site in question meets the three criteria specified. Site HE-LGS1 clearly does not meet the third criterion as it is without doubt an extensive tract of land. The proposed allocation is approximately 35.5 hectares in area. Whilst there is no size limit on sites that may be designated as Local Green Space Nigel McGurk, an Independent Examiner, found in 2014 that two proposed designations for Local Green Space in the Backwell Neighbourhood Plan were extensive tracts of land and therefore would not comply with paragraph 77 of the NPPF. The two sites were at least 19 hectares and 32 hectares. The Examiner held that “it is essential that, when allocating Local Green Space, plan-makers can clearly demonstrate that the requirements for its allocation are met in full”. The Examiner continued:

“In the case of Farleigh Fields, it is my view that 19 Hectares also comprises an extensive tract of land. To provide some perspective, at least twenty three full size football pitches would easily fit into an area of this size.

Given that the Framework is not ambiguous in stating that a Local Green Space designation is not appropriate for most green areas or open space, it is entirely reasonable to expect compelling evidence to demonstrate that any such allocation meets national policy requirements. Specific to demonstrating that Farleigh Fields, and Moor Lane Fields are not extensive tracts of land, no substantive or compelling evidence has been presented.”

Having regard to the Backwell decision above and the size and character of Hellifield we contend that the Site is an extensive tract of land. The Council’s assertion that the third criterion is nevertheless met as the Site has clearly defined boundaries is irrational, has no national policy support and cannot be justified. Furthermore the proposed allocation has increased since earlier consultations.

6.5.9 In addition to tests 1 and 2 the Council considered the planning and policy history of the Site. This is consistent with the additional guidance set out in the PPG relating to the designation of Local Green Space. In particular, the guidance provides that:

“Local Green Space designations will rarely be appropriate where land has planning permission for development. Exceptions could be where the development would be compatible with the reasons for designation or where the planning permission is no longer capable of being implemented.”

Extant Planning Permission – Legal Position

6.5.10 The Council noted the extant outline planning permission on the Site for the construction of Hellifield Rural Environmental Education Centre (reference no. 24/2005/5082) and the reserved matters approval relating to the outline permission (reference no. 42/2002/2763) but came to the conclusion that the Site could be considered to pass tests 1 and 2 provided those areas subject to the extant planning permission were excluded from the proposed designation. On that basis the Council excluded from the proposed Local Green Space designation those small areas of the Site upon which built development had been authorised by the extant outline permission and included the remaining areas of the outline application site within the designation.

6.5.11 This approach is entirely flawed. The Council cannot seek to carve out areas of the outline application site benefitting from a lawfully implemented permission solely on the basis that the approved plans do not propose any built development in those areas. As explained below, it is also unreasonable for the Council to conclude that all future uses of those areas will not be incompatible with a Local Green Space designation.

6.5.12 The application site boundary for the extant outline planning permission extends across the whole of the site that the Council is proposing to designate as Local Green Space. The approval of the outline planning permission and its lawful implementation will have created a new planning unit over the full extent of the application site. This unit not only benefits from the rights granted by the outline planning permission but ancillary/incidental uses will also be permitted without the need for any further planning consents to be obtained. Whilst it is noted that the application site for the reserved matters approval does not extend over the full area of the outline application site the Council has confirmed that both the outline permission and the reserved matters approval were implemented and remain extant. Accordingly, by issuing that confirmation, it must be assumed that the Council was satisfied that the condition of the outline permission requiring approval of all reserved matters prior to commencement was discharged.

6.5.13 We therefore submit that allocating those parts of the outline application site where no buildings or structures are currently proposed is entirely at odds with the extant planning permission and prejudices the ability of the landowner/developer to develop the site fully in accordance with their lawful rights.

6.5.14 The Council is also at fault by failing to note as part of their assessment that the whole of the Site is currently allocated in the adopted Local Plan (1999) as a Tourism Development Opportunity Site. It is therefore clear that the assessment of Site HE-LGS1 was flawed as the Council failed to apply test 2 for designation of Local Green Space properly.

6.5.15 Despite this failure, the Council proceeded to apply test 3 to the site and found that, with the exception of a small area, the land should be designated as local green space in accordance with the NPPF.

6.5.16 For a Local Plan to be found “sound” an Inspector at independent examination must find that the draft plan is justified. The PAS soundness checklist further advises that in order to be justified the plan should be based on a robust and credible evidence base. The Council’s allocation of land to the west of Hellifield as local green space is based upon a flawed Local Green Space Assessment and therefore the evidence base for Draft Policy ENV10 is not credible.

6.5.17 In addition, the Draft Local Plan must be consistent with National Policy. An assessment of the Council’s evidence base and Draft Policy ENV10 indicates that the Council propose to allocate an extensive tract of land which has existing planning consent for development. The Council have not demonstrated the reasoning for “carving up” the planning permission. The policy is therefore not consistent with paragraph 77, bullet point 3 of the NPPF. A local green space allocation must also be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period. The existing justified tourism allocation of the whole of the Site and the existing planning permission demonstrate that development is highly likely and required in this area. The policy is therefore also not consistent with paragraph 76 of the NPPF.

6.5.18 Local green space allocations should be “consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services”. The ‘Sustainability Statement’ submitted with the Planning Application demonstrates how the proposed scheme meets both local and national objectives of achieving sustainable development. The allocation of the land as local green space would prevent sustainable development of the land, and is therefore not consistent with national policy.

## 7. Conclusions

7.1 The whole of the Site and surrounding land is currently allocated in the adopted Local Plan for a tourism development. The Council propose to significantly reduce this tourism allocation and designate the remainder of the land as Local Green Space.

7.2 The Site benefits from an extant outline and reserved matters permission for tourism uses. In addition the Council are currently considering an application for development of the Site which demonstrates that the existing tourism allocation should be retained.

7.3 There is an increasing demand for tourism both in the Craven District and in the adjacent Yorkshire Dales National Park. The whole Site was originally allocated to meet this demand. The need for tourism development in the area has increased since the original allocation; the proposed significant reduction of the allocation fails to address this need.

7.4 The Council propose to allocate a significant area of land as Local Green Space. These representations demonstrate that not only does the proposed allocation fail to comply with the NPPF and guidance contained in the PPG, but it is also based on a flawed assessment of Green Space allocations.

7.5 The Council’s proposal to carve up an extant planning permission is unreasonable and as a result, the proposed allocation is not consistent with National Policy.

7.6 We therefore find the Publication Draft Local Plan to be unsound and propose the following changes at section 8 below in order for the plan to be found sound.

## Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

### 8. Proposed Changes to the Draft Local Plan

8.1 As a result of the Local Green Space Assessment December 2017, Page 154-155 of the Draft Local Plan, Policy ENV10 designates “Land to the west of Hellifield (Hellifield Flashes)” (site ref. HE-LGS1) as Local Green Space. Site ref. HE-LGS1 should be re-assessed properly taking into consideration the extant planning permissions and the overall size of the land and therefore this land cannot be allocated for Local Green Space.

8.2 This designation should be removed from Policy ENV10 and the corresponding Policy Maps. In addition, the Council should be required to re-assess their proposed Local Green Space allocations as other sites may have been the subject of the current flawed assessment.

☒☐

Respondent ID	015	Organisation	Canal and River Trust		
Section or Policy		ENV11		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Yes
Paragraph		Paragraphs 5.92 to 5.98		Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Yes
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	015/03/ENV11/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We welcome the content of this policy.

Waterside spaces are unique and new development needs to fully reflect their settings in terms of heritage, environmental and infrastructure impacts. In order to meet the spatial vision in section 2, and to protect and enhance the important role of the canal identified within the document, it is vital that any policy relating to the quality of development next to the Leeds & Liverpool Canal is effective in line with paragraph 192 of the National Planning Policy Framework to make the plan sound. We believe this can only be achieved if reference is given within the document to identify the need for development alongside waterways to:

- ☑ Integrate the waterway, towing path and canal environment into the public realm in terms of the design and management of the development.
- ☑ Improve access to, along and from the waterway.
- ☑ Optimise views of and natural surveillance of the canal.
- ☑ Improve the amenity of the canal

We welcome the content within paragraphs 5.92 to 5.98, which we believe are important to help ensure that development fully takes into account their potential impact on the canal; and to help ensure that development alongside the waterway can create successful waterside spaces.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      ENV11

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      017/53/ENV11/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy ENV11

We support this Policy. As Paragraph 5.92 notes, the Leeds-Liverpool Canal is one of the defining elements of the Plan area and it is essential that development in its vicinity relates sensitively to the waterway.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	009	Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)		
Section or Policy		ENV11		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	009/14/ENV11/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY wishes to endorse and support the above policies which are all consistent with national policies regarding the protection of the countryside, gaps between settlements and promotion of sustainable access (by means other than the private vehicle) to the countryside.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      008      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy      ENV12

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      008/22/ENV12/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

DRAFT POLICY ENV12: FOOTPATHS, BRIDLEWAYS, BYWAYS AND FOOTPATHS

5.53 At present we have no specific comment upon this policy requirement (beyond our point on Policy SD2) but wish to register our interest as the Site SK089/090 will require the provision of on-site mitigation. A more detailed commentary is provided in Section 5.0 of this representation. However, we reserve our right to comment upon this policy, if necessary.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID	009	Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)		
Section or Policy		ENV12		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	009/15/ENV12/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY wishes to endorse and support the above policies which are all consistent with national policies regarding the protection of the countryside, gaps between settlements and promotion of sustainable access (by means other than the private vehicle) to the countryside.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      059      Organisation

Section or Policy      ENV12

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      059/14/ENV12/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Support - Protection and improvement of FPs, BWs, CRs and disabled access improvements.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      002      Organisation      North Yorkshire Local Access Forum

Section or Policy      ENV12

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      002/03/ENV12/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

3. The 'enhancement' of the public rights of way network. We recognise that it is very difficult for Authorities to create entirely new rights of way, but we encourage the Authority to do so, especially in new housing developments that may have poor connections, or no connections at all, to the existing public rights of way network. The needs of cyclists and equestrians who are presently frustrated by gaps in the bridleway network should be a challenge that is met with early solutions.

4. Access for disabled people. We welcome the Plan's commitment to improvements in the network of paths that can be negotiated by wheelchair users and the less mobile. Making improvements that result in attractive circuits, beginning and ending in car parks that have disabled parking spaces and disabled lavatories would be a real achievement.

5. Byways. We welcome your liaison with NYCC's expert rights of way department.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	009	Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)		
Section or Policy		ENV13		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	009/16/ENV13/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY wishes to endorse and support the above policies which are all consistent with national policies regarding the protection of the countryside, gaps between settlements and promotion of sustainable access (by means other than the private vehicle) to the countryside.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		ENV13		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	017/54/ENV13/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy ENV13, Criterion 2

The draft Kildwick and Farnhill Conservation Area Appraisals identify the majority of the area between Kidwick/Farnhill and Cross Hills as making a strong contribution to the character and appearance of those Conservation Areas.

Therefore, we welcome the intention to safeguard this area from development.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      044      Organisation      Skipton Civic Society

Section or Policy      ENV2

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      044/02/ENV2/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Section 5 Environment, ENV2 (e)

Fail to include setting of non-designated heritage assets in ENV2(e).

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Modification: we ask for the addition of “and are sympathetic to their setting.”

It is often the case that non-designated assets are of value as a group, rather than individually, and that their setting (for example a High Street, a churchyard, a yard, a terrace, or other adjoining non-designated assets) is part of their heritage value. It is not only development of the actual non-designated asset that may affect this value, but development of adjoining property.

We know that the above wording regarding sympathy to setting is used in other local plans, such as that of Plymouth which supports “Development which is sympathetic to the setting of non-designated heritage assets.”

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	012	Organisation	Gladman Developments Limited		
Section or Policy		ENV2		Plan is Legally Compliant?	No
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	No
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	012/09/ENV2/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

4.5 Draft Policy ENV2: Heritage  
4.5.1 Gladman are pleased to note that further to our comments on the pre-submission version of the Craven Local Plan, the Council have sought to amend the policy to reflect the guidance set out in the Framework at paragraphs 126-141.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      059      Organisation

Section or Policy      ENV2

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      059/07/ENV2/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Support - Conservation of heritage

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	009	Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)			
Section or Policy	ENV2		Plan is Legally Compliant?		Not Specified	
Paragraph	5.23		Plan is Sound?		No	
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?		Not Specified	
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference		009/11/ENV2/TS	

#### Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY welcomes the amendments to paragraph 5.23 in line with their suggestion at the previous consultation stage (July 2017) that the setting of a heritage asset is also an important factor when considering the asset's significance.

However, CPRENY remain disappointed that the importance of the 'setting' of heritage assets has not been transposed through to Policy ENV2 and because of this fact, consider that the draft plan is not consistent with national policy.

Paragraphs 128 and 129 of the NPPF set out that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should consider the potential harm to heritage assets as well as to their setting. This is confirmed in recent case law by the Court of Appeal case (Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v (1) East Northamptonshire DC and Others [2014] EW Civ 137) which prescribed that the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings should not simply be given careful consideration but "considerable importance and weight" when carrying out the balancing exercise, which gives rise to a strong statutory presumption against granting planning permission for development which would cause harm to the setting of listed buildings. Even where the harm would be "less than substantial" the balancing exercise cannot ignore the overarching statutory duty imposed by Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. It is therefore important for the Council to recognise this.

#### Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY propose that point B is reworded to read:

Ensuring that proposals affecting a designated heritage asset (or an archaeological site of national importance) conserve those elements, including its setting, which contribute to its significance....

CPRENY believe that the words 'including its setting' should also be added in the same way to section C regarding Conservation Areas; Section D regarding archaeological sites of less than national importance; and Section E regarding non-designated heritage assets.

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	CPRENY are concerned that heritage is often something that has been overlooked by development management teams at the Council, with Historic England often not being consulted where they should have been, therefore this is a matter of importance to members to ensure that the Council's policies are correct to ensure that they can be utilised correctly and appropriately by other teams within the Council.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID      015      Organisation      Canal and River Trust

Section or Policy      ENV2

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      015/01/ENV2/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We welcome reference to the buildings, bridges, locks and structures associated Leeds & Liverpool canal as a heritage asset. The canal dates form the 18th Century, and is associated with the setting of a series of designated and non-designated assets, including bridges, locks, lock houses, and marker posts (amongst other), which significantly contribute to the character and appearance of the borough. The reference to this within the policy would significantly assist with safeguarding the setting of these assets.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		ENV2		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	017/48/ENV2/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy ENV2 and its justification

The District has a rich legacy of historic buildings, archaeological sites and historic landscapes. These elements help to define the individual identity of its settlements, contribute to the quality of life of its communities, and assist in helping the area to achieve its wider economic objectives. It is essential, therefore, that the Local Plan sets out an appropriate framework for the protection and enhancement of this resource.

We support this Policy and its justification. This provides a good framework for the future management of the historic environment of the District and provides a clear indication of how a decision-maker should react to development proposals. We particularly welcome (and endorse) the identification within the Policy of those elements which are considered to be of especial importance to the distinctive character of the plan area.

As such we consider that this Policy and its justification reflect the advice set out in Paragraph 126 of the NPPF.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      059      Organisation

Section or Policy      ENV3

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      059/08/ENV3/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Support - Good deisgn, and the elements identified a) to u).

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		ENV3		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	017/49/ENV3/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy ENV3 and its justification

We support this Policy which should help to ensure that development proposals safeguard, and help to reinforce, the distinctive character of the settlements and landscapes of the plan area.

We particularly welcome Criterion q. Craven’s town centres still retain several traditional shop fronts which make a valuable contribution to the distinctive character of their local area and it is wholly appropriate that these should be retained in any development proposals, wherever possible,.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      012      Organisation      Gladman Developments Limited

Section or Policy      ENV3

Plan is Legally Compliant?      No

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      No

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      012/10/ENV3/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### 4.6 Draft Policy ENV3: Good Design

4.6.1 Draft Policy ENV3 sets out a list of objectives/principles and states that development proposals should be approved if they meet these. In this case these relate to designing a good quality place. Gladman are disappointed to note that our concerns expressed during the last round of consultation have not been resolved.

4.6.2 In relation to these design policies Gladman refer to paragraphs 59 and 60 of the Framework. Specifically, paragraph 59 which states:

“Design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.”

4.6.3 Whilst Gladman recognise the importance of high quality design, planning policies should not be overly prescriptive and need flexibility in order for schemes to respond to site specifics and the character of the local area. There will not be a ‘one size fits all’ solution in relation to design and sites should be considered on a site by site basis with consideration given to various design principles/objectives.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	010	Organisation	United Utilities Water Ltd		
Section or Policy		ENV3		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	010/04/ENV3/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Health and Well-Being

We have previously recommended the inclusion of text within the Policy ENV3 (Good Design). We welcome the addition of criterion (f) as we feel it is it is important to highlight that new development sites are more appropriately located away from existing operational sources of pollution such as noise and odour. For ease of your reference, our wastewater treatment works in your borough include:

- Clapham Beck WWTW
- Lower Bentham WWTW
- Burton in Lonsdale WWTW
- Horton in Ribblesdale WWTW
- Newby WWTW
- Austwick WWTW
- Long Preston WWTW
- High Benham WWTW
- Hellifield WWTW
- Ingleton WWTW
- Gildersleets WWTW

Plans of these sites are enclosed.

PLANS ARE SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      008      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy      ENV3

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      008/18/ENV3/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

DRAFT POLICY ENV3: GOOD DESIGN

5.48 Good design goes to the heart of sustainable development. Our principal concern is to ensure that the policy does not replicate what may be deemed as Building Regulation considerations.

5.49 Otherwise we have no comment upon this policy requirement but wish to register our interest. A more detailed commentary is provided in Section 5.0 of this representation. However, we reserve our right to comment upon this policy if necessary.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID      028                      Organisation      Home Builders Federation

Section or Policy	ENV3	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Yes
Paragraph		Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		Plan is DtC Compliant?	No
Settlement Comment Relates to		Representation Reference	028/06/ENV3/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

DRAFT POLICY ENV3: GOOD DESIGN

This policy is not considered to be sound, as it is not considered to be effective, justified or consistent with national policy.

There are a number of criteria within this policy that cause concern for the HBF, and that require further clarity and / or evidence in order for them to be considered sound.

Criterion (i) looks for development proposals to be accessible and inclusive and to everyone. Whilst the HBF is generally supportive of providing for the needs of older people and other specialist groups, it is not clear what this policy is requiring of home builders. PPG (ID 56-07) identifies the type of evidence required to introduce a policy for accessible and adaptable homes, including the likely future need; the size, location, type and quality of dwellings needed; the accessibility and adaptability of the existing stock; how the needs vary across different housing tenures; and the overall viability. It is incumbent on the Council to provide a local assessment evidencing the specific case for Craven which justifies the inclusion of optional higher standards for accessible and adaptable homes. Evidence of an ageing population does not in itself justify the requirements of this policy, without appropriate evidence the HBF would not support the introduction of this policy.

Whilst within part (m) developers are encouraged to build new homes to the ‘Lifetime Homes’ standard so that they can be readily adapted to meet the needs of those with disabilities and the elderly as well as assisting independent living at home. The Council will probably be aware that the Lifetime Homes standard is no longer applicable following the Government’s Housing Standards review. Lifetime Homes have now been replaced by the optional Building Regulations accessibility standards. These standards can be introduced via a plan but only where there is specific evidence to justify their inclusion, as set out above. The HBF is unaware that the Council can provide the necessary evidence at this stage and as such this criterion is not supported.

Criterion (u) states that sustainability should be designed in, so that development takes the opportunity to reduce energy use and water use, carbon emissions and minimise waste and ensure future resilience to a changing climate. Developments should also take the opportunity wherever possible to generate power through solar or other means. Whilst the HBF does not generally object to encouragement to reduce energy or to generate power through solar or other means, it is important that this is not interpreted as a mandatory requirement. This would be contrary to the Government’s intentions, as set out in Fixing the Foundations and the Housing Standards Review, which specifically identified energy requirements for new housing development to be a matter solely for Building Regulations with no optional standards. The Deregulation Act 2015 was the legislative tool used to put in place the changes of the Housing Standards Review. This included an amendment to the Planning and Energy Act 2008 to remove the ability of local authorities to require higher than Building Regulations energy efficiency standards for new homes. Transitional arrangements were set out in a Written Ministerial Statement in March 2015.

It is also considered that the Council will also need to consider the potential cost of the requirements set out in parts (i), (m) and (u), as if these principles are taken as requirements for development they are likely to impact on the viability and deliverability of development.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

HBF propose that the policy is modified as follows:

- The HBF recommend the Council ensure they have the appropriate evidence to support the introduction of parts (i) and (m) of this policy or that the elements that are not justified are deleted from the policy.
- That further clarity is added to part (u) to ensure that it is clear that home builders will not be required to provide additional measures over and above those currently set out in Building Regulations.

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	To debate the comments made within our representations further and in greater detail. To ensure that the industry can respond to any additional evidence provided by the Council or others following submission of the plan.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID	012	Organisation	Gladman Developments Limited
---------------	-----	--------------	------------------------------

Section or Policy	ENV4
-------------------	------

Plan is Legally Compliant?	No
----------------------------	----

Paragraph	Plan is Sound?	No
-----------	----------------	----

Site Reference	Plan is DtC Compliant?	No
----------------	------------------------	----

Settlement Comment Relates to	Representation Reference	012/11/ENV4/TS
-------------------------------	--------------------------	----------------

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

4.7 Draft Policy ENV4: Biodiversity

4.7.1 Draft Policy ENV4 sets out the Council’s proposed approach to achieving improvements in Biodiversity.

4.7.2 Paragraph 113 of the Framework refers to the need for criteria based policies in relation to proposals affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas, and that protection should be commensurate with their status which gives appropriate weight to their importance and contributions to wider networks. Whilst it is noted that statutory bodies, including Natural England have not expressed any concerns regarding the working of ENV4, as currently drafted, Gladman do not believe this policy aligns with the Framework. The policy fails to make a distinction and recognise that there are two separate balancing exercises which need to be undertaken for national and local designated sites and their settings. We therefore suggest that the policy is revisited to ensure that it is consistent with the approach set out within the Framework.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Respondent ID      047      Organisation      Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

Section or Policy      ENV4

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      047/03/ENV4/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The Trust is pleased to see that policy ENV4 is very comprehensive. The only addition the Trust would like to see would be an accurate assessment of habitat loss and habitat created in mitigation. This could be achieved by ensuring that biodiversity offsetting calculations are provided for applications where there will be a loss of habitat. Natural England are consulting on updated recommendations for biodiversity offsetting so these metrics could be included either in the policy or in monitoring mechanisms.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Either in Policy ENV4 or in the monitoring plan there should be mention of the use of biodiversity offsetting to ensure that net gain or no net loss of biodiversity occurs.

An addition such as:

“For applications being submitted for more than 10 dwellings we will require an Ecological Constraints and Opportunities Plan (ECOP) and a Balance Sheet or table setting out habitats lost and gained as detailed in the British Standard (BS42020:2013). These ensure that the areas of habitat to be lost, retained or enhanced can be clearly seen on one plan, and can be clearly calculated in one table.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      015      Organisation      Canal and River Trust

Section or Policy      ENV5

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      015/02/ENV5/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We welcome the identification of the Leeds and Liverpool Canal as an important green infrastructure corridor. This would assist in promoting tourism and activity on the canal, and also would help assist promoting healthy lifestyles associated with walking and cycling activities on the canal corridor.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      008                      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy                      ENV5

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Plan is Sound?	No
Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Representation Reference	008/20/ENV5/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

DRAFT POLICY ENV5: GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

5.51 At present we have no comment upon this policy requirement but wish to register our interest as the Site SK089/090 which is listed within the Policy and requires the provision of on-site improvements. A more detailed commentary is provided in Section 5.0 of this representation. However, we reserve our right to comment upon this policy, if necessary.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID	063	Organisation	A & N Fothergill & Son.		
Section or Policy		ENV5		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		SK094		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	063/02/ENV5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Method for designating the requirement for Green Infrastructure Provision on housing sites and in particular Housing Site SK094.

The Council is seeking the provision of Green Infrastructure on certain allocated sites. Draft Policy ENV5, that sets out the policy approach for Green Infrastructure provision, is not objected to. However, the approach of identifying the extent of Green Infrastructure provision on allocated sites, by way of a green hatch across part of the site, is objected to.

With respect to housing site SK094, the Green Infrastructure provision 'green hatch' affects approximately 70% of the housing site. The land is presently Flood Risk Area and it is accepted that at present the land is not suitable for development. However, works on the Skipton Flood Alleviation Scheme are at an advanced stage. The works will significantly reduce the amount of land at risk from flooding within the town. It is highly probable that the amount of land at risk from flooding on housing site SK094 will significantly reduce.

The Green Infrastructure designation as currently indicated therefore compromise the ability of the land to be developed for housing. The site is in a highly sustainable location, and there are no other obvious drawbacks from bringing it forward for development.

The evidence base for the proposal maps Green Infrastructure designations comes from work undertaken by Natural England in response to policy YH8 from the Yorkshire & Humber Regional Spatial Strategy. The RSS was subsequently abolished and the evidence base is from information that is approximately 10 years old. Most importantly the Green Infrastructure designations were identified prior to commencement on the Skipton Flood Alleviation Scheme.

A rationale was produced by Natural England that explains how the Green Infrastructure designations were produced. That rationale is included as Appendix A. Step 4 of that rationale explains the site characteristics or indicators that were used to select sites for inclusion in the Green Infrastructure designation.

Land within the Fothergills' control, that forms part of housing site SK094 and is designated as Green Infrastructure, meets very few of the indicators that lead to a sites designation for Green Infrastructure. Of the key indicators used by Natural England: -

Open Space. The site is not an open space asset such as a park, woodland, or similar.

Biodiversity. This farmed pastoral land is very unlikely to make any noteworthy contribution to biodiversity.

Landscape. This low-lying site makes very limited landscape contribution.

Products from the land. The land is farmed and makes a small contribution to agriculture, although it's contribution is not so significant that would suggest the land should be designated for Green Infrastructure.

**Mitigating Flood Risk.** Based on the current Environment Agency Flood Risk maps the site is at risk from flooding. However, this is based on current Flood Risk maps and takes no account of the contribution of the Skipton Flood Alleviation Scheme and how this will impact on Flood Risk within the town.

Contribution to mitigating climate change. The site is not peatlands, managed woodlands or a site that would otherwise contribute to this indicator.

Health. This is not a location that is important for Air Quality management or could be of benefit to populations with poor health.

Accessibility. A public footpath skirts the southern end of the site, but the lands contribution to this indicator is not so significant that would suggest the land should be designated for Green Infrastructure.

Recreation. The farm land does not include any formal provision for recreation.

Cultural. The site contains no cultural features.

Tourism. The site is not a tourism asset.

Poor quality environment. The land is not a poor-quality environment. It comprises ordinary and unremarkable pastoral land.

Land and property values. The designation of this land or not as Green Infrastructure would have a very minimal impact on the surrounding local land and property values.

Economic growth. Designation of this site as Green Infrastructure would have no particular impact on economic growth.

Consideration of the key indicators used to designate the land as Green Infrastructure, reveals that the reason why this site was identified was because the land has traditionally been at risk of flooding.

The Fothergills' site has been at risk from Flooding from Eller Beck and Whaller Hill / Skibden Beck that drains into Eller Beck. It has also been at risk of flooding from the Leeds to Liverpool Canal overtopping its banks as result of increased discharges to the canal from Eller Beck and Whaller Hill / Skibden Beck. Flood Risk Assessments used to inform residential development applications on the housing site confirm this.

The Skipton Flood alleviation scheme will significantly alter the areas of land that will be at risk from flooding. The scheme will attenuate water entering the town from Eller Beck and Whaller Hill / Skibden Beck. It therefore seems very probable that once the flood risk areas for the town are remodelled that the Fothergills' site will no longer be designated as an area of flood risk. Furthermore, if it the site is not designated as an area of flood risk the site should not make such a significant Green Infrastructure contribution.

In summary, due to Flood Risk alleviation works within the town, much of the land to be designated as Green Infrastructure may no longer be appropriate to be designated in this way.

The impact of the designation in the format currently proposed is that the development potential of the site for housing is significantly reduced. The site is well located for housing development and in landscape terms development on the site would have limited impact. The ability to use the site efficiently and effectively for agriculture is also much reduced as the site will become enclosed by development. Constraining development on this site through the proposals map Green Infrastructure designation is not therefore appropriate and furthermore would put pressure on the Council to release other land for housing to help meet its housing requirements.

#### SUPPORTING INFORMATION - AN EVIDENCE BASE FOR GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE IN YORKSHIRE AND HUMBER, SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Rather than attempting to hatch the precise areas for Green Infrastructure Provision on proposed allocations, the plan should instead simply identify those sites where a contribution towards Green Infrastructure will be expected. This could be achieved by simply marking all those allocations where a Green Infrastructure contribution will be required by an asterisk, or alternatively by extending the green hatch across the entire allocation.

The change will allow a sensible decision to be made at the time a planning application is considered on the extent of Green Infrastructure to be required and the precise location(s) for it. This decision can be made using the most up to date evidence and information. The attempt to designate the land now will lead to inaccuracies and potentially the unnecessary safeguarding of land that is suitable for development. Conversely, the Council will face difficulties looking to prevent development on areas of land that more recent information, or site circumstances, suggest should be protected for Green Infrastructure.

There is a very strong justification for this change to be made with respect to site SK094 in particular, but the justification is applicable to the way Green Infrastructure designations are identified across the whole Plan.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      009      Organisation      Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)

Section or Policy	ENV5	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference	SG064	Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Representation Reference	009/12/ENV5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY welcomes the inclusion of a list of sites where green infrastructure is to be included within proposals on those allocations.

Whilst CPRENY have objected to the inclusion of site SG064, should the Local Plan include this site at adoption stage, CPRENY believe that this site should also be included within this list. This is primarily due to its prominent position within the open countryside and proximity to the Anley Crag plantation and the River Ribble. The development guidelines for the site as part of draft policy SP6 (page88 of the Publication draft Local Plan) states that “new proposals will include a comprehensive landscaping scheme to filter views of the development from the east and west. Semi mature trees will be planted for immediate effect.” With this in mind CPRENY believe that this planting would ideally form a new section of green infrastructure and ensure that the Plan is justified and effective.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY propose that site SG064 is also included within the list of allocated sites in policy ENV5

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      ENV5

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      017/50/ENV5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy ENV5

We support this Policy which should help to safeguard the Green Infrastructure of the District. Several elements of Craven’s Green Infrastructure network are either designated heritage assets in their own right or contribute to the setting of its historic buildings and structures. The protection and effective management of this resource will not only help to safeguard many elements which contribute to the distinctive character of the area but also help to deliver the plan’s Objectives for the historic environment.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      039      Organisation      North Yorkshire County Council

Section or Policy      ENV6

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Section 5.59

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      039/18/ENV6/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Flood Risk Management

##### Draft Policy ENV6 - Flood Risk

Section 5.59 - North Yorkshire County Council in its capacity as Lead Local Flood authority recently undertook a Section 19 Investigation for South Craven following the 2015 boxing Day Flood Event. There are some locations within the Local Plan in which the investigation took place. It should be noted the North Yorkshire County Council in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority is working together with local authorities and local residents to investigate and manage the flood risk in these locations. A spreadsheet is attached (SAVED ON SYSTEM) for your information which outlines the current flood risk across the sites allocated.

The policy aims to steer development to locations of low risk for all sources of flooding including Fluvial, Surface Water and Groundwater, which is welcomed. Development in medium to high flood risk should employ safeguards and mitigation measures that ensure to properties are at risk of flooding and that the development does not increase the risk to existing properties.

The policy addresses the need to investigate all options of surface water discharge when designing systems for surface water management. This is important as all developments should seek to dispose of surface water via infiltration before the use of connections to local watercourses or sewer can be established.

##### Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The policy should make clear reference to NYCC's SuDS Design Guidance, which outlines all requirements for surface water drainage systems on all major development.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      008      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy      ENV6

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      SK089 and SK090      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      008/21/ENV6/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

DRAFT POLICY ENV6: FLOOD RISK

5.52 At present we have no specific comment upon this policy requirement (beyond our point on Policy SD2) but wish to register our interest as the Site SK089/090 will require the provision of on-site mitigation. A more detailed commentary is provided in Section 5.0 of this representation. However, we reserve our right to comment upon this policy, if necessary.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID      059      Organisation

Section or Policy      ENV7

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      059/10/ENV7/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Support - Air quality, particularly e) encourage walking/cycling.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	011	Organisation	The Coal Authority		
Section or Policy		ENV7		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Yes
Paragraph		Paragraph 5.65		Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Yes
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	011/01/ENV7/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The Coal Authority is pleased to see that reference is been made in the supporting text to the significant coal mining legacy present in Craven area. It is also pleasing to see that consideration of prior extraction of coal is being encouraged.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      011      Organisation      The Coal Authority

Section or Policy      ENV7

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      011/02/ENV7/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The Coal Authority is pleased to see the inclusion of this policy which sets out consideration of unstable land, and any necessary remediation, as part of development proposals.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      010                      Organisation      United Utilities Water Ltd

Section or Policy                      ENV8

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?                      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?              Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      010/03/ENV8/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS

The following comments are submitted by United Utilities in response to the specific draft policies contained within the current Publication Local Plan. We wish to highlight that our previous representations remain valid.

#### Infrastructure Provision

United Utilities wishes to highlight the assets which are currently situated outside of the settlement boundary. Upgrades to these assets may be required in the near future, and it is important to ensure that any required upgrades and expansions to these sites can be made in order for us to meet the infrastructure requirements of proposed future development in the borough. It is therefore requested that Local Policy is worded to recognise that utility sites, located within the countryside are appropriate for development for operational purposes. Our preference would be for this principle to be reflected on the proposals map and in development plan policy. These assets include:

- Clapham Beck Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW)
- Lower Bentham WWTW
- Burton in Lonsdale WWTW
- Horton in Ribblesdale WWTW
- Newby WWTW
- Austwick WWTW
- Long Preston WWTW
- High Benham WWTW
- Hellifield WWTW
- Ingleton WWTW
- Gildersleets WWTW

This would enable us to ensure that we can continue to meet the growth and development aspiration of the Borough as well as respond to environmental agendas in accordance with our obligations.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID 017 Organisation Historic England

Section or Policy ENV9

Plan is Legally Compliant? Not Specified

Paragraph Criteria b and c

Plan is Sound? Yes

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant? Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference 017/51/ENV9/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy ENV9, Criteria (b) and (c)

The introductory section of the plan notes the outstanding local environment and the Vision sets out an intention that the high-quality landscapes and treasured environmental assets of the area be protected.

We therefore support the requirement that renewable energy and low carbon developments should:-

- Ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts upon built and historic assets and that such developments respect the character and immediate setting of the wider landscape
- Avoid developments that may detract from the landscape and scenic beauty or setting of the Forest of Bowland AONB and the Yorkshire Dales National Park

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	059	Organisation			
Section or Policy		ENV9		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	059/11/ENV9/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Support - The Council has NOT identified areas for commercial scale wind farms. Agree.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID 007 Organisation Ballan Ltd and Halton Homes Ltd

Section or Policy GEN

Plan is Legally Compliant? Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound? Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant? Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to Hellifield

Representation Reference 007/01/GEN/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

## 1. Introduction

1.1 This representation is submitted on behalf of Ballan Ltd and Halton Homes Ltd in relation to the land to the west of Hellifield and the soundness of the ‘Publication Draft Craven Local Plan’ (“Draft Local Plan”).

1.2 Craven District Council (“the Council”) published its Draft Local Plan for consultation on 2nd January 2018. The Council are consulting upon the Draft Local Plan until 13th February 2018. The consultation comprises a number of documents, including: the Draft Local Plan document and appendices, Policies Map, Statement of Consultation, Statement of Representations Procedure and a Sustainability Report. In addition, the Council have also published a number of supporting documents.

1.3 On 21 October 2016 Ballan Ltd submitted a planning application (ref. 42/2016/17496) for development of the land to the west of Hellifield (“the Site”) (as shown edged red on the plan contained at Appendix 1). This planning application is currently being considered by the Council (“the Planning Application”). Details of the Planning Application are discussed at Section 4 of this representation and throughout.

1.4 This representation should be read together with the following Planning Application documents:

☐ Location Plan (Appendix 1)

☐ Illustrative Master Plan (Appendix 2)

☐ Vision Document by Halliday Clark Architects (Appendix 3)

☐ Planning Supporting Statement (Appendix 4)

☐ Sustainability Statement (Appendix 5)

## 2. Legal Context

2.1 Section 20(5)(b) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires an Inspector to (at an independent examination) determine whether a Development Plan Document is “sound”.

## 3. National Policy Framework

3.1 Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”) explains “soundness” as follows:

“The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is “sound” – namely that it is:

☐ Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;

☐ Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;

☐ Effective – the plan should be delivered over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic properties; and

☐ Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.”

3.2 Paragraph 158 of the NPPF refers to the use of a proportionate evidence base and states:

“Each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental



characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.”

3.3 In addition, we note guidance published by the Planning Advisory Service entitled ‘Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist’ (March 2014). This guidance, although advisory, enables the preparation of a robust Local Plan which is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

3.4 The Soundness Checklist advises that in terms of being “justified” the plan should be based on a robust and credible evidence base involving:

- ☐ Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are backed up by facts.

- ☐ Evidence of participation of the local community and others having a stake in the area.

3.5 In terms of the plan being the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, the Soundness Checklist advises that these alternatives should be realistic and subject to sustainability appraisal. The plan should show how the policies and proposals help to ensure that the social, environmental, economic and resource use objectives of sustainability will be achieved.

3.6 With regards to the test of “effective”, the Soundness Checklist advises that this means the plan should be deliverable, requiring evidence of:

- ☐ Sound infrastructure delivery planning;

- ☐ Having no regulatory or national planning barriers to delivery;

- ☐ Delivery partners who are signed up to it;

- ☐ Coherence with the strategies of neighbouring authorities, including neighbouring marine planning authorities; and

- ☐ The plan should be flexible and able to be monitored.

3.7 The Soundness Checklist advises that the plan should be flexible to deal with changing circumstances, which may involve minor changes to respond to the outcome of the monitoring process or more significant changes to respond to problems such as lack of funding for major infrastructure proposals.

3.8 The NPPF contains a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 14 provides:

“At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision-taking.

For plan-making this means that:

- ☐ Local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area;

- ☐ Local plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:

- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or

- specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted...”

3.9 One of the Core Planning Principles contained in the NPPF (at paragraph 17) is to:

“proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the county needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of the area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities.”

(our emphasis)

3.10 Paragraph 28 of the NPPF supports a prosperous local economy and states that importance of sustainable rural tourism:

“support sustainable rural tourism and leisure development that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which represent the character of the countryside. This should include supporting the provisions and expansion of tourist and visitor facilities in appropriate locations where identified needs are not met by existing facilities in the rural service centres.”

(our emphasis)

#### 4. The Planning Application

4.1 Ballan Ltd have submitted an outline planning application (with all matters reserved except for means of access) for a proposed Leisure Development which is currently

being considered by the Council (“the Planning Application”). The description of the proposed development is as follows:

“Outline Application for the development of a leisure centre, including swimming pool, hotel and visitor accommodation including up to 300 lodges, park and ride facility, pedestrian access to Hellifield Station, parking areas, bus and coach drop off point, landscaping including ground modelling and water features.”

The Proposed Illustrative Masterplan submitted with the planning application is contained at Appendix 2 for information purposes. In addition, a vision document has also been produced by the Applicant (Appendix 3).

4.2 The Site covers an area of approximately 31.75ha of mainly agricultural fields, lakes, watercourse and woodland. The application site is bound by:

- ▣ Hellifield Train Station and associated railway line to the north;
- ▣ The settlement of Hellifield to the east;
- ▣ The A46 with Gallaber Park Holiday Park to the south; and
- ▣ Agricultural land and Gallaber pond with the A65 beyond to the west.

4.3 The Planning Application is supported by a number of documents including a detailed Environmental Statement.

4.4 The Planning Application is also supported by a ‘Planning Supporting Statement’ which provides full details of the site and the proposal. The Planning Supporting Statement should be read in conjunction with this representation.

## 5. Planning History

5.1 It is important to note the planning history of the land when considering any revised allocations/designations in the emerging Draft Local Plan.

5.2 The site has an extensive and complex planning history, the full details of which can be found at Section 3 of the Planning Supporting Statement. For the purposes of this representation it is important to note the following historic permissions:

5.2.1 In 2000 outline planning permission was granted for the construction of Hellifield Rural Environmental Centre on approximately 51 hectares of land to the west of Hellifield (ref. 5/42/149/C). However, this permission lapsed.

5.2.2 Renewal of planning permission 5/42/149/C was granted in 2003 (ref. 42/2002/2763). This permission permits the construction of Hellifield Environmental Centre (comprising tourism, exhibition, training and livestock buildings) on approximately 51 hectares of land. The approved location plan illustrating the extent of the permission is contained at Appendix 6.

5.2.3 In 2005 reserved matters for planning permission 42/2002/2763 were granted (ref. 42/2005/5082) (the approved red line location plan is enclosed at Appendix 7).

5.2.4 In February 2008 the Council informed that planning permissions 42/2002/2763 and 42/2005/5082 had been implemented (see Appendix 8).

## 6. Assessment of the Draft Local Plan

### 6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 An assessment of the Draft Local Plan and its supporting documents has been undertaken to establish whether its policies are “sound” with particular regard to the tourism allocations and proposed development of the Site.

6.1.2 The Craven plan area is located in North Yorkshire. The Craven District is approximately 1,777 square kilometres and the remainder of the Craven District lies within the Yorkshire Dales National Park (“YDNP”). The YDNP is a separate planning authority which produces its own Local Plan. Some of the YDNP policies have been considered as part of this representation.

6.1.3 The current local plan for Craven consists of the ‘saved’ policies of the Craven District Local Plan (1999). The Site is currently part of a larger Tourism Development Opportunity Site (“TDOP”) under saved policy EMP11 of the Local Plan (1999) (see Figure 2)

6.1.4 The Draft Local Plan proposes significantly reduce the size of the TDOS allocation and to allocate a small area of the land to the west of Hellifield for ‘Tourism Development Commitment’, the remainder of the site is proposed Local Green Space including areas of biodiversity value and archaeological value.

## FOLLOWING APPENDICES SAVED ON SYSTEM:

- Appendix 1 – Application 42/2016/17496 Location Plan Dwg. No. 548.02 (-) 240
- Appendix 2 – Application 42/2016/17496 Proposed Masterplan

- Appendix 3 – Application 42/2016/17496 Vision Document
- Appendix 4 – Application 42/2016/17496 Planning Supporting Statement
- Appendix 5 – Application 42/2016/17496 Sustainability Statement
- Appendix 6 – Application 42/2002/2763 Location Pla
- Appendix 7 – Application 42/2005/5082 Location Pla
- Appendix 8 – Letter dated 7 February 200

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      034      Organisation

Section or Policy      GEN

Paragraph      Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Site Reference      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Representation Reference      034/01/GEN/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The Local Plan and procedure of drafting it as a whole support the legal compliance and soundness of the Local Plan. I have watched closely the work relating to the preparation of the draft plan, having attended consultation meetings, submitted written representations, and also by attending and making verbal representations at several meetings of the Spatial-Planning Sub-Committee.

I am satisfied that the legal procedures have been followed properly, and that the Plan is sound. I write as a retired Solicitor and former District Councillor and I do, therefore, have a detailed knowledge of what is required by the Council. My opinion is that the Plan should be approved in its present form without amendment.

During the process of the Plan's preparation there were misguided and foolish attempts to include some sites in Giggleswick which were numbered SG083, SG084, SG085, SG086 & SG087. These sites are all in close proximity to the River Ribble and were unsuitable for a number of reasons detailed in written submissions by numerous locals and thankfully the Council removed the sites. I applaud the Council for taking note of the serious objections and for removing the sites from the Plan. One of the main objections was the propensity of the sites to flood. When that occurs it causes severe problems for residents of Gildersleets, which is a grouping of houses near the Settle A65 bypass and on occasion the flooding has resulted in water entering the drains which back up into their homes. Any development on any of these sites would add to the flooding problem, and it would also add to the difficulties faced by other communities downstream such as Ribchester and Whalley whose M.P. Nigel Evans is one of those who wrote to the Council objecting to the proposals.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	008	Organisation	The Wilman Family		
Section or Policy		GEN		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference		SK089 & SK090		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Skipton		Representation Reference	008/01/GEN/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

## 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Carter Jonas LLP represents the interests of the Wilman Family in respect of the emerging development plan for Craven. Messrs Wilman are major land and property owners in the District, particularly around the market town of Skipton.

1.2 Comments have been submitted to previous versions of the emerging Local Plan, notably the Regulation 18 Pre–Publication Draft version of Summer 2017.

Representation to that document was submitted in respect of Site SK089 & SK090: Land north of Elsey Croft which was identified in the document as a Preferred Housing Allocation. The purpose of the representation was to demonstrate the suitability of Site SK089 for allocation on the basis:

- It is fully deliverable within the meaning of paragraph 47 of the Framework and therefore capable to start delivering residential completions in the first 5 years of the plan period; and
- It represents the most appropriate option for allocation when considered against reasonable alternatives.

1.3 With the production of the Regulation 19 Publication Draft Local Plan, this is a document the planning authority considers to be “sound” and suitable for submission to the formal Examination process. As a consequence, the format of the consultation and representation process is required to consider the various provisions of Government policy and in compliance with the procedural and soundness tests as set out in the Framework (Paragraph 182) and the accompanying Planning Practice Guidance; as well as emerging policy in the form of provisions of the Housing White Paper (February 2017).

1.4 These representations are structured with the following format:

- Section 2 outlines the prevailing policy context, in particular the Framework and PPG;
- Section 3 sets out some general considerations and commentary about the Plan;
- Section 4 sets out our response to the issues and matters raised in the policy section of the draft Craven Local Plan;
- Section 5 responds to site specific issues raised in Policy SP5 Spatial Strategy for Skipton; and
- Section 6 identifies our conclusions and recommendations to what actions (we consider) are required to make the Plan sound.

1.5 It is hoped that the Council will find the comments made through this process helpful and constructive.

1.6 Completed representation forms are appended to this statement, which give full details of the client and Carter Jonas.

## 2 POLICY MATTERS

National Planning Policy Framework

2.1 Paragraphs 150 to 185 of the Framework set out the Government’s view on the plan-making process and reiterates the primacy of the development plan in decision making.

2.2 All local planning authorities are expected to produce a Local Plan which is prepared through a process of early and meaningful engagement and collaboration. Such documents are intended to be aspirational but realistic, seeking opportunities to achieve each of the three dimensions (social, economic and environmental) of sustainable development, with net gains across all three. In that regard the document Local Plan should be consistent with the principles and policies within the Framework. It advocates

that significant adverse impacts should be avoided wherever possible; where such impacts are unavoidable appropriate mitigation should be considered.

2.3 Paragraph 156 identifies what strategic priorities should be out in the Local Plan. These include:

- policies to deliver the homes and jobs needed in the area;
- provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development;
- infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, fresh water, waste water flood risk and energy (including heat);
- provision of health, education, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and
- conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape.

2.4 Paragraph 157 sets out some fundamental requirements and parameters. These include:

- the need to plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area;
- drawn up over an appropriate timeframe preferably a 15 year time horizon, taking account of longer term requirements, and kept up to date;
- based on a policy of co-operation with neighbouring authorities, public private and voluntary sector organisations;
- indicate broad areas of growth for strategic development on a key diagram and land use designations on a proposals map;
- Allocate sites for development and the flexible use of land; and,
- identify where it is appropriate to limit change, and specify land where development would be inappropriate, justifying why this should be so.

2.5 A number of key matters are then set out which require the Council to use a proportionate evidence base, which is adequate, up-to-date and relevant setting out the characteristics of the area and prospects taking full account of market and economic signals. Subsequent issues relate to planning strategically across local boundaries and the examination of local plans.

2.6 Examination of the Plan will be the next stage and it is worth briefly reiterating the four tests of soundness insofar as these inform these (and earlier) representations submitted to the Council: These require that when submitted for examination the Council considers the Local Plan to be:

- Positively prepared; i.e. the Plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development
  - Justified; i.e. the Plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.
  - Effective; i.e. the Plan should be deliverable across its period based upon joint working on cross boundary strategic priorities;
- and
- Consistent with national policy. i.e. the Plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

2.7 Advice is provided in the PPG about the publication and examination of the Local Plan, suggesting that the Publication Stage Plan (Regulation 19) is the documents that the local authority considers is ready for examination. It sets out an iterative process whereby the planning authority can submit the Local Plan and any proposed changes it considers appropriate along with supporting documents and a Statement of Representations Procedure.

2.8 With regard to the identification and allocation of sites the PPG is clear that the assessment of land availability is an important step in the preparation of Local Plans. It stresses the need for Local Planning Authorities to prepare land assessments for housing development in order to identify land to meet their objectively assessed needs. This assessment will principally involve assessing a site's suitability for development and the likelihood of the development coming forward.

2.9 In doing so it states that the planning authority should seek to find out the following information from respondents as part of their land assessment:

- Site location;
- Suggested potential type of development;
- Scale and timing of development
- Constraints on development.

2.10 The list of sites derived from the 'call for sites' exercise should be assessed against national policies and designations to establish which has reasonable potential for

development. This will involve determining the suitability, availability and achievability of sites.

2.11 The Practice Guidance states that the suitability of sites for development should be guided by:

- The development plan, emerging planning policy and national policy,
- Market and industry requirements in that housing market or functional economic market area;

2.12 When assessing the suitability of sites for development the PPG states account should be taken of how up-to-date the plan policies are and consider the appropriateness of identified constraints on sites and whether such constraints can be overcome. In addition to these considerations, the following factors should be considered to assess suitability now and in the future:

- physical limitations or problems such as access, infrastructure, ground conditions, flood risk, hazardous risks, pollution or contamination;
- potential impacts including the effect upon landscapes including landscape features, nature and heritage conservation;
- appropriateness and likely market attractiveness for the type of development proposed;
- contribution to regeneration priority areas;
- environmental / amenity impacts experienced by would be occupiers and neighbouring areas.

2.13 In terms of availability, a site is considered available for development, when, on the best information available, there is confidence that there are no legal or ownership problems, such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips tenancies or operational requirements of landowners. This will often mean that the land is controlled by a developer or landowner who has expressed an intention to develop, or the landowner has expressed an intention to sell.

2.14 Finally, in regards to achievability, the guidance is clear that a site is considered achievable for development where there is a reasonable prospect that the particular type of development will be developed on the site at a particular point in time. It acknowledges that this is essentially a judgement about the economic viability, and the capacity of the developer to complete as well as let or sell the development over the certain period.

2.15 Both the Framework and the PPG are clear that LPA's should meet their objectively assessed needs and where they have been unable to identify sufficient sites to do so, they should revisit their assessment of supply for example by changing the assumptions on the development potential on particular sites (including physical and policy constraints).

2.16 It is imperative that the Craven Local Plan embraces the Framework's aspirations to facilitate growth and meeting its full objectively assessed development needs.

### 3 PREVIOUS REPRESENTATION

3.1 Previous representations in Summer 2017 supported the Council's proposal to allocate land at Elsey Croft Skipton under references SK089 and SK090: SK089 & SK090 Land to the north of Airedale Avenue & Elsey Croft and east of railway line, Skipton. Our client agrees that Site SK089 'Land at Elsey Croft' is an appropriate development site. Discussion with officers confirm that land at SK089 is within the ownership of Craven District Council (CDC) and it is available; CDC would wish to see the two ownerships progress together. This is supported by the Wilman family as a pragmatic approach.

3.2 In submitting comments in Summer 2017, the principal aim of the representation was to demonstrate that Site SK089/SK090 is fully deliverable and is one of the most appropriate sites for allocation within the town. In supporting that position, it highlighted that the land is an urban fringe site surrounded by hard development on three sides and therefore is well related to the existing built up area. The development edge would follow the established line created by development of land to the south by Skipton Properties, a site that has been granted planning permission for 107 dwellings (LPA reference 63/2010/11062). That scheme has proved extremely popular and is nearly complete.

3.3 An assessment was set out considering suitability of the site in respect of the meaning of Paragraph 47 and Footnote 11 of the Framework and therefore whether it is appropriate for identification as a housing allocation. In brief the assessment suggested:

#### Availability

3.4 It is within the ownership and freehold control of the landowner. There is therefore a "willing" landowner. There are no legal impediments, need for land in third party ownership, investment constraints or risks associated with the site, or known constraints that would impede deliverability. The site can be brought forward when required by the Council. A number of developers and house builders have expressed an interest in the site.

Suitability

3.5 The ‘Residential Site Selection Process’ Background Paper includes an assessment of the merits of Site SK089 against a number of different criteria in order to determine its suitability for allocation. In order to aid the Council, we have carried out our own assessment of the site against the key criterion:

Environmental Considerations

3.6 At present, the site is heavily farmed and therefore has little ecological or environmental value. Equally there are no known environmental or ecological designations covering the land. We are currently preparing a preliminary ecological assessment, which will be submitted to the Council shortly, which will demonstrate that there are no ecological constraints present on the site that cannot be accommodated through good design.

3.7 The proposed development will incorporate a number of Green Infrastructure Corridors, which will provide an interlinked network of high quality habitats that will enhance the wildlife and ecological value of the site. This would deliver significant betterment over and above existing levels.

Connectivity

3.8 It was suggested that SK089/SK090 is conveniently located near to a number of local facilities and amenities as summarised in the table below:

FACILITY/	DISTANCE (METRES)/	AVERAGE WALK (DISTANCE) 5KM/HR
NEAREST BUS STOPS ON OTLEY ROAD (KINGSWAY)/	160 METRES/	2 MINUTES
SKIPTON TRAIN STATION/	1,800 METRES/	22 MINUTES
SKIPTON TOWN CENTRE/	1,100 METRES/	13 MINUTES
SANDYLANDS SPORT CENTRE/	2,260 METRES/	27 MINUTES
SKIPTON LIBRARY/	1,200 METRES/	14 MINUTES
NEAREST SUPERMARKET/	1,200 METRES/	14 MINUTES
SKIPTON HOSPITAL/	1,800 METRES/	22 MINUTES
SKIPTON BUILDING SOCIETY MAIN OFFICE (MAJOR EMPLOYER IN THE TOWN)/	870 METRES/	10 MINUTES
SKIPTON PARISH CHURCH OF ENGLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL/	980 METRES/	12 MINUTES
SKIPTON ERMYSTED’S GRAMMAR SCHOOL/	1,800 METRES/	22 MINUTES
SKIPTON GIRL’S HIGH SCHOOL/	2,000 METRES/	24 MINUTES
THE SKIPTON ACADEMY/	2,700 METRES/	33 MINUTES

3.9 It is evident that the majority of these facilities are within reasonable walking distance of the site (1.5 to 2.00 km based IHT guidelines) and therefore any future residents would be able to meet their day to day needs without recourse to a private vehicle. The site enjoys good access to public transport with bus stops located within easy walking distance of Otley Road. Equally, the train station is accessible by walking and there is a regular bus service from the site. The nearby bus stops provide a regular service to Skipton Bus Station, Clitheroe, Harrogate, Ilkley, Keighley, Leeds and Otley.

Impact on the Character and Form

3.10 Good design is central to achieving sustainable development, paragraph 8 of the Framework highlights that “well designed buildings and places can improve the lives of people and communities”. Site SK089/SK090 is located on the edge of an existing residential area, which is characterised by relatively modern detached and semi-detached properties arranged in a medium density suburban layout. In assessing the site it was considered to be contiguous with the existing built up area as evident by the fact that the proposed allocation is surrounded to the south and west by existing development. Otley Road to the north provides a clear boundary and delineation between the site and the land to the north. The site itself was considered to have little intrinsic landscape value.

3.11 Site SK089/SK090 is well related to the existing pattern of development and would represent an appropriate consolidation and rounding off of the eastern side of the town. The site would be visually contained and would respect the traditional form and character of the area. As previously stated the site will be bordered by built development along its entire southern boundary and therefore its allocation will not lead to the significant outward spread of the settlement or any significant encroachment in to the open countryside.



3.12 Views of the proposed allocation from the surrounding countryside would simply be interpreted as part of the town and against the existing backdrop of modern development in this locality. Any views from Otley Road would be protected by the provision of the green infrastructure corridor.

Impact on the Historic Assets

3.13 Paragraph 132 of the Framework states that the “significance (of a Heritage Asset) can be harmed or lost through development within its setting”. The proposed development would not impact on any designated or non-designated heritage assets, such as listed buildings, conservation areas, scheduled monuments etc.

Flooding

3.14 Detail on the Environment Agency Flood Risk map shows that the majority of the site is located in Flood Zone 1 and is thus considered to be at a low risk of flooding from fluvial sources (less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of river flooding. Part of the SK089 area is affected by Flood Risk Zone 3 and 4, which consequently is excluded from the developable area. As a result, it is a sequentially preferable site for allocation in flood risk terms. This is confirmed in the Craven’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).

3.15 Some potential issues with flooding from surface water are identified within in the SFRA. Nevertheless, it is considered that the site could accommodate a range of sustainable drainage measures to ensure that any surface water is appropriately controlled within the site and does not exceed existing greenfield run off rates. Given the size of the site this could include the use of appropriate landscape features such of swales, attenuation ponds etc.

Highways

3.16 We consider that the site is fully deliverable in terms of highway access and capacity. The previous planning application (planning reference no: 63/2008/8466) for residential development on the site was accompanied by a detailed Transport Assessment. The Assessment showed that an appropriate access could be achieved from Otley Road as well as through the adjoining residential estate roads such as Elsey Croft and Wensleydale Avenue. Additional pedestrian access could be provided from Wensleydale Avenue, which would provide a convenient route to Skipton Town Centre with its services, facilities and public transport links. The Assessment demonstrated that the local highway network had adequate capacity to accommodate the traffic likely to be generated by the proposed allocation.

Achievability

3.17 Paragraph 47 of the Framework states that for a site to be achievable there should be a reasonable prospect that housing will start being delivered on the site within the first five years of the plan period. As demonstrated, the site is fully achievable and there are no constraints that would impede its delivery. Furthermore, as a leading property consultancy in the area, Carter Jonas LLP considers that there is clear market demand for housing development on the site because of its location and attractive locality. This is exemplified by the developer interest in the site and development commencing on the commitment to the south.

4 GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 As a starting point before dealing with the policies and proposals, we have a number of general comments to make regarding the Publication Plan:

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	039	Organisation	North Yorkshire County Council		
Section or Policy		GEN		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	039/01/GEN/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Thank you for consulting North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) on the Publication Draft of the Craven Local Plan. NYCC welcomes the opportunity to continue to engage with Craven District Council on the preparation of the Local Plan and considers this part of the ongoing dialogue under the requirements of the Duty to Co-operate. We are encouraged to see the plan progress to its publication stage.

This submission is made as a corporate response of the County Council and includes representations received from across NYCC service areas. Please note this submission includes comments from North Yorkshire County Council in its capacity of Local Highway Authority (LHA).

The following response has been endorsed by the Business and Environmental Service Portfolio Holders:

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      016      Organisation      Skipton Properties Ltd

Section or Policy      GEN

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      016/06/GEN/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

## PUBICATION DRAFT CRAVEN LOCAL PLAN

### REPRESENTATIONS ON BEHAF OF SKIPTON PROPERTIES LIMITED

#### 1. Introduction

1.1 This representation is submitted on behalf of Skipton Properties Ltd (“SPL”) in relation to the soundness of the ‘Publication Draft Craven Local Plan’ (“Draft Local Plan”).

1.2 Craven District Council (“the Council”) published its Draft Local Plan for consultation on 2nd January 2018. The Council are consulting upon the Draft Local Plan until 13th February 2018. The consultation comprises a number of documents, including: the Draft Local Plan document and appendices, Policies Map, Statement of Consultation, Statement of Representations Procedure and a Sustainability Report. In addition, the Council have also published a number of supporting documents.

#### 2. Legal Context

2.1 Section 20(5)(b) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires an Inspector at an independent examination to determine whether a Development Plan Document is “sound”.

#### 3. National Policy Framework

3.1 Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”) explains “soundness” as follows:

“The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is “sound” – namely that it is:

- ☑ Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- ☑ Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- ☑ Effective – the plan should be delivered over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic properties; and
- ☑ Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.”

3.2 Paragraph 158 of the NPPF refers to the use of a proportionate evidence base and states:

“Each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.”

3.3 In addition, we note guidance published by the Planning Advisory Service entitled ‘Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist’ (March 2014). This guidance, although advisory, enables the preparation of a robust Local Plan which is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

3.4 The Soundness Checklist advises that in terms of being “justified” the plan should be based on a robust and credible evidence base involving:

- ☑ Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are backed up by facts.
- ☑ Evidence of participation of the local community and others having a stake in the area.

3.5 In terms of the plan being the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, the Soundness Checklist advises that these alternatives should

be realistic and subject to sustainability appraisal. The plan should show how the policies and proposals help to ensure that the social, environmental, economic and resource use objectives of sustainability will be achieved.

3.6 With regards to the test of “effective”, the Soundness Checklist advises that this means the plan should be deliverable, requiring evidence of:

- ☑ Sound infrastructure delivery planning;
- ☑ Having no regulatory or national planning barriers to delivery;
- ☑ Delivery partners who are signed up to it;
- ☑ Coherence with the strategies of neighbouring authorities, including neighbouring marine planning authorities; and
- ☑ The plan should be flexible and able to be monitored.

3.7 The Soundness Checklist advises that the plan should be flexible to deal with changing circumstances, which may involve minor changes to respond to the outcome of the monitoring process or more significant changes to respond to problems such as lack of funding for major infrastructure proposals.

3.8 The NPPF contains a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 14 provides:

“At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision-taking.

For plan-making this means that:

- ☑ Local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area;
- ☑ Local plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:
  - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
  - specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted...”

3.9 One of the Core Planning Principles contained in the NPPF (at paragraph 17) is to:

“proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the county needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of the area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities.”

(our emphasis)

3.10 Paragraph 28 of the NPPF supports a prosperous local economy and states that importance of sustainable rural tourism:

“support sustainable rural tourism and leisure development that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which represent the character of the countryside. This should include supporting the provisions and expansion of tourist and visitor facilities in appropriate locations where identified needs are not met by existing facilities in the rural service centres.”

(our emphasis)

#### 4. Assessment of the Draft Local Plan

##### 4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 An assessment of the Draft Local Plan and its supporting documents has been undertaken to establish whether its policies are “sound” with particular regard to the policies relating to Housing Mix and Density, Affordable Housing, Planning Obligations and Education Provision.

4.1.2 The Craven plan area is located in North Yorkshire. The Craven District is approximately 1,777 square kilometres and the remainder of the Craven District lies within the Yorkshire Dales National Park (“YDNP”). The Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority (“YDNPA”) is a separate planning authority which produces its own Local Plan.

4.1.3 The current local plan for Craven consists of the ‘saved’ policies of the Craven District Local Plan (1999).

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      019                      Organisation      Keyhaven Homes

Section or Policy	GEN	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference	SK101, SK114, SK119	Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Skipton	Representation Reference	019/01/GEN/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

### 1.0 Executive Summary

1.1 The detailed representations contained in this statement have been prepared in response to the Publication Draft Craven Local Plan on behalf of Keyhaven Homes who own / control sites SK101, SK114 and SK119.

1.2 The key points raised in these representations are:-

- We support the proposed allocation of Sites SK101 and SK114 in principle.
- We object to the Site SK119 no longer being proposed as a housing allocation. The Council’s pre-publication draft assessment of the site suggested it was landlocked and the response to our representations states that it is not proposed as an allocation as access is dependent on the adjoining site with consent being developed. The site is accessible through Site SK114 which is in the same ownership and an access road from SK114 to SK119 has been approved as part of the Reserved Matters for site SK114 (see Appendix 2 and 3). Access to the site is therefore not a constraint to development and the site can be delivered in the 15 year plan period.
- The Council has not considered all reasonable options for meeting housing need. Policy SP1 (Meeting Housing Need) is not set at a level which will deliver market and affordable housing need and there is no justifiable reason why the Council cannot meet the identified need.
- The expected yield for proposed allocations is based on 32 dwellings per hectare which is not considered to be achievable in Skipton. Given the yield of proposed allocations in Skipton only just meets the proposed distribution, if just one site does not come forward at this density, the identified need for Skipton will not be met. Additional sites therefore need to be identified to address this.
- The reduction in the proposed affordable housing provision from 40% to 30% is welcomed but it is still expected that this level of provision will be too high on sites in Skipton due to higher than average build costs associated with the topography and weather in this locality.

1.3The following sections of this statement provide detailed comments and evidence to support the key issues highlighted above.

### 2.0Introduction

2.1These representations have been prepared in response to the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan on behalf of Keyhaven Homes.

2.2 These representations are made in the specific context of following three sites in Skipton:-

- SK101 – East of Keighley Road and south of Cawder Lane (3.99 ha)
- SK114 – Cawder Hill / Horse Close and Garages off Cawder Road (8.28 ha)
- SK119 – Land South of Whinny Gill Reservoir (6.57 ha)

2.3 Sites SK101 and SK114 have been identified as potential housing sites in the Publication Draft Local Plan and are being promoted for residential allocation by Keyhaven Homes who have an interest in these sites.

2.4 Site SK119 was proposed as a residential allocation in the pre-publication draft consultation in April / May 2016. This site is no longer being proposed as a housing allocation as the Council's re-assessment of the site concluded that a suitable access cannot be achieved without the adjoining consented site being developed. The representation statement prepared in relation to the pre-publication draft along with the associated highways statement that was appended, demonstrated that a suitable access could be achieved and the site should be allocated for housing.

### 3.0 Site Description

3.1 The three potential housing sites lie to the south and south east of Skipton.

3.2 Sites SK114 and SK119 lie adjacent to housing commitment site 114, which is also under the control of Keyhaven homes. These sites would therefore form a natural extension to the settlement in conjunction with the development of the housing commitment site.

3.3 Site SK101 lies to the south of Skipton and would also form a natural extension to the existing settlement.

3.4 The sites have no previous planning history relevant to their promotion for a residential allocation.

3.5 The EA flood map shows that the sites lie within Flood Zone 1 and are therefore at the lowest risk of flooding and sequentially preferable.

3.6 There are no known physical constraints that would prevent the development of these sites.

### Representation Structure & National Planning Policy Framework Tests of Soundness

4.1 These representations have been prepared in relation to the Local Plan Consultation Draft and are based upon a review of the following:-

- o Publication Draft Craven Local Plan Consultation Document
- o Residential Site Selection Process Background Paper (June 2017)
- o Policy Response Paper (January 2018)

oSite Response Paper (January 2018)  
oHousing Growth Option Paper: Addendum (November 2017)  
oSHMA Update (November 2017)

National Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

4.2The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27th March 2012 and therefore the emerging Local Plan should be prepared in accordance with the guidance set out in the NPPF.

4.3Paragraphs 150 to 185 of the NPPF relate to plan-making. Paragraph 151 advises that local plans must be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development and therefore they should be consistent with the principles and policies set out in the Framework, including the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

4.4Paragraph 154 requires plans to be aspirational but realistic. Paragraph 178 advises that public bodies have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those which relate to strategic priorities.

NPPF Tests of Soundness / European SEA Directive and Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

4.5When the Local Plan is examined by an independent Inspector, the document will be assessed on the basis of whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound.

4.6Our response therefore gives due consideration to the Pre-Publication Draft and the associated evidence based on the four tests of soundness set out in the NPPF.

4.7Paragraph 182 of the NPPF states:-

“A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is “sound” – namely that it is:

- Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development.
- Justified - the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

4.8In addition, the representations focus on the legal duty to comply with the European SEA Directive – 2001/42/EC and the Environmental Assessment of Plans and



Programmes Regulations 2004. The Directive and the Regulations require the need for:

- 1.Environmental reports to be of sufficient quality and provide proper information to allow consideration of all the potential effects
- 2.Sufficient detail to allow the public to understand why the plan is said to be sound.
- 3.An accurate and equal assessment of the alternatives to the chosen strategy / policy and explanation as to why they were not considered to be the best option.

4.9For the plan to be found sound it will be necessary for the Council to be able to demonstrate that all alternative options were duly considered.

#### 6.0Conclusions

6.1These representations have been prepared on behalf of Keyhaven Homes who are promoting three sites for allocation in Skipton (SK101, SK114 and SK119).

6.2Sites SK101 and SK114 have been identified as potential housing sites in the Draft Local Plan, with the extent of site SK114 having been extended. We support the allocation of these sites.

6.3Site SK119 was proposed as a housing site at the previous consultation stage. However, it is no longer identified as a proposed allocation as the Council consider there is not a suitable access into the site. Whilst access into the site is to be gained from the adjoining housing commitment site, the two sites are in the same ownership and an access spur has been incorporated into the reserved matters approval for the site. The site is therefore deliverable within the 15 year plan period.

6.4Site SK119 should be identified as a proposed housing allocation in its own right but also in the context of the Council's background evidence which suggests there are insufficient sites in Skipton to support higher housing growth options and even in the event the housing growth option chosen remained unchanged, the allocations identified in Skipton are only just sufficient to meet the identified need based on all sites delivering at 32 dwellings per hectare, such that if just one site does not come forward as expected, then the identified need will not be met. In this regard, the allocation of site SK119 will also provide choice and flexibility in ensuring the identified need for Skipton can be met.

6.5Keyhaven Homes welcomes the proposed change to Draft Policy H2 which seeks to secure 30% affordable housing on developments of 11 dwellings or more or 1,000 sqm or more although it is maintained that as result of the higher than average build costs associated with developing in Skipton and the £1000 per sqm transfer rate that is applied, affordable housing would still be delivered at a loss resulting in viability issues.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	To engage in discussion regarding the issue of soundness highlighted in the representation statement.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	---

Respondent ID      008                      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy                      GEN

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?                      Not Specified

Site Reference                      SK089 an SK090

Plan is DtC Compliant?              Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Skipton

Representation Reference      008/30/GEN/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

## 7 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 These representations have been prepared on behalf of the Wilman family to the draft Local Plan in general and the proposals as they affect their land and property at Elsey Croft, off Otley Road to the east of Skipton.

7.2 These representations seek to raise a number of general concerns regarding the "soundness" of the Local Plan document in terms of the Plan period, the Duty to Co-operate, housing numbers and whether the Council has allocated sufficient land to deliver housing across the Plan period and beyond, particularly around Skipton the principal settlement. In particular whilst it is welcomed that a phasing policy is not being implemented it is important that the Council presents a realistic trajectory and site assessment to ensure that there is a constant supply of sites delivering housing across the Plan period and beyond. This is both for consistency and to ensure that there is certainty for infrastructure planning, investment and funding.

7.3 Land at north of Elsey Croft (SK089 and SK090) is in the Wilman family and Craven District Council's ownership. Both are willing land owners and the site is available. In principle the allocation of the site is accepted and welcomed; the family will work positively and collaboratively with the planning authority in bringing the site forward. This general area is suitable (with mitigation), available, achievable and deliverable.

7.4 That said since the Regulation 18 consultation of Summer 2017, the addition of a proposal for a primary school and nursery has changed the nature of the draft allocation. Having considered the effect of a 1.8ha requirement upon the site and the constraints of topography, slope and a watercourse/flood risk it is expected that the housing yield calculated from the site (218 units) is likely to be over optimistic; our assessment indicates 130 units (Option 1), Appendix 2. Given that the Council has only identified sufficient land to deliver the housing requirement for Skipton, we consider that the draft Local Plan is unsound.

7.5 To address this point two options have been explored and presented in the Appendices. Option 2 (Appendix 3) considers flipping the draft school site to the east on to land which better meets the Education Authority's site selection criteria and cost constraints. A third option (Option 3) included at Appendix 4 seeks to extend the entire allocation on to land to the east. It is considered that this should be the option submitted for Examination. It provides more certainty that the Plan's objectives (in respect of housing delivery) will be met and provides more certainty for the delivery of infrastructure, such as the primary school with nursery provision.

7.6 Amendments to Policy SP5 are proposed, which we suggest should include an individual plan showing the extent of the draft allocations. Proposed changes to the wording of the relevant parts of SP5 are set out at Appendix 5.

7.7 Of the series of supporting studies set out in the Regulation 18 representations, only the highways study has been commissioned at this stage and is attached at Appendix 6. This suggests that access into the extended (SK089/SK090) Elsey Croft allocation should not be problematic, through the residential estates to the south and west, and with potential for a principal access point from the A6069 Otley Road to the north. Additional studies will be completed once these representations have been submitted and the Council has reflected upon them.

7.8 A series of the response forms are included at Appendix 7. These request an opportunity to attend the relevant Hearings of the Examination process. The need for attendance will be informed by the extent to which the suggested changes are taken on board and whether more general concerns on soundness are addressed.

7.9 It is hoped that Craven Council find these comments helpful in progressing a sound Local Plan towards Examination and adoption. Carter Jonas and the Wilman family look forward to working cooperatively with the Council to bring the site forward.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



☐ Craven Local Plan – first draft version (November 2014);

☐ Craven Local Plan – second draft version (May 2016);

☐ Craven Local Plan – pre-submission version (July 2017).

### 1.3 National Policy

1.3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out four tests that must be met for Local Plans to be considered sound. In this regard, we submit that in order to prepare a sound plan it is fundamental that it is:

☐ Positively Prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;

☐ Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on a proportionate evidence base;

☐ Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross boundary strategic priorities; and

☐ Consistent with National Policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

### 1.4 The White Paper

1.4.1 The Government White Paper ('Fixing our Broken Housing Market') issued in February 2017 is a very clear statement from Government on the importance of the delivery of housing to the wider economy.

1.4.2 The Government are in no doubt that the housing market in Britain is broken which, according to the Prime Minister, is one of the greatest barriers to progress in the country today.

1.4.3 Average house costs are almost eight times average earnings which is an all-time record and soaring prices and rising rents caused by a shortage of the right homes in the right places has slammed the door of the housing market in the face of a whole generation

1.4.4 The reason for this crisis is that the Country is simply not building enough homes and has not done so for far too long. The consensus is that we need from 225,000 to 275,000 or more homes per year to keep up with population growth and to start to tackle years of under-supply.

1.4.5 Everyone involved in politics and the housing industry therefore has a moral duty to tackle this issue head on. The White Paper states quite unequivocally that 'the housing shortage isn't a looming crisis, a distant threat that will become a problem if we fail to act. We are already living in it.'

1.4.6 Tackling the housing shortage is not easy. It will inevitably require some tough decisions. But the alternative, according to the White Paper, is a divided nation, with an unbridgeable and ever-widening gap between the property haves and have-nots.

1.4.7 The challenge of increasing supply cannot be met by Government alone. It is vital to have local leadership and commitment from a wide range of stakeholders, including local authorities, private developers, housing associations, lenders and local communities.

1.4.8 The starting point is building more homes. This will slow the rise in housing costs so that more ordinary working families can afford to buy a home and it will also bring the cost of renting down. We need more land for homes where people want to live. All areas therefore need a plan to deal with the housing pressures they face.

1.4.9 Currently, over 40 per cent of local planning authorities do not have a plan that meets the projected growth in households in their area. All local authorities should therefore develop an up-to-date plan with their communities that meets their housing requirement based upon an honest assessment of the need for new homes.

1.4.10 Local planning authorities have a responsibility to do all that they can to meet their housing requirements, even though not every area may be able to do so in full. The identified housing requirement should be accommodated in the Local Plan, unless there are policies elsewhere in the National Planning Policy Framework that provide strong reasons for restricting development, or the adverse impacts of meeting this requirement would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Where an authority has demonstrated that it is unable to meet all of its housing requirement, it must be able to work constructively with neighbouring authorities to ensure the remainder is met.

1.4.11 Plans should be reviewed regularly, and are likely to require updating in whole or in part at least every five years. An authority will also need to update their plan if their existing housing target can no longer be justified against their objectively assessed housing requirement.

1.4.12 Policies in Local Plans should also allow a good mix of sites to come forward for development, so that there is choice for consumers, places can grow in ways that are sustainable, and there are opportunities for a diverse construction sector including opportunities for SME housebuilders to deliver much needed housing.

1.4.13 In terms of rural areas, the Government expects local planning authorities to identify opportunities for villages to thrive, especially where this would support services

and help meet the need to provide homes for local people who currently find it hard to live where they grew up. It is clear that improving the availability and affordability of homes in rural areas is vital for sustaining rural communities, alongside action to support jobs and services. There are opportunities to go further to support a good mix of sites and meet rural housing needs, especially where scope exists to expand settlements in a way which is sustainable and helps provide homes for local people. This is especially important in those rural areas where a high demand for homes makes the cost of housing a particular challenge for local people.

1.4.14 Finally, the Government have made it clear through the White Paper that local planning authorities are expected to have clear policies for addressing the housing requirements of groups with particular needs, such as older and disabled people.

1.4.15 The White Paper is the cornerstone of future Government policy on fixing the broken housing market. It provides the direction of travel the Government is intending to take and is a clear statement of intent that this Government is serious about the provision of the right number of houses in the right places. The Local Plan therefore needs to consider these policy intentions now in order to ensure that it fulfils the Government's agenda and provides the homes that its local communities need.

1.4.16 Following the election, Sajid Javid re-iterated the Government's intentions for boosting housing growth stating that he wants areas that have benefitted from soaring property prices to play their role in solving the housing crisis. Mr Javid pointed out that where property prices were particularly unaffordable, local leaders would need to take a long, hard and honest look to see if they are planning for the right number of homes.

1.4.17 Consultation on the new proposed standardised methodology for calculating housing need took place in late 2017. The Council will therefore need to consider the implications of this consultation going forward.

1.4.18 More recently, in October 2017, the Prime Minister reaffirmed the Government's commitment to addressing the broken housing market by bringing forward measures to boost home ownership and housing supply, stating:

"I will dedicate my premiership to fixing this problem – to restoring hope. To renewing the British Dream for a new generation of people. And that means fixing our broken housing market."

"For 30 or 40 years we simply haven't built enough homes. As a result, prices have risen so much that the average home now costs almost 8 times average earnings. And that's been a disaster for young people in particular."

1.4.19 Furthermore, in a message to housebuilders, the Prime Minister indicated that:

"We, the government, will make sure the land is available. We'll make sure our young people have the skills you need. In return, you must do your duty to Britain and build the homes our country needs."

1.4.20 The Autumn Budget 2017 brought further details of the Government's commitment to building a Britain that is 'fit for the future'. A prominent feature of this is tackling the housing crisis, with housebuilding featuring prominently amongst the Chancellor's announcements, which included further confirmation that:

"The Government is determined to fix the broken housing market, and restore the dream of home ownership for a new generation."

1.4.21 The affordability of housing for young people is a key challenge for the Government, and whilst it is recognised that there is no 'single magic bullet' to solve the housing crisis, the Government is actively seeking to tackle obstacles standing in the way of first-time buyers. The Government sees a 'big step up' in new house building as an important element in its strategy to address the acute affordability problem and has set a goal to build 300,000 homes a year by the mid-2020s.

1.4.22 The vital importance of housing to the economic success of our cities and regions is also highlighted in the Government White Paper "Industrial Strategy: building a Britain fit for the Future", which was published in November 2017. This includes reference to the introduction of planning reforms that will ensure more land is available for housing, and that better use is made of underused land in our cities and towns. It also sets out the challenge to raise housing supply to 300,000 per year before the end of the current Parliament. The Government wants to support places with ambitious and innovative plans to build additional homes where they are needed, and those which will support wider economic growth. Furthermore, the Government wants to support greater collaboration between councils, a more strategic approach to the planning of housing and infrastructure, more innovation and high quality design in new homes and the creation of the right conditions for new private investment.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      027                      Organisation      Giggleswick School

Section or Policy                      GEN

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?                      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?              Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Giggleswick

Representation Reference      027/10/GEN/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

## 7. Conclusion

7.1 The ability of Giggleswick School to deliver a small number of high quality residential developments is critical to its ability to generate investment funds. This is particularly the case given the current scarcity of public sector investment. The ability to deliver such developments is essential to enable the School to undertake much-needed maintenance of and improvements to its facilities, whilst the opportunities themselves will contribute towards meeting housing needs and improving the quality of life for communities in the local area. The School is experienced at delivering residential development opportunities.

7.2 The School strongly supports the allocation of the land at Lord's Close for residential development. The residential development of the land is required to:

- Meet the housing needs of the local community in this part of the District.
- Facilitate the delivery of much-needed new and improved sports facilities and open space within the School's estate.

7.3 The land at Lords Close is suitable, available and achievable for residential development. The land is demonstrably deliverable and it is envisaged that the new homes will be developed within five years of the adoption of the Local Plan. As such, the School considers that the allocation of the land is sound.

7.4 Notwithstanding the above, the School objects to the content of the PDLP which:

- Seeks to unnecessarily suppress the rate of housing development across the District. In this regard, it is considered that there is a lack of alignment between the housing OAN and employment OAN, and the rationale for the rejection of a higher housing requirement is flawed.
- Disproportionately constrains the amount of growth proposed in the Tier 4 villages and in Giggleswick in particular.
- Proposes to designate the land south of Riverside (SG015) as 'Open Space, Civic Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities' (Policy INF3) despite the current inability to viably use the site for such a purpose. The School considers that such land should be allocated for residential development.
- Proposes to designate the land south of Church Street (SG004), also referred to as the 'Glebe Field', as 'Local Green Space' (Policy ENV10), despite the land not having the attributes required in this respect.

7.5 In respect of the above points, the School considers that the content of the PDLP is unsound and respectfully requests that it is amended accordingly. We trust that these representations are helpful to CDC as it continues to progress the emerging Local Plan. The School would welcome discussions with CDC about the content of this report.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      027      Organisation      Giggleswick School

Section or Policy      GEN

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Giggleswick

Representation Reference      027/01/GEN/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### 1. Introduction

1.1 This Report is prepared by Turley on behalf of our client Giggleswick School (hereafter referred to as “the School”). It provides representations to Craven District Council (CDC) regarding the Publication Draft Craven Local Plan<sup>1</sup> (December 2017) (PDLP) which is currently the subject of public consultation. It also provides comments on other relevant “background documents” which comprise the underpinning evidence base for the PDLP.

1.2 CDC will be aware that in response to previous Local Plan consultations in the preceding three years the School has promoted the following sites in Giggleswick village – all of which are within its ownership – for a mix of sports and housing development:

- Land adjacent to Lords Close and Sandholme Close (ref. SG014)
- South of Riversdale (ref. SG015)
- South of Church Street, east of Tems Street (also referred to as ‘The Glebe Field’) (ref. SG004)
- Land at Eshton’s playing field, west of Raines Road

1.3 These sites and the School’s intentions for them are discussed in Section 6 of this Report.

#### Overview

1.4 The School welcomes CDC’s progress with the emerging Local Plan and the changes which have been made from the Pre-Publication Draft version made available in June 2017. In particular, the School strongly supports the allocation of its land at Lord’s Close for residential development (reference: SG014), the development of which is required to meet housing needs and facilitate the delivery of much-needed new and improved sports facilities and open space within the School’s estate.

1.5 However, the School remains concerned with some aspects of the PDLP, including:

- The scale of housing growth proposed across the District and in the Tier 4 villages; and
- The proposed designation of the Schools land at Church Street (reference: SG004) and south of Riverdale (reference: SG015) as Local Green Space (Policy ENV10) and Open Space (Policy INF3) respectively.

1.6 The School’s concerns are set out in detail in this report and it respectfully requests that CDC reconsiders the content of the emerging Local Plan accordingly.

#### Structure

1.7 The remainder of this Report is structured as follows:

- Section 2: Giggleswick School
- Section 3: Policy Context
- Section 4: The District-Wide Housing Need
- Section 5: The Need for Housing in Giggleswick
- Section 6: Development Opportunities in Giggleswick

- Section 7: Conclusion

## 2. Giggleswick School

2.1 Giggleswick School is an independent co-educational day and boarding school which caters for children of all ages. The School was founded on approximately half an acre of land in the early 16th Century. Over the last 500 years it has steadily grown in size and today the campus comprises several sites across the Giggleswick village, including the principal school buildings and chapel to the north, boarding houses in the heart of the village itself, and sports pitches/playing fields located towards the centre and south.

2.2 The School has a rich history and has played an instrumental role in the growth and development of Giggleswick village. The village has grown in tandem with – and indeed because of – the success of the School. The School continues to play a crucial and active role in village life, with regular sporting and social events, whilst a significant number of residents living in the local area work on the campus, either as part of the educational team or in maintaining and managing the School's estate. The School is therefore a major asset both for Giggleswick and Craven as a whole; it is a significant local employer, has a critical role in the economic and cultural vitality of the area, and raises the profile of the District both in the UK and internationally.

2.3 The School operates at a high level and is recognised for the exemplary education which it provides to its students. However, it faces ongoing competition with other similar educational establishments throughout the north of England and beyond. The future sustainability and success of Giggleswick School is dependent upon its ability to maintain its high standards and its highly regarded reputation, and to provide an attractive “offer” for prospective UK and international students. It is therefore critically important for the School to continue its programme of investment, to maintain and enhance both its education and recreational facilities.

2.4 Mindful of the School's charitable status, the development of small-scale but high quality residential developments which are well integrated into the built fabric of the village has been essential in providing finance to underpin the expansion and improvement of the School's campus. In the last 10 years, the revenue from such developments has enabled the investment of £13m in new facilities to give the School the best possible classrooms and sports and cultural facilities. This includes a new £1.5 million Sports Hall and the Richard Whiteley Theatre which hosts a full programme of live productions, music and dance as well as being used for drama lessons and cocurricular clubs and societies. These facilities are essential in enabling the School to compete in the market place, but have also conveyed direct benefits to the local community who make use of the facilities.

2.5 To this end the School has identified a small number of future opportunities to generate investment funds for further much-needed improvements to its campus. The opportunities themselves will contribute towards meeting the housing and sporting needs of the local area in the interests of improving the quality of life in the wider community. The School remains keen to work with CDC to realise these opportunities.

## 3. Policy Context

3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides the overarching policy context for the emerging Local Plan. In this regard, insofar as its policies are relevant to this representation, the NPPF requires local planning authorities to:

- “...boost significantly the supply of housing...” (paragraph 47);
- “...identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations....” (paragraph 50);
- “...ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing...” (paragraph 47);
- Ensure that their Local Plan incorporates “...sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change...” (paragraph 14);
- “...plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area...” (paragraph 16). Indeed, the need to “plan positively” is one of the four tests of soundness;
- Ensure “...that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth...” (paragraph 19);
- Ensure that Local Plans are “...aspirational but realistic...” (paragraph 154);
- Ensure that their Local Plans not only meet needs but also respond “...positively to wider opportunities for growth...” (paragraph 17); and
- Conserve and enhance the natural environment (paragraph 109).

3.2 We refer to other policies of the NPPF, as well as the national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), elsewhere in this Report.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      010      Organisation      United Utilities Water Ltd

Section or Policy      GEN

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      010/01/GEN/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Thank you for your consultation seeking the views of United Utilities as part of the Development Plan process.

United Utilities wishes to build a strong partnership with all Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to aid sustainable development and growth within its area of operation. We aim to proactively identify future development needs and share our information. This helps:

- ensure a strong connection between development and infrastructure planning;
- deliver sound planning strategies; and
- inform our future infrastructure investment submissions for determination by our regulator.

When preparing the Development Plan and future policies, we can most appropriately manage the impact of development on our infrastructure if development is identified in locations where infrastructure is available with existing capacity. It may be necessary to co-ordinate the delivery of development with the delivery of infrastructure in some circumstances.

Upon adoption, the emerging Craven Local Plan will represent the key planning document for the District, setting the level and general location of new development to meet its future needs to 2032. The Local Plan will also identify specific development sites intended to contribute to the achievement of the wider development targets for the District.

United Utilities wishes to submit the following comments to the Council for consideration as part of the current 'Publication Version' Local Plan consultation. Our comments are submitted in accordance with the consultation deadline of 13th February 2018.

#### Summary

Moving forward, we respectfully request that the Council continues to consult with United Utilities for all future planning documents. We are keen to continue working in partnership with the Council to ensure that all new growth can be delivered sustainably, and with the necessary infrastructure available, in line with the Council's delivery targets.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      012      Organisation      Gladman Developments Limited

Section or Policy      GEN

Plan is Legally Compliant?      No

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      No

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      012/14/GEN/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

### 5.1 General Comments

5.1.1 Having considered the submission version of the Craven Local Plan, Gladman are concerned about a range of matters including the housing requirement as well as several of the detailed development. The plan must be positively prepared, effective, justified and consistent with national policy to be found sound at examination. In the first instance the Council must start with clearly defining and NPPF and PPG compliant OAN by developing an unconstrained requirement which properly follows the guidelines as set out at the national level.

5.1.2 Careful consideration also needs to be given to the spatial strategy that forms the basis of the spatial distribution of growth across the district. It is important that all sustainable settlements should be allowed to play their part in meeting their own housing and employment needs as well as contributing to the wider district requirement. A flexible approach to delivering the development needs of the district will ensure the plan's ultimate success.

### 5.2 Test of soundness

5.2.1 GDL reiterate the importance of the tests of soundness when progressing with the Craven Local Plan. The Framework sets out four tests that must be met for Local Plans to be considered sound. In this regard, we submit that in order for the Craven Local Plan to be sound it is fundamental that it is:

- ☑ Positively Prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- ☑ Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence base;
- ☑ Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross boundary strategic priorities; and
- ☑ Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	039	Organisation	North Yorkshire County Council		
Section or Policy		GEN		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	039/21/GEN/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Planning Services

Please take into account the safeguarding policies in the emerging Minerals and Waste Joint Plan.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      046      Organisation      Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Bolton Abbey

Section or Policy      GEN

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      Bolton Abbey      Representation Reference      046/02/GEN/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Summary Comments and Detailed Comments on Publication Draft Craven Local Plan 2018

Please find below comments made by Rural Solutions (RSL) on behalf of Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST) (Bolton Abbey Estate) to the Publication Draft Craven Local Plan 2018 (PDCLP) by Craven District Council as the relevant Local Planning Authority (LPA).

It is important that comments on the PDCLP are considered in the context of both CST's previous comments on earlier CDC Local Plan drafts and with regard to the policy framework relating to Bolton Abbey in the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority's adopted Local Plan 2016.

This document and the comments on the (PDCLP) is therefore set out in the following sections:

Section 1: Summary of comments on the PDCLP

Section 2: A summary of CST's previous comments on earlier Local Plan drafts by CDC

Section 3: An assessment of the policy framework relating to Bolton Abbey in the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority's adopted Local Plan 2016

Section 4: Detailed comments on content of the PDCLP as it relates specifically to Bolton Abbey (including clarification on minor changes since the Third Pre-Publication Draft Local Plan 2017).

Section 5: Detailed comments on other areas of the PDCLP

Section 6: Comments on the Soundness of the PDCLP (as it relates to the policy approach to Bolton Abbey)

Section 7: Comments relating to the Duty to Co-operate (as it relates to the policy approach to Bolton Abbey)

General Comments

CST principally wishes to STRONGLY SUPPORT the policy approach (Draft Policy EC4/EC4a and settlement hierarchy) to supporting development at Bolton Abbey in the PDCLP.

By way of context, CST's Yorkshire Estate provides 160 full time equivalent jobs at Bolton Abbey, manages 450,000 visitors per year and contributes c.£8m of enabled Gross Value Added to the local economy each year (Source: New Economics Foundation). It therefore provides social, economic and environmental benefits far beyond "just the estate".

However, CST needs to diversify its visitor offer at Bolton Abbey to address various issues, including: little secondary spend; no sense of arrival; vulnerability of operation due to bad weather/school holidays, no play areas, no mid-range visitor accommodation, major planning constraints, increased competition, high maintenance costs, services (eg subsidised post office) at risk.

Since 2009 CST has therefore been looking at ways to address these pressing issues in its Core Visitor Area (CVA from Bolton Bridge to Barden Tower, including land in both CDC and the YDNP), gathering related evidence and participated in the preparation of related local plans. As such, CST has engaged extensively with CDC and the YDNPA to

provide a policy framework for development over the periods covered by respective Local Plans (though it should be noted that CST's proposals address a timeframe that runs from the short-term to 20-50 years in the future).

The policy approach included in the draft CDCLP and particularly draft policy EC4a has been developed in a collaborative way between CST, CDC and other key stakeholders, principally Historic England (HE) and the YDNPA, over many years and addresses the need for development in that part of the CVA which falls within the CDC plan-area in a positive way.

A significant amount of resources has therefore been invested by CST and CDC in identifying a policy-based approach to support development at Bolton Abbey, and CST would like to thank CDC for its input in this regard.

Bolton Abbey village (as well as the wider Bolton Abbey CVA) falls partly within the CDC plan-area and partly within the YDNPA plan-area. The policy approach of including the village in the settlement hierarchy of the CDCLP is consistent with the approach taken in the Yorkshire Dales Local Plan adopted on December 20th 2016. CST STRONGLY SUPPORTS the inclusion of Bolton Abbey within Tier 4b of the settlement hierarchy in the PDCLP.

CST considers that the approach taken by the draft plan reflects a positive and cogent approach to cross-boundary working in this part of the plan-area. It is very clear that the duty to cooperate (as it relates to this part of the plan area) has been met.

CST SUPPORTS draft policy EC4 (TOURISM). In particular, the provision of an over-arching tourism policy that provides support for the multi-faceted parts of the tourism industry is considered to be beneficial. In CST's view it is right that an over-arching tourism policy is included in the Local Plan, as proposed by CDC. The policy's specific spatial reference to supporting tourism development at Bolton Abbey/Bolton Abbey Railway Station is supported.

CST STRONGLY SUPPORTS draft policy EC4a (TOURISM-LED DEVELOPMENT AT BOLTON ABBEY). For some time now, CST's visitor operation has been diminished by factors including: bad weather; little secondary spend; high maintenance costs; increased competition; major planning constraints; lack of sense of arrival; limited visitor accommodation; limited staff accommodation; services at risk; no play areas. Draft policy EC4a provides the positive policy framework which allows CST to diversify the visitor offer at Bolton Abbey.

CST has reviewed the Sustainability Appraisal of policy EC4a Tourism-Led Development at Bolton Abbey and supports the findings that there will be numerous Major Positive Effects of the policy and no negative effects.

As well as strongly supporting the policy and the sustainability appraisal of it, CST also CONSIDERS the policy to be sound, as qualified in section 6 of this document. The policy approach is based upon a very strong and robust evidence-based document. In particular, the Bolton Abbey Development Options Appraisal Study (BADOAS) 2017 by planning consultants Lichfields for CST appraises four strategic development options for delivering development in the CVA. This appraisal draws on a suite of robust technical evidence documents, as listed later in this representation, and presents an evidenced based piece of work akin to an SEA (Strategic Environmental Assessment). The related appraisal highlights a clear preferred (optimal) option as:

“‘Composite’ development clustered around both Bolton Abbey village AND Bolton Bridge with some limited development (e.g. small age-specific play areas) throughout the CVA.”

The approach taken in the draft PDCLP to development in that part of the CVA within the plan-area aligns with the findings of the BADOAS report and the preferred option



outlined above.

CST SUPPORTS the inclusion of a footnote at p.188 of the PDCLP which references the Bolton Abbey Development Options Appraisals Study (BADOAS) document produced on behalf of CST which provides a detailed justification for the approach taken in draft policy EC4a.

The policy proposals incorporated within the PDCLP are considered to meet all four tests of soundness as set out in paragraph 182 of the NPPF.

Development proposed by CST in part of the plan-area covered by the PDCLP can be considered to enhance to the area and provide key benefits including:

- Public open greenspace;
- An attractive focal point to Bolton Abbey village;
- Improved amenity;
- An increased awareness of the former Barnyard area in Bolton Abbey village;
- A much greater choice of high quality accommodation for visitors/staff/others;
- Renewable energy supply;
- An enhanced sense of arrival/departure for visitors;
- Heritage-themed learning-through-play facilities;
- One of the few wet weather play facility in the Dales area;
- Sale of local/organic/estate produce;
- Better access to/from Bolton Abbey Station;
- Improved road safety;
- Homes for young people (e.g. subsidised housing, as is the case for existing staff);
- Office or other work-space units; and,
- 37 extra full-time equivalent high quality/value jobs.

The policy framework in the draft PDCLP will provide a means to deliver many of these benefits in a sustainable way, with the greatest proportion of “hard” development in the CVA taking place in the PDCLP plan-area.

Many of these benefits will synergise with the benefits of the current restoration of the Tithe Barn (built c.1520) to create a wedding venue. The Tithe Barn is a major part of the proposals for Bolton Abbey village and planning consent was granted by the YDNPA for this use in May 2017 and is due to open later this year.

CST considers the approach of the PDCLP to Bolton Abbey is sound in general terms but suggests that the wording of policy SP4, SP11 and EC4a require minor amendment in order to ensure the effectiveness of the plan.

CST, together with RSL, looks forward to attending the examination of the draft Local Plan to support CDC in relation to the draft policy EC4a for Tourism-Led Development at Bolton Abbey and the inclusion of Bolton Abbey within the settlement hierarchy.

In the interim, and to allow the prompt delivery of development in due course, CST is advancing work that will inform and underpin the detailed masterplanning process required by draft policy EC4a, including a stone study, as requested by Historic England as an important item, and a feasibility study. The stone study will: establish what type and quality of stone and slate is currently used at Bolton Abbey; what type and quantity of stone/slate is needed for related new build and repairs; where this stone can be

sourced from. The feasibility study will consider the exact mix and quantum of development to be taken forward in the Masterplan process (which, as draft policy EC4a notes, is to involve the collaboration of various stakeholders including CDC and Historic England).

## Section 2: A summary of CST's previous comments on earlier Local Plan drafts

CST has actively engaged in the Local Plan production process. A brief summary of its previous comments are provided for reference and clarity.

### October 2014 Consultation Response – First Pre-Publication Draft Local Plan

The response provided:

- Detailed information on the Bolton Abbey Estate and its development needs
- Clarification (written and maps) on the extent to which Bolton Abbey village acts as a genuine service village in relation to the southern dales and surrounding area
- The changing approach to rural development in national policy and guidance (NPPF para 55/NPPG)
- The Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority's recognition of Bolton Abbey as a service village

The response requested:

- The amendment of the settlement hierarchy to include Bolton Abbey
- An allocation of a 3.5ha site including the central Bolton Abbey Car Park for mixed-use development in the plan
- Amendment of specific policy wording in relation to tourism.

### May 2016 Consultation Response – Second Pre-Publication Draft

The response included:

- Detailed information on the Bolton Abbey Estate and its development needs (reiterated from the 2015 consultation response)
- Support for the amendment of the spatial strategy to include Bolton Abbey
- Confirmation that CST's proposal for the allocation of a large site at the centre of Bolton Abbey (and a site at Bolton Bridge) had been informed by a detailed appraisal and masterplan process.
- Concern that neither site was allocated in the Local Plan
- Concern that without clear plan-led support the general support for development at Bolton Abbey in the Local Plan could not be realised through the development management process.

The response requested:

- That the CDLP should also contain policy references to the delivery of the above site(s) through a sensitive heritage and landscape based Masterplan, as well as a specific Bolton Abbey related policy

or

- If for any reason it was not possible for the CDLP to contain the foregoing, then it must at least designate the 3.9 ha site in Bolton Abby village (and also the 1.75 ha site at Bolton Bridge by the A59 roundabout) for mixed use development, together with a specific policy on the delivery of the site(s).

#### July 2017 Consultation Response – Third Pre-Publication Draft

The response included:

- Strong support for the policy approach (Draft Policy EC4/EC4a and settlement hierarchy) to supporting development at Bolton Abbey in the current consultation draft Local Plan
- An acknowledgement that whilst CST regretted the lack of an allocation at Bolton Abbey, the policy provided a positive framework for development in this location
- Support for the Sustainability Appraisal's conclusions that no reasonable alternatives had been identified to the policy approach to Bolton Abbey
- Proposed amendments to the Council's policy regarding homes on unallocated sites due to lack of clarity regarding acceptability of housing development at Bolton Abbey

As it related to the Council's policy approach to Bolton Abbey (draft Policy EC4/EC4a and settlement hierarchy) the Estate raised no objections and requested no changes to the Local Plan.

Section 3: An assessment of the policy framework relating to Bolton Abbey in the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority's adopted Local Plan 2016

It is of relevance to note that CST actively engaged with the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority (YDNPA) throughout the production of the Yorkshire Dales Local Plan. CST provided consultation responses on all draft versions of the Local Plan and was represented at the examination in public on the Local Plan.

The Yorkshire Dales Local Plan was adopted on December 2016. Policy SP3 (Spatial Strategy) includes Bolton Abbey as a Service Village. The Glossary to the Local Plan at p.105 defines a Service Village as 'A settlement that provides a range of services to communities within an immediate area.'

As well as including Bolton Abbey as a service village within the plan's settlement hierarchy, the plan also in the justification for policy T5 (Indoor Facilities) states that:

'6.35 The busier tourist areas, such as of (sic) Bolton Abbey, Malham, Hawes, Horton, Reeth, Clapham, Aysgarth, Kettlewell and Dent are the most likely locations to receive proposals for further visitor-related development...' (our emphasis).

The Yorkshire Dales National Park Local Plan therefore acknowledges both the sustainability of Bolton Abbey as a service village and its importance for tourism.

The PDCLP's policy approach of including Bolton Abbey in the settlement hierarchy of the CDCLP and acknowledging its important contribution to tourism in Craven is therefore wholly consistent with the approach taken in the adopted Yorkshire Dales Local Plan. CST STRONGLY SUPPORTS the consistency of this approach.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      002      Organisation      North Yorkshire Local Access Forum

Section or Policy      GEN

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      002/04/GEN/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

These comments constitute formal advice from the North Yorkshire Local Access Forum. Craven District Council is required, in accordance with section 94(5) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, to have regard to relevant advice from this forum in carrying out its functions.

Publication Draft Craven Local Plan

Comments of the North Yorkshire Local Access Forum

The North Yorkshire Local Access Forum is pleased to be consulted by Craven District Council on the publication draft Craven Local Plan.

This response has been produced by the lead representative for the Craven District Council area on behalf of the Forum, following the attendance of Matthew Collins at the Local Access Forum's meeting on 17 January 2018.

Thank you for attending the meeting of North Yorkshire LAF yesterday. I hope that you found our comments useful. As you saw, broadly speaking, we gave the Plan the thumbs-up. We appreciate that at this stage, further comments may not be incorporated, but I hope that you will be able to give consideration to the following points. They are points only of emphasis, and do not affect the substance of the Plan, which the LAF welcomes.

1. The plan objectives might usefully include a reference to access as one of the objectives.
2. Local green spaces. The LAF was impressed by the Plan's commitment to the creation and protection of green spaces with public access. Obviously, existing public parks will be protected, but the idea of creating entirely new green spaces is ambitious. We hope that the plan succeeds and that the public will enjoy the sort of rights of access to these green spaces that they already enjoy in public parks or commons.
3. The 'enhancement' of the public rights of way network. We recognise that it is very difficult for Authorities to create entirely new rights of way, but we encourage the Authority to do so, especially in new housing developments that may have poor connections, or no connections at all, to the existing public rights of way network. The needs of cyclists and equestrians who are presently frustrated by gaps in the bridleway network should be a challenge that is met with early solutions.
4. Access for disabled people. We welcome the Plan's commitment to improvements in the network of paths that can be negotiated by wheelchair users and the less mobile. Making improvements that result in attractive circuits, beginning and ending in car parks that have disabled parking spaces and disabled lavatories would be a real achievement.

5. Byways. We welcome your liaison with NYCC's expert rights of way department.

#### Conclusion

We hope you will find our comments constructive which are offered under the LAF's remit to advise section 94(4) bodies. We should also like to engage further on any particular issues arising from this consultation, and look forward to your feedback.

#### Feedback

The Forum requests feedback on the above advice. Please provide this to the Secretary to the Local Access Forum – [kate.arscott@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:kate.arscott@northyorks.gov.uk)

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      051      Organisation      Natural England

Section or Policy      GEN

Plan is Legally Compliant?      No

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      051/01/GEN/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Planning consultation: Publication Draft Craven Local Plan – Regulation 19 Draft Document for Publication, January 2018

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 21 December 2017 which was received by Natural England on the same date.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

#### Soundness and Legal Compliance

Natural England welcome the progress made and updates to the draft plan and supporting Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and evidence base. However we consider that there are a number of outstanding concerns, as set out below, which we consider need to be addressed in order for the plan to be both sound and legally compliant.

We have had ongoing dialogue with Craven District Council on the development of the plan and are hopeful that our outstanding concerns can be addressed prior to submission.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	046	Organisation	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Bolton Abbey		
Section or Policy		GEN		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Yes
Settlement Comment Relates to	Bolton Abbey			Representation Reference	046/01/GEN/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Publication Draft Craven Local Plan (PDCLP) 2018: Formal response

I am writing on behalf of The Trustees of the Chatsworth Settlement (also known as the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees (CST)) to submit our formal response to the above. As such, I outline related matters herein and attach the related documentation outlined below.

1. Proponent

The Chatsworth Settlement, known internally as the Devonshire Group, owns the land and estates of the Dukedom of Devonshire. Its main estates are in the vicinity of Chatsworth in Derbyshire and Bolton Abbey in North Yorkshire. It also runs visitor and other businesses on these estates, including: hotels; retail and catering outlets; forestry; livestock and arable farming. It employs over 650 full time employees. It is committed to quality in all its activities and takes a responsible approach to development; as such, it measures performance in financial as well as social and environmental terms.

CST’s Yorkshire Estate provides 160 full time equivalent jobs at Bolton Abbey, receives 450,000 visitors per year and contributes c.£8m of enabled Gross Value Added to the local economy each year (Source: New Economics Foundation 2014). Its income funds socio-economic facilities (e.g. village shop/post office) and environmental management activities (e.g. architectural conservation) without grant support. CST thereby provides benefits far beyond “just the estate”.

However, it has to ensure projects are viable, yet its visitor operation at Bolton Abbey is being diminished by: little secondary spend; seasonal bias; vulnerability to bad weather; no sense of arrival; high maintenance costs; increased competition; major planning constraints; limited visitor accommodation; limited staff accommodation; services at risk; no play areas.

Since 2009 CST has therefore been looking at ways to diversify the “visitor offer” in its Core Visitor Area (CVA from Bolton Bridge to Barden Tower, including land in both Craven District Council (CDC) and the Yorkshire Dales National Park (YDNP)), gathering related evidence and participating in the preparation of related local plans. As such, CST has engaged extensively with related local planning authorities (LPAs) to provide a policy framework for development over the periods covered by the respective Local Plans (though CST’s needs and intended proposals extend beyond these plan periods).

The policy approach included in the PDCLP and particularly draft policy EC4a has therefore been developed in a collaborative way between CST, CDC and other key stakeholders, principally Historic England (HE) and the YDNP Authority (YDNPA) over many years and positively addresses the need for development in that part of the CVA which falls within the CDC plan-area.

A significant amount of resources has therefore been invested by CST and CDC in identifying a policy-based approach to support development at Bolton Abbey, and CST would



like to thank CDC for its input in this regard.

## 2. Response (summary)

CST's response to the PDCLP 2018 as attached can be summarised as follows:

- STRONG SUPPORT for the policy approach (Draft Policy EC4/EC4a and settlement hierarchy) to support development at Bolton Abbey
- STRONG SUPPORT for the inclusion of Bolton Abbey in Tier 4b of the settlement hierarchy (ie wholly consistent with the approach of the YDNP Local Plan adopted in 2016 with regard to the same)
- VIEW that the duty to cooperate (insofar as it relates to this part of the plan area) has been met.
- SUPPORT for draft policy EC4 (Tourism) in providing an over-arching tourism policy that supports the multi-faceted parts of the industry
- SUPPORT for draft policy EC4's specific spatial reference to supporting tourism development at Bolton Abbey/Bolton Abbey Railway Station
- STRONG SUPPORT for draft policy EC4a (Tourism-led development at Bolton Abbey) to address the need to diversify the visitor offer at Bolton Abbey
- AGREEMENT with the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal insofar as it considers that policy EC4a (Tourism-Led Development at Bolton Abbey) will have numerous "Major Positive Effects" and "No Negative Effects"
- VIEW that policy EC4a is "sound" since it is based on a very strong and robust evidence-based document, the Bolton Abbey Development Options Appraisal Study (BADOAS) 2017 by planning consultants Lichfields, which comprehensively appraised four "strategic development options" for development in the Bolton Abbey CVA and identified a preferred (optimal) option as "Composite" development clustered around both Bolton Abbey village AND Bolton Bridge with some limited development (e.g. small agespecific play areas) throughout the CVA
- SUPPORT for the inclusion of a footnote in the PDCLP (p.188) to reference the BADOAS document which provides a detailed justification of the approach taken in draft policy EC4a
- VIEW that the policy proposals within the PDCLP meet all four tests of soundness as set out in paragraph 182 of the NPPF
- VIEW that the intended development by CST in part of the plan-area (and relating to EC4a) will enhance the area and provide key benefits including:
  - increased public open greenspace
  - attractive focal point to Bolton Abbey village
  - improved amenity
  - enhanced sense of arrival/departure for visitors
  - increased awareness of the former Barnyard area in Bolton Abbey village
  - a much greater choice of high quality/wider choice of accommodation for visitors/staff/others
  - renewable energy supply
  - heritage-themed learning-through-play facilities
  - one of the few wet weather play facility in the Dales area
  - sale of local/organic/estate produce
  - better access to/from Bolton Abbey Station
  - improved road/pedestrian safety
  - homes for young people (e.g. subsidised housing, as is the case for existing staff)
  - office or other work-space units
  - 37 extra full-time equivalent high quality/value jobs.
- VIEW that the policy framework in the PDCLP will help deliver many of these benefits in a sustainable way, with the greatest proportion of "hard" development in the CVA taking place in CDC
- VIEW that many of these benefits will synergise with those of the Tithe Barn (built c.1520) currently being restored to create a wedding venue that will open later this year

- VIEW that the approach of the PDCLP to Bolton Abbey is sound in general terms but that the wording of policies SP4, SP11 and EC4a require minor amendments to ensure the effectiveness of the plan
- NOTE that CST has advanced work to inform and underpin the detailed masterplanning process (required by draft policy EC4a) by starting a heritage stone study (as requested by Historic England) to establish the type, quantity, source and cost of stone/slate needed (for related new build and repairs) as well as a feasibility study to establish the exact mix and quantum of related development.

CST, together with RSL and Lichfields, looks forward to attending the examination of the PDCLP to support CDC in relation to draft policy EC4a (Tourism-Led Development at Bolton Abbey) and the inclusion of Bolton Abbey within the settlement hierarchy.  
I therefore look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	059	Organisation		
Section or Policy	H1		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	059/15/H1/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Support - Meeting housing needs for older people.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      008      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy      H1

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      008/23/H1/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### SECTION 6: HOUSING

5.54 A number of key facts and figures are set out at the beginning of the section highlighting a series of particular concerns which inform policy; these include an aging population which will increase nearly 50% over the plan period. Whilst affordability issues are not as substantive as the neighbouring North Yorkshire District of Harrogate, the District's affordability ratio is the high with a mismatch between local incomes and the cost of buying or renting a home. A second point is the requirement for 2,520 affordable homes for the Plan period 2012 -2032 (at 126dpa).

#### DRAFT POLICY H1 SPECIALIST HOUSING FOR OLDER PEOPLE

5.55 Craven District is noted as having an aging population. It is appropriate that the Local Plan recognises the need to provide appropriate accommodation. A requirement for homes which meet the needs for older and disabled people is recognised and supported.

5.56 It would be helpful for the policy and evidence base to ascertain the ability for people to stay in their own homes and to adapt existing housing stock to suitable standards. This should be investigated and the policy updated accordingly.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID	008	Organisation	The Wilman Family		
Section or Policy		H2		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	008/24/H2/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

DRAFT POLICY H2: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

5.57 A substantive requirement for affordable homes to buy and rent is recognised and the provision of affordable housing is supported. However it is considered that the Council’s constrained requirement will fail to address the issue.

5.58 This policy sets out a requirement for 30% affordable on sites of 11 or more dwellings, with a number of variations in line with national policy. Any need for affordable housing must be balanced against viability implications of the policy requirements and market consideration across the District.

5.59 One of the key considerations for viability relates to the likely contribution to infrastructure costs arising from the development and also as a consequence of potential Community Infrastructure Levy. With no surprise viability gets worse the greater the contribution required.

5.60 Within Provision a) I, a viability clause is included. Such an approach, whilst supported, should not be used to justify an unrealistic affordable housing target.

5.61 Given viability concerns across different parts of the District a variable contributions approach may be appropriate based upon geography and/or other criteria. An affordable housing market uplift can then be applied to housing targets.

5.62 It is not clear from the policy how self-build, custom building and starter homes will be treated.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID	036	Organisation		
Section or Policy		H2	Plan is Legally Compliant?	No
Paragraph		6.23-6.25	Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	036/03/H2/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

## 5.RURAL EXCEPTION SITES

Please could I ask that the inspector looks at amending the local plan to clarify the “rural exception” rule in the interest of making it “sound”.

It would seem apparent to me that this is aimed at “not for profit” organisations because by their very definition “developers” are in it for profit. Is it just for non profit organisation or can developers use it to get round planning legislation ?

Also wouldn't it make sense to be clear about what number are acceptable in terms of “small sites” and “small numbers of market homes”. After all there are specific numbers as far as “major” developments are concerned in other parts of planning legislation.

If the inspector feels that this is not part of his role then perhaps CDC could pick up on this point when they prepare the promised ‘supplementary planning document’. Clarity now would close the scope for argument at a later date.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation I would appreciate the chance to talk briefly to the Planning Inspector.

Respondent ID	026	Organisation	David Hill LLP		
Section or Policy		H2		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	026/01/H2/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

### 1.0 Introduction

This document has been prepared as a response to the publication draft of the Craven Local Plan December 2017. The document assesses the affordable housing policy from the draft plan.

### 2.0 Affordable Housing

Having read the affordable housing policy we have found that it does not accord with government guidance on viability as it seeks to prevent applicants undertaking viability appraisals apart from in exceptional circumstances and seeks to restrict the way in which viability appraisals are undertaken by making it so developers are unable to take into account abnormal costs in a viability appraisal.

#### 2.1 The Draft Policy/Supporting Text

The extracts of the policy and supporting text which are of interest are highlighted in bold below. (N.B BOLD TEXT DOES NOT TRANSLATE INTO ACCESS. HIGHLIGHTED AREAS ARE INDICATED WITH <<BOLD>>)

“6.17 The Council’s Local Plan Viability Assessment Addendum (November 2017) has been used to inform the affordable housing targets and site thresholds. The assessment work indicates that, for all the different types and sizes of greenfield sites typically found and likely to come forward in the plan area, the vast majority of sites will be able to deliver 30% affordable housing. <<BOLD - It is expected therefore that, normally, it will be viable for housing sites in Craven to provide 30% affordable dwellings and meet other planning obligation requirements of the local plan. Abnormal costs associated with individual sites should be negotiated between the developer and the landowner.”>>  
“6.18 << BOLD - Only in very exceptional circumstances will the local planning authority review individual sites in terms of scheme viability>>. In these circumstances developers will be expected to conduct negotiations on a transparent and ‘open book’ basis.”

#### “DRAFT POLICY H2: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

a) Local affordable homes that are needed in the plan area will be delivered by:

l. the provision of a minimum of 30% of proposed new dwellings as affordable housing on greenfield sites of 11 dwellings or more, and on any site with a combined gross floor area of more than 1000 sqm. In designated rural areas, proposals on greenfield sites of 6 to 10 dwellings, will be required to make an equivalent financial contribution. << BOLD - Development proposals that seek to provide a lower level of affordable housing contribution will not be acceptable unless it can be clearly demonstrated that exceptional circumstances exist which justify a reduced affordable housing contribution>>.”

#### 2.2 Government Guidance on Viability - Viability and Decision Taking

##### 2.2.1 How should viability be Assessed in Decision-Taking?

“Decision-taking on individual applications does not normally require consideration of viability. <<BOLD - However, where the deliverability of the development may be compromised by the scale of planning obligations and other costs, a viability assessment may be necessary. This should be informed by the particular circumstances of the site and proposed development in question. Assessing the viability of a particular site requires more detailed analysis than at plan level.>>

A site is viable if the value generated by its development exceeds the costs of developing it and also provides sufficient incentive for the land to come forward and the



development to be undertaken.  
Paragraph: 016 Reference ID: 10-016-20140306  
Revision date: 06 03 2014”

Why the proposed affordable housing policy does not comply with Paragraph 016 (above)

The guidance does not state that exceptional circumstances are necessary in order for a viability assessment to be acceptable, instead they are acceptable when the deliverability of the site is brought into question by the level of planning obligations required. The guidance also makes the point that the site-specific viability is different to demonstrating the viability of a policy in a local plan. Therefore, the statement in paragraph 6.17 of the supporting text for the affordable housing policy suggesting that the viability assessment for the local plan provides enough evidence to mean specific sites will not require viability assessments in the future; is not in line with government guidance on viability.

#### 2.2.2 Costs

“Assessment of costs should be based on robust evidence which is reflective of market conditions. All development costs should be taken into account including:

- build costs based on appropriate data, for example that of the Building Cost Information Service;
- <<BOLD - abnormal costs, including those associated with treatment for contaminated sites or listed buildings, or historic costs associated with brownfield, phased or complex sites;>>
- infrastructure costs, which might include roads, sustainable drainage systems, and other green infrastructure, connection to utilities and decentralised energy and provision of social and cultural infrastructure;
- cumulative policy costs and planning obligations. The full cost of planning standards, policies and obligations will need to be taken into account, including the cost of the Community Infrastructure Levy.
- finance costs including those incurred through loans;
- professional, project management and sales and legal costs.

Paragraph: 022 Reference ID: 10-022-20140306  
Revision date: 06 03 2014”

Why the proposed affordable housing policy does not comply with Paragraph 022 (above)

The draft supporting text for the affordable housing policy states that abnormal costs cannot be considered in viability assessments and should instead be negotiated between the developer and the landowner. However, paragraph 22 states that abnormal costs should be considered within the costs as part of any viability assessment. Therefore, the proposed policy does not accord with government guidance on viability. It is also worth noting that items such as site clearance and demolition of buildings are considered abnormal costs. This means that this policy may prevent brownfield sites coming forward for development as key viability considerations, such as site clearance, could not be considered as part of a viability assessment. It is noted that Vacant Building Credit will help with the delivery of brownfield sites, however in some instances the benefit of this policy will not cover the remediation costs of the site clearance/remediation and so the policy needs to be sufficiently flexible to allow viability negotiations to take place and include all development costs within these negotiations so that delivery of housing sites is not prevented.

2.3 Government Guidance on planning obligations 2.3.1 Are planning obligations negotiable? “Obligations should only be sought where they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Where they provide essential site specific items to mitigate the impact of the development, such as a necessary road improvement, there may only be limited opportunity to negotiate. Where local planning authorities are requiring affordable housing obligations or tariff style contributions to infrastructure, they should be flexible in their requirements. Their policy should be clear that such planning obligations will take into account specific site circumstances.  
Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 23b-006-20140306 Revision date: 06 03 2014”

Why the proposed affordable housing policy does not comply with Paragraph 006 (above)

The draft policy on affordable housing states that viability assessments will only be acceptable in exceptional circumstances. This is not in line with Paragraph 006 which requires flexibility in policy in terms of site specific planning obligations. This will include site specific abnormal costs and so paragraph 6.17 is also not compliant with this paragraph. The new policy requires flexibility due to variations between sites. Over the plan period market conditions will change, which will affect build costs and house prices. Other factors used in the viability assessment for the local plan will also change, such as affordable housing transfer values and educational contributions. Therefore, flexibility in the policy is required to take account of changing circumstances over the plan period which would otherwise hinder housing delivery.

#### 2.4 Level of Proposed Affordable Housing

Due to the challenging topography in many parts of Craven which significantly increase build costs on road layout, retaining walls, dead walling and split levels together with higher than normal planning requirements with regard to materials it is unlikely that many sites in Craven will be able to deliver 30% affordable homes together with the other contributions required by the Council. This is borne out in recent developments where the development has been required to provide less than 30% affordable units after going through the viability process before considering the proposed Education Contribution (e.g. Green Lane, Glusburn 10%, and Elsey Croft 20%). The current proposal is likely to mean that landowners will not bring sites forward for development.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### 3.0 Suggested alteration to affordable housing policy

The policy needs to be reworded to comply with government guidance and should seek to encourage viability assessments whilst being flexible in the approach taken in viability negotiations so that the policy doesn't stall residential development in the district.

The level of affordable housing policy should be reduced further to be in line with recent viability negotiations that have allowed development of sites to take place.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      012      Organisation      Gladman Developments Limited

Section or Policy      H2

Plan is Legally Compliant?      No

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      No

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      012/13/H2/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### 4.9 Draft Policy H2: Affordable Housing

4.9.1 Draft Policy H2 sets out the affordable housing policy for the Craven District and proposes that on development sites of 11 or more homes, the Council will seek a minimum of 30% of homes for affordable housing.

4.9.2 Gladman acknowledges the amendment to the policy to reduce the affordable housing target from 40% to 30%. We are however concerned that the flexible approach taken in the previous version of the plan regarding viability and the delivery of affordable housing has to some extent been lost from the policy. We wish to express particular concerns in relation to the language used in the policy and specifically the reference to ‘exceptional circumstances’. We consider that it would be more appropriate to refer to the viability of development, as this is most likely to be the reason for the need to reduce the provision of affordable housing.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      019                      Organisation      Keyhaven Homes

Section or Policy                      H2

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?                      Not Specified

Plan is DtC Compliant?              Not Specified

Representation Reference      019/09/H2/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

## Section 6: Housing

### Draft Policy H2: Affordable Housing

5.51Keyhaven Homes support the proposed amendment to the proposed levels of affordable housing set out in Draft Policy H2. The policy now seeks a provision of 30% of new dwellings as affordable housing on-site as part of developments of 11 dwellings or 1000 sqm or more. This reduction is welcomed given Keyhaven Homes experience of sites in the Craven area that the previously proposed figure of 40% was not viable and is preventing sites from being brought forward for development. However, it is still maintained that the transfer price of £1000 per sqm is insufficient to cover the higher than average building costs associated with developing in this area as a result of its topography, which also results in a higher number of lost work days due to bad weather and the distances sub-contractors have to travel to site. The transfer rate applied is considered to only be sufficient when applied to flat, greenfield sites in lower lying areas.

5.52Paragraph 6.20 of the Draft Local Plan advises that the value of affordable housing will be determined by the Council's latest transfer prices, with a footnote now highlighting that this is currently set at £1000 per sqm. This is a critical part of the policy in determining the level of affordable housing that is deliverable in Craven. It is essential that this forms part of the policy and is duly consulted upon. Based on Keyhaven Homes experience a transfer value of £1000 per sqm is insufficient to cover the higher than average building costs associated with developing in this area as a result of its topography, which also results in a higher number of lost work days due to bad weather and the distances sub-contractors have to travel to site. The transfer rate applied is considered to only be sufficient when applied to flat, greenfield sites in lower lying areas. On this basis, any affordable housing being provided at a loss, this directly impacts on viability.

5.53Whilst the reduction from 40% to 30% affordable housing provision is welcomed, it is considered that viability will remain an issue on sites in Skipton due to the transfer prices not covering the higher than average build costs associated with developing in this area.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	To engage in discussion regarding the issue of soundness highlighted in the representation statement.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	---

Respondent ID      016      Organisation      Skipton Properties Ltd

Section or Policy      H2

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      016/07/H2/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Draft Policy H2: Criterion a) I

4.3.9 The thresholds for requiring Affordable Housing contributions is not clear, not properly justified and not in accordance with National Policy. It is therefore unsound. As drafted, the threshold applies to any development sites that generate more than 1000 sq. m of combined gross floor space, irrespective of the number of dwellings proposed. The Planning Practice Guidance states:

“There are specific circumstances where contributions for affordable housing and tariff style planning obligations (section 106 planning obligations) should not be sought from small scale and self-build development. This follows the order of the Court of Appeal dated 13 May 2016, which give legal effect to the policy set out in the written ministerial statement of 28 November 2014 and should be taken into account.

These circumstances are that; contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1,000 square metres (gross internal area) in designated rural areas, local planning authorities may choose to apply a lower threshold of 5-units or less. No affordable housing or tariff-style contributions should then be sought from these developments. In addition, in a rural area where the lower 5-unit or less threshold is applied, affordable housing and tariff style contributions should be sought from developments of between 6 and 10-units in the form of cash payments which are commuted until after completion of units within the development. This applies to rural areas described under section 157(1) of the Housing Act 1985, which includes National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty affordable housing and tariff-style contributions should not be sought from any development consisting only of the construction of a residential annex or extension to an existing home

Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 23b-031-20161116

Revision date: 16 11 2016 See previous version”

4.3.10 The Practice Guidance provide further clarity as follows:

“Are there any exceptions to the 10-unit threshold?

Local planning authorities may choose to apply a lower threshold of 5-units or less to development in designated rural areas being areas as described under section 157 of the Housing Act 1985, which includes National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. No affordable housing or tariff-style contributions should then be sought from these developments.

4.3.11 Where this lower threshold is applied, local planning authorities should only seek affordable housing contributions from developments of between 6 to 10-units as financial contributions and not affordable housing units on site. Any payments made (whether as an affordable housing contribution or contribution to a pooled funding pot for general infrastructure provision) should also be commuted until after completion of units within the development.

Paragraph: 017 Reference ID: 23b-017-20160519

Revision date: 19 05 2016”

4.3.12 Criterion a) I; provides for an even lower threshold of less than 6 dwellings by stating that any sites over 1000 sq. m require an affordable contribution. This is clearly at odds with the thresholds set out in the Practice Guidance as Government Policy intended to stimulate local economies by alleviating the burden of planning obligations on small scale house builders. The Policy could be brought into line with the Governments thresholds by introducing further clarity such that:

“No affordable housing contributions will be sought on developments of 5 or less dwellings”:

4.3.13 Criterion a) II. As per paragraph 6.21 the Policy seeks to retain flexibility to apply Vacant Building Credit in appropriate circumstances. The policy should be amended such that:

“Vacant Building Credit will be applied in accordance with national planning policy.”

4.3.14 Criterion d): This criterion 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 a first phase of development by adding that level of discount as an additional requirement (on top of normal policy requirements) on a subsequent phase.

4.3.15 The purpose of the criterion has no basis in evidence or national planning policy. In practice, any 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. The criterion is therefore unsound and should be deleted from the plan.

4.3.16 Criterion f): This part of the Policy fails to recognise that for Rural Exception Sites to come forward without grant support a sufficient financial incentive must be provided to landowners for them to release sites. The introduction of market housing to cross subsidise affordable housing on these sites will therefore not only contribute to the construction cost of the affordable housing but also to the price paid to the landowner. It is therefore inappropriate to ignore that the fact that for exceptions sites to come forward, the landowner should be able to realise a sufficient financial incentive to release the site. Criterion g) II should be amended such that:

“the market homes proposed are the minimum number required to achieve viability in the absence of any public subsidy or with reduced public subsidy, and for the landowner to realise a sufficient financial incentive to release the site”.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Criterion a)I The Policy could be brought into line with the Governments thresholds by introducing further clarity such that:

“No affordable housing contributions will be sought on developments of 5 or less dwellings”:

4.3.13 Criterion a) II. As per paragraph 6.21 the Policy seeks to retain flexibility to apply Vacant Building Credit in appropriate circumstances. The policy should be amended such that:

“Vacant Building Credit will be applied in accordance with national planning policy.”

Criterion d - 4.3.15 The purpose of the criterion has no basis in evidence or national planning policy. In practice, any 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. The criterion is therefore unsound and should be deleted from the plan.

Criterion g) II should be amended such that:

“the market homes proposed are the minimum number required to achieve viability in the absence of any public subsidy or with reduced public subsidy, and for the landowner to realise a sufficient financial incentive to release the site”.

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      036      Organisation

Section or Policy      H2

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      No

Plan is Sound?      No

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      036/02/H2/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Section 5

Support for the Local plan.

Holistic approach to affordable housing.

I would like to support the local plan in so far as it says that affordable housing numbers will be looked at holistically. This is clearly the right and just approach to take.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Even though my standpoint on affordable housing was supported by Harrogate Borough Council, who say there should be 12 not 8 at Grundy, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I would respectfully ask for the inspectors views on this important issue.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?



Reason for Participation

I would appreciate the chance to talk briefly to the Planning Inspector.

Respondent ID 009 Organisation Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)

Section or Policy H2

Plan is Legally Compliant? Not Specified

Paragraph Plan is Sound? No

Site Reference Plan is DtC Compliant? Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to Representation Reference 009/17/H2/TS

#### Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY reiterates its statement made in respect of draft policy SP2 that of concern to CPRENY is the Council's acknowledgement that the 40% affordable target figure has been lowered to 30%. This combined with the higher annual housing requirement figure means that the full objectively assessed need for affordable housing (FOANAH) will not be met as only 66% would be delivered – when combined with the provision in the NP. The Council appear to be relying on other initiatives to bridge the gap and lower the actual 'affordable need' for the District, however, CPRENY believe this is a risky strategy. Whilst in theory the schemes mentioned in the Addendum report and in the Local Plan (paras 4.15-4.17) may help reduce this need and may, for example, help return vacant properties into use (which CPRENY are fully supportive of), the reliance on them to deliver is such that should any scheme fail, or funding not be delivered, then the percentage of people in need of such homes within the district will increased.

Furthermore, it is well documented that developers agree to the delivery of such homes to gain a planning permission, and then all too often state that the actual delivery is unviable, and the number of affordable homes required do not get delivered. This happens throughout the district, North Yorkshire and the country. CPRENY believe that by lowering the requirement at this stage will only lead to more substantial reductions at the time proposals are delivered.

Paragraph 50 of the NPPF states that where local planning authorities have identified affordable housing is needed, local plans should contain policies for meeting this need. Paragraph 6.13 of the draft Local Plan sets out "to address the issue of a shortfall in affordable homes across Craven, increasing the supply of new affordable homes is a priority for the local plan." It goes on to state at paragraph 6.16 that "the scale of need revealed by the 2017 SHMA would justify the Council establishing a high target for the amount of affordable housing that will be required from new development sites." Setting a higher target of 40% was welcomed by CPRENY in their previous response to the third pre-publication draft Local Plan in July 2017.

CPRENY believe that a more appropriate approach would be to adopt a 'variable' percentage, where larger sites are required to deliver 40% affordable units, reducing in scale to 30% in order to ensure that a figure closer to the FOANAH is actually delivered. CPPRENY have found that affordable housing is of real concern to many members and resident across the district who are employed in more traditional and seasonal employment.

CPRENY are supportive of the requirement for sites offering between 5-10 dwellings to provide 30% affordable housing and those sites of under 5 units offering a cash contribution.

#### Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY believe a variable scale for affordable housing should be required rather than a flat rate of '30%' across all sites. This would ensure the plan has been positively prepared and is consistent with national planning policies in the delivery of affordable housing.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      028      Organisation      Home Builders Federation

Section or Policy      H2

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      No

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      028/08/H2/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### DRAFT POLICY H2: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

This policy is not considered to be sound, as it is not considered to be effective.

The HBF supports the provision of affordable housing. The HBF also acknowledges the amendment to the policy to reduce the affordable housing target from 40% to 30%. However, the HBF has concerns in relation to the language used in the policy, particularly reference to ‘exceptional circumstances’, it would be more appropriate to refer to the viability of development, as this is most likely to be the reason for the need to reduce the provision of affordable housing.

#### Future Engagement

I trust that the Council will find these comments useful as it continues to progress its Local Plan. I would be happy to discuss these issues in greater detail or assist in facilitating discussions with the wider house building industry.

The HBF would like to be kept informed of all forthcoming consultations upon the Local Plan and associated documents. Please use the contact details provided below for future correspondence.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

HBF propose that the policy is modified as follows:

- Development proposals that seek to provide a lower level of affordable housing contribution will (DELETE - not be) only be acceptable (DELETE – unless) where it can be (DELETE – clearly) demonstrated that the development would not be viable unless the (DELETE - exceptional circumstances exist which justify a reduced) affordable housing contribution is reduced.

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	To debate the comments made within our representations further and in greater detail. To ensure that the industry can respond to any additional evidence provided by the Council or others following submission of the plan.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID	059	Organisation		
Section or Policy		H2	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	059/16/H2/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Object - the 30% provision should apply also to developments of less than 11 dwellings. There is potential for avoidance of the AH rrequirement by piecemeal development if this exception is allowed.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      016      Organisation      Skipton Properties Ltd

Section or Policy      H2      Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      6.21      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      016/04/H2/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Paragraph 6.21 Vacant Building Credit

4.3.7 Paragraph 6.21 states that “The Council will bear this in mind when considering whether a vacant building credit should apply...”. This implies that Vacant Building Credit is discretionary on the part of the Council. This conflicts with the provisions for VBC as set out in the NPPG and is therefore unsound.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

4.3.8 The justification should be amended to make it clear that the Council will apply VBC in accordance with National Policy.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      016                      Organisation      Skipton Properties Ltd

Section or Policy	H2	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph	6.20	Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Representation Reference	016/03/H2/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Financial and Off-Site Contributions

4.3.4 Paragraph 6.20 of the draft Local Plan is unsound because it sets out a methodology for calculating off-site contributions in lieu of affordable housing being provided on site. The paragraph is describing a policy approach and is not a justification for a policy. 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.

4.3.5 The proposed calculation is itself also fundamentally flawed; its 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 calculation is not justified and should therefore be deleted from the Local Plan.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

4.3.6 In order to address this issue, Paragraph 6.20 should be deleted in its entirety from the Local Plan. 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.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      016      Organisation      Skipton Properties Ltd

Section or Policy      H2

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      016/02/H2/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### 4.3 Draft Policy H2: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

4.3.1 The draft policy H2 and the text at Paragraph 6.11 of the draft Local Plan are unsound because they specify that 30% affordable housing is a minimum requirement and proceed on false assumptions regarding viability generally.

4.3.2 Paragraph 6.18 perpetuates and amplifies such unsoundness because it provides that only in very exceptional circumstances will the local planning authority review individual sites in terms of scheme viability.

The financial viability of developments should be assessed on a scheme by scheme basis. See further submissions provided by Savills at Appendix 1.

4.3.3 The policy is unsound because:

- a) The expression of a provision of a minimum of 30% affordable housing is simply unsound if it is to be supposed that this is a minimum which the Council will seek to achieve. It proceeds on a false assumption that, as drafted, a viability appraisal will be required on every single development, so as to ensure that a greater level of affordable housing could not be achieved. It seems unlikely that this is the Council's objective but as drafted (with an exception of a minimum provision) then that is how the policy must be interpreted. We consider that this is unsound both substantively and as a matter of drafting because it is not clear and will not provide any certainty to developers.
- b) The expression of 30% affordable housing to be a target would be sound but only if this is not subject to a caveat that any lower provision would be the subject of demonstrating exceptional circumstances. Once again, such policy is not supported in National Planning Policy Guidance which makes clear that viability must be underpinned by an analysis of a very wide range of factors including profit levels, abnormal costs and fundamentally, a land value which reflects the sale of land at a level appropriate to a willing seller.
- c) As drafted, the policy will act as a straitjacket upon delivery of affordable housing. As noted by Savills, each site has varying factors which can hugely affect financial viability and therefore each site must be capable of demonstrating a viability level in the market at a particular time and should not be based upon, what amounts to be an additional test in demonstrating "exceptional circumstances".
- d) Land values throughout the area can vary and therefore, in combination with other circumstances, viability could be affected. We do not accept a general proposition, that all land values will support a delivery of 30%, which appears to be the assumption of the Aspinall Verdi report.
- e) We also do not accept that profits should be based upon 20% GDV for market sale (private) units and 6% profit on affordable units. Housebuilders and their funders will require, in general, a return of 20% of GDV and this should be the assumption in any viability appraisal.
- f) Overall, the assumption that all abnormal costs should be borne by the Landowner is not as a principle, acceptable and nor is it underpinned by national guidance. The level of affordable housing should take into account an underlying land value which would be acceptable to a willing seller. If a reasonable land value cannot be achieved then it is unrealistic to expect a Landowner (unless desperate) to enter into agreement which will not realise a level of value which would encourage a sale.

#### APPENDIX 1

CRAVEN LOCAL PLAN PRE-PUBLICATION CONSULTATION DRAFT - VIABILITY ASSESSMENT –

## ADDENDUM REPORT AND DRAFT AFFORDABLE HOUSING POLICY, PREPARED BY SAVILLES.

We have been instructed by Skipton Properties to analyse the above report, which was published by Aspinall Verdi (AV) on 29th November 2017, and the subsequent Draft Affordable Housing Policy document. Herein we provide our view against the following points outlined in the report and the Draft Policy:

1. The recommendation that a minimum provision of 30% affordable housing on new build schemes is required across the District.
2. That abnormal costs on individual sites should be negotiated between the developer and the landowner and that 'only in very exceptional circumstances' will the local planning authority review individual sites in terms of scheme viability.
3. AV's opinion that profit should be split at 20% on the Gross Development Value (GDV) of private/market sale units and a 6% profit assigned to the affordable units on development sites.

### 1. Minimum provision of 30% affordable housing

A policy that specifies a minimum level of affordable housing, particularly at a high level such as 30%, is not practical as it does not provide certainty to developers. Less development will take place as a result of a minimum level of affordable housing being enforced on all sites as this will affect the financial viability on schemes.

Every development site differs based on a number of factors, including but not limited to: Gross Development Value (GDV, also known as sales revenue) based on housing mix, number of units, floor areas and sales rates per micromarket and development costs (such as build costs and abnormal costs). As the variables on each site is different, applying a 'minimum' across the board could jeopardise the entire viability of a site.

In addition, we would note that this 'minimum' policy does not conform to affordable housing policies from other local authorities across the country. As is the case with other local authorities, the affordable provision should therefore be a target provision and not a minimum.

### 2. Abnormal costs and viability in 'exceptional circumstances'

As indicated above, each site differs depending on a number of factors, which include but are not limited to, a combination of GDV and varying development costs. Build costs in particular are increasing rapidly at present as a result of labour, skills and materials shortages, and abnormal costs vary widely based on ground conditions, drainage, contamination etc. for each site. As each site has varying factors, these can hugely affect financial viability and as such each site and its individual circumstances should be considered on its own merit.

We therefore firmly reject the assumption that viability assessments should only be reviewed in exceptional circumstances.

### 3. Profit on GDV

AV's report indicates that when assessing the return (profit) on sites, a profit of 20% on the GDV should be applied on the market sale (private) units and 6% profit on the affordable units. Savills rejects this assumption.

We work with a range of housebuilders and continually monitor the level of profit margins that developers purchase land upon. The definitions of profit margins differ from developer to developer; but ultimately, the profit margin that developers use in calculating a land value is their Operating Margin.

Taking into consideration the current market conditions that the UK housing market finds itself in, developers require an operating margin of 18% to 22% of Gross Development Value (GDV) – or in simple terms a percentage of revenue, with the vast majority of schemes requiring a return of 20% of GDV.

### Risk

The level of profit required to pursue a scheme correlates with the level of risk, with a higher level of risk requiring levels of profit at the higher end of the scale. Examples of risk include:

- Specific market conditions (sales revenue, rate of sale);
- High levels of abnormal development costs;
- Lower levels of economies of scale;
- A housebuilder's lending facility and finance requirements;
- Macroeconomic and political concerns.

There are also a number of ongoing policy-related and macro-economic changes that will have an effect on schemes, which include:

- Uncertainty over both the global and UK economy following the referendum. Fitch and S&P downgrading the UK credit ratings from AAA to AA, GBP at its lowest level against

the dollar for more than 30 years, and uncertainty as to the timescales and terms relating to Brexit all add another layer of instability and uncertainty to the market;

- Recent Stamp Duty reforms for commercial property; and
- Increased Stamp Duty rates for those purchasing additional residential properties.

#### GLA Viability Toolkit (2014)

We would also refer to the GLA's Viability Toolkit (2014). In January 2014 the GLA updated its position on an appropriate level of developer return to be used in their Development Control Toolkit stating:

"The 2014 Toolkit, following the BNP Paribas Real Estate review, takes a composite benchmark of 20% Developer Return on the market element of the scheme. This replaces the approach previously adopted, which shows a 17% Developer Return".

"The 2014 Toolkit, following the BNP Paribas Real Estate review, takes a composite benchmark of 20%

Developer Return on the market element of the scheme. This replaces the approach previously adopted which shows a 17% Developer Return and a 6% Internal Overhead on build costs. The 20% Developer Return is seen to be competitive in current market circumstances. However, scheme specifics may suggest a lower or higher developer return is appropriate and should be amended reflecting site specifics where necessary."

The updates to the Toolkit follow on from BNP Paribas' review of the 2011 version. Table 4.2.1 (page 24) states that 20% profit on GDV is "reflective of levels currently required by funders."

#### Southwark CIL Viability Study, November 2013

In April 2015 the Council started charging CIL, based on viability evidence by BNP Paribas Real Estate. The target profit margin in the Council's study was 25% on Cost. BNPP state that:

"While Developer's Profit has to be assumed in any appraisal, its level is closely correlated with risk. The greater the risk, the higher the profit level required by lenders. While profit levels were typically up to around 15% of completed development value at the peak of the market in 2007, banks now require schemes to show a higher profit to reflect the current risk. Typically developers and banks are targeting around 20%-25% profit on Gross Development Value (GDV) or Cost respectively."

Appeal ref: APP/N2739/S/16/3149425 - Land off Flaxley Road, Selby YO8 4BW

The above site relates to the erection of circa 200 dwellings and the conversion of agricultural buildings to form a further 2 dwellings. A reduced affordable housing provision of 22% from 40% policy was agreed at an acceptable blended developer's profit of 20% on GDV.

Appeal ref: APP/N2739/S/17/3168721 - Land north of The Laurels, York Road, Barlby, Selby YO8 5JH We would also note the above site, which went to appeal in November 2017 for the erection of 37 dwellings, at a reduction of the affordable housing element from 40% to 6%. A profit on GDV was accepted at blended 20%

#### Additional supporting evidence

We have attached Savills Research paper 'Residential Development Margin – Competitive Return to a Willing Developer' dated October 2016, which provides additional justification of a blended 20% profit on GDV level.

We have also attached e-mail correspondence from a number of housebuilders across Yorkshire, who reiterate that their minimum requirement is a 20% return on GDV. Similarly we have included a letter from a funder that states that they will only fund development if its return is a minimum of 25% profit on GDV.

#### Conclusion

As indicated above, in addition to the requirement for a return of 20% profit on GDV across all tenures we unequivocally disagree with the assumption that a minimum of 30% affordable housing across the District is suitable. This does not provide certainty to developers, does not consider the fact that each site has varying factors that affect revenue and cost, and additionally it does not conform to affordable housing policies from other local authorities across the country. As is the case with other local authorities, the affordable provision should therefore be a target provision and not a minimum.

Given the individualities of each site we therefore also firmly reject the assumption that viability assessments should only be reviewed in exceptional circumstances.

Residential Development Margin  
Competitive Return to a Willing Developer  
Prepared by Savills.  
Executive Summary

The level of return required by a willing developer needs to have regard to the scale and complexity of the project in question, its cash efficiency, the scale of investment required and the embedded sales risk. Returns need to be set at a level which supports existing business models, stimulates new entrants into the housing market and which do not act as a barrier to entry to smaller less efficient companies. With no new entrants of scale into the housing market over the last ten years, and SME's in perpetual decline, the evidence would suggest that current returns are not adequate for the risks involved.

In all cases developer margin is essentially split into three components with Net Operating Margin, overheads and finance needing to be considered in order to derive a gross hurdle rate. This is more easily explained as follows:

Figure 1 Understanding Gross Margins

Operating Margin + Overheads = Site Level Net Margin + Finance = Gross Margin

Source: Savills

Establishing the correct Site Level Net Margin for incorporation into residual land value calculations used during development viability discussions is key to ensuring the continuation of a robust and sustainable residential development industry.

Our analysis indicates that Operating Margin targets for housebuilders across the economic cycle are 15-20% on Gross Development Value (GDV). Overheads vary significantly (5% - 12%) depending on the scale and type of developer. For the purpose of our analysis we have used an average of 8% on GDV and, after adjusting for site specific finance the resultant suggests a Site Level Net Margin target of 20-25% of GDV. It should be noted that this does not take account of any exceptional items or planning costs associated with the promotion of strategic sites. Similarly it does not take in to account the cost of securing and promoting unsuccessful sites, which developers have to cover centrally. This figure could subsequently be higher for certain types and scale of development, such as high capital projects in London and provincial City Centres. Also, in most cases, Return on Capital Employed (ROCE) is considered to be an equally important indicator, particularly on large capital intensive schemes. A target ROCE needs to be achieved alongside the Site Level Net Margin of 20-25% on GDV. This means that the minimum KPIs used within viability testing (the hurdle rates) should be a Site Level Net Margin of 20% - 25% on GDV, blended across all tenures, subject to also achieving a minimum site level hurdle rate of 25% Return on Capital Employed (ROCE).

Introduction

The Savills Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) team has a national mandate from the Home Builders Federation (HBF) to prepare CIL representations, attend Examination Hearings and offer CIL consultancy advice across the country. Savills is the only consultancy firm to have a team of this scale solely focused on CIL advice; making the CIL team a market leader.

The CIL team has been involved with all stages of the CIL process (both pre- and post-implementation) offering advice to landowners, housebuilders, developers and local authorities. Since its inception, the CIL team has submitted over 250 separate representations and formed over 100 local housebuilder and developer consortiums.

We are therefore well placed to observe trends in the emerging viability work and subsequent CIL examinations.

Purpose

The purpose of this Briefing Note is to present evidence of what represents a competitive return to a willing developer, taking account of the Government's policy priority to stimulate new entrants into the housing market, support the SME sector and to build one million homes during the course of this Parliament.

Please note that this report is based on research and publically available data compiled in the period January - June 2016.

Definitions



The following definitions will be referred to throughout the report:

Description Calculation Target

Percentages

Gross Development Value (GDV) = Total Development Receipts (Turnover) n/a

Operating Profit (£) = Turnover less All Development Costs (Excl. Cost of Debt) - Overheads

n/a

Operating Margin = Operating Profit (as a % of GDV) 15% to 20%

Gross Profit (£) = Operating Profit + Overheads n/a

Gross Margin = Gross Profit (as a % of GDV) 23% to 28%

Site Level Net Margin (% of GDV) = Minimum profit margin, or hurdle rate, required to allow the development to commence<sup>1</sup>

20% to 25%

Return on Capital Employed

(ROCE)

= Site Level Net Margin divided by annualised cumulative funds employed (including overheads)

Min. 25%

Overhead (%) The level of overhead required by a home builder (of any size) to undertake residential development (NB:

In addition to normal overheads many housing developers include the cost of directly employing design managers, buyers and surveyors within their cost of overheads).

Development Margin

Policy Background

1.1 The NPPF states that to ensure viability developments should provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer<sup>2</sup>.

1.2 A competitive return to a developer is one that provides a sufficient return for the developer to continue a successful and resilient business through the economic cycle; taking account of the risk profile of the business and its development programme, within the current policy environment.

1.3 A key policy priority of the Government is to build one million additional homes during the course of this Parliament. This is an ambitious target that will require further investment and expansion of output across all developers currently in the market, compared with the 180,000 gross additional homes that were delivered in 2014-15 (Figure 2). Expansion of output by Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs), including new entrants, is an essential part of the route to building one million homes. The steep decline in output from SMEs since the 2008-09 downturn is still holding back housebuilding, as shown in Figure 4.

Figure 2 Housebuilding and planning permissions in England - GRAPH SAVED ON SYSTEM

1.4 Expansion will require additional financial investment. A necessary condition of the financial investment required across both new entrants and existing developers is that developer margins and the return on capital employed are seen by those in the capital markets as being sufficiently robust and sustainable to justify that investment. In the case of quoted national housebuilders their finance is secured at a corporate level via capital markets. This enables them to secure competitive rates, as the majority of their business is undertaken by way of equity rather than debt. In contrast, SMEs secure finance on a project-by-project basis from third parties lenders at much higher rates (8-

14%).

1.5 The most readily available market evidence of a competitive return is the return achieved for the shareholders of the quoted Plc housebuilders, noting that the Top 14 House Builders accounted for 59% of new home starts in Great Britain in 2015<sup>3</sup>. The Operating Margins (based on Earnings or Profit before Interest and Tax) of the Plc housebuilders are shown in Figure 3 below.

Figure 3 Operating Margins of major housebuilders 1993 2015 - GRAPH SAVED ON SYSTEM

1.6 It should be noted that the analysis above refers to blended margins across the business, including:

All types, size and risk profile of site;

All tenures of housing, including market sale, market rent and affordable;

The costs of securing and promoting unsuccessful sites; and

Overheads.

1.7 A number of viability consultants argue that a different developer margin should be applied to private and affordable housing. However, it is increasingly common for developers to purchase land prior to securing an offer from Registered Providers who are subject to more market risk from the current affordable housing regime than in previous systems of funding. It should also be highlighted that even when a Registered Provider has been secured on a site, the developer is open to risk from planning, ground conditions, delays and abnormalities. Developers will therefore review a site as a whole, adopting a blended development margin to reflect the risk of the project in its totality.

1.8 Since the economic downturn, the average level of Operating Margin achieved has been building back to 15% to 20% which was achieved during the 2000 to 2007 period, when sector output was approaching and then exceeding 200,000 additional homes per annum (Figure 4 and Figure 2). Only if margins are maintained at these percentages will the required levels of investment in housebuilding be made, enabling significant investment in new entrants and reinvestment amongst existing developers. The margin needs to be sufficiently high to protect, or at least cushion, investors from such downturn risks as evidenced during the 2008-2009 downturn.

Figure 4 Registrations by size of housebuilder compared to margin levels - GRAPH SAVED ON SYSTEM

1.9 With the number of new entrants and SMEs in serious decline (as highlighted in Figure 4), this analysis highlights that existing and historic margins have been insufficient to stimulate a broader range of operators into the market. In order for the Government's targets to increase housing supply and SME operators to be realised, the level of competitive returns secured needs to be reflective of the risk and lending requirements of this key part of the sector.

Providers of Finance & Capital

1.10 Shareholders in the quoted housebuilders are principally institutional investors - pension funds, insurance companies and private equity funds. They have a wide range of companies and sectors to choose from, including retail, house building, mining, transport, energy and telecommunications, all with different risk and return profiles. If shareholders' hurdle rates are not achieved then they will invest in other sectors, reducing the development capacity of the house building sector.

1.11 In the case of SMEs the profile of their finance providers is different. Given the varying covenant strength of these companies (compared to national housebuilders) the requirements of lenders for development funding are much stricter. SMEs will therefore be required to demonstrate sufficient site level margins to cover the additional risk implied by their respective covenant strength. Acknowledgment of the additional overheads and finance costs incurred by SMEs needs, therefore, to be recognised.

Market Trends

1.12 The key measures are Site Level Net Margin and ROCE associated with a cashflow that is deliverable from a funder's perspective. For a development to be viable, all of these measures need to meet acceptable target levels.

Gross vs. Net Margins

1.13 As illustrated in Figure 1, it is important to distinguish between site level margins and the Operating Margin reported in house builder accounts. This is discussed in the Harman Report, which suggests that:

Overheads for house-building typically lie in the range of 5% - 10% of gross development value, with only the very largest developers operating near the lower end of the scale" 4 (emphasis added)

1.14 JP Morgan's analysis 5 of Plc housebuilder performance for the financial years 2012 and 2013 indicates that the average overheads of the quoted housebuilders (the difference between Gross Margin and Earnings Before Interest and Tax) were 6.4% and 6.0% of revenue respectively, averaging 6.2%. However, it should be highlighted that SMEs are subject to higher overheads, within the range of 5-12% of GDV. This suggests that an average of 8% for overheads is more appropriate, which when applied to a target Operating Margin range of 15% to 20% of revenue derives, at a corporate level, a Gross Margin of 23% to 28% of GDV.

1.15 In viability testing, if delivery is not to be constrained, operating margins should be set at a level which facilitates developers of all shapes and sizes; as opposed to a level which relies upon the efficiencies of scale achieved solely by the larger developers.

1.16 Both Operating Margin and Gross Margin are quoted before deduction of the cost of paying interest on debt, which at a corporate level has averaged 3-5% of GDV in recent years. Therefore the hurdle rate for Site Level Net Margin for larger housebuilders is 20-25% of GDV. For SMEs the hurdle rate will be higher (in the region of 25-30%) to reflect their higher project finance costs.

1.17 This is the basis of the developer margin hurdle rate that is applicable to site level development appraisals calculating the Residual Land Value (RLV), in which the cost of debt is included separately<sup>6</sup>.

1.18 Around this average, there will be a range of site specific development risks and therefore a range of site level hurdle rates for developer margin. For example: Smaller, lower density, less constrained sites are inherently less capital intensive and represent a lower delivery risk than costlier larger sites and higher density sites. It therefore follows that smaller, lower density sites hurdle rate will be below the corporate average. Although it should be noted that sales risk and delivery risk are inherently different. For example, a small site with low delivery risk can still represent a higher risk to the developer if in a high value location above the Help to Buy thresholds. In this case the site will require a higher hurdle rate to reflect the increased sales risk.

In contrast, larger complex sites requiring up-front infrastructure delivery and protracted timescales will be above the corporate level average. This is particularly relevant for brownfield sites where the extent of abnormal costs (ground conditions and remediation) is largely unknown at the outset.

Furthermore, on large sites there is significantly more sales risk, as there is greater uncertainty about the strength of market conditions over the life of the development, which is likely to include a market downturn. Such uncertainty both in terms of cost and timings increases the risk profile and therefore the hurdle rate required.

The variance in sales rate also needs to be considered, with the relative strength of the market reflected in the risk profile of a site. It therefore follows that larger sites in weaker or over-supplied markets reflect a greater risk and subsequently require a higher hurdle rate than similar sites in stronger markets. Similarly, larger projects pose a greater sales risk as they are likely to be developed across a property cycle introducing more uncertainty.

1.19 The above is particularly relevant for large-scale development and regeneration areas, where large upfront costs hamper the developer's ability to achieve the required ROCE, such that a higher margin is necessary to reflect the additional risk. In these instances, ROCE becomes the primary hurdle rate as highlighted by the Harman Report: "Developments of large flatted blocks on previously used land in urban areas with high cash requirements will demand significantly higher levels of profit to achieve an acceptable ROCE than developments of a more standard, less cash intensive nature on virgin ground. Likewise, projects with significant up-front infrastructure may also require higher levels of profit to generate an acceptable ROCE" <sup>7</sup>

1.20 The requirements for those investing in the sector will subsequently be a minimum hurdle rate of 25%. Although it is worth highlighting that our analysis is based on typical hurdle rates on sites across the Country. It does not therefore reflect the additional cost and risk associated with delivering sites in London. In this instance, different investment requirements may be sought, reflecting significantly higher minimum hurdle rates.

Appeal Precedent

1.21 For the reasons outlined above, development margin is a key point in viability discussions and will vary depending on a number of factors. This point has been acknowledged by a number of Inspectors at appeals, including the following:

Land at The Manor, Shinfield, Reading <sup>8</sup>

"The appellants supported their calculations by providing letters and emails from six national housebuilders who set out their net profit margin targets for residential developments. The figures ranged from a minimum of 17% to 28%, with the usual target being in the range 20-25%. Those that differentiated between market and affordable housing in their correspondence did not set different profit margins. Due to the level and nature of the supporting evidence, I give it great weight. I conclude that the national housebuilders' figures are to be preferred and that a figure of 20% GDV, which is at the lower end of the range, is reasonable" <sup>9</sup>

#### Land at Lowfield Road, Rotherham<sup>10</sup>

"The Council's approach, set out in the DVs report, is that a profit of around 17.5% is reasonable for a scheme of this nature, which equates (on a 'blended basis') to 16.47% on revenue. The DV has provided evidence to support this view, based on a range of sites identified only in general terms. The return to a developer is inevitably going to vary considerably between one development and another, and will properly reflect the risk of a specific project. Reference has been made to a number of appeal decisions where varying levels of developer profit have been accepted. However these other decisions are of limited value, as much will depend on the individual circumstances of the particular site and development.

There are various 'rules of thumb' which are quoted when discussing developer profit, and these generally vary between 15% and 25%. However, in general, it is reasonable to assume that on more marginal sites, profit expectations would be higher. In this case, the developer has been very clear about the slow sales and the reasons why the site has not been mothballed, as it otherwise might have been. This background tends to support a figure in the upper part of the 'normal' range.

In this case, recognising the approach of this appellant to the use of in-house professional expertise, the appellant's proposed level of developer profit shown in the viability appraisal (22% - i.e. 15% profit and 7% overheads) is reasonable. <sup>11</sup>

#### Land between Lydney Bypass and Highfield Road<sup>12</sup>

"The Council considered that due to the improving market a profit level of 17.5% would be reasonable. The Appellant on the other hand considered that 20% would be the minimum on which finance could be obtained. The amount required by a developer to undertake the development is a reflection of the anticipated risk. In this case the evidence indicates that the market is not an easy one within this part of the country. Although the Council considered that work had started on the site with the installation of the pumping station, I am not convinced that this would greatly reduce the risk element of the project. Whilst the greenfield site has an attractive position with enviable views it is not within a prime location on the edge of one of the major towns such as Gloucester or Cheltenham. Furthermore the scheme would be carried out over a relatively long time period and this would add to uncertainty in terms of future economic conditions.

Taking all of the above circumstances into account I consider that it is reasonable to adopt the Appellant's figure of 20% of gross development value as the input for Developer's profit in this case" <sup>13</sup>

#### Summary

The evidence in this paper indicates that the minimum margin used within viability testing for development sites should be a Site Level Net Margin<sup>14</sup> of 20-25% on GDV, blended across all tenures, subject to achieving a minimum site ROCE of 25%, subject to consideration of the risk profile of the scheme. Those sites with a higher risk profile (i.e. longer term projects with significant upfront infrastructure costs and abnormals) will be at the upper end of this range, shorter term projects with less capital intensive infrastructure are likely to fall at the lower end.

The reference to ROCE is particularly important on large, capital intensive schemes. This needs to be achieved in addition to the Site Level Net Margin of 20-25% on GDV. Typically, the assessment of viability is undertaken using ARGUS Developer or a bespoke residual land value model. These include a developer margin and normally report on IRR not ROCE. In these cases the relevant hurdle rate for site specific appraisals is an Internal Rate of Return of at least 25%.

A number of viability consultants argue that a different developer margin should be applied to private and affordable housing. If this is the case, then the blended margin across all tenures should equate to the hurdle rate referred to above.

It is increasingly common for developers to purchase land prior to securing an offer from Registered Providers who themselves are subject to more market risk from the current affordable housing regime than in previous systems of funding. There is, therefore, a heightened risk associated with the affordable housing in addition to increased holding and finance costs. We would also highlight that the potential for the introduction of Starter Homes results in an additional level of risk for developers (these units being retained by the housebuilder as opposed to being sold to a Registered Provider). Receipts from Starter Homes are received later on in a project's cashflow and, to reflect this increased risk, developers will subsequently require a higher return on these units compared to 'traditional' affordable housing.

g) The policy and text should therefore be amended as follows:

☐ Page 170, paragraph 6.17 and 6.18 of the draft Local Plan should be amended by the deletion of the following text:

“Abnormal costs associated with individual sites should be negotiated between the developer and the landowner.”

☐ Page 170, paragraph 6.18 of the draft Local Plan should be amended by the deletion of the following text:

“Only in very exceptional circumstances will the local planning authority review individual sites in terms of scheme viability”

and its replacement with something along the lines of:

“The financial viability of developments should be assessed on a scheme by scheme basis having regard to individual circumstances.”

Policy H2 should be amended by:

(i) the deletion of the text "a minimum of" from criterion a) l; and

(ii) the deletion of the text "not be acceptable unless it can be clearly demonstrated that exceptional circumstances exist which justify" from criterion a)l. and its replacement with something along the lines of:

"will be supported by an appropriate viability appraisal which justifies"

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      039                      Organisation      North Yorkshire County Council

Section or Policy	H2	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Representation Reference	039/06/H2/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Strategic Policy and Economic Growth

The County Council notes that the Plan seeks to achieve a minimum of 30% affordable housing. We also note the District Council's evidence base advises that this level is viable, whilst also meeting the funding requirements of the critical infrastructure needed to enable the delivery of the Plan. On this basis the County Council is supportive of this policy. However, we would urge that viability evidence base be kept under regular review, as we would be concerned if a change in the viability of development led to the delivery of such infrastructure becoming unviable.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      027      Organisation      Giggleswick School

Section or Policy      H2

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      027/05/H2/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Affordable Homes

4.21 CDC's SHMA Update<sup>11</sup> identifies that there is a net shortfall of 126 affordable dwellings pa. The PDLP identifies a target for affordable housing provision of 30%, which will be insufficient to meet the shortfall. The PDLP evidence base notes that the scale of affordable need in the District would justify a higher target but that it is important that the target itself is realistic and maintains general housing delivery. We highlight that the identification of a slightly higher housing requirement would yield a greater amount of affordable housing delivery, whilst achieving additional economic gains. We strongly encourage CDC to consider such an approach.

4.22 The 30% target is lower than that identified in the Pre-Publication Draft Local Plan (40%). This change in policy is proposed in response to an update to the Local Plan evidence in respect of viability<sup>12</sup>. The School welcomes the change in approach, noting that it is necessary to ensure that the delivery of new homes in the District is not compromised by unduly onerous obligations.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      060      Organisation      Craven Cattle Marts Ltd

Section or Policy      IM13

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to      Hellifield

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      No

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      060/03/IM13/OS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The identification of 'white land' to the south of the existing housing commitment within Hellifield (land south of Kendal Road). See attached plan for the relevant land.

Allocation of the land identified on the attached plan for housing would be a logical rounding off of the existing village. The site to the north already has planning permission for development. This site would be sandwiched between residential properties at Beckhouse to the west, residential properties at Park Crescent to the east, and the permitted housing to the north.

The site is sustainably located, close to the facilities within the village, and has excellent access to Hellifield train station and bus routes that provide public transport connections to larger settlements. A very small part of the land is identified as Flood Risk Area (the south eastern corner), but the majority of the site is suitable for development. Previous planning permissions have established that a good access into the site can be achieved from the A65 Kendal Road, and that the development would not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the local area. A development could take place from the site without causing an unacceptable impact on the amenities of existing neighbouring residents.

Allocation of the land for housing would therefore help to meet the housing needs of the District within a sustainable location that has no unacceptable planning impacts.

SITE PLAN SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The land identified on the attached plan should be allocated as a housing allocation within the Local Plan.

SITE PLAN SAVED ON SYSTEM.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      060      Organisation      Craven Cattle Marts Ltd

Section or Policy      IM13

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      060/01/IM13/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The identification of 'white land' between an existing employment premises occupied by Townson Tractors and an existing HGV depot.

Allocation of land identified on the attached plan as an employment site would be appropriate. The District has a need to find suitable sites for employment. Relatively flat sites that are not at risk from flooding, and with good access to the highway network, are in very limited supply.

The landowner is willing to make this land available for employment use. The site is sandwiched between an existing business to the east known as Townson Tractors and a HGV operating depot to the west. It could therefore be identified for employment development with a minimal impact on the character and appearance of the wider open countryside. Good access can be provided from the site onto the A65.

Allocation of the land for employment would therefore help meet the employment needs of the District without any unacceptable planning impacts.

SITE PLAN SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The land on the attached plan should be identified as an employment allocation within the Local Plan.

SITE PLAN SAVED ON SYSTEM.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      060      Organisation      Craven Cattle Marts Ltd

Section or Policy      IM13

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Hellifield      Representation Reference      060/06/IM13/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

the identification of land to the east of Haw Grove, Hellifield as land for Sport and Recreation and land to the east of Thornview Road as 'white land'. See attached plan for the relevant land.

All of the land identified on the attached plan is owned by CCM Ltd. A peppercorn rent is paid to CCM Ltd for the sports field.

The existing sports ground is recognised by the Council's Sports Development Officer as needing significant improvement and investment. In particular it is understood that changing facilities at the site are inadequate.

An opportunity is available to secure significant investment in the Sporting provision as the site, secure the provision of improved sporting facilities, and provide land for housing in a sustainable location that would have no unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the local landscape.

Both the sports ground and white land to the east should be collectively allocated as an 'Opportunity Site' to provide improved sporting facilities that will be secured through the provision of residential development on part of the site. It is envisaged that access to the site will be needed from Haw Grove, and that any resulting development will maintain at least the same amount of land for sporting use and furthermore will significantly enhance the sporting facilities at the site. In addition to a site allocation, a new planning policy within the plan will be required to facilitate and guide development proposals on the land.

SITE PLAN SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Both the sports ground and white land to the east should be collectively allocated as an 'Opportunity Site' to provide improved sporting facilities that will be secured through the provision of residential development on the land. The attached plan identifies the land to be allocated. In addition to a site allocation, a new planning policy within the plan will be required to facilitate and guide development proposals on the land to ensure that any resulting development will maintain at least the same amount of land for sporting use, and furthermore will significantly enhance the sporting facilities at the site.

SITE PLAN SAVED ON SYSTEM.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      060      Organisation      Craven Cattle Marts Ltd

Section or Policy      IM13

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Hellifield      Representation Reference      060/07/IM13/OS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The identification of 'white land' to the east of Gisburn Road, Hellifield. See attached plan for the relevant land.

Allocation of the land identified on the attached plan for housing would be a logical rounding off of the existing village. The site would be very much an infill location sited adjacent to, and in-between, other built development.

The site is sustainably located, close to the facilities within the village, and has excellent access to Hellifield trainstation and bus routes that provide public transport connections to larger settlements. The land is not Flood Risk Area and the site is suitable for development. Direct access can be achieved onto Gisburn Road, and development could be undertaken without having an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the local area. A development could also take place from the site without causing an unacceptable impact on the amenities of existing neighbouring residents.

Allocation of the land for housing would therefore help to meet the housing needs of the District within a sustainable location that has no unacceptable planning impacts.

SITE PLAN SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The land identified on the attached plan should be allocated as a housing allocation within the Local Plan.

SITE PLAN SAVED ON SYSTEM.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	059	Organisation		
Section or Policy		IM14	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Gargrave		Representation Reference	059/26/IM14/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policies Map/ Inset Map 14

Object - The fields south of Marton Road, opposite the Mason's Arms and to the west should be designated as Local Green Space.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      030      Organisation      Glusburn Holdings Ltd

Section or Policy      IM2

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      SC037(a)      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      Glusburn and Crosshills      Representation Reference      030/04/IM2/OS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Further to our representations in response to Draft Policies SP4, SP8 and EC2 - including with regard to our client's land to the south and west of Hayfield Mills, Glusburn - it is considered that Inset Map 2 is unsound for the reasons stated in those aforementioned representations i.e. related to the omission of the land as a housing allocation and it's inclusion within the 'Existing Employment Area' designation.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Modifications:

It is considered that Inset Map 2 should be amended as follows:

to reduce the extent of the Existing Employment Area, to remove the land to the south and west of Hayfield Mills that is surplus to requirements and has been for some time (i.e. all of the land within the potential development site as shown on the indicative site layout that accompanies our representations on Draft Policy SP8);

To allocate the land to the west and south of Hayfield Mills that is surplus to requirements (again as shown on the indicative site layout that accompanies these representations) for residential development;

Remove Site Ref. SC037(a) as a Draft Housing Allocations if it does not comprise genuine previously developed land (as defined in the Framework).

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Given the nature of our representations in response to Draft Policies SP4, SP8, EC2 and Inset Map 2, we consider that it would be beneficial to have the opportunity to explain and expand on our comments in relation to this proposed development site - and for related discussions to take place on the range of issues involved and the Council's justification for excluding the site from its proposed housing allocations despite its clear sustainability credentials and the Council's own support for the site earlier in the Local Plan preparation process - as part of the oral examination.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID	046	Organisation	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Bolton Abbey		
Section or Policy		IM20		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Embsay with Eastby		Representation Reference	046/12/IM20/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

INSET MAP No. 20: EMB SAY WITH EASTBY

CST owns land to the south of Shires Lane and east of the cricket field, Embsay.

The land received planning consent in 2016 at appeal for housing development.

CST SUPPORTS the identification of the land concerned as an Existing Housing Commitment on the proposals map for Embsay.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      060      Organisation      Craven Cattle Marts Ltd

Section or Policy      IM21

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Carleton      Representation Reference      060/02/IM21/OS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The identification of 'white land' to the north and south of Leys Close, Carleton. See attached plan for the relevent land.

Allocation of the land identified on the attached plan for housing would be a logical site for new development within the existing village. The site would be very much an infil location sited adjacent to, and in-between, other built development.

The site is sustainably located, close to the facilities within the village and has excellent access to the principle town of Skipton. The land is not Flood Risk Area and the site is suitable for development. Consideration would need to be given to protecting the setting of the adjacent church, but in principle development could be undertaken without having an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the local area. A development could also take place from the site without causing an unacceptable impact on the amenities of existing neighbouring residents.

There are no proposed housing allocations within the village of Carleton, despite the village being very close to the principle District Town of Skipton and the village offering some basic facilities and services. The proposals map for the Publication Draft Local Plan does however identify an existing housing commitment on the northern side of Carla Beck Lane. Outline Planning permission was given in July 2016, under Planning Ref. 17/2016/16571, for circa 24 dwellings. This development, which would have provided housing within the village, is no longer to go ahead. The site has instead been purchased by a nearby resident who did not wish to see such a significant development go ahead. Instead planning approval now exists for a scheme of just 4 dwellings, with full planning permission being given in October 2017 under Planning Ref. 17/2017/18073.

As the existing housing commitment at Carla Beck Lane, Carleton will not go ahead, there is a requirement to find other realistic sites for housing development within the village. There are no obvious constraints on this site that would prevent development, and therefore, allocation of the land would be appropriate to help meet the housing needs of the District.

SITE PLAN SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The land identified on the attached plan should be allocated as a housing allocation within the Local Plan.

SITE PLAN SAVED ON SYSTEM.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      046      Organisation      Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Bolton Abbey

Section or Policy      IM24

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Bolton Abbey

Representation Reference      046/09/IM24/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### PROPOSALS MAP FOR BOLTON ABBEY

CST SUPPORTS the draft proposals map for Bolton Abbey (as shown at Fig.1 below).

CST notes that the proposals map identifies the part of its Core Visitor Area (CVA) within the Craven Local Plan area with the legend 'Core Visitor Area (Tourism-Led, Mixed-Use Development Opportunity Site at Bolton Abbey) EC4a'. CST notes that the area of its CVA which sits within the National Park has been taken off the map (at the request of the YDNPA). CST considers that the greater clarity provided by the proposals map is to be welcomed, but has no major comment on the change.

The proposals map identifies:

General locations for development within the Core Visitor Area at Bolton Abbey EC4a

These locations are referred to in policy EC4a as:

- Land including and surrounding the main village car park at Bolton Abbey village
- Land to the north-north-west of the B6160 / A59 roundabout at Bolton Bridge
- Land north of the highway spur (part of former A59) to the west of the B6160 at Bolton Bridge

The proposals map provides clarity on locations for development incorporated in the policy and is supported as such.

COPY OF PROPOSALS MAP INCLUDED IN REPRESENTATION. SAVED ON SYSTEM.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council





Respondent ID      062                      Organisation      Francmanis Properties

Section or Policy	IM4	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference	SG027	Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Settle	Representation Reference	062/03/IM4/CN

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

REPRESENTATION TO PUBLICATION CONSULTATION DOCUMENT IN RELATION TO 'LAND TO THE SOUTH OF BROCKHOLE VIEW AND WEST OF BROCKHOLE LANE, SETTLE' (SG027 AND SG068)

APPENDIX 2 – Triangle of land on western edge of site SG027

On behalf of our client, Francmanis Properties, we would like to highlight an error on the Publication Draft Craven Local Plan Submission Policies Map.

Whilst the allocation of SG027 is welcome we note that the draft allocation of the site includes an area designated as 'Green Infrastructure Provision on Draft Housing Allocation', as highlighted in the map extract below:

Figure 1: Area (circled in red) identified as Green Infrastructure Provision within the Publication Draft Craven Local Plan Submission Policies Map

The area highlighted above currently is subject to outline planning permission for the erection of circa 16no. dwellings and associated access. This application was determined under reference 62/2016/17447 and received approval at the Planning Committee Meeting on 13th March 2017. We are aware that our client is currently in the process of finalising a S106 Agreement with Craven District Council at which point planning permission will be agreed.

Once agreed the site will have outline permission for circa 16 dwellings and whilst the permission would only be in outline, the application submission included an indicative scheme as shown below:

Figure 2: indicative scheme submitted as part of application 62/2016/17447 with approximate area of green infrastructure provision marked in red

The indicative scheme shows the provision of 7 dwellings in the area marked as an area designated as 'Green Infrastructure Provision on Draft Housing Allocation' in the Publication Draft Local Plan. Our client would object strongly to the allocation of this small area of land for green infrastructure as it could result in the loss of an area that already has outline planning permission for residential development.

For this reason, THE PROPOSED GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AREA SHOULD NOT be included within this area and the full site should be shown as a draft housing allocation. Should you have any questions or queries in respect to the housing allocation please do not hesitate to contact us.

PLANS SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID 062 Organisation Francmanis Properties

Section or Policy IM4

Plan is Legally Compliant? Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound? Not Specified

Site Reference SG027, SG068

Plan is DtC Compliant? Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to Settle

Representation Reference 062/02/IM4/CN

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

REPRESENTATION TO PUBLICATION CONSULTATION DOCUMENT IN RELATION TO 'LAND TO THE SOUTH OF BROCKHOLE VIEW AND WEST OF BROCKHOLE LANE, SETTLE' (SG027 AND SG068)

APPENDIX 1 – Land to the North East of sites SG027 and SG068

On behalf of our client, Francmanis Properties, we would like to highlight an error on the Publication Draft Craven Local Plan Submission Policies Map.

On maps 4 & 4a: Settle and Giggleswick, an area to the north east of our client's landholding off Ingfield Lane (north east of site SG027 and SG068) is shown as NOT having an allocation, as shown on the map extract below:

Figure 1: Area (circled in red) that should be shown as an existing housing commitment within the Publication Draft Craven Local Plan Submission Policies Map

The area highlighted above currently has planning permission for the erection of 4no. dwellings. This application was determined under reference 62/2015/16414 and approved by Craven District Council on 13th January 2016.

In light of the above, on behalf of our client Francmanis Properties, we request that this area is shown as an 'Existing Housing Commitment' on the Submission Policies Map. The image below shows outlined in red the area that should be allocated.

Should you have any questions or queries in respect to the housing allocation please do not hesitate to contact us.

SITE PLANS SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      016      Organisation      Skipton Properties Ltd

Section or Policy      INF1

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      8.2

Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      016/05/INF1/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### SECTION 8 INFRASTRUCTURE, SERVICES AND FACILITIES

##### 4.4 Draft Policy INF1: PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

4.4.1 Paragraph 8.2: – Community Infrastructure Levy. This paragraph states that the Council will consider introducing a Community Infrastructure Levy and that developers will be ‘safeguarded from double charging’. The Local Plan Viability

Assessment is however, predicated on the basis that the Council will not introduce CIL. That is, the policies within the plan that set out obligations for affordable housing, open space, education are all derived from an evidence base that specifically excluded the potential additional burden of CIL on developers. This paragraph indicates that the Council intends to now retrospectively introduce CIL once the Local Plan is adopted. This is unsound because to do so would completely undermine the evidence base for these Local Plan policies. Paragraph 8.2 should be deleted unless the Council clarifies in this statement that it will only consider a CIL in conjunction with a future review of the Local Plan.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Paragraph 8.2 should be deleted unless the Council clarifies in this statement that it will only consider a CIL in conjunction with a future review of the Local Plan.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      021                      Organisation      Education and Skills Funding Agency

Section or Policy                      INF1

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?                      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?              Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      021/01/INF1/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

1. The Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) welcomes the opportunity to contribute to the development of planning policy at the local level.
2. The ESFA submitted comments to the Craven Local Plan Consultation (Reg 18), in July 2017, in which we made a number of comments and suggestions in relation to the education sections of the Local Plan, which we felt would help support the development of a sound Local Plan.

Comments on the Local Plan / Site Allocations DPD

3. As you will be aware, the primary focus at this stage of the Local Plan's preparation is on the soundness of the plan, with regard to it being positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The following detailed comments set out the ESFA's view of the plan's soundness in respect of education provision.
4. Given the requirement for all Local Plans to be consistent with national policy, the ESFA also welcomes the explicit reference in paragraph 8.53 to the importance placed within the NPPF on the need to ensure that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Amending Policy INF1 Planning Obligations to include support for the allocation of land for the expansion of existing schools, and/or the provision of new schools, would further demonstrate that the plan has been 'positively prepared' based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed infrastructure requirements.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      059      Organisation

Section or Policy      **INF1**

Paragraph      8.1

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      059/21/INF1/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Support - That obligations should b e directly related to the development.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      008      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy      INF1

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      008/25/INF1/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### SECTION 8: INFRASTRUCTURE, SERVICES AND FACILITIES

5.63 It is important that the Council meets the objectively assessed needs for the District and ensures that sufficient infrastructure is provided. In this regard the introduction of the requirement for a primary school at this stage of the Plan preparation is questioned. Whilst the principle is supported (if the evidence suggests it is required) more clarity and certainty is required.

#### DRAFT POLICY INF1: PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

5.64 At present, we have no comment upon this policy requirement but wish to register our interest as the Site SK089/090 falls to be considered under its provisions. A more detailed commentary is provided in Section 6.0 of this representation. However, we reserve our right to comment upon this policy, if necessary

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID      014      Organisation      NHS Property Services

Section or Policy      INF2

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      014/01/INF2/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy INF2 (Community Facilities and Social Spaces) of the Local Plan 2033 restricts the loss or change of use of existing ‘community facilities’. Whilst Paragraph 70 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should ‘guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services’, the overarching objective of this same paragraph is to ensure the delivery of facilities and services for the community. Policies aimed at preventing the loss or change of use of community facilities and assets, where healthcare is included within this definition, can have a harmful impact on the NHS’s ability to ensure the delivery of facilities and services for the community. Where such policies are overly restrictive, the disposal of unneeded and unsuitable healthcare facilities for best value can be prevented or delayed. This has a direct impact on the provision and quality of healthcare facilities and services, as it can prevent or delay the reinvestment of capital in modern and fit-for-purpose facilities and require ongoing revenue to be spent on maintaining inefficient parts of the estate. Furthermore, most surplus healthcare facilities are purpose built and at the end of their useful lives, and thus highly unlikely to be viable or suitable for other uses. It is important to note that there are separate, rigorous testing and approval processes employed by NHS commissioners to identify unneeded and unsuitable healthcare facilities. These must be satisfied prior to any property being declared surplus and put up for disposal. An essential element of supporting the wider transformation of NHS services and the health estate is to ensure that surplus and vacant NHS sites are not strategically constrained by local planning policies, particularly for providing alternative uses (principally housing). Much surplus NHS property is outdated and no longer suitable for modern healthcare or other C2 or D1 uses without significant investment. Where NHS commissioners can demonstrate that healthcare facilities are no longer required for the provision of services, there should be a presumption that such sites are suitable for housing (or other appropriate uses), and should not be subject to restrictive policies or periods of marketing.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID	008	Organisation	The Wilman Family		
Section or Policy		INF2		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	008/26/INF2/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

DRAFT POLICY INF2: COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SOCIAL SPACES  
5.65 At present we have no comment upon this policy requirement but wish to register our interest as the Site SK089/090 may require the provision of on-site improvements. A more detailed commentary is provided in Section 6.0 of this representation. However, we reserve our right to comment upon this policy, if necessary.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID      057      Organisation      Theatres Trust

Section or Policy      INF2

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      057/01/INF2/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Community Facilities and Social Spaces

As noted in our previous representation the Theatres Trust supports references to ‘culture’ throughout this and other policies within the proposed plan.

The protection given to existing facilities through Draft Policy INF2 is also supported.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	035	Organisation		
Section or Policy		INF3	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Inset map 18	Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Thornton in Craven		Representation Reference	035/01/INF3/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The front garden Beech House has been included in Inset map18 for Thornton in Craven.  
INF3 refers to the provision, protection and improvement of parks, sports field and recreational grounds with public access.  
In the case of my frontage this is clearly not the case as its private lawn/garden with no public access and could not be used for sports/recreational activities. I feel that its been included by mistake and should be removed from the inset map

LAND REGISTRY PLANS INCLUDED IN REPRESENTATION. SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Remove my private land shown on the attached plans from inset map designation

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      027      Organisation      Giggleswick School

Section or Policy      INF3

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      SG015

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Giggleswick

Representation Reference      027/08/INF3/OS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

South of Riversdale (SG015)

6.17 Site SG015 comprises 0.22ha of land immediately south of Riversdale and north of Lord's playing fields. It is an undeveloped site and includes a small number of trees which were the subject of an Arboricultural Assessment, which was submitted to CDC in August 2014 alongside an illustrative layout for residential development. These submissions demonstrated that the site can be appropriately developed whilst also retaining the most valuable trees.

6.18 CDC also controls a small area of land at and adjoining the site. The School has previously been in discussions with CDC regarding its delivery and would be willing to work with CDC in respect of its joint promotion and disposal. The School would appreciate further discussions with CDC in respect of this matter.

6.19 There are no known utility or infrastructure capacity issues within the area which would pose an obstacle to the early delivery of the site. It is small in scale with a potential yield of 6 dwellings, and it is therefore anticipated that it can be readily accommodated within the existing infrastructure network. It can be accessed either via:

- Riversdale without necessitating access from the narrow access road at the northern boundary of the site; and/or
- Bankwell Road by means of a link at the north of the Lord's playing field.

6.20 CDC's SHLAA identified that the land is suitable for residential development and this was confirmed by its identification as a 'Preferred Housing Site' in the first draft Local Plan in late 2014. This conclusion is reiterated in the evidence base which accompanies the PDL19.

6.21 The site was previously designated as 'Existing Recreation/Amenity Space' by the Craven District Local Plan (1999) and is proposed to be designated as 'Open Space, Civic Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities' by Policy INF3 of the PDL19. The School objects to the designation of the land as such. It is marginal land and is unused. It is currently dominated by overgrown scrub vegetation and cannot be viably used as part of the playing fields to the south. As such, it is not used and has no value as open space. The designation of the land as such is therefore unjustified and, as such, is unsound.

6.22 The School objects to the designation of SG015 as open space and considers that it should instead be allocated for a small-scale residential development.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		INF5		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Criterion C		Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	017/61/INF5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy INF5 Criterion (c)  
Sound We support the requirement that new communications infrastructure should avoid harm to sensitive areas in line with the provisions of Policy ENV2. This will ensure that such developments do not detract from those elements which help to give the District its special character.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      039      Organisation      North Yorkshire County Council

Section or Policy      INF5

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      039/20/INF5/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Mobile Communications

##### Mobile Infrastructure:

Although it states that Craven is reasonably well provisioned for mobile coverage, the effects of new development can affect coverage greatly. Rather than having the Mobile Operators react to customer demand following a new development, within the plans for new housing or industrial developments the provision for 4G mobile phone coverage should be built within the development. If it could be included as part of the planning conditions for the developer then it would be included as part of the development costs.

The advantages in doing this are:-

- Developments are not built with no or poor mobile phone coverage
- The marketing value of the properties increase with the guarantee of the latest mobile phone connectivity
- The greater potential for economic growth within the area this then provides
- The masts to cover the developments could be built into the design of the development and therefore no stand out as retrospective build sites do
- It is cheaper to deploy as part of initial site build
- Developments are not built that block present signal.

The County Council would encourage the District to ensure that its policies enable it to secure fibre to the premises as part of the consenting of all new properties, accepting that in more remote locations this may not be practicable.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	021	Organisation	Education and Skills Funding Agency
---------------	-----	--------------	-------------------------------------

Section or Policy INF6

## Paragraph

### Site Reference

### Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
----------------------------	---------------

Plan is Sound?	No
----------------	----

Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
------------------------	---------------

Representation Reference 021/05/INF6/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

## Developer Contributions and CIL

8. One of the tests of soundness is that a Local Plan is 'effective' i.e. the plan should be deliverable over its period. In this context and with specific regard to planning for schools, there is a need to ensure that education contributions made by developers are sufficient to deliver the additional school places required to meet the increase in demand generated by new developments. The ESFA notes that you do not currently have a CIL charging schedule in place and that S106 Agreements will be used to secure the infrastructure necessary to new support new development sites within Craven. The ESFA supports the Council's approach to ensure developer contributions address the impacts arising from growth.

9. The ESFA has requested modifications to the Local Plan to ensure that sufficient developer contributions are sought in all cases. In the opinion of the ESFA, the Local Plan does not demonstrate effectiveness in delivering education infrastructure, because Draft Policy INF6: Education Provision fails to give sufficient guidance regarding the funding mechanism that will be used to provide additional school places.

## Conclusion

10. Finally, I hope the above comments are helpful in finalising Craven's Local Plan, with specific regard to the provision of land for new schools.

11. Please notify the ESFA when the Local Plan is submitted for examination, the Inspector's report is published and the Local Plan is adopted.

12. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries regarding this response. The ESFA looks forward to continuing to work with Craven District Council to develop a sound Local Plan which will aid in the delivery of new schools.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The ESFA considers this to be an issue of soundness which can be rectified by ensuring that the infrastructure policies and supporting text include the following:

- ② Free transfer of land to the Council and construction costs to be met by the development, including trigger points for delivery, on sites which include a school.
- ② Clear references to the funding mechanism to be applied, whether Section 106 or CIL, and cross-references to the relevant evidence that justifies this approach.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      039      Organisation      North Yorkshire County Council

Section or Policy      INF6

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      039/07/INF6/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Children and Young People's Services

We welcome the proposal for securing contributions thorough planning obligations for education.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      016                      Organisation      Skipton Properties Ltd

Section or Policy	INF6	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Representation Reference	016/08/INF6/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### 4.5 Draft Policy INF6: EDUCATION PROVISION

4.5.1 Policy INF6 and the accompanying Appendix B are UNSOUND because there is no evidence to justify the thresholds at which contributions will be sought and no evidence to justify the proposed formula for calculating contributions. The Policy also fails to set out any detail on the circumstances where a contribution will be necessary having regard to an objective assessment of need to meet education infrastructure requirements.

4.5.2 INF6: 1st Para and criterion (d): States that planning obligations for education will be sought ‘where necessary’. Neither the supporting text or Appendix B defines ‘where necessary’. In fact, the whole policy and Appendix B fails to clarify any circumstances at all where it will not be necessary for a contribution from a residential development. The Policy and Appendix therefore lacks any credibility as there is a complete lack of transparency on the actual circumstances where a contribution will be necessary relative to the CIL Reg tests. In practical terms, a residential development may have an impact on a local school within the school catchment area of the development site in circumstances where that school has a lack of capacity to accommodate the number of children that might be ‘generated’ by the development. In those circumstances, there is a clearly a ‘need’ to increase the capacity of the school and a reasonable contribution can assist towards that objective.

4.5.3 In order to be transparent, the Policy and Appendix B must clearly set out the circumstances where a contribution will be necessary. In doing so, the Council needs to have regard to the following issues. NYCC Education Authority can provide an assessment of the current school capacity (the number of children it can accommodate) against the actual number of children on the school roll at the time of the application in order to work out the ‘spare capacity’. If there is a lack of capacity at the time of the application, a contribution to improve that capacity may be necessary. The same exercise can also be undertaken using forecasts from the Education Authority over a 3/5 year period of the likely increase in the school roll, in order to determine if there is any ‘spare capacity’ in 3/5 years’ time. This is designed to reveal whether there is likely to be any capacity issues at the point the residential development delivers occupied houses. There are though fundamental flaws with this approach, and the Council/Education Authority needs to clearly set out the exact methodology for calculating the forecast school occupancy rates. This is because it is likely the forecast increase in school occupancy is based on population and migration projections. These will be the same population and migration projections used to forecast housing need requirements as the basis for identifying housing allocations. Thus, there is likely to be an element of double counting if the Education Authority forecasts an increase in a school’s occupancy, and then calculates an additional increase in occupancy from an allocated housing site. The detail of these ‘necessary’ tests must be clearly articulated and evidenced, and set out in the Policy itself.

4.5.4 INF6 (a) and (b): This deals with the thresholds at which a contribution will be sought. Reference is made in Appendix B (p 4.1) to “North Yorkshire has operated a policy and methodology”... in relation to a threshold of 25 dwellings. This policy and methodology is not referenced nor forms part of the CDC Local Plan evidence base. In any event, CDC seeks to depart from this NYCC norm and introduces a lower threshold of 15 dwellings for all sites outside of Skipton. There is no evidence for this policy approach. The Council must evidence and clearly set out its reasons for the proposed site size thresholds and that evidence must be subject to scrutiny.

4.5.5 INF6 (c): The last part of this criterion adds “...if they are clearly incapable of being enlarged to two-bedroom units.” This is a completely subjective test, incapable of being rationally measured. It is unnecessary, and introduces uncertainty and ineffectiveness into the policy criterion. It should be deleted.

4.5.6 INF6 Appendix B: As a general point, the Appendix contains elements of Policy not justification. It needs careful review, with the elements of Policy taken out and inserted directly into Policy INF6.

4.5.7 Appendix B Para 2.1: This paragraph states that the Council will consider applying a requirement for education contributions from retail and employment developments. As above, this is policy not justification. And it is un-evidenced Policy which conflicts with the attempted justification in the remainder of Appendix B. It is unsound and should be deleted.

4.5.8 Appendix B Para 3.2: This paragraph is seeking to prevent disaggregation of sites in order to avoid the thresholds for contributions. Firstly, this is policy and not justification. Secondly, it is unnecessary in any event because each application must be considered on its individual merits against the ‘need and threshold tests’ set out in Policy.

4.5.9 Appendix B Para 5.14: This sets out a Policy position (not justification) of requiring a claw back period (for unspent commuted sums) of 10 years. This is not reasonable on the basis that the justification for a commuted sum is that it must be necessary to resolve a school capacity issue and thus fairly related to the development. Applications for full permission must (under current legislation) be implemented within 3 years of permission. In Craven, the majority of sites are under 100 dwellings and thus will be built out within 5 years of permission. If the required contribution has not been spent by the Education Authority within 5 years of the payment (often made at 50% occupation) – it cannot have been needed to resolve an infrastructure issue. The issue here is that the Council and the Education Authority, in justifying the need for a contribution, must then act within a reasonable period to ensure that contribution is spent on increasing capacity at the school local to the development site – so that those residents are not faced with an infrastructure deficiency. The claw back period should be a maximum of 3 years from payment for that reason. More importantly, this paragraph attempts to introduce a policy of allowing the Education Authority to direct paid contributions away from the school where the need (and thus the basic justification for the contribution) has been identified. This is the opposite of fair and transparent as any ‘necessary’ contributions should be ring fenced to the school with the identified capacity problem.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      021      Organisation      Education and Skills Funding Agency

Section or Policy      INF6

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      021/02/INF6/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

5. It would be helpful if Policy INF6 Education Provision were amended to include links to the relevant documents used by NYCC to assess need and demand for additional school places. Whilst we have no doubt around the quality of assessment undertaken by NYCC this would help to demonstrate more clearly that the approach to the planning and delivery of education infrastructure is justified based on proportionate evidence.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	008	Organisation	The Wilman Family		
Section or Policy		INT		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	008/05/INT/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

5 LOCAL PLAN DOCUMENT

5.1 The comments and observations contained in the following section mirror the structure of the Local Plan so far as it is relevant.

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

5.2 Setting out a background to the preparation of the Local Plan, this provides a useful summary of the context for the Local Plan process, structure of the Plan and supplementary documents (DtC) and appraisals (SA) which have been prepared or are being drafted to inform and guide the spatial strategy in the Plan and for the production of neighbourhood planning documents.

5.3 Comments upon the Plan period (paragraphs 1.1 and 1.8) are raised elsewhere.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	008	Organisation	The Wilman Family		
Section or Policy		INT		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		PLAN PERIOD PARA 1.1 and 1.8 et al		Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	No
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	008/03/INT/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Plan Period

4.9 It is noted that the draft Local Plan has a twenty year time frame for the period 2012 to 2032. Whilst it is positive that the Council has already proposed a modest extension to the Plan period from 2030 to 2032, our view is that such an aspiration would have been appropriate five years ago. Consequently an end date to the Local Plan period of 2032 is not supported by the respondents as it is not a justified position.

4.10 Assuming adoption of the Local Plan document by early 2019, a remaining plan period of twelve years falls short of the fifteen year period advised in the Framework. This is particularly so as it appears that the Plan does not appear to take into account longer term requirements as envisaged at Paragraph 157.

4.11 To address this point we consider that the planning authority should extend the Plan period to 2035 which would be consistent with the aims of the Framework and would be commensurate with adjoining (North Yorkshire) authorities,for example Harrogate Borough Council to the north which is working on a similar time frame for adoption of the Local Plan.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID      027                      Organisation      Giggleswick School

Section or Policy                      INT

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph                      1.8

Plan is Sound?                      No

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?              Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      027/03/INT/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### The Plan Period

4.18 The NPPF states that Local Plans should be “...drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon...” (paragraph 157). It is noted that CDC’s current timetable<sup>9</sup> anticipates adoption of the emerging Local Plan in March 2019. Even if this is achieved, which is considered to be somewhat unlikely, it will mean that the Local Plan covers only a 13-year time horizon given that the plan period will end in 2032. In this respect, the PDLP is inconsistent with the NPPF and is therefore unsound. The plan period must be extended to 2034 at the earliest.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      028      Organisation      Home Builders Federation

Section or Policy      INT      Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      1.1 and 1.8      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      No

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      028/01/INT/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CRAVEN LOCAL PLAN: PUBLICATION DRAFT (Reg 19)

Thank you for consulting with the Home Builders Federation on the Publication Draft Craven Local Plan Regulation 19 document.

The HBF is the principal representative body of the house-building industry in England and Wales. Our representations reflect the views of our membership, which includes multi-national PLC's, regional developers and small, local builders. In any one year, our members account for over 80% of all new "for sale" market housing built in England and Wales as well as a large proportion of newly built affordable housing.

The Council will be aware that the HBF provided comments upon the previous drafts of the plan, dated 31st October 2014, 9th May 2016 and 31st July 2017.

Plan Period

The plan period is clearly set out at paragraph 1.1 and 1.8 of the document. It is noted that the end date remains at 2032. Whilst it is recognised that the Council previously extended the plan period from 2030 to 2032 the slippage in plan preparation means that it is now unlikely to achieve a 15-year time horizon post adoption. The Council will be aware that the NPPF, paragraph 157, identifies a preference for a time horizon of at least 15 years. The HBF suggests that the Council consider further extending the plan period to accord with this preference.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	To debate the comments made within our representations further and in greater detail. To ensure that the industry can respond to any additional evidence provided by the Council or others following submission of the plan.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--



Respondent ID      055      Organisation      KCS Development Limited

Section or Policy      INT

Plan is Legally Compliant?      No

Paragraph      1.8

Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Gargrave

Representation Reference      055/01/INT/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Section: Plan Period (paragraph 1.8)

#### Introduction

1.1 This representation has been written by Johnson Mowat on behalf of KCS Development in relation to the Publication draft Craven Local Plan and their land interest at Skipton Road, Gargrave (site ref GA025).

1.2 Johnson Mowat has made representations to the Craven Local Plan at various stages both in relation to the general policies and the site specific selection process. It should also be noted that representations have also been made to the Gargrave Neighbourhood Plan process at every opportunity.

1.3 A planning application is currently pending consideration with the Council in relation to site GA025 for the residential development of 44 dwellings.

1.4 We take this opportunity to raise concerns in relation to the soundness of the Local Plan as currently drafted and in particular bring attention to significant failures on the Council's behalf in relation to the preparation of the Local Plan and the site selection process. As a result of these shortcomings our Client is considering taking legal action against the Council should the Local Plan proceed as drafted.

1.5 Setting out our concerns below we first address the general policies of the Local Plan and then the site specific elements.

1.6 Paragraph 157 of the Framework states that plans should be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon, take account of longer term requirements, and be kept up to date". We note that the Plan end date is 2032. Given the current slippage in the Plan preparation timescales it is considered appropriate that the plan period should be extended to account for at least 15 years post adoption.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation      In order to demonstrate our case for the allocation of GA025, Land off Skipton Road

Respondent ID      012      Organisation      Gladman Developments Limited

Section or Policy      INT

Plan is Legally Compliant?      No

Paragraph      1.1, 1.8

Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      No

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      012/04/INT/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

### 3.2 Plan Period

3.2.1 Paragraphs 1.1 and 1.8 clearly set out that the plan period of the document is 2012 to 2032. Gladman have previously expressed concerns with this plan period, with a delay in preparation meaning that it is now impossible that a 15-year time horizon, post adoption can be achieved.

3.2.2 Paragraph 157 of the NPPF states that crucially, Local Plans should;

“be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably 15-year time horizon, take account of longer term requirements, and be kept up to date.”

3.2.3 In line with this, Gladman suggest that the Council consider further, extending the plan period to conform with this guidance.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	008	Organisation	The Wilman Family		
Section or Policy		MON		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	008/28/MON/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

SECTION 9 MONITORING

5.68 Setting out the proposals for measuring the delivery of the draft Local Plan, this section sets out the Council’s proposed strategy. For the reasons set out earlier we are of the view that the proposals set out in the Local Plan are broadly unsound as the Council has not demonstrated that it can meet the full objectively assessed needs for the District.

5.69 It is important that the Council gives realistic consideration to the likely sources for achieving the housing requirement consistently over the Plan period.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--



Respondent ID      008      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy	MON	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph	Para 1.1., 1.8, Section 9	Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Representation Reference	008/04/MON/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Plan Review

4.12 Associated with the comments made on the Plan period above, Section 9 of the Draft Plan states that Monitoring is an essential part of the plan making process to ensure the Plan objectives are being delivered and to identify any negative effects from the implementation of a policy.

4.13 Such an approach is supported in principle, however, it would be appropriate for the section to include a periodic review or to express the circumstances where the policies may be reviewed. For example, the failure to achieve the Plan objectives and Vision for example through under delivery of development or infrastructure.

4.14 At this stage the Local Plan does not include a housing trajectory to demonstrate how it will deliver the objectively assessed housing needs over the Plan period. This is considered to be a failing and may render the Plan unsound as it is not effective. One of the principal purposes of the planning system is to significantly boost the delivery of housing; in the absence of delivery rates/yields there would seem to be no reliable method for assessing the success or otherwise (i.e. effectiveness) of the Plan's policies. In this regard, as published we consider the Plan to be unsound.

4.15 Discussion with the Authority suggests that the Council's processes are "out of kilter" and officers will be requesting such detailed information about the timing and delivery of housing development, after the closure of the Regulation 19. It is suggested that any such information is collated quickly and included with any material and consulted upon prior to formal Submission of the Local Plan to the Planning Inspectorate.

4.16 Furthermore within the provisions of the Framework it recommends that Local Plans are reviewed as a matter of course every five years, simply to ensure that the evidence base, policies and proposals remain up to date. We would recommend the draft Local Plan should include such a provision.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID      058      Organisation      National Grid

Section or Policy      NOC

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      058/01/NOC/NO

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL GRID

National Grid has appointed Amec Foster Wheeler to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf.

We have reviewed the above consultation document and can confirm that National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation.

#### Further Advice

National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning our networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us.

To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets. Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database:

Hannah Lorna Bevins  
Consultant Town Planner  
n.grid@amecfw.com  
Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK  
Gables House  
Kenilworth Road  
Leamington Spa  
CV32 6JX

Spencer Jefferies  
Development Liaison Officer, National Grid  
box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com  
National Grid House  
Warwick Technology Park  
Gallows Hill  
Warwick  
CV34 6DA

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      039      Organisation      North Yorkshire County Council

Section or Policy      NOC

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      039/19/NOC/NO

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Health and Adult Services

No comments

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	039	Organisation	North Yorkshire County Council		
Section or Policy		NOC		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	039/15/NOC/NO

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Library and Community Services

The text has been updated to reflect the wording supplied a few months ago; we are therefore happy with it so there are no further comments to make.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      039      Organisation      North Yorkshire County Council

Section or Policy      **NOC**

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      039/16/NOC/NO

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Public Health

No comments

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      039                      Organisation      North Yorkshire County Council

Section or Policy                      NOC

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?                      Not Specified

Plan is DtC Compliant?              Not Specified

Representation Reference      039/17/NOC/NO

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Passenger Transport

No comments

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      039      Organisation      North Yorkshire County Council

Section or Policy      NOC

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      039/13/NOC/NO

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Heritage Service

We have no further comments.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		POB		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Objective PO6		Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	017/10/POB/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

**Objective PO6**  
We support the intention to enhance the vitality of the market towns and larger village centres. The centres of all the market towns and most of the larger villages have been designated as Conservation Areas and contain many Listed Buildings. It is important that the vitality and viability of the market towns are maintained in order to help ensure that their historic assets remain in use which will help to encourage continued investment in their repair and maintenance.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      POB

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Objective PO3

Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      017/09/POB/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

**Objective PO3**

We support the intention to conserve and enhance the character and setting of Craven’s landscapes and the special qualities of the protected landscapes of the Forest of Bowland AONB and the Yorkshire Dales National Park.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		POB		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Objective PO2		Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	017/08/POB/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Objective PO2  
We support the intention to conserve and enhance the high quality of the local environment and to reinforce the distinctive character of Craven’s towns, villages and cultural heritage

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      POB

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Objective PO1

Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      017/07/POB/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Objective PO1

Whilst we support the thrust of this Objective, given that one of the aims of the Plan is to ensure that Craven’s high-quality environment is not harmed, this Objective should also refer to the intention to make certain that the patterns of development also safeguard the character and landscape setting of the District’s towns and villages.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Objective PO1 add an additional bullet-point along the following lines:-

“Respect the character and landscape setting of Craven’s settlements,”

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      008                      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy                      POB

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Representation Reference	008/08/POB/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

A series of ten Plan objectives are then set out (PO1 to PO10); as a general point these are supported.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      002      Organisation      North Yorkshire Local Access Forum

Section or Policy      POB

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      002/01/POB/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Thank you for attending the meeting of North Yorkshire LAF yesterday. I hope that you found our comments useful. As you saw, broadly speaking, we gave the Plan the thumbs-up. We appreciate that at this stage, further comments may not be incorporated, but I hope that you will be able to give consideration to the following points. They are points only of emphasis, and do not affect the substance of the Plan, which the LAF welcomes.

1. The plan objectives might usefully include a reference to access as one of the objectives.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	046	Organisation	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Bolton Abbey		
Section or Policy		SA		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	046/08/SA/SA

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

SUSTAINABILITY OF DRAFT POLICY EC4A: TOURISM –LED DEVELOPMENT AT BOLTON ABBEY

CST wishes to SUPPORT the findings of the sustainability assessment (SA) of policy EC4a.

The SA notes:

‘Reasonable Alternatives: None identified’

CST would concur that in policy (rather than allocation) terms there is no reasonable alternative to the approach taken by CDC in introducing EC4a to guide and support new development at the Estate.

The BADOAS report considered four options for development in the Bolton Abbey CVA and identified that only the option of “Composite” development clustered around both Bolton Abbey village AND Bolton Bridge with some limited development (e.g. small age-specific play areas) throughout the CVA” provided a realistic option to meet the area’s development needs whilst also respecting and enhancing the sensitive nature of the historic environment there. The draft policy reflects, and will facilitate, the delivery of the part of the option relating to the Craven plan-area.

The SA finds no negative impacts of the policy when assessed against the Strategic Objectives of the plan. Only ‘Major positive effects’, ‘Minor positive effects’ or ‘Neutral effect or no relationship identified’ are noted.

In particular, numerous ‘Major Positive Effects’ are considered to occur when the policy is assessed against the following draft Strategic Objectives:

- “SO1) Maximise employment opportunities within Craven
- SO2) Maximise opportunities for economic and business growth
- SO3) Promote equality and diversity, and foster community cohesion by reducing all forms of poverty
- SO12) Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment including heritage assets and their settings and areas of identified and potential archaeological interest”

The SA of Policy EC4a provides a robust validation of the policy introduced by CDC.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	051	Organisation	Natural England
---------------	-----	--------------	-----------------

Section or Policy SA

Plan is Legally Compliant? No

Paragraph	Plan is Sound?	No
-----------	----------------	----

Site Reference	Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
----------------	------------------------	---------------

Settlement Comment Relates to	Representation Reference	051/03/SA/SA
-------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

## Sustainability Appraisal

Notwithstanding the issues raised above with regards to the HRA, which should be updated in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) when resolved, Natural England is broadly satisfied with the SA. However we have a number of specific concerns about the impact of allocations on nationally protected landscapes and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) where we consider further assessment is required to ensure that the appraisal is legally compliant.

Firstly Natural England advises that we have an outstanding objection in place with regards to allocation SG064 (planning application ref 62/2017/18064) for full details please see our letter dated 19 January 2018 (our ref 234204, attached for your ease of reference). Natural England considers that development in this location and on this scale will have unacceptable impacts on the setting of the Yorkshire Dales National Park and that insufficient evidence has been provided to rule out impacts on River Ribble (Long Preston Deeps) SSSI.

We note that these issues do not appear to have been addressed in the Sustainability Appraisal, although some discussion regarding landscape impacts is provided in the evidence base. With regards to impacts on the setting of the National Park, based on the evidence provided with 62/2017/18064, we advise that the Appraisal will need to set out the overriding social or economic reasons for selecting this site and include an assessment of alternative sites and why this is the most sustainable alternative.

Concerning the SSSI we advise that evidence to satisfy our concerns regarding impacts on SSSI birds, water quality and recreational impacts (as set out in our letter dated 19 January 2018) should be provided and the necessary mitigation measures set out. Should mitigation prove impossible then damage to the features of the SSSI should be considered in the context of the sustainability of this option.

Supporting Information ref 234204:

Planning consultation: Additional information regarding outline application with some matters reserved the construction of a new Business Park, a car dealership and residential development Location: Anley Crag Business Park Land To The West Of The B6480 (Skipton Road) Settle North Yorkshire

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 15 December 2017 which was received by Natural England on the same date.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

## SUMMARY OF NATURAL ENGLAND'S ADVICE

## OBJECTION (Landscape)

Natural England objects to this proposal. As submitted we consider it will have a significant impact on the purposes of designation of Yorkshire Dales National Park.

## FURTHER INFORMATION REQUIRED (Protected Sites)

As submitted, the application could have potential significant effects on River Ribble (Long Preston Deepes) Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Natural England requires further information in order to determine the significance of these impacts and the scope for mitigation:

Further information is required to determine whether:

- ☐ the land within both the red and blue line boundary is linked to the SSSI (i.e. do waders and waterfowl from the SSSI use this land for foraging or other behaviours);
- ☐ the development will cause noise and/or visual disturbance to birds using the SSSI or any linked land;
- ☐ the proposal will displace any birds using linked land;
- ☐ the proposal will have an impact on the water quality of the SSSI through increased hydrocarbons and heavy metals from the proposal;
- ☐ there will be any recreational impacts on the SSSI or any linked land;
- ☐ there will be any urban edge effects to the SSSI or any linked land (cat predation, vandalism etc.)

We have reached this view for the following reasons:

### Yorkshire Dales National Park Protected Landscape

- ☐ The proposed development will have significant and adverse impact on the setting of the Yorkshire Dales National Park;
- ☐ The proposal is a greenfield site completely separate from Settle or any other settlement. The landscape character of the area is predominately one of farmland, woodland, farmsteads and individual barns. The proposal will create an urban form in a rural setting;
- ☐ The design and materials proposed are not in keeping with the landscape character nor with the local vernacular of the area;
- ☐ Settle is the one of the primary entry points into the Yorkshire Dales National Park and retains its character as a small Dales market town. The proposal would drastically alter the character of this entry point into the Park;
- ☐ The development sits on a raised embankment and is very prominent in the landscape;
- ☐ Views of the development looking towards the National Park would have considerable visual impact.

### Comments regarding Addendum to Landscape and Visual Appraisal

Natural England welcomes the additional viewpoints, wireframe and photomontages provided, which we consider to be helpful for assessing the landscape and visual impact of the proposal on the Yorkshire Dales National Park. We also broadly welcome the additional assessment provided, however we disagree with the conclusions reached regarding the impact of the proposal, particularly with regards to impacts on the setting of the National Park.

Natural England does not consider that appropriate weight has been given to the importance of the setting of the national park. We do not agree that the lack of reference to the setting and importance of views into the National Park in the special qualities of the Yorkshire Dales National Park diminishes their importance. We consider that the setting and importance of views into National Parks should be given great weight in decision making regarding landscape impacts.

Further information request River Ribble (Long Preston Deepes) Site of Special Scientific Interest

### Comments regarding Supplementary Ecological Assessment

Natural England does not consider that the further information provided regarding impacts on River Ribble (Long Preston Deeps) SSSI satisfies the concerns we raised regarding damage to the features for which the SSSI was designated in our letter dated 07 July 2017 (our ref 217309). We attach our previous response for your ease of reference.

We note that additional breeding bird survey work was undertaken but are unclear from the information provided what methodology was used. In addition we note that no reference is made to any desk study work or consultation with local ecological groups regarding functionally linked land for River Ribble (Long Preston Deeps) SSSI birds. We consider that it is key to understand the context for the survey. In particular we advise that consultation with the Long Preston Deeps Partnership is strongly recommended considering their knowledge and expertise on birds in this area. However we would also expect the assessment to consider any WeBS data or records from the North and East Yorkshire North & East Yorkshire Ecological Data Centre and advise that consultation with the RSPB and Yorkshire Wildlife Trust are considered.

Regarding the assessment of impacts on winter and passage assemblage bird species we note the second paragraph which states that a lack of shallow pools or open water is a criteria which rules out the use of the site by species listed in the SSSI citation. Natural England very strongly disagrees with this assertion. We advise that such species utilise water habitats on the SSSI itself and rely on arable and pasture outside the SSSI boundary as well as other wetlands. In addition to a desk study and local consultation as described above, we advise that the potential of habitats present on the proposal site, for SSSI birds, should be carefully assessed by an experienced practitioner and that should this assessment suggest potential for winter and passage assemblage bird species from the SSSI then wintering bird surveys should be undertaken.

Natural England notes that the Supplementary Ecological Assessment makes no attempt to address our concerns regarding water quality, direct noise and visual disturbance on the SSSI itself or urban edge effects to the SSSI.

Finally we note the comments regarding recreational disturbance. Natural England does not consider that the constraints described in relation to the route via a waymarked footpath leading from the corner of the unmade farm track at the end of Runley Mill Lane appear to be significant enough to stop recreational users considering the attractiveness of the Ribble Way to users at this point. We advise that further information regarding access to the SSSI from the Ribble Way is gathered and what issues exist. In addition options for onsite natural greenspace and recreational routes should be expanded on and signposting and education around impacts on SSSI birds should be considered.

Please note that if your authority is minded to grant planning permission contrary to the advice in this letter, you are required under Section 28I (6) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) to notify Natural England of the permission, the terms on which it is proposed to grant it and how, if at all, your authority has taken account of Natural England's advice. You must also allow a further period of 21 days before the operation can commence.

Should the developer wish to explore options for avoiding or mitigating the effects described above with Natural England, we advise they seek advice through our Discretionary Advice Service.

Should the proposal change, please consult us again.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID 017 Organisation Historic England

Section or Policy SA

Plan is Legally Compliant? Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound? Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant? Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference 017/63/SA/SA

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Re: Publication Draft Craven Local Plan – Sustainability Appraisal Report

Thank you for consulting Historic England about the Sustainability Appraisal Report of the Publication Draft of the Craven Local Plan. In terms of the historic environment, we would broadly endorse the evaluation of the likely impact which the Policies and proposals of the Plan might have upon the historic environment and, where an adverse effect has been identified, the proposed mitigation measures which have been proposed to reduce that harm.

We should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information set out in the Report published in January, 2018. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals which may subsequently arise (either as a result of this consultation or in later versions of the Strategy) where we consider that, despite the SA/SEA, these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      012      Organisation      Gladman Developments Limited

Section or Policy      SD1

Plan is Legally Compliant?      No

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      No

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      012/05/SD1/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

4.1 Draft Policy SD1: The Presumption In Favour Of Sustainable Development

4.1.1 Gladman are fully supportive of the inclusion of the policy on Sustainable Development. The ethos of sustainable development is key to assessing planning proposals, it is the golden thread running through the NPPF.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID	008	Organisation	The Wilman Family		
Section or Policy		SD1		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	008/09/SD1/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

DRAFT POLICY SD1: PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT:  
5.9 As stated this policy reflects verbatim the matters as set out in the Framework. It may be that this will need to take into account forthcoming changes in the Framework. Draft changes are anticipated in March or April, after the close of the consultation period. Further comments may be required on this matter.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      015      Organisation      Canal and River Trust

Section or Policy      SD2

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      015/04/SD2/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We welcome the reference to the canal within the ‘Vision for Craven’ in 2032. The Leeds & Liverpool canal is a multifaceted asset, which allows for leisure activities including boating; walking; cycling; and fishing. The canal is also a heritage asset. Together, these mean that the canal can provide for and enhance tourism in the borough.

Draft Policy SD2: Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change

We welcome the approach to support renewable and low carbon technologies.

Water from the canal offers a significant opportunity for the provision of thermal energy, which is an available low carbon heat source. As a result, it might make the policy aims more achievable and effective if reference to this potential source could be included within additional explanatory text within the document.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We would welcome reference in the explanatory text to the role that the canal (and other waterways) may play in providing thermal energy as a low carbon energy source. This would help make the plan more effective.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      008      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy      SD2      Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Section 3      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      008/10/SD2/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

DRAFT POLICY SD2: MEETING THE CHALLENGE

5.10 It is considered that Policy SD2 is unnecessary in its present form and should be deleted. The provisions in relation to flood risk could be transposed into an “SP” or “ENV” policy; for example Draft Policy ENV6.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID	009	Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)		
Section or Policy	SD2		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified	
Paragraph	Section 3		Plan is Sound?	No	
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified	
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	009/03/SD2/TS	

#### Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Whilst supportive of this policy thrust in general, CPRENY believe that the policy is missing a sentence in relation to air quality.

Currently the policy refers to supporting the move to a low carbon future and flood risk.

The flood risk element of this policy is taken further via policy ENV6 and both interact well. However, no such paragraph exists for air quality matters which would seek to reinforce policy ENV7 dealing specifically with both land and air quality.

CPRENY believe that a reference to air quality in Policy SD2 would make the plan more robust in light of the recent Wealden Judgement Wealden District Council v. Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Lewes District Council and South Downs National Park Authority [2017] and also following the Government's commitment to produce Air Quality Plans. This is also compatible with paragraph 109 and 120 of the Framework which both seek to avoid and prevent unacceptable risks from pollution on health and wellbeing.

#### Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY believe that the addition of the following sentence within the bullet point list of the first paragraph of SD2 would ensure that the policy is more robust and thus both effective and consistent with national policy:

- Proposes new development in locations which prevent an unacceptable risk from air pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity for both new and existing developments.

It is suggested that this would be inserted between existing points 2 and 3 and the current numbering system be revised to recognise 5 new points.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Section or Policy	SP1	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Yes
Paragraph	Section 4, Paragraph 4.18	Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference	HB028	Plan is DtC Compliant?	Yes
Settlement Comment Relates to	High Bentham	Representation Reference	001/02/SP1/TS

Paragraph 4.18 of the Plan accepts the delivery of an annual average of 230 dwellings per annum over the plan period will be a challenge. The Plan goes on to note that with its allocation of land for housing to meet 94% of the 4,600 dwelling requirement with no proposed phasing for the development of these sites that there is good reason to be optimistic on delivery. However, I would comment that this level of completions is challenging and difficult to meet given the lack of phasing and the number of sites that need to be brought forward in the five year period. It is also noted that the requirement of policy SP1, meeting housing need, is a minimum provision and is ambitious in the light of the housing monitoring data showing that 768 dwellings have been completed between 1 April, 2012 and 30 September, 2017. This track record is well below the 230 requirement set out by policy SP1.

Allocate reduced site HB028 (plan attached) to provide maximum flexibility and additional capacity of the plan period to 2032.

Page 269 of 477

Respondent ID      012      Organisation      Gladman Developments Limited

Section or Policy      SP1

Plan is Legally Compliant?      No

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      No

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      012/06/SP1/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### 4.2 Draft Policy SP1: Meeting Housing Need

4.2.1 The submission version of the Craven Local Plan sets out a minimum provision of 4,600 additional dwellings between 2012 and 2032. The 2017 SHMA update increases the OAN to 242 dwellings per annum, with 206 dwellings attribute to the Craven Local Plan area, and 36 dwellings to the Yorkshire Dales National Park.

4.2.2 The Yorkshire Dales Local Plan was adopted in 2016, it looks to expand the supply of housing to meet a target of 55 new dwellings each year. Gladman note that the Yorkshire Dales Local Plan covers an area beyond the Craven District HMA. We therefore consider that it is not clear how much of the OAN from Craven will be provided for within the National Park, and note that this is not covered by the MoU or the Duty to Cooperate Statement provided in the evidence base. Therefore, it is not evident whether the OAN is being met in full or not.

4.2.3 Gladman are pleased that the proposed housing requirement is expressed as a 'minimum provision'.

4.2.4 Whilst it is noted that further to the pre-submission consultation, the updated SHMA has given consideration to alterations to headship rates, Gladman still consider that the OAN and housing requirement set out at draft Policy SP1 is too low. We continue to suggest that it is appropriate to apply a market signals uplift and that a figure closer to 280 dpa would be considered appropriate for the Craven Local Plan Area. Gladman consider that a higher housing figure would assist the Council in dealing with the increasing need for affordable housing in line with guidance.

4.2.5 This policy is therefore not considered to be sound, as it is not considered to be positively prepared, justified or consistent with national policy.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      008                      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy	SP1	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph	Section 4, Key Diagram	Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Representation Reference	008/11/SP1/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### DRAFT POLICY SP1 MEETING HOUSING NEED

##### Housing Requirement

5.13 Provision is made within the Draft Policy for a minimum 4,600 additional dwellings over the Plan period, equating to a minimum of 230 net dwellings annually. Consistent with our earlier comments we consider the Plan period should be extended to 2035 and the provision increased to a minimum of 5,300 net additional dwellings (based upon the 230 net dwellings per annum). We do consider however, that the housing requirement should be increased over the current (or extended) Plan period.

5.14 An Update SHMA (Arc4) was published in November 2017 (2017 Update) to inform the Local Plan preparation. This highlights that Craven District sits within two Strategic Housing Market Areas; namely the Lancaster and another extending across Craven, Bradford and Calderdale. It identifies that the Southern part of the District (around Skipton) interacts strongly with Bradford. Given that relationship, the 2017 Update suggests that economic growth and development activity in and between Bradford and Skipton should explore potential interactions and consequences through the Duty to Co-operate.

5.15 Nevertheless, the 2017 Update identifies that the District should be defined as a distinct Housing Market Area (HMA) for planning purposes. The 2017 Update which covers the Craven HMA identifies an OAN of 242 dwellings; an increase from the 2016 SHMA figure of 214 dpa. That is subsequently split with 206 dwellings attributed to Craven Local Plan Area and 36 dwellings to the National Park. Adopted in 2016 the Yorkshire Dales Local Plan predates the 2017 Update. It seeks to increase supply in the National Park by 55 dwellings each year. However the Yorkshire Dales covers more than the Craven HMA extending into adjacent Districts of Richmondshire and South Lakeland. It is not clear how much of Craven's OAN (Update 2017) will be provided for within the National Park, nor is this covered in the DtC Statement.

5.16 It is important that the OAN should also seek to deliver the need for affordable homes set out in the SHMA 2017 Update at 126 dwellings. Elsewhere in the Plan, qualifying sites are anticipated to deliver 30% of units (subject to viability) as affordable housing. A simple extrapolation of the Local Plan requirement suggests that it will only deliver a maximum of 69 units per annum (30% of 230), around 55% of the need. Policies in the Framework seek to boost housing supply to increase choice of high quality homes, to address affordability and to meet objectively assessed need in full. It would appear therefore that the basis of this policy is unsound as it is not consistent with National Policy.

5.17 Consideration should be given to increasing the minimum housing requirement.

##### Housing Delivery

5.18 There is some concern regarding housing delivery, given the final part of the draft policy. "Housing Monitoring" indicates that 768 net dwellings have been completed between 1st April 2012 and 30th September; a 5.5 year period. This suggests that within the Plan period to date the Council has only delivered a net additional 140 dwellings per annum, from all tenures. For the remaining plan period (to 2032), this suggests a requirement for 3,832 new dwellings.

5.19 As a basic position the Council will need to double the present rate of the housing delivery to around 265 dwellings per annum over the remainder of the Plan period (to 2032) to deliver the housing requirement. There appears to be no mechanism to indicate how the Local Plan may seek to achieve this.

5.20 Material contained at page 18 in the Annual Monitoring Report (published December 2017) sets out a potential Housing Trajectory against the draft requirement. On the face of it this appears somewhat unrealistic peaking at 2020/21 at 425 before dipping to 250 at 2023/24, then peaking at 420 at 2025/26, before falling away to 220dpa

towards the end of the Plan period. As presented the housing trajectory appears to be a “roller coaster ride”. We would suggest that this is unsound as it does not represent positive planning. It would be more appropriate that the trajectory enables a continuous delivery of housing across the plan period to give certainty.

5.21 There is no phasing proposed in the Local Plan policies which is welcomed. However, the Council must take measures to ensure that a continuous supply of suitable housing land is made available, from a wide range of outlets across the District (and Skipton in particular) removing any policy burdens or other obstacles to delivery and ensure a continuous supply of sites.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--



Respondent ID      028      Organisation      Home Builders Federation

Section or Policy      SP1

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      No

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      028/03/SP1/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### DRAFT POLICY SP1: MEETING HOUSING NEED

This policy is not considered to be sound, as it is not considered to be positively prepared, justified or consistent with national policy.

This policy looks to make a minimum provision for 4,600 net additional dwellings over the plan period, equating to an average of 230 dwellings per annum.

The 2017 SHMA update increases the OAN to 242 dwellings per annum, with 206 dwellings attribute to the Craven Local Plan area, and 36 dwellings to the Yorkshire Dales National Park. The Yorkshire Dales Local Plan was adopted in 2016, it looks to expand the supply of housing to meet a target of 55 new dwellings each year. However, the Yorkshire Dales Local Plan covers more than just the Craven district HMA. It is not clear how much of the OAN from Craven will be provided for within the National Park, and as mentioned previously this is not covered by the MoU or the Duty to Cooperate Statement. Therefore, it is not clear, whether the OAN is being met in full or not. It is noted that previously the Local Plan had chosen to utilise the figure for the whole of Craven district as its housing figure ignoring any contribution to be made by the Yorkshire Dales Local Plan.

It is noted that some of the comments made previously by the HBF in relation to the SHMA appear to be have been given consideration, for example the use of the alternative headship rates which see rates for the 25-34 age group return to a mid-point between the 2014 and 2008 based rates by 2033. However, the HBF would continue to suggest that a higher housing figure would assist the Council in dealing with the increasing need for affordable housing in line with PPG (ID2a-029).

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

HBF propose that the policy is modified as follows:

- The HBF recommend that further consideration is given to the housing requirement to ensure that the OAN is met and that an appropriate level of affordable housing is provided.

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	To debate the comments made within our representations further and in greater detail. To ensure that the industry can respond to any additional evidence provided by the Council or others following submission of the plan.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID	009	Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)		
Section or Policy		SP1		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Section 4, Paragraphs 4.1-4.18		Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	009/04/SP1/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Section 4 deals with ‘meeting the housing need’.

In the response to the third draft pre-publication local plan (July 2017), CPRENY set out that although they welcomed the lower housing requirement in general to previous drafts, they were concerned that the proposed number of units per year would prove to be unviable at 214dpa given the persistent under delivery experienced throughout the district.

CPRENY understand that since that consultation, the Council have since produced an Addendum to the Local Plan Housing Growth Options Paper (which was produced for the 2017 consultation), which has been published as part of this consultation.

Upon reading this document the Council have selected a new growth option which sets a requirement of 230dpa. CPRENY believe that this figure is too high given the past 17 years under delivery as set out at Table 5.16 of the Addendum report. CPRENY believe that the Council have thus selected a new requirement, based on pressure from industry rather than defend their preferred option which was already ‘high’ in comparison with the actual deliverables on the ground. Whilst the Council needs to plan positively for growth they also need to be ‘realistic’ and take account of local constraints when determining a housing requirement figure.

CPRENY are also aware that the DCLG published its Housing White Paper a draft standard methodology to be used for calculating fully objectively assessed need for England’s local planning authorities recently. The figure for Craven district is 165dpa (for the period 2016-2026) – whilst this may be subject to change and is purely the FOAN and not a housing requirement, this FOAN is significantly lower than the Council’s calculation of 206 (for the area outside of the National Park). It is understood that DCLG wish to approve the standard methodology as soon as possible after the 31st March 2018. The Council however have stated in the Addendum, at paragraph 4.14, that they want to submit their draft plan to the Secretary of State prior to the deadline of 31st March 2018. CPRENY are therefore, concerned that the Council are submitting the Local Plan ‘under pressure’ rather than wait and potentially incorporate the Government’s figures into the Plan. It is acknowledged that these may be subject to change and that the Council’s Plan timescale is different to that of the Government’s, however, not waiting for the outcome of the consultation may trigger either an early review of housing figures to be required (i.e. immediately after adoption) or, could easily warrant the Examination in Public to be deferred until the impact of DCLG’s standard methodology is understood which would seem to be potentially short-sighted and a waste of time for all involved in preparation activities.

Of further concern to CPRENY is the Council’s acknowledgement that the 40% affordable target figure has been lowered to 30%. This combined with the higher annual housing requirement figure means that the full objectively assessed need for affordable housing (FOANAH) will not be met. The Council appear to be relying on other initiatives to bridge the gap and lower the actual ‘affordable need’ for the District, however, CPRENY believe this is a risky strategy. Whilst in theory the schemes mentioned in the Addendum report and in the Local Plan (paras 4.15-4.17) may help reduce this need and for example help return vacant properties into use (which CPRENY are fully supportive of), the reliance on them to deliver is such that should any scheme fail, or funding not be delivered, then the percentage of people in need of such homes within the district will increased.

Furthermore, it is well documented that developers agree to the delivery of such homes in order to gain a planning permission, and then all too often state that the actual delivery is unviable, and the number of affordable homes required do not get delivered. This happens throughout the district, North Yorkshire and the country. CPRENY believe that by lowering the requirement at this stage will only lead to more substantial reductions at the time proposals are delivered. Whilst affordable housing is dealt with via Policy H2 – CPRENY believe that a cross-reference to this Policy within this policy would make it more robust.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY believe that the previous housing requirement figure of 214 dpa should be used as a maximum figure, or preferably a lower figure which more accurately represent a viable delivery in line with past completion data. Consideration should also be given to the DCLG figures proposed in the Housing White Paper consultation. CPRENY are of the opinion that a reference to policy H2 and the percentage requirement across developments should be included within policy SP1 to aid the Council require such a level to be delivered.

Wish to participate in examination?☒

Reason for Participation

This is an important issue which needs to be discussed as part of the Examination as the outcome will inform the entire spatial strategy of the plan

Respondent ID	064	Organisation	York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Enterprise Partnership		
Section or Policy		SP1		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Yes
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Yes
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	064/01/SP1/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Strongly support the full objectively assessed housing need of 242 homes per annum for the District and the proposed housing requirement of 230 dpa for the Plan area, recognising the links to employment growth and the need to attract younger workers and an appropriate local labour market. The LEP also supports the policy approach of unphased housing allocations and additional efforts to increase delivery of affordable housing (e.g. the work of the YNYER Housing Partnership and initiatives such as ‘Great Place’). The allowance included for housing losses in Tables 4 and 5 is also welcomed as a helpful means of meeting net annual housing targets.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?☐

Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      039                      Organisation      North Yorkshire County Council

Section or Policy	SP1	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Representation Reference	039/03/SP1/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Strategic Policy and Economic Growth

The County Council welcomes the aspiration to provide 230 dwellings per annum in order to meet identified needs within the Plan area to support the local labour force to enable the delivery of the Plan's economic aspirations.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      027      Organisation      Giggleswick School

Section or Policy      SP1

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Giggleswick      Representation Reference      027/02/SP1/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### 4. The District-Wide Housing Need

4.1 This Section provides comments on the need for new homes in Craven.

The Scale of Housing Delivery

Assessing the options

4.2 Before commenting on the scale of the housing requirement identified in Policy SP1 of the PDLP, we set out an initial fundamental point regarding the basis on which it has been identified. Previous consultations in respect of the emerging Local Plan have identified that, in addition to the housing requirement itself, several “alternative growth options”<sup>2</sup> have been considered by CDC, including in particular:

- Option A (145 dpa) which is “...based on the annual average number of dwellings completed (net) over the past 9 years...”; and
- Option D (350 to 400 dpa) which is the level of delivery required to enable the District “...to meet all its need for affordable housing (FOANAH)...”.

4.3 Option A is not a logical, reasonable or robust growth option. It is supply-led; it has not been identified by a robust assessment of potential housing needs but instead simply projects forward the number of new homes completed in previous years. It does not therefore represent a legitimate growth option which has been identified in accordance with the methodology set out in the PPG or the NPPF.

4.4 Moreover, Option A is well below the OAN for the District and would evidently fail to meet housing needs in full. It is therefore unsustainable and wholly inconsistent with the requirements of the NPPF. It would effectively plan for decline, constrain economic growth, and exacerbate the housing crisis which is evident in the extremely low and worsening affordability in the District (see below).

4.5 Option D is broadly aligned with the scale of the affordable housing need in the District. As such, and unlike Option A, it is a legitimate growth option. However, it is notable that it is significantly higher than the other options considered by CDC. Options A, B and C are different from each other by 32 to 37 dwellings respectively; in contrast, the lower end of the range presented by Option D is 136 dwellings – almost 64% – higher than Option C.

4.6 CDC has subsequently considered intermediary growth options, which are higher than Option C but lower than Option D3. However, the higher growth options are ruled out because, inter alia, the additional dwellings required could not be accommodated in Skipton, such that additional delivery would need to take place in the District’s “...lower order service centre settlements...”. CDC contends that this “...would not represent a sustainable pattern of growth...”. The School disagrees with this conclusion. It is not considered a sound approach to fail to meet housing needs principally because the District’s largest settlement is unable to accommodate its required share of growth. This is particularly the case given that the identified “share” is somewhat arbitrary and artificial. Moreover, it is evident that the “lower order” settlements are capable of sustainably accommodating higher levels of growth and that it is necessary to do so if they are to be sustainable in future years. This matter is discussed in greater detail in relation to Giggleswick in the following chapter.

4.7 Mindful of the above, it is considered that the process of identifying the housing requirement proposed in the PDLP is flawed and cannot be considered to be “...the most appropriate strategy...”<sup>4</sup> when considered against the reasonable alternatives, given that the alternatives themselves are not reasonable. It is therefore unjustified in the meaning of paragraph 182 of the NPPF. It is important to note that, in this respect, the assessment of the impact and appropriateness of the PDLP undertaken by the associated Sustainability Appraisal<sup>5</sup> (SA) is also considered to be deficient.

## The Housing Requirement

4.8 Policy SP1 of the PDLP identifies a requirement to deliver 230 dpa between 2012 and 2032. A higher requirement has been disregarded by CDC on the basis that:

- It may not be deliverable given the low rate of past dwelling completions in the District;
- It would result in greater environmental harm; and
- It would be “out of balance” with current economic growth forecasts for the District.

4.9 Each of these issues is discussed in turn below.

## Past dwelling completions

4.10 It is acknowledged that housing completions in Craven over the preceding 10 years have been low, averaging approximately just 162 dpa between 2007/08 and 2016/17. However, as acknowledged by the Local Plan evidence base<sup>7</sup>, this can be attributed to two key factors:

- The economic downturn in the late 2000's. This was deepest and longest period of economic recession since the 1920's, which resulted in a significant decline in housing completions as finance – both for development and for mortgages – was extremely constrained.
- The absence of an up-to-date local Development Plan which provides a deliverable supply of development land.

4.11 As such, it is both erroneous and misleading to use past dwelling completions as a benchmark for the level of housing growth which should be provided for to secure a sustainable future for the District. They are not representative of what can be achieved in a positive economic context where a deliverable and viable supply of housing land is made available. Instead, they represent periods of recession and land supply constraints. The approach of CDC in this respect does not meet the clear requirement of the NPPF to plan positively and will not overcome obstacles experienced in previous years to achieve a sustainable and aspirational vision for growth.

4.12 There is clear evidence that:

- A higher level of development can be achieved in the District, with 278 dwellings delivered in 2007/08; and
- There is a recognised imbalance between supply and demand, with the District having an affordability ratio of 8.12 – almost 8% higher than that across England as a whole.

4.13 It is evident that there is high demand in the District, as acknowledged by CDC in its assessment of market signals. In this context, the low rate of past completions does not justify a reduced housing requirement.

## Environmental considerations

4.14 The PDLP sets out that a requirement in excess of that proposed would risk environmental harm and/or unsustainable patterns of growth. However, it is evident that there is development land in the District that is not identified as a draft allocation but which is both suitable for development and sustainably located. For example, the School's land south of Riversdale is not located in a flood zone or subject to any overriding environmental constraints. CDC's own evidence base<sup>8</sup> notes that the site “...performs satisfactorily...” in the Sustainability Analysis and is deemed to be sustainable for residential development.

4.15 The evidence base for the PDLP therefore demonstrates that a higher housing requirement can be achieved whilst ensuring that the Local Plan itself is environmentally sustainable. Whilst environmental considerations might not support a requirement of 350-400 dpa, a requirement of 256 dpa – 11.3% higher than currently proposed – was set out in the previous version of the Local Plan and was judged by CDC at that time to be environmentally sustainable.

## Conclusion

4.16 It is clear that the rationale applied by CDC in selecting the requirement – and in rejecting a requirement in excess of 214 dpa – is somewhat flawed. As such, the housing requirement proposed by Policy SP1 of the PDLP is not justified and is, therefore, unsound. We consider that CDC should re-consider the merits of a higher housing requirement.

4.17 Given the wide array of potential and environmentally sustainable development options identified by CDC, coupled with the scale of housing demand in the District, there is no reason why a higher level of growth should be considered unsustainable or unachievable. As CDC acknowledges, a higher rate of growth would result in the

delivery of more affordable housing, which is an important consideration given that the approach set out in the PDLP is incapable of meeting such needs. We therefore strongly encourage CDC to pursue such a strategy.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      055      Organisation      KCS Development Limited

Section or Policy      SP1

Plan is Legally Compliant?      No

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      055/02/SP1/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy SP1: Meeting Housing Needs

- 2.1 JM have previously made representations seeking a higher housing requirement within the Local Plan. At this time it is not clear whether the Council’s Local Plan housing requirement seeks to meet the full OAN for the District including the need of the Yorkshire Dales National Park that sits within the District.
- 2.2 It is once again reiterated that the current low housing requirement sought by the Council does not achieve the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework to significantly boost the supply of housing within the District.
- 2.3 We are aware that these concerns are raised by other interested parties including the House Builders Federation (HBF) and ask the Council to refer to that submission for detailed justification.
- 2.4 It is our view that a higher housing requirement would also assist the Council in dealing with the increased need in affordable housing. This is considered a more prevalent issue now that the District’s affordable housing provision target has reduced to 30% on major sites and quite often no affordable provision on smaller site submissions.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      019      Organisation      Keyhaven Homes

Section or Policy      SP1

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      SK119      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      019/03/SP1/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Section 4: Strategic Policies and Spatial Strategy

##### Draft Policy SP1 – Meeting Housing Need

5.4We object to the proposed approach to meeting housing need for Craven and the Council’s proposed approach of taking forward growth option F (230 dwellings per annum) set out in the Housing Growth Option Paper (Addendum 2017).

5.5The SHMA Update 2017 identifies an OAN figure for Craven District as a whole is 242 dwellings (a baseline of 141, with a long term migration adjustment to 199 and a headship rate adjustment to 202) with a further uplift of 40 to take account of market signals. This figure has been apportioned with 206 dwellings in the Craven District LPA and 36 to the Yorkshire Dales National Park.

5.6The rejection of the higher Housing Growth Options C1 (242 dwellings per annum) and E (280 dwellings per annum) and the Council’s decision not to assess any option in the Growth Option Addendum (November 2017) that would meet the full, objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing is UNSOUND.

5.7As highlighted at paragraph 4.2 of the consultation document, the NPPF requires local authorities to use their evidence base to ensure that, unless there are robust grounds why not, then the housing requirement should meet the full, objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing in their area. At paragraph 4.14 of the consultation document it is advised that the proposed housing requirement figure of 230 dwellings per annum will not meet the full need for affordable housing. It is stated that higher growth options assessed in the Local plan Housing Growth Options Paper have been rejected because of their conflict with the plan’s spatial strategy and the significant uncertainty over their deliverability.

5.8Such an approach clearly conflicts with the aims of the NPPF and the Council’s own objectives in the Local Plan, particularly given the Council identify Affordable Housing Need as a ‘Key Issue’ for the Craven Plan Area at paragraph 2.41 (Key Issues).

5.9In the Housing Growth Option Paper Addendum (November 2017) it is acknowledged at paragraph 4.15-4.16 that even Option E (280 dpa), the Council’s highest growth option in this Paper, is likely to fall short of meeting the full objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing. The Council state that this option is likely to be an unsustainable and undeliverable option and as such there is ‘no need to consider any higher alternative growth option to that of Option E’. We do not agree with this conclusion.

5.10It is suggested at paragraph 4.14 that higher growth options have been rejected because of their conflict with the plan’s spatial strategy and the significant uncertainty



over their delivery. We do not agree with this conclusion, in particular Keyhaven Homes have a deliverable and developable site in Skipton, the most sustainable location for new development and which lies in Flood Zone 1. Site SK119 was proposed for allocation at the draft consultation stage but is no longer proposed for allocation as the Council consider a suitable access cannot be achieved as the delivery of the site is dependent upon the adjoining consented scheme being developed out.

5.11 Site SK119 is in the same ownership as the adjoining housing commitment site (114) which the Council have granted planning permission for residential development. The requirement for the adjoining consented site to come forward first is not an insurmountable constraint; it is merely a matter of timing that is wholly achievable with the 15 year plan period. This is an example of a sustainable and deliverable site in the main settlement of Skipton that could deliver additional dwellings without significant risks to the environment or loss of land at medium / high risk of flooding and which accords with the plan's spatial strategy. This demonstrates the Council's chosen growth option is not sound as they have not fairly considered all reasonable alternatives in rejecting the higher Housing Growth Options.

5.12 It is also noted at paragraph 5.15 of the Housing Growth Option Paper that the Council suggest that the level of housing required in Skipton for Growth Options C1 (1,533 dwellings) and E (1,959 dwellings) cannot be met as a maximum yield in Skipton from suitable sites is suggested to be 1,402 dwellings. Again, we do not agree with this conclusion as previously identified, site SK119 which was identified for allocation at the draft consultation stage, remains a suitable and deliverable site which could deliver up to 210 dwellings and would increase the capacity in Skipton to at least support Option C1 (1,533 dwellings).

5.13 The Council acknowledge at paragraph 5.36 of the Housing Growth Option Paper Addendum (November 2017) that supporting Housing Growth Option 'F', the provision of 230 dwellings / annum will result in approximately 66% of the 126 dwellings per annum identified affordable housing need in the housing market area being delivered, based on 30% affordable housing provision. It is suggested at paragraph 4.18 of the consultation document that the Council is proactive in seeking to maximise affordable housing supply through its action plans and strategies and on all opportunity sites, but this does not constitute a strategy for delivering the unmet need. The NPPF is clear (paragraph 182) that a plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed requirement including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so. There is no evidence within the consultation document that Craven has an agreement in place with neighbouring authorities to deliver the unmet need.

5.14 On the basis of the preceding assessment, it is maintained that Policy SP1 and the evidence base which sits behind it is UNSOUND as it is:-

- Not positively prepared as the policy does not meet the full objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing and has not set out a strategy for unmet needs being addressed in neighbouring authorities.
- Not justified - preferred housing growth option F (230 dwellings per annum) cannot be justified and the Council has not fairly assessed all reasonable alternative options. The Council has not provided robust evidence to demonstrate why the higher housing growth options are not sustainable particularly in light of the delivery of affordable housing being a key issue for the District and the availability of additional suitable sites in Skipton, which I have highlighted (SK119).
- Not consistent with national policy – the policy does not comply with the requirement in the NPPF for the full objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing to be met and it is not accepted that there are no further suitable sites in Skipton which could meet a higher level of housing need.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

5.20 To meet the full objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing, taking into account the 27 affordable houses that are expected to be delivered in the Yorkshire Dales National Park plan area, there is a requirement for 99 affordable dwellings per annum in the Craven Local Plan area. To deliver this quantum of affordable dwellings through the proposed affordable housing policy of 30%, a housing requirement figure of 330 dwellings per annum would be needed, 100 dwellings per annum higher than the figure currently proposed by the Council. This figure would result in a requirement for Skipton of 150 dwellings per annum, an increase of 35 dwellings per annum (535 dwellings over the plan period).

Wish to participate in examination?



Reason for Participation

To engage in discussion regarding the issue of soundness highlighted in the representation statement.

Respondent ID      055      Organisation      KCS Development Limited

Section or Policy      SP10

Plan is Legally Compliant?      No

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      GA025

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Gargrave

Representation Reference      055/04/SP10/OS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Policy SP10: Strategy for Gargrave

4.1 The housing allocations, particularly those relating to the Village of Gargrave, Policy SP10: Strategy for Gargrave, are unsound because they are not positively prepared or justified. The evidence base used in relation to the site selection process is flawed and as such we stated that the Local Plan is not prepared using a proportionate evidence base.

4.2 It is noted that three sites are allocated for housing for Gargrave village, including two major sites at Land off Eshton Road, north of Canal (GA009) and Lane to the west of Walton Close, Gargrave (GA031). The overall total yield of new housing in Gargrave across the plan period of circa 118 dwellings is welcomed however the identified sites are disputed given the flawed evidence base.

4.3 The site Land off Skipton Road (GA025) has wrongly been omitted from the Council's site selection process at every step of the way. The Council have stated that the justification for not selecting this site is due to Flood Risk.

4.4 On multiple occasions Johnson Mowat and KCS Development have submitted to both the Local Plan team and the Development Control team (as part of pending application 30/2017/17787) evidence to demonstrate that the site was situated in Flood Zone 1. This includes at the following stages:

☐ Craven Pre-publication draft Local Plan – October 2014

☐ Craven Local Plan Second draft (pre-publication) – May 2016

☐ Preferred Sites for Housing – August 2016

☐ Submission of Planning Application 30/2017/17787 on 6th February 2017

☐ Pre-publication draft Local Plan – July 2017

4.5 This evidence which included extensive flood modelling work, the scope of which was agreed with the Environment Agency, has demonstrated that the Flood Risk as set out on the Environment Agency mapping is no longer accurate, it is overstated, and the site falls within Flood Zone 1. The Council have chosen to progress the Local Plan on a flawed evidence base, ignoring the most up to date and reliable information. It is therefore unsound as it has not been prepared using a proportionate evidence base.

4.6 We are disappointed to learn that, as part of the application process, the Environment Agency provided written confirmation, on two separate occasions, in March 2017 confirming the Flood Zone 1 status of the application site and raised no objection to the principle of development. Please see attached letters dated 8th March and 28th March 2017. This confirmation unfortunately remained undisclosed to ourselves and KCS Development Ltd until October later in the year. It has also come to light that this correspondence has remained undisclosed from the Local Plan Team, effecting the positive consideration of this site within the site selection process.

4.7 Upon demonstrating that the site was located within Flood Zone 1 the Council should have subjected the site to the same sustainability testing as other potential sites. Disappointingly this was not the case and the site was not appraised or put forward for public consultation as a potential housing allocation. In doing so the Council have failed to follow an appropriate site selection process.

4.8 The application site is a highly sustainable site and scores well under sustainability testing. We consider it a more favourable housing site than the proposed GA009 and GA031 sites currently put forward by the plan. In this respect the housing allocations set out in this policy are not positively prepared or justified.

4.9 It should be noted that the site was included within the Craven Pre-publication draft Local Plan (October 2014) as a preferred housing allocation and was then removed

from the plan.

4.10 We consider that application site (GA025) offers a preferable alternative to the housing allocations sites identified in the Local Plan for Gargrave, particularly GA009.

4.11 The Gargrave Neighbourhood Plan was submitted to the Council in June 2016 for formal consultation prior to examination by an Inspector. The Neighbourhood Plan was put on hold and a revised document was issued re reconsultation on October 2017 including a further additional housing site. We await further details regarding submission and examination of the Neighbourhood Plan.

4.12 The Neighbourhood Plan sets out a number of housing allocations, including sites with consents approvals and some new housing sites. Proposed Local Plan housing allocation GA009 was rejected at very early stages of the Neighbourhood Plan making process by the Working Group as a suitable option.

4.13 Site GA009 has performed poorly at every stage of consultation both in the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan processes. The May 2015 NP assessment of the site concluded:

i. "Open, undulating pasture in the open countryside, adjacent to the Yorkshire Dales National Park. Generally poor accessibility to services and to the existing road network. Some policy constraints – identified as Special Landscape Area in the adopted Development Plan and part of the site is at risk of flooding. Not well related to village and considered to be important to the setting of Gargrave and to views of the National Park from the village and key amenity corridors, notably the Leeds Liverpool Canal. Final Assessment – Inappropriate (emphasis added)."

4.14 It is our view that the proposed allocation of site GA009 is inappropriate. The proposed development represents a poor fit with the existing built form of the village and is an illogical extension. In this area of the village the built form is linear in nature, situated along the road frontage. The proposed allocation for a circa 60 unit extra care facility departs from this character and results in a detached development poorly related to the existing properties.

4.15 In our representations to the Preferred Housing Options Local Plan consultation in August 2016, Johnson Mowat made representation regarding the accessibility and sustainability of the preferred housing sites GA009 and GA031. It is considered our comments remain appropriate.

4.16 Whilst site GA009 is in proximity to bus stops on Eshton Road, these serve the infrequent bus services 75, 210, 211, 873 and 884. Only four buses operate Monday to Saturday to Skipton and Malham; it should also be noted that two of these buses are in close proximity to one another 10.00am (no. 210/211) and 10.01am (no. 75) further reducing choice of travel times. Sunday services are also limited along this route with three buses to Malham throughout the day, one bus to Easingwold and two buses to Malham.

4.17 GA031 is not situated on a bus line at all with the nearest bus stop 750m away situated in the heart of the village. This bus stop serves all those services listed above and the more frequent hourly 580 service between Skipton and Settle which utilises the A65.

4.18 Site GA025 is located on this higher frequency bus route with the nearest bus stop within 400m.

4.19 All in all the analysis has demonstrated that site GA031 has poor accessibility to public transport, 750m away from the nearest bus stop. Whilst GA009 is in proximity to bus stops these are only serviced by infrequent services of no more than 4 buses to Malham and 4 buses to Skipton. The frequency is further reduced as these times are in close proximity to one another.

4.20 Site GA025 provides the best accessibility to the public transport network located on the A65 upon which the hourly service between Skipton and Settle operates. These bus stops also benefit from the other services which run through Gargrave and are described above.

## Conclusion

5.1 We take this opportunity to object to the Craven Publication Draft Local Plan. For the reasons set out above we find it unsound as currently drafted.

5.2 Significant concerns have been raised in relation to the site selection methodology, in particular the fair and proper treatment/ consideration of site GA025 in the Local Plan process. In omitting this site from the site selection process the Council have erred in law and should be brought to account.

5.3 Should the Council be minded to progress the Local Plan without appropriate consideration for site GA025 through the site selection process, the Council are likely to attract a legal challenge on this issue. Written confirmation of the site's flood zone status was provided by the Environment Agency in March 2017 through the currently pending application. The fact that this information was not shared either with the Applicant nor the Council's Policy colleagues is a failure beyond reason and has resulted in the mistreatment of the site in the Local Plan process. With the EA response brought to light at the end of 2017 it is disappointing that the Council have not sought to rectify

the error and assessed the site appropriately.

5.4 Our Client has taken legal advice from Mr David Walton, Walton & Co, on the matter and is resolved to expose the inadequacies of the Council and the Local Plan process through legal challenge.

5.5 I trust that the Council will find these comments useful as it continues through the Local Plan process and we look forward to hearing confirmation that the current issues have been addressed including appropriate consideration of site GA025.

5.6 Should the Council wish to discuss any of the matters raised we would be happy to engage. Johnson Mowat would like to be kept informed of all forthcoming consultations of the Local Plan.

APPENDIX 1 – Environment Agency letter to Craven Council dated 8th March 2017

Mr Mark Moore  
Craven District Council  
Development Management  
Council Offices Granville Street  
Skipton  
North Yorkshire  
BD23 1PS

Our ref: RA/2017/136323/01-L01

Your ref: 30/2017/17787

Date: 08 March 2017

Dear Mr Moore

OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 45 DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS, WITH MEANS OF ACCESS FROM SKIPTON ROAD, GARGRAVE  
(APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT AND SCALE RESERVED) LAND OFF SKIPTON ROAD, GARGRAVE, SKIPTON

Thank you for consulting us on the above application.

Provided that the proposed development is built in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) then we have no objections.

This position is based on the level information provided within the FRA and the in-depth modelling undertaken on likely flood flow routes, mechanisms and flood levels. The site levels from the topographic survey and the road levels suggest that the site would not flood during a 1% flood event from the River Aire. The more detailed modelling and resulting flow routes for the overland flows from Eshton Beck also suggests that the site would not be impacted from flooding from the North, as these flows would be intercepted by the canal and discharge via the canals overflows downstream.

We are aware that the applicant currently has a formal flood map challenge being undertaken.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

27 March 2018

Page 285 of 477

Rachel Clarke-Wood  
Planning Advisor

APPENDIX 2 – Environment Agency letter to Craven Council dated 28th March 2017

Mr Mark Moore  
Craven District Council  
Development Management  
Council Offices Granville Street  
Skipton  
North Yorkshire  
BD23 1PS

Our ref: RA/2017/136323/02-L01  
Your ref: 30/2017/17787  
Date: 28 March 2017

Dear Mr Moore

AMENDED PLANS (FRA). OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 45 DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS, WITH MEANS OF ACCESS FROM SKIPTON ROAD, GARGRAVE (APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT AND SCALE RESERVED) LAND OFF SKIPTON ROAD, GARGRAVE, SKIPTON

Thank you for consulting us on the above application.

Provided that the proposed development is built in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) then we have no objections. Surface water drainage must be agreed with NYCC in their role as LLFA, and also with the IDB.

Our previous response dated 08/03/17 still remains valid. I have attached this below for your reference.

This position is based on the level information provided within the FRA and the in-depth modelling undertaken on likely flood flow routes, mechanisms and flood levels. The site levels from the topographic survey and the road levels suggest that the site would not flood during a 1% flood event from the River Aire. The more detailed modelling and resulting flow routes for the overland flows from Eshton Beck also suggests that the site would not be impacted from flooding from the North, as these flows would be intercepted by the canal and discharge via the canals overflows downstream.

We are aware that the applicant currently has a formal flood map challenge being undertaken.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	039	Organisation	North Yorkshire County Council		
Section or Policy		SP10		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference		GA009		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Gargrave		Representation Reference	039/14/SP10/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

NYCC Property Services

NYCC seeks clarification as to why there is an additional area of green infrastructure provided on the east of the Eshton Road site (GA009). There is concern that this additional green infrastructure provision restricts the most viable part of this site. Whilst the remaining site area is in theory large enough for the provision of the required extra care facilities, due to the irregular shape of the site and when taking into considering the infrastructure that would need to be provided to enable development, we feel the viability of the remaining land is significantly impacted. Given that the field immediatley east of site GA009 does not include any allocations within the current plan, it is considered that this will provide a natural buffer to reduce the impact of any development of the GA009 site.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The additional allocation of Green Infrastructure should be removed to ensure that a viable Extra Care scheme can be developed in the interests of the local residents who may benefit from this valuable service.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	051	Organisation	Natural England		
Section or Policy		SP10		Plan is Legally Compliant?	No
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		GA009		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Gargrave		Representation Reference	051/07/SP10/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Landscape Visual Impact Assessment  
Development Principles

One of the key conclusions of the report is to suggest the need for detailed LVIA at project stage for a number of sites. We note that this has been carried forward in the plan in some cases and welcome this but note that a number of sites do not have this requirement. We advise that following sites should also include the requirement for LVIA at the project stage in the development principles:

GA009

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      SP10

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Gargrave      Representation Reference      017/42/SP10/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy SP10, final Paragraph

We support the inclusion of a statement which clearly ties the Development Principles into the Policy framework of the Local Plan.

It is not sufficient to rely on the general development management Policies which are set out elsewhere in the plan to ensure that the development of each of these sites comes forward in a manner likely to deliver sustainable development.

The development principles set out clear guidance to all concerned in the planning process about what will, and will not, be permitted on each of these sites. As such the help the decision-maker determine how they should react to a development proposal.

The inclusion of this cross-reference to the development Principles in Policy SP10 is in accordance with the advice in Paragraph 153 of the NPPF.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017                      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy                      SP10

Paragraph

Site Reference                      GA031

Settlement Comment Relates to      Gargrave

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?                      Yes

Plan is DtC Compliant?              Not Specified

Representation Reference      017/43/SP10/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site GA031; Land to the west of Walton Close, Gargrave

This site lies close to the boundary of the Gargrave Conservation Area and some 350 metres from the edge of a Scheduled Monument.  
This bullet-point alerts potential developers of the proximity of these assets and the need for any proposals to ensure that the elements which contribute to their significance are appropriately conserved.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      SP11

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      017/44/SP11/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy SP11, final Paragraph

We support the inclusion of a statement which clearly ties the Development Principles into the Policy framework of the Local Plan.

It is not sufficient to rely on the general development management Policies which are set out elsewhere in the plan to ensure that the development of each of these sites comes forward in a manner likely to deliver sustainable development.

The development principles set out clear guidance to all concerned in the planning process about what will, and will not, be permitted on each of these sites. As such the help the decision-maker determine how they should react to a development proposal.

The inclusion of this cross-reference to the development Principles in Policy SP11 is in accordance with the advice in Paragraph 153 of the NPPF.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



which might present an obstacle to the early delivery of the development. As such, the land is available for development in the short term.

6.8 Subject to the allocation of the land within the adopted development plan, the Schools intention is to secure outline planning permission for its residential development. The School will thereafter market and sell the land to an appropriate housebuilder.

#### Achievability

6.9 The residential development of the Lords Close site is achievable and viable in the short-term. It is located in a strong market area which experiences high demand for new family homes. It is in close proximity to high quality transport routes and public transport services, such that it can be easily accessed. Mindful of the scale of the development, it is envisaged that the new homes can be delivered in a single phase within two to three years.

#### The need for the development

6.10 As discussed in the preceding chapters of this report, The School considers that the PDLP has significantly underestimated the scale of housing development required both across the District and in Giggleswick itself. It is considered that the residential development of Lord's Close is required to meet such needs. It will meet the growing demand for new homes in the local area, addressing the affordability challenges which are present, and underpinning its sustainability over the longer-term.

6.11 The delivery of the development is also a critical aspect of the School's proposals for future growth. As discussed in Chapter 2 of this representation and mindful of the School's charitable status, the development of small-scale but high quality residential developments which are well integrated into the built fabric of the village is essential in providing finance to underpin the expansion and improvement of the School's campus. This is required to enable the School to compete in the market place, but also conveys direct benefits to the local community who make use of the facilities.

6.12 In this context, the development of new homes at Lord's Close will provide the financial resources required to deliver improvements to the School's campus. This could entail improvements to the School's sports facilities. In this regard, CDC will be aware that various parts of the School's existing sports facilities are in urgent need of repair and enhancement. This is essential to ensure that the sports facilities remain fit for purpose and to enable the School to compete in the market place. In particular:

- The Schools existing artificial playing surface on land at the Eshton's playing field to the west of Raines Road is nearing the end of its lifespan. It needs to be relaid in the near future in order for its continued use by the School and local community to be safe.
- Existing areas of open space to the north of the Lords Close playing field are unusable, as a result of the roots of adjacent trees creating an uneven playing surface. There is a need to re-profile the land in this location such that the land can be brought back into use for sports and recreation activities.

6.13 In addition, the School has identified a need to enhance the scale and quality of the sports pitches within its estate such that it is able to present an attractive "offer" to prospective students. Similarly, CDC's Playing Pitch Strategy<sup>20</sup> has identified an urgent need for increased rugby pitch provision in the local area and recommends that "...further 3G provision is developed at Giggleswick school, in order to service the northern and central sub-areas..." (paragraph 3.8.21). The objective to deliver enhanced sports facilities within the School's estate is identified in the PDLP<sup>21</sup>.

6.14 The School has explored funding options for the improvements to its campus from external investment partners and public sector organisations, but any such opportunities are of insufficient scale to deliver the works required. As such, the residential development of the land at Lords Close is required in order to provide the essential funding necessary. If new homes are not delivered at Lords Close and the School is unable to obtain the associated uplift in land value, the School will be unable to deliver the required improvements to its campus.

#### Conclusion

6.15 The School strongly supports the allocation of SG014 and the associated "development principles" identified in the PDLP. The residential development of the land is required to:

- Meet the housing needs of the local community in this part of the District, as discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 of this representation.
- Facilitate the delivery of new and improved sports facilities and open space within the School's estate, in respect of:

- The repair of existing facilities; and
- Deliver improved sports facilities in response to a local need and to enable the School to compete in the market place.

6.16 The land at Lords Close is suitable, available and achievable for residential development. The land is demonstrably deliverable and it is envisaged that the new homes will be developed within five years of the adoption of the Local Plan. The School considers that the allocation of the land is sound.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      SP11

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      BU012      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Burton in Lonsdale      Representation Reference      017/45/SP11/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site BU12; Richard Thornton’s CE Primary School, Burton- in- Lonsdale

The former Richard Thornton’s CE Primary School is a Grade II Listed Building and the site lies within the Burton-in-Lonsdale Conservation Area. The development of this site provides an opportunity to bring this vacant building back into use.

The Heritage Impact Assessment considered that development to the north-east and south of these buildings would have a large adverse impact upon their setting. Therefore, we support the intention to exclude the area in front of the Listed Buildings from the developable area as shown on Inset Map 7.

We also support the requirement, in the first bullet-point, that the conversion of the school buildings and any new development should conserve the significance of these Listed Buildings and the nearby Scheduled Monument.

These will and will help to ensure that the site is developed in a manner which conserves the setting of these assets.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		SP11		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference		CN006		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Cononley		Representation Reference	017/46/SP11/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site CN006 Station Works, north of Cononley Lane, Cononley, second bulletpoint

This site lies adjoins the boundary of the Cononley Conservation Area and is prominent in several of the key views across the Conservation Area. The Heritage Impact Assessment considered that the loss of the mill buildings would have a large adverse impact upon the setting of the Cononley Conservation Area. Therefore, we support the requirement for development to retain and convert these buildings. We also support the requirement, in the second bullet-point, that the site and design of any new development should conserve the significance of the nearby heritage assets.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      049      Organisation      RN Wooler & Co Ltd

Section or Policy      SP11

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      CA012

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Carleton

Representation Reference      049/01/SP11/OS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

REPRESENTATION TO PUBLICATION CONSULTATION DOCUMENT IN RELATION TO LAND AT GRUNDY FARM AND EAST OF PARK LANE TERRACE, CARLETON-IN-CRAVEN (CA012)  
Our client, RN Wooler & Co Ltd, has made previous representations on the Local Plan and wishes to take this opportunity to **STRONGLY OBJECT** to the lack of housing allocation in Carleton and in particular the absence of an allocation for site CA012, land at Grundy Farm, Carleton-in-Craven.

The site is located at the heart of the village of Carleton and has been promoted throughout the emerging Local Plan process as shown in the image below.

Fig1: Site CA012 as proposed within Preferred Sites for Consultation' Summer 2014. (SAVED ON SYSTEM)

Initially, our client wishes to make known their **STRONG OBJECTION** to the consultation draft Local Plan, in particular the decision not to allocate any housing sites within Carleton.

The Publication Draft Local Plan notes that the NET Housing Requirement for the village, based on 230 dpa 2012 to 2032 is 55 dwellings, representing a 1.2% proportion of housing growth in line with draft Policy SP4.

A calculation provided within Table 5 of the Pre-Publication Draft Craven Local Plan advises that the total number of permissions and net completions in Carleton (at 30/09/2017) was 52. As such, the residual housing requirement for allocation in Carleton stood at 2 dwellings. This figure assumes that all approved dwellings will be built out which cannot be guaranteed.

For example, this figure assumed that 24 dwellings would be coming forward for development on land at Carla Beck Lane, which attained outline permission in July 2016 (ref: 17/2016/16571). This site is shown as a housing allocation in the Submission Policies Map as shown below:

Figure 2: Existing Housing Commitment shown at Carla Beck Lane (hatched in blue) (SAVED ON SYSTEM)

Rural Solutions Ltd wrote to the Craven District Council Planning Policy Team in April 2017 in relation to the non-delivery of the 24 dwellings at Carla Beck Lane. This letter advised the council that our client did not wish to build out 24 dwellings on this site. The letter also requested that Craven District Council 'reduced the extent of site allocation for the Carla Beck Lane site to that shown on the attached indicative site plan, with a yield of up to five houses'.

Within the 'Site Response Papers' (response to comments received during consultation on the pre-publication draft local plan 2017), published in January 2018, the council notes the following:

In regards to Land on Carla Beck Lane, as this site already has planning permission for 24 houses the Council have to base our housing numbers on the information that we have in front of us. If this application was quashed and a new planning application submitted then the Council could take the new proposed numbers for the site into consideration and make the necessary amendments.

In light of the above, the council must now reconsider the need for a housing allocation in the village to meet the proposed housing requirements within the Local Plan. We consider that the proposed site at Grundy Farm is the only current site that can make a significant contribution to the housing requirements of the village during the plan period.

In January 2018 the suitability of the Grundy Farm site for development was considered as part of the 'Residential Site Selection Process'. As part of this assessment it noted that the site should not be considered in the pool of sites as the site 'does not include a sufficient frontage to enable an access of acceptable standards to be formed on to the public highway (Highways Comments)'.

A planning application on site CA012 is currently being considered by Craven District Council under reference 17/2017/17886. This revised application proposes circa 15 dwellings (plans currently being produced) on the site. As part of this application in depth discussions have taken place between Rural Solutions Ltd and North Yorkshire County Council Highways Team. NYCC Highways have now confirmed that a suitable access point can be achieved to the site and a formal response is expected in due course.

A previous sustainability appraisal of the site, undertaken by the council in April 2016, advised that 'Because of the impact on the Conservation Area and listed farm buildings identified in the open space assessment and Allocation Site Assessment, the development of the whole of CA012 is unacceptable'.

It is of note that in the two subsequent appraisals of the site in both July 2017 and January 2018, the council raise no concerns to any potential impact of development upon heritage assets. We would like to take this opportunity to commend the council for removing their initial concerns and we concur with the assessment of the council that the development of the site can take place without any potential impact upon nearby heritage assets.

As a highways solution has now been found, and there are no other concerns raised by the council following their site assessment, there is now no reason why site CA012 cannot come forward as an allocation in the Local Plan. The site can make a significant contribution to the housing requirement of Carleton within the Local Plan period, particularly as the site at Carla Beck Lane has reduced from 24 dwellings to 4 dwellings follow the recent planning approval.

The client have done all they can to keep Craven District Council informed as to the plans and aspirations for the site at Carla Beck Lane. Development has now commenced on the four dwelling scheme at Carla Beck Lane and the client has no intention of developing 24 dwellings at the site.

#### Comments on Soundness of Proposed Local Plan (Non-allocation of site CA012)

In line with paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework we provide the following comments in respect to the soundness of the proposed allocation:

Positively prepared – the council has not considered the previous local plan representations submitted on behalf of our client. These representations had previously acknowledged that the Carla Beck Lane site would be reduced from 24 dwellings to 4 dwellings resulting in a deficit of 20 dwellings in the residual housing requirement of the village. The plan in its current form makes no provision for the residual housing requirement for the village.

Justified – There is no reason why the council would ignore all the previous representations submitted on behalf of the client that has clearly advised that the Carla Beck Lane site would only achieve four dwellings. The loss of 20 dwellings from this permission has resulted in their being a deficit of 22 dwelling in the village for the plan period. We

have continually put forward the site at Grundy Farm for allocation as part of the emerging local plan. Following confirmation from NYCC Highways that a suitable access can be achieved on the site there is no justifiable reason why the site at Grundy Farm cannot be considered as a housing allocation.

Effective – The allocation of the site for housing development would be effective in addressing the clearly identified residual housing need in the village. The site is also being promoted by a local housing developer who has confirmed that the site is deliverable in the short term and can make an effective contribution to housing need in the district. Plan Objective PO4 seeks to ‘maintain a continuous supply of housing land to meet housing needs throughout the plan period’. It is clear that there is a deficit in the residual housing requirements for the village following the reduction in dwelling numbers at Carla Beck Farm. The lack of allocated housing sites within the village will detrimentally impact upon the villages potential to effectively provide a continuous supply of housing land as required by the plan. Plan Objective 5 also seeks to improve housing choice in terms of house type, size, tenure, price and location. It is clear that there are no sites allocated housing sites within the village capable of providing affordable housing a mix of units are required by the local plan. By allocating additional land as part of the plan, the council allow themselves the potential for a continuous supply of housing in the village throughout the plan period. Additional allocation will also allow for the delivery of affordable housing throughout the plan period. For these reasons we do not consider the plan to be effective in its current form.

Consistent with national policy – The allocation of the site would be consistent with the NPPF’s objective to ‘boost significantly the supply of housing’. As the site at Carla Beck Lane will now no longer yield the 24 dwellings allocated within the local plan it is clear that the council will be unable to meet their OAN, as required by the NPPF. The inclusion of additional deliverable housing allocations in the village, such as that proposed at Grundy Farm, would allow the council the flexibility to adapt to any changes within the district and would allow for a continuous supply of both market and affordable housing over the plan period.

Conclusion  
Given that the site at Carla Beck Lane has been reduced from 24 dwellings to 4 dwellings, a there would be a residual housing requirement of 22 dwellings within Carleton within the plan period. It is clear that additional housing allocation sites will be required to meet the requirement within the emerging local plan. Initial concerns in respect to potentially access issues have been discussed with NYCC Highway as part of an ongoing outline planning application (ref: 17/2017/17886). As a highway solution has now been found, there is no reason why the site cannot come forward as a housing allocation in the Local Plan.

The site allocation would make a substantial contribution to the residual housing requirement for the village throughout the plan period.

We plan to attend the forthcoming examination in public to make further representations on behalf of our client.

Our client, therefore **STRONGLY OBJECTS** to the lack of housing allocations for Carleton and in particular the absence of an allocation for site CA012, land at Grundy Farm.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	We plan to attend the forthcoming examination in public to make further representations on behalf of our client.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID	046	Organisation	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Bolton Abbey		
Section or Policy		SP11		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Bolton Abbey			Representation Reference	046/10/SP11/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

DRAFT POLICY SP11: STRATEGY FOR TIER 4A AND 4B VILLAGES WITH BASIC SERVICES AND BISECTED VILLAGES WITH BASIC SERVICES

Whilst supporting the identification of Bolton Abbey as a 4B Settlement, CST notes that the wording of this policy [SP11] is somewhat misleading.

The opening to the policy states that:

‘Tier 4 settlements will receive a limited amount of growth that underpins their role and function as settlements with basic services and to ensure ongoing sustainability. Villages with basic services and/or tourism function which are bisected by the National Park boundary also receive an appropriate level of growth on the following sites:’ (our emphasis)

The policy then goes onto list four sites for allocation. The wording highlighted in bold above would suggest that all of the sites listed are to be found in villages bisected by the National Park boundary. That is not the case and only of the four allocated sites is in a village bisected by the National Park boundary (Giggleswick). The other three sites are in 4A villages, not 4B (bisected villages).

Whilst the policy may be incorrectly worded in this regard, CST is concerned that the policy as worded could also cause confusion at the development management stage. The policy as worded could be incorrectly interpreted in isolation as only allowing development in 4A and 4B villages on the named allocated sites. Policy SP4 criterion H supports development on previously developed sites in the main built up area of settlements in Tier 1 – 4A/B settlements, whilst criterion I of that policy supports the release of non-allocated sites adjoining the main built up area, subject to compliance with one of three listed sub-criteria including:

‘c) development is justified by special economic, environmental and /or social circumstances,’

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

It is strongly recommended that the policy wording highlighted above is amended for clarity to read:

‘Tier 4 settlements (including villages with basic services and/or tourism function which are bisected by the National Park boundary) will receive a limited amount of growth that underpins their role and function as settlements with basic services and to ensure ongoing sustainability. An appropriate level of growth will be delivered on the following allocated sites (in addition to development on non-allocated sites that conform to policy SP4 criteria)... ’

This change will make the plan more legible and effective.



Respondent ID	037	Organisation		
Section or Policy		SP11	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Yes
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		SC066	Plan is DtC Compliant?	Yes
Settlement Comment Relates to	Sutton in Craven		Representation Reference	037/01/SP11/OS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy SP11 makes no housing allocations within Sutton village. The Spatial Strategy at SP11 is thus flawed and also not justified for the same reason. Sutton village is a sustainable location for some limited housing development.

Submissions were made earlier in the Local Plan process in connection with a specific site SCO66 Land West of Greenroyd Drive (plan attached).

The table on page 89 of the Residential Site Selection process (incorporating employment site selection) Background Paper January 2018 states: The site has current difficulties in access. There may be acceptable access but this is subject to the garden in adjacent house number 32 requiring hard surfacing to provide replacement off park parking (Highways comments 2016). This does not reflect the up to date position whereby a planning application (2017/18753) is under process and shortly to be determined, for residential development of 10 units affording access into the site via the demolition of No 32 Greenroyd Drive (owned by the applicant). The Highway Authority have confirmed they are happy with this arrangement.

Even if no other sites are allocated for Housing in Sutton, this site is locationally excellent and constitutes “rounding off” of the settlement having being previously recommended for inclusion within the settlement boundary in the previous Local Plan examination. The Inspector who chaired the Inquiry on the currently adopted Craven Local Plan, reported prior to its adoption, that the land in question should be included in the development limits for Sutton village as it is “virtually surrounded by development”. I go further and consider that it should be allocated for housing development under SP11.This would be consistent with the objective of SP4 to direct limited growth to Tier 4a settlements as the site is not excessively large relative to the village.

National Policy in the NPPPF seeks to secure sustainable development; one component of which is locating housing development in settlements which have good access to services and public transport. The failure to allocate SCO66 for housing under SP11 renders the Plan unsound as it is neither justified nor consistent with national policy.

BACKGROUND INFO PROVIDED: SITE PLAN AND EXTRACT FROM INSPECTORS REPORT ON 1999 CRAVEN LOCAL PLAN SAVED ON SYSTEM.  
 FOLLOWING BACKGROUND LETTER ALSO PROVIDED:

SUBMISSION REGARDING SCO66: LAND TO REAR OF BAY HORSE BARN SUTTON-IN-CRAVEN

Further to our recent telephone conversations, we agreed I would write to you to put the case forward for inclusion of the above site within the forthcoming Craven Local Plan as an allocated housing site. I understand my client Mr Summerskill initiated this process some time ago.

From a historical perspective, the Inspector who chaired the Inquiry on the currently adopted Craven Local Plan, reported prior to its adoption, that the land in question should be included in the development limits for Sutton village as it is “virtually surrounded by development” (see attached Committee report). Although the Committee resolved to disregard that advice (and it is by no means clear why), it is nonetheless sage planning advice proffered by an experienced independent Planning Inspector. That in itself carries substantial weight.

Secondly and perhaps more saliently, the premise on which the Inspector came to the above finding, still prevails on the ground today; that is to say that the land in question is completely surrounded by development and its exclusion from the settlement boundary of Sutton village is nonsensical and serves no planning purpose whatsoever. I also understand that there is some development potential identified on the car park to the rear of the Bay Horse Inn, which if undertaken, will render the site in question even more contained by other housing development.

I understand that settlement limits are not to be included as part of the forthcoming Local Plan. As such, and given the considerable size of the land in question (which you will see from the attached indicative plan is capable of accommodating around 15 units), I would submit that the land in question should be identified as a potential housing site.

The site is identified as SCO66 on the Pool of Site Options with Potential for Residential/Mixed Use Sustainability Appraisal Document (5/4/16). It is suggested in the table that the site is not included in the pool of sites due to lack of access. However, it can be seen on the attached plan that there are two potential means of access to the site. The first is from Ellers Road. Whilst the client does not own the entirety of the length of that particular access onto the carriageway, he nonetheless possesses a right of access across it. Whatever the views of the Highway Authority in respect of that access, the fact remains that it has served several dwellings without incident for many years and it seems probable that it could service at least part of the site.

The other potentially more viable access option is from Greenroyd Drive through the side garden of No 32 Greenroyd Drive, which is under the ownership of my client. This may potentially require the acquisition of a small strip of land from Yorkshire Housing in order to facilitate the requisite width to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority. I am about to pursue negotiations with the latter, but a preliminary enquiry has indicated that they would not unreasonably withhold disposal of the land in question.

I am sure you are aware that it is common practice to impose Grampian type of conditions on planning consents requiring that the development is not commenced until some particular action is undertaken; typically on land outside the applicant’s ownership (for instance, as here, to secure highway works). The relevant test for such conditions is that these can be used provided there is not “no prospect at all” of the condition being complied with. In other words, even if there is only a slight chance that the terms in the condition can be met, then such conditions can be imposed on planning consents. Whilst negotiations with Yorkshire Housing are ongoing at this point, there is certainly no suggestion that the land in question cannot be acquired.

A fallback position, in the event that for some inexplicable reason, that could not be secured, would be the partial or wholesale demolition of No 32 Greenroyd Drive, which would also potentially facilitate an access of reasonable width into the site. The latter option is not preferred by my client, but it nonetheless exists.

Therefore from the submissions in made thus far, it is clear that “lack of suitable access” is not a legitimate barrier to the allocation of the land for housing in the forthcoming Local Plan.

Secondly, I understand that an earlier version of the April 2016 document (cited above), pointed out that a small part of the site presents flood risk issues. However, an examination of the Flood Risk Map on the Environment Agency website reveals that the site lies outside flood zones 2 and 3 (see attached map extract). The site has also never been known to flood. Accordingly, it appears that there is no legitimate basis to resist inclusion of the site on the basis of flood risk. Whilst Holme Beck does run along the northern perimeter of the site, this is set at a significantly lower level. It also does not appear to have acted as a barrier to development in terms of the new housing

recently constructed to the rear of Greenroyd Mill, which lies to the immediate north of the site.

Secondly, there is a suggestion that a nearby Special Protection Area and Special Area of Conservation need to be “investigated further”. Both of these ecology designations lie a considerable distance to the West of the site in question and it is virtually inconceivable that their designation would in any way affect the viability of the site for development. The site also comprises cultivated and well managed garden land. It is thus highly improbable that it presents any habitat of ecological interest. Accordingly, there is no evidence to suggest that there is any ecological interest that should pose a barrier to the allocation of the site for housing in the forthcoming Local Plan.

In summary, from the submissions in this letter it is clear that there should be no barrier to inclusion of the site as an allocated housing site in the forthcoming Local Plan. Indeed, from a planning perspective, the site scores extremely highly; it is well contained by development visually and would not amount to an encroachment into the countryside; it scores very highly from a sustainability perspective, being physically well related to the settlement of Sutton village and the extended range of facilities in Crosshills and Glusburn. The fact the site falls within the Conservation Area is not particularly unusual and would simply require greater attention to detail in the site layout and house design.

I also understand that the Council are unable at the present time to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing. This makes the case for allocating sustainable sites such as this, all the more imperative.

In the circumstances, I would invite you to give serious consideration to inclusion of this site as an allocated housing site in the forthcoming Local Plan as it can make a realistic and beneficial contribution towards meeting the housing needs of the Borough, without adversely impacting on any interest of acknowledged importance. The fact that the Inspector reporting on the current iteration of the Local Plan identified that the site should be included in the settlement boundary of Sutton village, lends considerable credence to the above assertion.

I would ask that you keep me informed of forthcoming developments in the Local Plan, particularly those that may require further submissions to be made on behalf of my client in respect of this particular piece of land.

I have also attached a draft indicative layout of a possible housing scheme in order to further your negotiations with the Highway Authority.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

SCO66 should be allocated for Housing in Policy SP11.

Criterion a) to c) of subsection I to Policy SP4 should be deleted, but the first sentence “supporting the release of non allocated sites for housing that adjoins the main built up area of settlements” should be retained. The next line after subsection c) should simply read Proposals will be supported provided they meet the following criteria:....

These measures will render the plan sound insofar as it will be justified and consistent with national policy.

I also attach a copy of the site SCO66 and my original submission to David Greenfield dated 11/7/16 which provides background information relevant to this submission. Also attachments Committee report pages 1 and 2 which refer to the Inspectors’ comments on the current Local Plan relative to SCO66.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      048      Organisation      Burley Development Ltd

Section or Policy      SP11

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      SG085, SG086      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Giggleswick      Representation Reference      048/01/SP11/OS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### REPRESENTATION TO PUBLICATION CONSULTATION DOCUMENT IN RELATION TO LAND WEST AND EAST OF RAINES ROAD, GIGGLESWICK (SITES SG085 AND SG086)

Our client Mr Mike Smith, of Burley Developments Ltd, has made previous representations on the Local Plan and wishes to take this opportunity to OBJECT to the proposal in the Plan Publication Consultation Draft for sites SG085 and SG086, land to the west and land to the east of Raines Road, Giggleswick.

The two sites are located on the southern edge of Giggleswick and have been promoted throughout the emerging Local Plan process as shown in the image below. The sites adjoin a Site SG072 which attained planning permission for seven dwellings in May 2015 (identified by the number 7 in the below image). This site is currently being developed by our client, Burley Developments Ltd.

Fig1: Sites SG085 and SG086 as proposed within 'Pool of Sites Options' May 2016. (PLAN OF SITES INCLUDED IN REPRESENTATION. SAVED ON SYSTEM)

Initially, our client wishes to make known their OBJECTION to the consultation draft Local Plan, in particular the decision not to allocate sites SG085 and SG086 as draft housing allocations within the Local Plan.

The Publication Draft Local Plan notes that the NET Housing Requirement for the village, based on 230 dpa 2012 to 2032 is 37 dwellings, representing a 0.8% proportion of housing growth in line with draft Policy SP4.

In April 2016 the suitability of each site for development was considered as part of the 'Pool of Site Options with Potential for Residential or Mixed Use and Sustainability Appraisal'. As part of this assessment it noted that the sites provided 'a good opportunity for suitable residential development'. Following this, the sites were included in the subsequent consultation document 'Preferred Sites for Housing' published in July 2016.

Further analysis in both 2017 and 2018 confirmed that the sites 'perform satisfactorily in the Sustainability Analysis' and are 'deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites (with mitigation measures and recommendations) 'subject to Stage 2 analysis.

The Stage 2 analysis for each site concludes that 'the site passes all four District Level Analyses. It can be potentially a Preferred Site, but Giggleswick is not to be allocated any Preferred Sites under the draft Local Plan'.

Whilst the above assessment advised that 'Giggleswick is not to be allocated any Preferred Sites under the draft Local Plan', a review of draft Policy SP11 and the draft proposal plan includes site SG014 at Lords Close, Giggleswick which has the potential to yield 35 dwellings.

Fig2: Site SG014 as proposed within 'Publication Draft Proposals Map' January 2018 (sites SG085 and SG086 marked by red dot) (SAVED ON SYSTEM)

As site SG014 is included within the draft Publication Plan there are no reasons why sites SG085 and SG086, both being considered sustainable by the LPA, cannot be included also.

The two sites are extremely deliverable, a point emphasised as our client is currently in the process of developing 7 dwellings on land to the north of, and adjacent to site SG085 (as shown on the image above).

The two sites are both of a size that can provide a level of affordable housing. There has been no affordable housing in Giggleswick in recent years and the provision of additional housing allocations within the village can guarantee the provision of affordable housing throughout the plan period.

Whilst Giggleswick has not received any affordable housing in recent years, the nearby town of Settle has received affordable housing. It is considered that Giggleswick could take additional housing allocation as it is less constrained than the town of Settle, particularly in respect to the topography.

The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that local planning authorities should 'boost significantly the supply of housing' and the housing figures set out in both the current and emerging Local Plan are acknowledged as being a minimum requirement.

Both sites are considered to be sustainable locations within the village of Giggleswick and are sites that have been included as housing allocations within the Local Plan throughout its development.

The allocation of a single site for development within the village does not allow for sustainable growth throughout the plan period (from 2012 -2032). At present, it is likely that the proposed housing site at Lords Close would be delivered within the first half of the plan period resulting in no further growth in the second half of the plan period. By allocating more than a single site, the council would ensure that there is the potential for continued housing growth throughout the plan period.

The council could choose one site for the first half of the plan period and one for the second half of the plan period, based on the sites deliverability. It is clear that sites SG085 and SG086 would be extremely deliverable within the plan period, and more deliverable than other potential development sites, particularly as the client is currently on site developing the adjacent land to the north of site SG085.

Given the above it is contested that the Publication Draft Craven Local Plan can be considered 'sound' as it would fail to support positive growth in locations that have been identified to be sustainable.

#### Comments on Soundness of Local Plan (Non-Allocation of sites SG085 and SG086)

In line with paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework we provide the following comments in respect to the soundness of the proposed allocation:

Positively prepared – the only reason why the sites have not been allocated by the council are because 'Giggleswick is not to be allocated any Preferred Sites under the draft Local Plan'. In spite of this, the Publication Draft Policies Map identifies site SG014 as a Draft Housing Allocation within the village. As site SG014 is included within the draft Publication Plan there are no reasons why sites SG085 and SG086, both being considered sustainable by the LPA, cannot be included also.

Justified – Following the council's own assessment of the sites as being 'a good opportunity for suitable residential development' the site there is no justifiable reason why the site cannot be considered as a housing allocation.

Effective – The allocation of the sites for housing development would be effective as it would deliver housing to the benefit of both the village and wider district. The sites are also being promoted by a local housing developer who has confirmed that the site is deliverable within the plan period and can make an effective contribution to housing need in the district. Plan Objective PO4 seeks to ‘maintain a continuous supply of housing land to meet housing needs throughout the plan period’. The allocation of a single housing site within the plan period will not result in a continuous supply of housing for the residents of Giggleswick. Plan Objective 5 also seeks to improve housing choice in terms of house type, size, tenure, price and location. Again we argue by only allocating a single housing site within Giggleswick would restrict the potential for the council deliver the required mix of housing, including affordable housing over the plan period. By allocating additional land as part of the plan, the council allow themselves the potential for a continuous supply of housing in the village throughout the plan period. Additionalal location will also allow for the delivery of affordable housing throughout the plan period. For these reasons we do not consider the plan to be effective in its current form.

Consistent with national policy – The allocation of these sites would be consistent with the NPPF’s objective to ‘boost significantly the supply of housing’. Should the site at Lords Close (SG014) not come forward in the plan period then the council would be at risk of being unable to meet their OAN, as required by the NPPF. The inclusion of additional deliverable housing allocations in the village would allow the council the flexibility to adapt to any changes within the district and would allow for a continuous supply of both market and affordable housing over the plan period.

Conclusion

As has been established in previous representations, there are no site - specific land, ecology or landscape designations, neither are there any listed buildings or designated heritage assets on or adjacent to either site that would prevent or restrict their development.

Given the above, it is considered that each site represents excellent options for delivering new, high quality housing in Giggleswick on sites that can be genuinely integrated into the village without causing harm to it or its surroundings. The sites are of a scale that can provide much needed affordable housing to the village and wider district as is required within the draft Local Plan.

Our client, therefore OBJECTS to the proposal in the Plan Publication Consultation Draft for sites SG085 and SG086, land to the west and land to the east of Raines Road, Giggleswick.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	039	Organisation	North Yorkshire County Council		
Section or Policy		SP12		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	039/05/SP12/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Strategic Policy and Economic Growth

The recognition and inclusion of essential infrastructure within the Development Principles for each site, set out in policies SP5-SP11, is supported. This will improve confidence and certainty that the sites will be able to fully address the identified issues and achieve viable and sustainable development. The use of developer contributions is strongly supported given that there is evidence of an infrastructure funding gap. Without adequate funding the viability and deliverability of sites may be compromised leading to delays in provision. As a strategic infrastructure provider the County Council is keen to work with the District on infrastructure requirements and would welcome discussions on how best this can be achieved.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	064	Organisation	York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Enterprise Partnership		
Section or Policy		SP12		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Yes
Paragraph		4.66 to 4.70		Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Yes
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	064/03/SP12/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The LEP supports Policy SP12 given that appropriate infrastructure is a prerequisite for growth. The LEP looks forward to working with Craven District Council, developers and relevant partners to ensure provision of the infrastructure required to deliver the planned levels of growth and the proposals of the Craven Local Plan.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      008      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy      SP12

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      SK089 and SK090

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Skipton

Representation Reference      008/16/SP12/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

**DRAFT POLICY SP12: INFRASTRUCTURE, STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENT DELIVERY**

5.43 This policy seeks to ensure that in parallel with the delivery of growth that there is capacity in existing local infrastructure to accommodate growth or where necessary it is reinforced, upgraded or new capacity is installed.

5.44 With Draft Allocation SK089/090, there is a requirement for some 1.8ha to be “reserved” for the provision of a primary school. Notwithstanding any site specific issues, no evidence has been provided in the draft Local Plan to explain the justification for the requirement, timetable for delivery and how it is being financed. This is a particular concern given the anticipated reduction in yield off the site.

5.45 At this stage the draft Local Plan is considered unsound as it is not justified, in terms of whether it comprises the most appropriate strategy in the circumstances (given the understanding that a Primary School has been closed elsewhere in the town). Engagement with the Education Authority has elicited a response and it is expected that this will result in changes to the Plan prior to formal Submission. As published however, we consider the Local Plan to be unsound.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?



Reason for Participation

Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.

Respondent ID      015      Organisation      Canal and River Trust

Section or Policy      SP12

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      015/05/SP12/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We welcome the recognition that development proposals are expected to provide or enable the provision of infrastructure directly related to or made necessary by that development.

Significant developments that inter-link with our towpath, or are in proximity to our towpath network, can place extra liabilities and burdens upon the waterway infrastructure, particularly as a result of its use as a form of open space and as a sustainable transport route. The Trust currently maintains its towpaths in a “steady state” and it is therefore essential that appropriate contributions are secured from developers in order to mitigate the impact of new development on the Trust’s assets where appropriate and necessary.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	009	Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)		
Section or Policy		SP2		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Section 4, Paragraphs 4.19-4.28		Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	009/05/SP2/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

This section of the Local Plan is entitled 'Economic Growth'.

As suggested in the July 2017 consultation response, CPRENY welcomes the transposition of the reference to North Yorkshire within the text of Policy SP2 for clarification purposes.

CPRENY are concerned that 32Ha of employment land has been allocated based on the need to update the ELR to reflect the revised housing requirement target. Given that CPRENY have objected to the higher proposed requirement, it follows that they must object to this figure also.

There is some confusion surrounding paragraph 4.26 of the draft Local Plan which states that "evidence suggests that the realistic range of employment land requirement is relatively narrow (5ha) but it is considered appropriate to indicate a minimum level of provision to ensure that the Local Plan strategies for housing and economic growth are aligned and complementary to deliver a balanced pattern of growth in Craven [...] to achieve this, draft Policy SP2 proposes a minimum of 32ha of employment land for B Class Uses be provided in the plan area ..."

There is a huge difference (27ha) between what evidence suggests is required and what the plan proposes is required as a minimum amount of employment land. This could be for a variety of reasons, including the fact that the general population of residents of Craven district are retired or approaching retirement age, residents choose to live in the rural district of Craven and commute out of the area to work, or residents are engaged in agriculture or tourism-based industries and thus employment land is not needed in significant amounts. The settlements themselves are relatively small with larger businesses already operating on sites within the district.

Whilst it is important to allocate land to foster and support existing businesses to expand and new business opportunities to be realised, surely allocating 27ha of land over what evidence suggest is actually required is excessive? CPRENY believe that a lower allocation reflecting the actual need would be more realistic. Whilst the Framework encourages proactive planning for economic growth, paragraph 22 of the NPPF states that policies should avoid the long-term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Therefore, CPRENY believe, it would seem sensible to not over-allocate in the first instance.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY believe that a lower allocation would be more appropriate in line with actual requirements.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID	059	Organisation		
Section or Policy		SP2	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		4.28	Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	059/02/SP2/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Support - The Skipton-colne railway line should be reinstated. In light of today's (12/02/2018) announcement by Government, it should be electrified to avoid deisel pollution/fossil fuel consumption.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	039	Organisation	North Yorkshire County Council		
Section or Policy		SP2		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	039/04/SP2/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Strategic Policy and Economic Growth

North Yorkshire County Council's Plan for Economic Growth sets out a number of aims, including for: a larger business base and increased number of good quality jobs; people across the County having equal access to economic opportunity; and an increased overall median average wage. As such the County Council welcomes opportunities in the Plan to deliver 32ha economic development land and the wider flexibility and potential within the Plan that exists for facilitating economic growth.

There is also reference to improved road and rail infrastructure which is fine in itself however it isn't certain at this time that proposals to improve the Colne Valley rail line will ever be delivered and therefore future conomic growth should not be contingent on this.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      029      Organisation      Henry Boot Developments Ltd

Section or Policy      SP2

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      SK049      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      029/03/SP2/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

**SP2 Economic Activity and Business Growth**

Support is given to the proposed allocation of a minimum of 32 hectares of employment land in the District ,over the plan period, for B1, B2 and B8 uses and the explicit allocation of additional employment land in Skipton, including site SK049, Land East of Skipton by Pass, Skipton under policy SP5, to meet future employment land requirements.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	008	Organisation	The Wilman Family		
Section or Policy		SP2		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	008/12/SP2/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

DRAFT POLICY SP2: ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND BUSINESS GROWTH

5.22 Building a strong competitive economy is one of the key themes of Government policy and the Framework places a strong emphasis upon proactive planning to identify business and development needs and ensure that the economy is fit for the future. Government advises that the planning system should not act as a brake on economic growth aspirations. To this end the policy and provisions are broadly supported.

5.23 Within this policy the evidence suggests a current shortfall in provision of between 11 and 16ha of employment land to be provided over the Plan period. It is important that the selection of sites is consistent with the spatial hierarchy and focuses growth into those areas where housing growth will occur.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      056      Organisation      Bentham Town Council

Section or Policy      SP2

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Bentham

Representation Reference      056/01/SP2/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Economic Activity & Business Growth

Section 4.19 states ‘The delivery of new housing in Craven will also need to be balanced with the approach to facilitating economic growth and providing employment opportunities for residents and entrepreneurs.’

Section 4.24 then shows that the available employment land is some 11-16ha short of the identified requirement.

Looking at the Key Settlement of Bentham, some 14.6ha of housing land is identified with absolutely no provision of employment land. This compares with 10ha housing land and 6.7ha of employment land in Settle and 3.2ha housing land and 2.94ha employment land in Ingleton.

Bearing in mind that employment land should be provided close to housing, then, if Bentham is expected to have 250 new homes during the life of the Local Plan, some employment land should be provided to service these new residents.

Earlier versions of the Local Plan did include employment land in the area but these have now been removed.

To be sustainable new housing needs employment opportunities close by. This Local Plan does not identify sufficient employment land for the housing requirement and fails to provide any employment land in one of its key settlements. Where are the new residents of Bentham expected to find employment when public transport and the road infra structure does not readily support working outside of the area.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The Local Plan needs to be modified to include the provision of more employment land, specifically to make provision for such within the key settlement of Bentham to support the new residents of the 250 proposed dwellings without them having to leave the area everyday, which is unsustainable

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	064	Organisation	York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Enterprise Partnership		
Section or Policy		SP2		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Yes
Paragraph		Section 2, Section 4 and Section 7, SP2 and EC1-4		Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Yes
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	064/02/SP2/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Section 2, Section 4 and Section 7  
SP2 and EC1-4

Support the policy approach of a minimum of 32 ha of employment land to ensure housing and economic growth are aligned and encourage growth and productivity improvements. The complementary strong economic and infrastructure focus in the vision and objectives and Section 7 is also supported. The Plan seeks to address earlier land / premises supply issues for employment and housing and improve strategic transport links and facilities in order to encourage growth and address challenges such as:

- Low wage levels
- an aging population and shrinking workforce
- housing affordability gap.

SP2, when read with SD1, plus EC1, EC2, EC3 and EC4, also provide for economic growth and activity on unallocated sites, wherever appropriate, including the important employment site at Broughton Hall. The LEP welcomes this flexible approach to improving the local economy.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      008      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy      SP3

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      008/13/SP3/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### DRAFT POLICY SP3: HOUSING MIX AND DENSITY

5.24 An approach which promotes a diverse mix of house types and sizes is supported where it is flexible, not overly prescriptive and requiring of significant evidence and analysis. It is important that any policy is workable and ensures that housing delivery can be increased in line with the requirement for the remainder of the Plan period.

##### Housing Mix

5.25 It is important that the housing market in Craven has a balance of housing types and sizes. The SHMA sets out a requirement for the District as a whole. Whilst the need for a mix of house types and tenures is appreciated, it is important that the Council does not seek to compromise or stall much needed housing by overly prescriptive policy requirements or the need to provide disproportionate level of additional evidence.

5.26 Similar comments were issued to the previous consultation supporting the policy but suggested it should be workable. CDC have made modest changes so the policy is less prescriptive and the final mix of housing types and sizes will be secured through negotiation with the applicant.

5.27 Such changes are welcome but concerns still remain. It is considered that the approach to housing mix in Provision (a) is specific and overly prescriptive requiring developers to provide evidence where they diverge from the policy. A rigid approach may simply delay delivery of much needed homes, given that most housing is provided by the private sector. It is not justified and therefore unsound; the provision should be deleted.

##### Density

5.28 Provision (b) relates to a density requirement of 32 dph (dwellings per hectare). Government policy promotes the efficient use of land and higher densities of development are consistent with this aim. Securing higher densities within defined centres is a suitable aspiration in the town and city centres and in locations with good access to public transport. However, seeking net densities of 32 dwellings per hectare across the District appears to be a blanket policy with no finesse for local characteristic and good design principles. The requirement for demonstrating variations to the policy does not suggest how evidence of detriment etc. Should be provided. It is unclear what the justification for this approach is nor how it will be applied in practice.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

5.29 To address these comments it is suggested that a more positive statement is included wherein:

“the planning authority will work with developers to deliver housing that contributes to identified needs taking account of local variations in housing need, local characteristics, scheme viability or other site specific circumstances which may indicate that a different housing mix or density is required to meet local plan objectives.”

Wish to participate in examination?



Reason for Participation

Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		SP3		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	017/11/SP3/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy SP3, Criterion c  
We support the intention to allow variations from the indicative densities to take account of site-specific circumstances. This flexibility may be necessary in order to ensure that new development safeguards the distinctive character of a particular settlement or the setting of a heritage asset.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      028      Organisation      Home Builders Federation

Section or Policy      SP3

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      No

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      028/04/SP3/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### DRAFT POLICY SP3: HOUSING MIX AND DENSITY

This policy is not considered to be sound, as it is not considered to be effective or justified.

The HBF notes that this policy has been amended to increase flexibility and this is generally considered an improvement. However, the HBF still consider that it is important that any policy is workable and ensures housing delivery will not be compromised or stalled due to overly prescriptive requirements or the need to provide significant amounts of additional evidence.

The draft policy still identifies a very prescriptive mix of house types, although it is noted that this is no longer down to decimal places. And whilst the policy suggests this is a general guide, thereby providing a degree of flexibility, it appears this will need to be justified in every case.

The HBF therefore continues to recommend a more flexible approach is taken regarding housing mix which whilst taking account of the SHMA findings is also cognisant that needs and demand will vary from area to area and site to site and that the need to provide evidence for each and every variation to this very specific mix is likely to delay development and may reduce deliverability of sites.

The HBF also remains unclear of the justification for a density requirement of 32dph, and suggest that it is removed. Again, it is not clear how this will be applied flexibly and what evidence the Council will require of developers looking to deviate from this policy requirement.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

HBF propose that the policy is modified as follows:

- The mix and density of new housing developments will ensure that land is used in an effective and efficient manner to address local housing needs... (DELETE THE FOLLOWING UP TO CLOSE OF BRACKETS - This will be achieved in the following ways:

- a)The local planning authority will use the housing mix set out below as a general guide for achieving an appropriate overall mix of new housing across the plan area and across all tenures;

- Homes with 1-2 bedrooms – 39%
- Homes with 3 bedrooms – 44%
- Homes with 4 or more bedrooms – 17%

- b)The local planning authority will use 32 dwellings per hectare (net) as a general guide for achieving an appropriate overall housing density across the plan area and across all tenures; )

c)The local planning authority will work with developers to deliver housing that contributes to the identified needs taking.. (DELETE THE FOLLOWING UP TO CLOSE OF BRACKETS apply the general guides, set out in parts a) and b) above, flexibly to ensure that individual proposals across the plan area are able to take) ... account of local variations in housing need, local characteristics, scheme viability or other site-specific circumstances, which may indicate that a different housing mix or density is required in order to achieve local plan objectives.

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	To debate the comments made within our representations further and in greater detail. To ensure that the industry can respond to any additional evidence provided by the Council or others following submission of the plan.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID      012      Organisation      Gladman Developments Limited

Section or Policy      SP3

Plan is Legally Compliant?      No

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      No

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      012/07/SP3/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### 4.3 Draft Policy SP3: Housing Mix and Density

4.3.1 Draft Policy SP3 relates to housing mix and density and sets out two requirements that residential development proposals will normally be expected to adhere to. Whilst Gladman are pleased to note that in line with our previous recommendations, the policy has been amended to increase flexibility, we still consider that it details an overly prescriptive mix of house types.

4.3.2 Gladman continues to recommend a more flexible approach is taken regarding housing mix which, whilst taking account of the SHMA findings, is also mindful that needs and demand will vary from area to area and site to site and that the need to provide evidence for each and every variation to this very specific mix is likely to delay development and may reduce the deliverability of sites.

4.3.3 In respect of the indicative housing density that is set out, Gladman continue to believe that a further element of flexibility should be built into the policy. Gladman support an approach which does not set a rigid density requirement, but rather seeks to encourage higher densities in certain locations, such as Skipton. This will enable sites to be designed to a density which is appropriate and responds to any site specific features or reflects the densities within the locality. Such a flexible approach is supported as it allows for housing density to be considered on a site by site and settlement by settlement basis.

4.3.4 This policy is not considered to be sound, as it is not considered to be effective or justified.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      019      Organisation      Keyhaven Homes

Section or Policy      SP3

Paragraph      Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified  
Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      019/04/SP3/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Draft Policy SP3 – Housing Mix and Density

5.15Draft Policy SP3 states that the Local Planning Authority will use 32 dwellings per hectare (net) as a general guide for achieving appropriate overall housing density across the plan area and across all tenures. Whilst the policy does state that the density and mix will be applied as general guides and with flexibility to ensure that individual proposals across the plan area are able to take account of local variations in housing need, scheme viability or other site-specific circumstances, which may indicate that different housing mix or density is required in order to achieve local plan objectives.

5.16We do not consider that 32 dwellings per hectare for sites in Skipton is achievable given the proposed allocations are urban extension sites and will therefore have to take into account their location adjacent to open countryside, and topography constraints alongside standard open space requirements. Whilst the flexibility in the policy is welcomed, it is questioned whether in this context, there is any merit in setting out a specific density given the policy essentially supports density of development appropriate to local circumstances.

5.17Of greater concern in relation to the proposed housing density is that the figure of 32 dwellings per hectare appears to have been applied to proposed allocations in identifying the expected yield for each site. As identified later in this statement, the sites proposed to be allocated in Skipton are expected to yield on just the amount of dwellings needed to meet the proposed distribution for Skipton. As we do not consider that a density of 32 dwellings per hectare is achievable on the proposed greenfield extension sites in Skipton, should the sites come forward at any lower than 32 dwellings per hectare, there would be insufficient sites to meet the proposed distribution for Skipton.

5.18On this basis, the proposed density of 32 dwellings per hectare and its application to the expected site yield for proposed allocations in Skipton is UNSOUND as it will result in the plan not being EFFECTIVE as the reliance on this density for sites in Skipton is expected to result in too few dwellings being delivered when sites are brought forward for development, as the density is too high for this locality.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation      To engage in discussion regarding the issue of soundness highlighted in the representation statement.



Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	059	Organisation		
Section or Policy		SP3	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		4.30	Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	059/01/SP3/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Other - The Council, with effective national support, must ensure that developers deliver the proportion of affordable houses identified in the initial outline planning permission. That should be 30% (4.30).

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	038	Organisation		
Section or Policy		SP3	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Yes
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Yes
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	038/02/SP3/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We previously made objections in relation to Policy SP3, but are confident that the changes made to this draft policy now provide sufficient flexibility so as not to hinder potential developments from coming forward.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation We could attend on behalf of our client if considered necessary.

Respondent ID      056      Organisation      Bentham Town Council

Section or Policy      SP3, H2

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      6.8

Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Bentham

Representation Reference      056/02/SP3H2/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Affordable Housing Provision 6.8

Draft Policy SP3 on housing mix and density identifies that the suitable housing mix is 39% 1-2 bed properties, 44% 3-bed and 17% 4+ beds.

Paragraph 6.7 states that there is a mis-match between local incomes and the cost of renting or buying in the Local Plan area – meaning that more families are reliant upon some form of affordable housing.

Paragraph 6.8 then suggests that a suitable provision for this housing is 87.4% 1-2 bed and 12.6% 3+ bed properties.

This is unsound.

Bentham has been lucky in the provision of affordable housing in the recent past with the provision of over 40 properties. Unfortunately, the vast majority were built as 2-bed ‘4-person’ houses with only a small percentage of 3 & 4-bed houses.

A 2-bed property is not a 4-person house if the family consists of 2 parents, a son and a daughter. The problem is that young families have a habit of growing! There are now several families in Bentham where the parents sleep on a pull-out sofa bed in the living room every night because their children have the 2 bedrooms. This is not a satisfactory way of living, and the Local Plan needs amending to ensure that more families do not end up in the same trap. Our grandparents grew up with large families living in cramped conditions, our children should not have to.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The Local Plan needs to be modified to include the provision of a larger proportion of 3+ bedroom affordable homes. The provision of too many small affordable homes traps families in situations that are difficult to escape due to inaffordability of larger private sector properties. The Plan needs to address this

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID	060	Organisation	Craven Cattle Marts Ltd		
Section or Policy		SP4		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Hellifield			Representation Reference	060/04/SP4/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The role of Hellifield within the proposed spatial strategy should be significantly enhanced. The village is proposed to receive just 2 dwellings per annum over the plan period. The plan should propose a figure that is greater.

The village has good existing facilities and excellent connections to larger settlements within the District. There are also many sites within the village that would be suitable for housing development without having an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area. The amount of new development that the village is expected to receive is significantly below that of other nearby settlements that have no greater connections to larger service centres and no better facilities.

Hellifield railway station provides a direct connection to Settle, Skipton, Keighley, Bingley and Leeds. Bus connections are also available. Local facilities include a primary school, basic local shops including a takeaway and café, a doctor's surgery, churches, a village hall, a public house, a social club, children's play areas, and a sports pitch. The allocation of more land for housing within the village, or alternatively increasing the proportion of housing the village is expected to receive, would be appropriate given the facilities that are available, and furthermore, would help to sustain these existing facilities.

Other settlements with the District are proposed to receive disproportionately more housing development than Hellifield. For example, the settlements of Ingleton and Bentham are not dissimilar to Hellifield in terms of the population and facilities that are available, but both are planned to receive significantly more development.

Bentham is technically a town, albeit a very small town, and it is recognised that it has a slightly better choice of shops and facilities than Hellifield. However, the intention that Bentham should receive almost 11% of new housing development over the plan period compared to just 0.8% for Hellifield is completely unbalanced in terms of the distribution of new housing development.

Similarly, the village of Ingleton id proposed to receive 3.5% of new development over the plan period. The village has no rail connection and the local facilities within the village are only very slightly better than the offer that is available within Hellifield. The proportion of new housing development proposed in Ingleton when compared to Hellifield is not appropriate.

In summary, the village of Hellifield has the facilities and sites to accommodate more housing than is currently proposed over the plan period. The planned growth for Hellifield should be increased and this approach would help to support existing facilities within the village.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Draft Planning Policy SP4: Spatial Strategy and Housing Growth should be amended to provide a greater role for Hellifield to accommodate Housing Growth. It is considered that it should be identified as a Tier 3 settlement (Local Service Centres). In the alternative, if it is held it is not appropriate to be defined as a Tier 3 settlement, it should be retained as a Tier 4 settlement and the amount of housing that it is planned to receive significantly increased.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	009	Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)		
Section or Policy	SP4			Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	009/06/SP4/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY supports the revision of text in draft policy SP4 at point F as suggested in their July 2017 response. It is considered that this gives more protection for the countryside of Craven district and will enable development to support the spatial strategy.

However, this policy amalgamates SP4 and the previous draft policy H1 and this is now a very long and unwieldy policy. To be more ‘user-friendly’, CPRENY suggest that a separate policy is created which amalgamates the refence to the open countryside in point F and those points pertinent to development in the open countryside – currently detailed in Point K.

Alternatively, it is questioned whether the table highlighting the ‘Guidelines for the distribution of new dwellings to deliver the spatial strategy’ to the rear of the policy is actually required to be located within the same policy – this could be contained in a separate policy.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY suggest that the following modification could be made to establish a new policy dealing with development in the open countryside: ‘and open countryside’ would be taken out of point F of policy SP4 - as would Point K.

A new Policy would replicate Point K in its entirety.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      008      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy      SP4

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Key Diagram

Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      008/31/SP1/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### SECTION 4 STRATEGIC POLICIES AND SPATIAL STRATEGY

5.11 Within this section the Council sets out how much development will be progressed over the Plan period and the spatial distribution of that development, including the specific sites for delivering the strategy.

Key Diagram

5.12 There appears to be no Key Diagram at a District wide scale identifying the main settlement hierarchy and areas of general restraint. We would suggest that provision of such a diagram/pictorial may help with the flow of the document. Such a map would not be of a scale for identifying individual development sites or allocations.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒

Reason for Participation

Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.

Respondent ID      055                      Organisation      KCS Development Limited

Section or Policy                      SP4

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to      Gargrave

Plan is Legally Compliant?      No

Plan is Sound?      No

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      055/03/SP4/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy SP4: Spatial Strategy and Housing Growth

3.1 This policy is not considered to be sound as it is not considered to be positively prepared or effective.

3.2 We once again support the inclusion of Gargrave within the settlement hierarchy as a Local Service Centre.

3.3 It is suggested that the policy is amended to clearly identify that the housing provision and requirement figure is a “minimum” figure rather than ceiling to ensure that appropriate and sustainable developments are delivered.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	037	Organisation		
Section or Policy		SP4	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Yes
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Yes
Settlement Comment Relates to	Sutton in Craven		Representation Reference	037/02/SP4/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The spatial strategy is unsound because it is inconsistent with national policy: Appendix 4 NPPF para 2 states that :  
– the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

Sutton-in-Craven is listed as a Tier 4a settlement. The plan understates the sustainability of Sutton village (by not making any housing allocations therein) as it has excellent access to the services and public transport facilities in Glusburn and Cross Hills. There is a Co-operative supermarket at Cross Hills, as well as South Craven Secondary School and many other facilities, including Cross Hills Medical Centre.

I also make submissions in relation to criterion I of SP4 which states:

I. Supporting the release of non-allocated sites for housing that adjoin the main built up area\*\* of settlements where:-

a) it can be demonstrated that the planned growth in the spatial strategy for the settlement will not be delivered during the plan period ,or

b) it is a rural exception site in accordance with Policy H2

This seeks to restrict the development of non allocated sites unless it can be demonstrated that the planned growth will not be achieved or the site is a rural exception site. This is setting a ceiling on housing provision which could come forward on a windfall site which is acceptable on its planning merits. This is inconsistent with the NPPF objective to “boost significantly” the supply of housing. The requirement of I ii) requiring proposals to be proportionate to the size of the settlement and iii) complementary to settlement form are adequate safeguards.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      028      Organisation      Home Builders Federation

Section or Policy      SP4

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Plan is Sound?      No

Plan is DtC Compliant?      No

Representation Reference      028/05/SP4/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### DRAFT POLICY SP4: SPATIAL STRATEGY AND HOUSING GROWTH

This policy is not considered to be sound, as it is not considered to be positively prepared or effective.

The HBF are supportive of amendments to this policy to clearly acknowledge that the figures are provided as a guide only.

The HBF would continue to suggest that the housing provision figure identified in the policy is clearly identified as a minimum as set out in SP1. The HBF are also keen to ensure that appropriate and sustainable developments are delivered, we would not want the rigid application of this policy to prevent any additional development.

#### DRAFT POLICIES SP5 TO SP11

The HBF does not wish to comment upon the acceptability or otherwise of individual allocations. It is, however, recommended that the housing yield in each policy is clearly identified as an indicative figure. The HBF also recommends that a buffer of sites over and above the residual requirement is identified. This is required to ensure that the plan meets its housing requirement as a minimum and to take account of the inevitable slow or non-implementation from some sites.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

HBF propose that the policy is modified as follows:

•Guidelines for the distribution of new dwellings to deliver the spatial strategy is set out in the table below:

Tier

Settlement

(DELETE - Proportion of housing growth (%) at 230 dwellings pa)

Minimum Housing Provision ((DELETE approx.). Number of NET dwellings pa)

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	To debate the comments made within our representations further and in greater detail. To ensure that the industry can respond to any additional evidence provided by the Council or others following submission of the plan.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID      046      Organisation      Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Bolton Abbey

Section or Policy      SP4

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Bolton Abbey      Representation Reference      046/04/SP4/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY

P.43-57

Bolton Abbey is identified within the settlement hierarchy in Tier 4b Villages with Basic Services that are bisected by the National Park boundary

Bolton Abbey fulfils an important service village function for the Southern Dales (particularly Wharfedale and nearby settlements) as a result of the large number of services it offers. The settlement contains an unusually high level of services for a village of its size, in part due to its complimentary roles as both a visitor attraction and a service centre. These services include: post office; bus stop; village hall; shops; toilets used by the public for free but maintained by CST ; church; short stay public car park; tea room; delicatessen; gym/health spa; hotel; pub/bistro; cricket club; farm shop; garage.

Significant employment in tourism and other sectors within the village and the Estate office’s role as a central ‘hub’ for the Estate and its workers means that the village is an active one, which as outlined above provides for a relatively high proportion of people who both live and work locally. As noted in the BADOAS 18% of households include at least one employee or former employee based at Bolton Abbey, with many other properties occupied by workers on local farms. This is markedly different to some of Craven’s other villages where there is little employment and the major role of the settlement is that of a commuter dormitory.

As such the village has also been designated as a “service village” in the adopted Yorkshire Dales National Park Local Plan (YDNPLP) as noted at section 3.

In view of this and other factors, the inclusion of Bolton Abbey within the CDC Local Plan settlement hierarchy is clearly justified.

CST STRONGLY SUPPORTS the inclusion of Bolton Abbey within the settlement hierarchy contained within the PDCLP

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	046	Organisation	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Bolton Abbey		
Section or Policy		SP4		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Bolton Abbey			Representation Reference	046/05/SP4/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

DRAFT POLICY SP4: SPATIAL STRATEGY AND HOUSING GROWTH  
p.48-52

The policy builds upon the settlement hierarchy which as noted above is supported by CST.

The justification for the policy outlines the reasons why no housing developed is allocated to Bolton Abbey (or Long Preston):

‘4.45 As set out above, Tier 4 settlements comprise villages with basic services (4a) and villages with basic services that are bisected by the YDNP boundary (4b). Overall, a limited level of growth is directed towards Tier 4 settlements, however allocated growth is not directed to Bolton Abbey and Long Preston as Tier 4b settlements for the following reasons:-

- The majority of the built settlement of Long Preston is located within the Yorkshire Dales National Park and no land has been made available to allocate growth in the very small part of the village located in the Craven Plan area;
- Bolton Abbey is not to be allocated housing growth in the spatial strategy in view of the significance and sensitivity of its heritage assets.’ (our emphasis)

The policy then goes onto provide a distinct criterion relating to development in Tier 4b settlements, which states:

‘E. Directing limited growth towards Tier 4b settlements (Villages with Basic Services Bisected by the National Park Boundary) to reflect their roles as tourism hubs or gateways on the edge of the Yorkshire Dales National Park;’

This criterion was not included in the previous draft plan and is SUPPORTED by CST.

However, CST has outlined throughout its engagement process with CDC that its proposals for the village do include an element of housing. This is important in terms of providing a mix of uses, strengthening the local community and providing for a sustainable form of development.

When Development Management Officers are assessing proposals at Bolton Abbey which are likely to include an element of housing, CST considers it is greatly important that the policy cannot be read (and misunderstood) as presenting a barrier to housing development.



CST therefore requests an explanatory addition to the sentence at the end of paragraph 4.45 final bullet point in order that it states (proposed additional wording underlined):

‘• Bolton Abbey is not to be allocated housing growth in the spatial strategy in view of the significance and sensitivity of its heritage assets, but some limited housing will be permitted subject to policy EC4a.’

CST also requests that criterion E of the policy provides clarity on the delivery of the limited growth i.e. delivery through an allocated site in Giggleswick (draft policy SP11) and through development on unallocated sites in accordance with criteria H and (in particular) I. This clarity can be providing through the additional wording below (proposed additional wording underlined):

‘E. Directing limited growth towards Tier 4b settlements (Villages with Basic Services Bisected by the National Park Boundary) to reflect their roles as tourism hubs or gateways on the edge of the Yorkshire Dales National Park. This growth to be delivered via an allocated site (policy SP11) and through unallocated growth that accords with criteria H and I of this policy and policy EC4a.

CST STRONGLY SUPPORTS the inclusion of Bolton Abbey as a Tier 4b in the settlement hierarchy of policy SP4 and welcomes the inclusion of a specific criterion € to the policy that relates to development in bisected villages such as Bolton Abbey.

However, whilst CST notes and understands CDC’s reason for not specifically allocating housing within Bolton Abbey, it must caveat its overall support for the policy on the basis of concerns regarding the effectiveness of the policy if the clarity above regarding housing development is not duly provided. Without that clarity the policy could be misunderstood and misinterpreted by Development Management Officers in so far as it relates to the acceptability of limited housing growth at Bolton Abbey. On that basis there is a risk that the policy may fail to be effective in terms of the intention to support development and include limited housing growth at Bolton Abbey.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CST therefore requests an explanatory addition to the sentence at the end of paragraph 4.45 final bullet point in order that it states (proposed additional wording underlined): (N.B. FORMATTING HAS NOT TRANSFERRED TO DATABASE. UNDERLINE SECTIONS ARE INDICATED BY A NOTE IN BRACKETS)

‘• Bolton Abbey is not to be allocated housing growth in the spatial strategy in view of the significance and sensitivity of its heritage assets, (following section underlined:) but some limited housing will be permitted subject to policy EC4a.’

CST also requests that criterion E of the policy provides clarity on the delivery of the limited growth i.e. delivery through an allocated site in Giggleswick (draft policy SP11) and through development on unallocated sites in accordance with criteria H and (in particular) I. This clarity can be providing through the additional wording below (proposed additional wording underlined):

‘E. Directing limited growth towards Tier 4b settlements (Villages with Basic Services Bisected by the National Park Boundary) to reflect their roles as tourism hubs or gateways on the edge of the Yorkshire Dales National Park. (following section underlined:) This growth to be delivered via an allocated site (policy SP11) and through unallocated growth that accords with criteria H and I of this policy and policy EC4a.

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	019	Organisation	Keyhaven Homes		
Section or Policy		SP4		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		SK119		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	019/05/SP4/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

## Draft Policy SP4 – Spatial Strategy and Housing Growth

5.19 Draft Policy SP4 seeks to deliver 50% of the proposed housing growth in Skipton as it is the Tier 1 settlement. We support the proposal to deliver the majority of growth to Skipton. However, we do not support the housing growth option proposed by the Council and consider the figure should be higher to ensure the delivery of the full objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing is delivered. In this regard, the proportional housing provision figure for Skipton should be higher to ensure market and affordable housing need is met.

5.20 To meet the full objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing, taking into account the 27 affordable houses that are expected to be delivered in the Yorkshire Dales National Park plan area, there is a requirement for 99 affordable dwellings per annum in the Craven Local Plan area. To deliver this quantum of affordable dwellings through the proposed affordable housing policy of 30%, a housing requirement figure of 330 dwellings per annum would be needed, 100 dwellings per annum higher than the figure currently proposed by the Council. This figure would result in a requirement for Skipton of 150 dwellings per annum, an increase of 35 dwellings per annum (535 dwellings over the plan period).

5.21As identified later in this representation statement, Keyhaven Homes site SK119 was proposed for allocation at the draft consultation stage and was therefore deemed to be suitable for allocation by the Council. The site was removed at the pre-publication stage due to concerns over the site being landlocked. The site is accessible through the adjoining consented site and is in the same ownership. The site should not therefore be assessed as having an access constraint, it is only a matter of timing, with the site being deliverable with the plan period.

5.22 Site SK119 extends to 6.57 hectares and therefore at the Council's identified density of 32 dwellings per hectare, the site could deliver 210 dwellings, nearly half of the additional housing that should be identified in Skipton under Policy SP1 to meet the full objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing, although based on Keyhaven Homes experience the actual site yield would be lower than this as it is maintained that 32 dwellings per hectare is not achievable on greenfield urban extension sites in Skipton.

5.23 Table 5 (Summary of Housing Requirement and Proposed Supply by Settlement) which forms part of the supporting justification to Policy SP4 identified a gross residual housing requirement of 1,399 dwellings for Skipton set against an approximate yield of 1,402 dwellings from the proposed Skipton allocations. This provides no flexibility should one or more allocation not come forward as expected and in the context that the housing requirement figure is a minimum. It has also been highlighted that the expected yield for each site is based on the Council's general density guide of 32 dwellings per hectare. As this is not considered to be achievable on the urban extension greenfield sites in Skipton, this presents a real risk that there are insufficient sites identified to meet even the Council's current proposed residual housing requirement in Skipton of 1,399 dwellings, with the deficit increasing should a higher housing growth option be supported. In this context, given the availability and suitability of Site SK119,

this site could provide flexibility and choice with Skipton, the principal town and address any deficit as a result of the Council’s assumption that all the proposed allocations in Skipton will deliver at a density of 32 dwellings per hectare.

5.24The wording in Policy SP4 (Spatial Strategy and Housing Growth) should also replicate the wording in Policy SP1 which states that the housing provision figures are minimum figures.

5.25Whilst we therefore support the proportion of 50% of housing growth to be distributed to Skipton, Draft Policy SP4 is UNSOUND, as the policy has:-

- Not been positively prepared, is unjustified and does not accord with national policy as the housing provision figure relates back to the proposed housing requirement which we do not support for the reasons set out at paragraph 5.13 of this statement.
- Not effective as the wording of this policy should accord with the wording of Policy SP1, which states that provision figures are a minimum and the proposed yield from each site is based on an expected density of 32 dwellings per hectare which we do not consider is achievable in Skipton and therefore the reliance on the figure will result in insufficient dwellings being developed to meet the proposed distribution for Skipton, particularly as the Council has only identified sufficient sites to just meet the residual requirement based on delivery at 32 dwellings per hectare. In the event that just one proposed allocation in Skipton came forward at a lower density, the identified need for Skipton will not be met. Additional sites therefore need to be identified to address this.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	To engage in discussion regarding the issue of soundness highlighted in the representation statement.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	---

Respondent ID	023	Organisation			
Section or Policy		SP4		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Carleton			Representation Reference	023/02/SP4/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

2.HOUSING NEED

I have heard the Head of Planning Mr Neville Watson on tape (23/10) responding to Councillor Heseltine question about housing need in Carleton telling the planning committee that granting planning for only 4 houses on the brownfield site at Carla Beck won't affect housing need figures for the village. If he was right, then Carleton doesn't need any more development sites passed before 2032 and the current draft is fine.

It suggests that if 20 more houses are needed at some stage to replace the ones lost (if 4 are built at Carla Beck not 24) the local plan will need amending .

and the draft local plan is right then please bring one or more of other 3 preferred sites in Carleton forward in local plan. At the same time please make it absolutely clear that the green field at Grundy is not a preferred option to build on for a whole host of sound planning reasons.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      040      Organisation      Cononley Parish Council

Section or Policy      SP4

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Section 4, page 57

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Cononley

Representation Reference      040/02/SP4/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Table 5 - Summary of Housing Requirement and Proposed Supply by Settlement

The Parish Council seeks clarification on the following point:

- do the figures for Cononley as itemised in Table 5 include all currently planned builds? In particular, do the figures include the number of planned builds at the Station Road, Mill development?

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	008	Organisation	The Wilman Family		
Section or Policy		SP4		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	008/14/SP4/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

DRAFT POLICY SP4: SPATIAL STRATEGY AND HOUSING GROWTH

5.30 There are concerns that this policy is overly prescriptive and is not positively prepared or effective. In broad terms, we consider that the policy should seek to positively deliver growth which is commensurate with the settlement in question and its ability to accommodate growth. We would suggest that the phrases “limited”, “limited” and “low” are removed from provisions D, E and F, respectively.

5.31 For the tabulation at the end of the policy (Page 51 onwards) in line with our other comments we would suggest that reference to “230 net dwellings per annum” is removed from the third column heading. With the fourth column we consider that this should suggest “Minimum” Housing Provision, along with the removal of “approximately”, as this would more accurately reflect a positive approach.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      001      Organisation      C/O Richard Turner & Sons

Section or Policy      SP4      Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Section 4, Paragraph 4.49      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      HB028      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      High Bentham      Representation Reference      001/03/SP4/OS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

It is noted that paragraph 4.49 of the plan recognises that it will still be appropriate to support the release of land for housing in addition to the Plan's land allocations and previously developed land within the main built up areas. The paragraph notes that, for example, circumstances may change in relation to the availability of land allocations. In these circumstances where allocated land may not come forward during the plan period and the planned growth for a settlement is clearly not being delivered, then other sustainable housing development within that settlement will be supported.

We take this to mean that in principle site HB028 in its reduced form that was put forward could be considered within this category. As noted in our representation in relation to policy SP1, the number of dwellings required appears to be ambitious but we also note in Table 5 on page 57 of the Plan that the estimated yield from sites within High and Low Bentham is very high at 494, set against a low record of net completions at 13 between 2012 and 2017. This suggests that there may be difficulties with some sites being brought forward, so we see no reason why site HB028 in its reduced form could not be allocated to provide greater flexibility in meeting this ambitious target. The site could be made available relatively quickly.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

In the light of the ambitious targets both as a whole and for Bentham in particular it is key that as much flexibility is retained for allocations within the area. It appears that paragraph 4.49 appears to be saying this but with site HB028 in its reduced form being specifically put forward, we consider that this is a site that could qualify under this paragraph and therefore could also be allocated for residential development.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation      To ensure that my client's site is fully considered as part of the examination process.

Respondent ID      030                      Organisation      Glusburn Holdings Ltd

Section or Policy                      SP4

Paragraph

Site Reference                      SC014

Settlement Comment Relates to      Glusburn and Crosshills

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Plan is Sound?                      No

Plan is DtC Compliant?              Yes

Representation Reference      030/01/SP4/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The draft policy wording suggests at part C that a sustainable pattern of growth will be promoted to deliver the spatial strategy of the plan period 2012 to 2032 (inter alia) “Directing a proportionate level of growth to Glusburn/Crosshills, Gargrave and Ingleton to underpin their roles as Tier 3 settlements (Local Service Centres)”. All three settlements are proposed to accommodate 3.5% (approx. 8 net dwellings per annum) of housing growth.

In the case of Glusburn/Crosshills this is a material reduction as compared to the 5.5% (or 14 net dwellings per annum) proposed for this area in the Preferred Sites for Housing Consultation Document (and 5.1% or 13 net dwellings per annum in the Second Draft Local Plan).

It is considered that Policy SP4 should be amended to include a higher level of housing development in Glusburn/Crosshills, given the combination of its status as a Local Service Centre and that it is a substantial centre of population in Craven (as acknowledged in Draft Policy SP8).

Glusburn/Crosshills has a good range of local amenities and additional housing development would help ensure the future vitality and viability of such services.

Further to the above, Glusburn/Crosshills is recognised as a Level 3 retail centre elsewhere in the Draft Local Plan (Draft Policy EC5), whereas the two other Local Service Centres - Ingleton and Gargrave - have a lower level retail centre (Level 4) and no recognised retail centre at all respectively. We consider this reflects the stronger potential for Glusburn/Crosshills to accommodate a higher level of development, and in turn deliver benefits to the vitality and viability of local amenities.

Furthermore, allowing for increased housing at Glusburn/Crosshills would improve the prospects of delivering the number of homes required, both locally and district wide, to meet the needs of the area (including to achieve the minimum housing provision set out within Draft Policy SP1).

With reference to the tests of soundness, it is submitted that Draft Policy SP4 is:

1. Not positively prepared - as it promotes a low level of housing growth/development in Glusburn/Crosshills that does not fulfil the potential that this area has to accommodate further development as part of a sustainable pattern of growth, including mindful of its existing size/population, range of amenities and consequent status as a Level 3 retail centre.
2. Not justified - as it is considered that the proposed reduction in the level of housing growth/development in Glusburn/Crosshills as compared to earlier drafts of the Local Plan is not justified.
3. Not effective - as it stymies the potential for Glusburn/Crosshills to fulfil its role as a Local Service Centre and make a more meaningful contribution to housing delivery in the district and a sustainable pattern of growth and enhance the prospects of delivering the number of homes required (both in Glusburn/Crosshills and district wide) in the plan period.



4. Not consistent with national policy- as it does not take the opportunity to enhance the potential to deliver sustainable development including a sustainable pattern of growth in the district.

In light of the above it is considered that the Draft Local Plan is unsound insofar as Draft Policy SP4 is concerned and that changes should be made to this element of the Local Plan.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

It is considered that Policy SP4 should be amended to include a higher level of housing development in Glusburn/Crosshills, given the combination of its status as a Local Service Centre and that it is a substantial centre of population in Craven (as acknowledged in Draft Policy SP8).

As set out in our representations regarding Draft Policy SP8 it is considered that land in our client’s ownership, to the south and west of Hayfield Mills in Glusburn (Site SC014), which is surplus to requirements is readily available for development and could accommodate such additional housing in the area (subject to it being demonstrated that such development would be acceptable from a flood risk perspective).

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Given the nature of our representations in response to Draft Policies SP4, SP8, EC2 and Inset Map 2, we consider that it would be beneficial to have the opportunity to explain and expand on our comments in relation to this proposed development site - and for related discussions to take place on the range of issues involved and the Council’s justification for excluding the site from its proposed housing allocations despite its clear sustainability credentials and the Council’s own support for the site earlier in the Local Plan preparation process - as part of the oral examination.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID	027	Organisation	Giggleswick School		
Section or Policy		SP4		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	027/06/SP4/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

5. The Need for Housing in Giggleswick

5.1 Policy SP4 of the PDLP sets out a spatial strategy for the delivery of the proposed housing requirement. It seeks to focus growth in the key settlements of Skipton, Settle, and Low and High Bentham, whilst directing lower levels of growth to other locations. 0.8% of the housing requirement is proposed to be delivered in Giggleswick, equating to 1.84 dpa and an overall requirement for just 37 dwellings over the 20-year plan period. However, on the basis that completions to date and extant commitments total 36 dwellings, the PDLP identifies that there is no baseline need to allocate any further land development in the village.

5.2 The PDLP does allocate the School’s land at Lords Close for a residential development, with an estimated yield of 35 dwellings. However, mindful that this exceeds the 1 dwelling residual requirement referred to above, it identifies that the site is an “exception”. The School disagrees with this conclusion.

The Requirement

5.3 The School objects to the very low rate of growth proposed for Giggleswick. The rate of growth is significantly lower than that which has been achieved in the recent past. For example, Census data shows that between 2001 and 2011 the dwelling stock of the village increased by 69 dwellings, an average rate of 7 dpa13. The PDLP therefore proposes to drastically reduce the rate of delivery in Giggleswick.

5.4 The delivery of 1.84 dpa in Giggleswick equates to an annual growth rate of 0.33%14. This is much lower than the average rate of growth for the District (0.85%). It is acknowledged that growth is principally focussed on the larger settlements, which are typically more sustainable given that they offer a greater range of services and facilities. However, it is noted that the housing requirement in the PDLP equates to an annual growth rate of:

- 1.63% in Skipton; and
- 1.5% in Settle.

5.5 It is therefore evident that the spatial strategy focusses on the larger settlements to a disproportionate extent.

5.6 A low rate of growth in Giggleswick, particularly compared to Settle and other larger settlements, would risk the village being left behind and could diminish its role within the settlement hierarchy of the District. The PDLP proposes a low rate of growth in all of the Tier 4 settlements, referred to as ‘Villages with Basic Services’. The villages account for over a quarter (25.39%) of all of the housing in Craven, but are apportioned just 12.61% of the proposed requirement for the District in the PDLP. As illustrated in Figure 5.1 below:

- On average each village accounts for 1.81% of the housing stock in the District but they have a proposed growth rate in the PDLP of just 0.84%.
- Giggleswick makes an above average contribution to the housing stock of the District (2.06%, compared to the average of 1.81%) but has a below average growth rate (0.80%, compared to the average of 0.84%).

5.7 It is therefore clear that the Tier 4 settlements are disproportionately constrained in terms of growth by the PDLP, with provision in Giggleswick being particularly unreasonable given that it falls considerably short of the average. This is despite CDC’s own evidence base acknowledging that Giggleswick is one of the largest Tier 4 villages15.

Figure 5.1: Percentage of housing stock and proposed rate of growth in Tier 4 settlements (GRAPH INCLUDED IN ORIGINAL DOCUMENT SAVED ON SYSTEM)

5.8 The rate of housing delivery in Giggleswick is much more constrained than some of the other villages. In particular:

- Giggleswick is notably larger than Cononley (556 and 456 dwellings respectively). However, the proposed rate of development in Cononley – 6 dpa – is more than double that proposed in Giggleswick.
- Giggleswick is over four times larger than Clapham (131 dwellings respectively). Despite this, the PDLP proposes that the two villages will have the same proposed rate of housing delivery of 2 dpa.
- Giggleswick is comparable in size to Carleton (542 dwellings). However, the PDLP proposes that Carleton will accommodate 3 dpa, significantly above the growth rate proposed for Giggleswick.

5.9 It is therefore clear that the level of growth in Giggleswick identified in Policy SP4 is unreasonably low. This may be due in part to the spatial distribution for the Tier 4 settlements being determined on the basis of the existing commitments in each. For example, the PDLP proposes a requirement in Embsay of 5 dpa – more than double the rate of development in Giggleswick, despite Embsay being only slightly larger in size. This high requirement for Embsay appears to be proposed principally on the basis that there are extant planning permissions to deliver 101 dwellings in the village. A similar situation is evident for other villages – larger housing requirements are proposed where there are a high number of extant commitments. This is not a sound approach to plan-making; Local Plans should seek to positively plan for sustainable development, not be influenced unduly in this way.

5.10 Giggleswick is one of the largest Tier 4 settlements and is a demonstrably sustainable location for the development of new homes. It adjoins the town of Settle immediately to the east of the village. Local residents have access to a wide range of shops, services and facilities – including food stores, a library, doctors surgery, dentist, schools and extensive areas of public open space, all of which are located within or approximately 1km from Giggleswick. The village lies approximately 600m to the north east of the A65 highway and the majority of it is within a 1km walking distance of Settle railway. The range of services and facilities in Giggleswick and its accessibility means that it is demonstrably more sustainable than several of the other Tier 4 settlements in the District, some of which – such as Embsay – have a significantly larger housing requirement.

5.11 There is therefore no reason why growth in Giggleswick should be constrained. Indeed, given the size, role and function of the village, it is considered that the scale of its need is likely to exceed that identified by Policy SP4. The rate of growth proposed for Giggleswick in Policy SP4 should be increased such that it is commensurate with the sustainability and role of the village.

5.12 Notwithstanding the level of growth proposed in Giggleswick by Policy SP4, the PDLP proposes the allocation of the School's land at Lords Close (ref. SG014) for residential development (Policy SP1). The School welcomes this allocation, which will bring forward much-needed new homes in Giggleswick to meet the needs of the settlement and underpin its future sustainability. Mindful that the extent of land allocations proposed in the PDLP equates almost exactly to the identified housing requirement, it is evident that the residential development of the Lords Close site is an important component in meeting the housing needs of the wider District.

## 6. Development Opportunities in Giggleswick

6.1 Giggleswick School has promoted three potential residential development sites to CDC in previous representations, including the following:

- SG014: Land at Lords Close
- SG015: South of Riversdale and north of school playing fields
- SG004: South of Church Street, east of Tems Street

6.2 The first of the above sites (SG014) is proposed to be allocated for residential development by Policy SP11 of the PDLP, with an estimated yield of 35 dwellings. The second two sites (SG015 and SG004) are not proposed to be allocated for development and are instead proposed to be designated as Local Green Space (Policy ENV10) and as Open Space (Policy INF3) respectively. Each of the three sites is discussed below.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?    ☐    Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      010      Organisation      United Utilities Water Ltd

Section or Policy      SP4

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      010/02/SP4/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Site Allocations

We note that the Local Plan is considering the allocation of a number of large development sites for a mix of land uses. The Council is aware from past discussions with colleagues that a fuller understanding of the impact on water and wastewater infrastructure can only be achieved once more details are known, such as the timescales for development, the approach to surface water management and the chosen points of connection. On receipt of more information it may be that we can provide more detailed comments regarding the sites which are being promoted as draft allocations. The assessment of capacity in our infrastructure is an ongoing process as a range of details become available.

Additional information in respect of development sites is often only available at the planning application stage. With this information, we will be able to better understand the potential impacts of development on infrastructure and, as a result, it may be necessary to coordinate the delivery of development with the timing for delivery of infrastructure improvements. We have recommended that this should be included as a detailed development management policy and in this regard we note the content of Draft Policy ENV8: Water Resources, Water Quality and Groundwater. In relation to this point, it is worthwhile highlighting that many of the rural areas of the District will be supported by infrastructure which is proportionate to its rural location. We would like to emphasise that disproportionate growth in any settlement, particularly smaller settlements, has the potential to place a strain on existing water and wastewater infrastructure.

#### Fragmented Ownership

For any strategic sites within its area of operation, United Utilities would be interested to know whether the site is within fragmented ownership. If ownership is fragmented, we would strongly encourage the Council to establish how the landowners intend to work together to ensure the co-ordinated delivery of infrastructure in the most sustainable fashion.

We believe that coordinated delivery of infrastructure can only be secured on strategic sites in fragmented ownership where there is a clear legal agreement between the landowners. This legal agreement would ensure the coordinated site-wide delivery of infrastructure in the most appropriate way, alongside an associated site-wide mechanism for drawing down land value between landowners on all development parcels, whilst also making proportionate contributions to key infrastructure as the delivery of the site takes place.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      012      Organisation      Gladman Developments Limited

Section or Policy      SP4

Plan is Legally Compliant?      No

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      No

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      012/08/SP4/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### 4.4 Draft Policy SP4: Spatial Strategy and Housing Growth

4.4.1 Draft Policy SP4 sets out the housing strategy, specifically providing details regarding the spatial approach to the delivery of housing across the district. The largest proportion of the annual requirement (50%) goes to the principle town of Skipton. The Key Service Centres of Settle and Low/High Bentham are each allocated 10.9% of the growth target, with the remainder distributed to lower order settlements.

4.4.2 Gladman consider that it is appropriate that development is focussed upon the main settlements of Skipton, Settle and Low/High Bentham, as these represent the most sustainable locations for growth. The Council should recognise that directing further growth to Craven's Local Service Centres and Villages will result in a number of benefits for their ongoing vibrancy. Gladman are disappointed to note that from the pre-submission version to the submission version of the Craven Local Plan, the Council seeks to direct increased growth to the Key Service Centres of Settle and Low/High Bentham, and as such reduces the growth to the Local Service Centres and Villages.

4.4.3 Gladman are however supportive of amendments to this policy wording to clearly acknowledge that the growth figures are provided as a guide only. We again suggest that the policy wording ought to be further amended to make it clear that the distribution of housing to each settlement is represented as a figure. This will bring the policy in line with the wording of draft Policy SP1 and will ensure that any confusion and inconsistency between the two policies is avoided.

4.4.4 Further, if the proportions of development, that are set out within the policy, are rigidly applied, there is a very real chance that sustainable development opportunities, in accordance with draft Policy H1, might be prevented from coming forward.

4.4.5 Gladman therefore continue to recommend that the wording of the policy and the associated table is amended to reflect that the figures provided are only considered as guidelines.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      059      Organisation

Section or Policy      SP4

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      059/04/SP4/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Support - Particularly that all the criteria i) to vii) are satisfied for justification under I a, b, c.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	059	Organisation		
Section or Policy		SP4	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		4.41	Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference			Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	059/03/SP4/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Support - Gargrave's identification as a Local Service Centre (Tier 3)

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      SP4      Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Criterion J.c, Criterion K.c.ii      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      017/13/SP4/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy SP4, Criterion J.c

As the NPPF makes clear ‘Enabling development’ is development which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset. As worded, this Criterion appears to encompass more than simply the conservation of heritage assets.

Since any type of development could, potentially, be used to justify Enabling Development, it is unclear why it is limited to housing in Tier 5 Settlements and in the open countryside. Moreover, 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).

Therefore, it is suggested that this Criterion is deleted.

Policy SP4, Criterion K.c. ii

As the NPPF makes clear ‘Enabling development’ is development which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset. As worded, this Criterion appears to encompass more than simply the conservation of heritage assets.

Since any type of development could, potentially, be used to justify Enabling Development, it is unclear why it is limited to housing in Tier 5 Settlements and in the open countryside. Moreover, 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).

Therefore, it is suggested that this Criterion is deleted.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Delete Policy SP4 Criterion J.c

Delete Policy SP4 Criterion K.c.ii

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		SP4		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	017/12/SP4/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy SP4, Criterion I  
We support the requirements which any nonallocated site would need to satisfy. This will help to ensure that any such developments safeguard the character and setting of Craven’s settlements and the District’s environmental assets.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      027      Organisation      Giggleswick School

Section or Policy      SP4

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      No

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      027/04/SP4/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Reserve Sites

4.19 In identifying land allocations which are sufficient to deliver housing growth, the presumption in favour of sustainable development established by the NPPF includes a specific requirement to ensure that Local Plans have “...sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change...” (paragraph 14). For example, if CDC only allocates just enough land to deliver the Local Plan housing requirement, there is a risk that the requirement will not be achieved if one or more of the allocated sites is not delivered. Local Plans should therefore “over-allocate” to an extent, thereby ensuring that they incorporate flexibility. Such an approach is endorsed by the Local Plans Expert Group (LPEG) – an independent panel of planning experts assembled by the Government to advise on improvements to the plan-making process. LPEG has recommended that Local Plans should “...make provision for, and provide a mechanism for the release of, developable Reserve Sites equivalent to 20% of their housing requirement...Reserve Sites represent land that can be brought forward to respond to changes in circumstances...”<sup>10</sup>. This is a sensible approach to ensure that development needs are met and that Local Plans are capable of being robust throughout the entire plan period.

4.20 The scale of the land allocations identified in the PDLP is sufficient only to deliver the proposed housing requirement. It will not therefore provide the flexibility required to ensure that the minimum housing requirement is delivered in the event that only one or two sites are not delivered or do not come forward as quickly as envisaged by CDC. We therefore encourage CDC to identify Reserve Sites in its emerging Local Plan to ensure that it is capable of being found sound.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	004	Organisation		
Section or Policy		SP4, SP9	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		IN050	Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Ingleton	Representation Reference	004/01/SP4SP9/TS

#### Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

These Representations have been prepared by Addison Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of Mr J Rucastle. These Representations specifically address the SOUNDNESS of draft Policies SP4 and SP9 in relation to the spatial strategy for Ingleton; and the omission of a proposed Allocation Site under Draft Policy SP9: Strategy for Ingleton – Tier 3. DRAFT POLICY SP4: SPATIAL STRATEGY AND HOUSING GROWTH: - this policy identifies Ingleton as a Tier 3 settlement which is a service centre with a good range of services, shops and facilities. Criterion C states:

“Directing a proportionate level of growth to Glusburn/Crosshills, Gargrave and Ingleton to underpin their roles as Tier 3 settlements (Local Service Centres);”

The Policy also sets out that the anticipated level of growth for Ingleton is 3.5% of the District wide requirement or the equivalent of 8 net dwellings per annum. This is reproduced in more detail at Table 5 p57 which states that the anticipated level of housing growth for Ingleton is 3.5% of the District requirement which equates to 160 dwellings as a minimum requirement for the Plan Period.

The Table states that 32 dwellings have been completed in the period 2012 to Sept 2017 which leaves a residual gross requirement of 143 dwellings (including an allowance of 15 dwellings lost). Allowing for sites with outstanding permission in Ingleton totalling 40 dwellings, the residual minimum housing requirement for Ingleton for the Plan Period is 103 dwellings.

DRAFT POLICY SP9: STRATEGY FOR INGLETON –TIER 3 then identifies 5 sites as proposed Allocations to deliver exactly 103 dwellings over the Plan Period. The extract from the draft Proposals Map below shows the five proposed housing sites (coloured light blue). The five draft housing Allocations are labelled with site references: IN06, IN010, IN028, IN029, and IN048.

#### SOUNDNESS

Policy SP4, in relation to the Spatial Strategy for Ingleton, is not sound because it fails to allocate sufficient housing land to provide a degree of flexibility to ensure housing needs for Ingleton are met over the Plan Period.

Policy SP4 identifies a minimum housing requirement of 143 dwellings over the Plan Period. It then assumes that all 40 dwellings with planning permission will be delivered in the short term. No allowance is made for non-implementation of those 40 dwellings. Similarly, by allocating exactly enough land to meet the minimum residual requirement of 103 dwellings, no allowance is made for any difficulties that may arise with delivering those allocations. The Council, in effect, assumes that 100% of existing permissions and allocations will be delivered – but, that 100% delivery still only delivers enough housing land to meet the minimum requirement.

This is not a realistic scenario and will undoubtedly lead to insufficient housing land being delivered in Ingleton to meet housing needs over the Plan Period. The Policy is therefore UNSOUND because it is ineffective and fails to address the evidenced need for housing in Ingleton.

#### SUPPORTING INFORMATION SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### OMISSION SITE

The lack of soundness of Policies SP4 and SP9 in relation to the spatial strategy and housing growth for Ingleton could be addressed through an additional Housing Allocation. The following site located at Rarber Top Lane and the A65 Ingleton can deliver 5 family dwellings (including ancillary office spaces) in the Plan Period. This site is available, suitable and deliverable as a Housing Allocation, with a willing developer that will deliver housing on receipt of planning permission. Evidence has been prepared to show how the site is deliverable and sustainable. This evidence is included as Appendices with this submission:

App - R1: 38-2016-01-Rev A-Site Location Plan

App - R2: 38-2016-20-Rev A-Site Layout Plan

App - R3: APC Planning Appeal Statement - 24-11-17

App - R4: Landscape Appeal Statement GL0816 - 16-11-2017

The SOUNDNESS of Policies SP4 and SP9 in relation to Ingleton could therefore be addressed through the Allocation of this site. Five additional dwellings with ancillary office spaces will provide a minimum degree of flexibility needed to ensure the spatial strategy and housing needs for Ingleton are met and have economic development benefits.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      003      Organisation

Section or Policy      SP4, SP9

Paragraph      Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Site Reference      IN031

Plan is Sound?      No

Settlement Comment Relates to      Ingleton

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      003/01/SP4SP9/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

These Representations have been prepared by Addison Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of Mr J Kidd. These Representations specifically address the SOUNDNESS of draft Policies SP4 and SP9 in relation to the spatial strategy for Ingleton; and the omission of a proposed Allocation Site under Draft Policy SP9: Strategy for Ingleton – Tier 3. DRAFT POLICY SP4: SPATIAL STRATEGY AND HOUSING GROWTH: - this policy identifies Ingleton as a Tier 3 settlement which is a service centre with a good range of services, shops and facilities. Criterion C states:

“Directing a proportionate level of growth to Glusburn/Crosshills, Gargrave and Ingleton to underpin their roles as Tier 3 settlements (Local Service Centres);”

The Policy also sets out that the anticipated level of growth for Ingleton is 3.5% of the District wide requirement or the equivalent of 8 net dwellings per annum. This is reproduced in more detail at Table 5 p57 which states that the anticipated level of housing growth for Ingleton is 3.5% of the District requirement which equates to 160 dwellings as a minimum requirement for the Plan Period.

The Table states that 32 dwellings have been completed in the period 2012 to Sept 2017 which leaves a residual gross requirement of 143 dwellings (including an allowance of 15 dwellings lost). Allowing for sites with outstanding permission in Ingleton totalling 40 dwellings, the residual minimum housing requirement for Ingleton for the Plan Period is 103 dwellings.

DRAFT POLICY SP9: STRATEGY FOR INGLETON –TIER 3 then identifies 5 sites as proposed Allocations to deliver exactly 103 dwellings over the Plan Period. The extract from the draft Proposals Map below shows the five proposed housing sites (coloured light blue). The five draft housing Allocations are labelled with site references: IN06, IN010, IN028, IN029, and IN048.

SOUNDNESS

Policy SP4, in relation to the Spatial Strategy for Ingleton, is not sound because it fails to allocate sufficient housing land to provide a degree of flexibility to ensure housing needs for Ingleton are met over the Plan Period.

Policy SP4 identifies a minimum housing requirement of 143 dwellings over the Plan Period. It then assumes that all 40 dwellings with planning permission will be delivered in the short term. No allowance is made for non-implementation of those 40 dwellings. Similarly, by allocating exactly enough land to meet the minimum residual requirement of 103 dwellings, no allowance is made for any difficulties that may arise with delivering those allocations. The Council, in effect, assumes that 100% of existing permissions and allocations will be delivered – but, that 100% delivery still only delivers enough housing land to meet the minimum requirement.

This is not a realistic scenario and will undoubtedly lead to insufficient housing land being delivered in Ingleton to meet housing needs over the Plan Period. The Policy is therefore UNSOUND because it is ineffective and fails to address the evidenced need for housing in Ingleton.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION PROVIDED. SAVED ON SYSTEM.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### OMISSION SITE

The lack of soundness of Policies SP4 and SP9 in relation to the spatial strategy and housing growth for Ingleton could be addressed through an additional Housing Allocation. The following site located at Bentham Road and the A65 Ingleton can deliver 10 family dwellings (including affordable housing) in the Plan Period. This site is available, suitable and deliverable as a Housing Allocation, with a willing developer that will deliver housing on receipt of planning permission. Evidence has been prepared to show how the site is deliverable and sustainable. This evidence is included as Appendices with this submission:

App - I1: Site Location Plan

App - I2: Site Plan as Existing – Topographical Survey

App - I3a: Site Layout Plan as Proposed, Elevations, Floorplans and Sections

121701-01 rev F Site plan

121701-05 rev A Elevations and floor plans

App I3b: 16-1069-001 Proposed Site Access

App I4: Design and Access Statement 05-02-2018

App I5: Planning Statement 05-02-2018

App I6: Transport and Sustainable Access Statement - 15-12-2017

App I7a: Tree Survey 05-12-2017

App I7b: Tree Survey Plan 05-12-2017

App I8: FRA and Drainage Strategy KRS.0334.001.R.001.A

Appendix 8 is particularly notable as it provides evidence to demonstrate that the Environment Agency Flood Risk Map zoning for the site is erroneous and demonstrates how the site can be delivered without risk to the development or elsewhere.

The SOUNDNESS of Policies SP4 and SP9 in relation to Ingleton could therefore be addressed through the Allocation of this site. Ten additional dwellings will provide a minimum degree of flexibility needed to ensure the spatial strategy and housing needs for Ingleton are met.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      020                      Organisation      RSPB Northern England

Section or Policy	SP5	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference	SK081, SK082, SK108a (incorporating SK080a), SK087, SK088, SK089, SK094, SK	Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Skipton	Representation Reference	020/01/SP5/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Thank you for the opportunity to provide representations on the Publication Draft Craven Local Plan. The RSPB has a wealth of experience of working with local authorities on Local Plans across the country. We consider that spatial planning offers an important opportunity to take a strategic and sustainable approach to protecting our most important wildlife sites, identifying and creating opportunities for local wildlife and biodiversity gain, whilst meeting wider social and economic needs. We would like to take this opportunity to specifically draw attention to the potential impacts to foraging wading birds using potentially functionally linked land associated with the North Pennine Moors Special Protection Area (SPA) and the South Pennine Moors (Phase 2) SPA respectively that have correctly been highlighted in the Plan. Our representation relates specifically to a number of preferred development sites that are detailed as ‘Housing sites’ in the Plan.

#### North Pennine Moors SPA

We welcome the acknowledgement in the Habitat Regulations Assessment – Appropriate Assessment Report (December 2017) of the potential loss of important foraging sites to development. We also welcome the recommendation for preferred development sites in the Skipton area to undergo review in relation to potential foraging areas for Golden plover (a qualifying SPA citation species) and Curlew (a species that meets the qualifying criteria but is not formally notified as an SPA citation species).

Golden plovers nest on the moors and blanket bogs of the North Pennine Moors SPA but do most of their feeding on surrounding pastures. They do not nest on the pastures but will sometimes take their chicks up to 2 kilometres (km) to feed on farmland. They occupy the pastures (and the moors) from late February to late July, but mid-March to June is when they are used most. Females feed on pastures during the daytime while males incubate or brood young chicks. Males then feed on pastures at night-time while females are on nest duty. Research has found that females can fly up to 7.4km from the nest to feed, while males flew 2.4 to 2.7km (means of the minimum and maximum distances each individual was recorded from its nest). The research found that 10.7km was the maximum distance recorded away from the nest to feed. Fields were surveyed for foraging females between 09:00 and 18:00 when flocks were most stable. Males left for the pastures about 22:30 and returned to the moors about 04:00.

SPA-nesting Curlew will often feed on nearby pastures before settling to breed on moorland. Once their chicks have hatched they are more likely to remain on moorland, but will accompany them to the nearest suitable farmland for foraging.

We welcome the acknowledgement in the Plan to conduct Biodiversity Appraisals as part of the key Development Principles associated with a number of the Policies. Specifically, Biodiversity Appraisals for Policies SK081, 082, 108a (incorporating SK080a), 87, 88, 89, 94, 114 and 124 will be of particular importance due to these preferred development sites being the closest in Craven District to the North Pennine Moors SPA. Whilst it could be suggested that all of the aforementioned preferred development sites may appear to be less likely to support foraging Golden plover and Curlew, due to all lying adjacent to residential areas, an assessment of whether foraging birds could be present will still be required.

#### Survey and Mitigation

We recommend that for all preferred development detailed above, a reconnaissance visit is made to assess their likely suitability to support Golden plover and Curlew, i.e. whether or not they are pasture fields. If the sites are deemed to be potentially suitable, a daytime search of the fields for species presence should be conducted from mid-March onwards. We note that the local RSPB Group were consulted on whether they held any records of Golden plover in the Skipton area. It should be noted that RSPB Local



Groups do not hold bird records and that any mention of species records may be anecdotal, unless a formal survey was completed. If birds likely to be associated with the SPAs are located on the preferred development sites, then formal surveys will be required to be undertaken to accurately ascertain the numbers of foraging birds using the land. For Golden plover, this will also need to include night-time surveys to account for foraging males. We would be happy to be consulted on the methodology required for such a survey if required.

If foraging SPA species are found to be using the preferred development sites mentioned above, there will also be a requirement to appropriately identify and acquire suitable land elsewhere within the area as part of the Biodiversity Mitigation Plans, in order to mitigate against the loss of important functionally linked foraging land.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Within the Development Principles for Employment Site SK113, page 76 of the Publication Version Local Plan, add the following additional bullet point:-

- 'In addition to B1, B2, and B8 development, both education development (Use Class D1) and Sui Generis employment development, will be supported in principle on the site to help meet the respective needs of both Craven College and Craven Cattle Mart.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      008                      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy                      SP5

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?                      No

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?              Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Skipton

Representation Reference      008/15/SP5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### DRAFT POLICY SP5: STRATEGY FOR SKIPTON

5.32 Tables 3, 4 and 5 set out the pattern of development in the District in the form of completions (to 30th September 2017) and extant planning permissions for the same period. These suggest that in addition to the 768 completions, there are extant consents for 1,549 dwellings.

5.33 Overall this would suggest whilst there has been a slow delivery of housing to date a healthy supply of sites is evident. However in the absence of a detailed housing trajectory it is difficult to understand how those permissions will contribute to the delivery of the spatial strategy over the Plan period or what mechanism is put in place should the sites fail to come forward as expected.

5.34 Given the Framework seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing through positively prepared Plans which have flexibility to deal with changing circumstances, then a buffer is required. Advice from the Local Plan Expert Group recommends the use of a 20% buffer to ensure the Plan can maintain a five year supply and responds rapidly and flexibly to change. Such an approach is consistent with Carter Jonas' and our client's position and it is suggested that the Council takes this stance and includes a buffer accordingly.

5.35 At Table 3 CDC calculates that there is 12% difference between gross and net completions. This suggests a net to gross of 12% should be applied to the housing requirement, which is CDC's approach as suggested in Table 5. This is unsound and it is suggested that a 20% buffer is added.

5.36 Table 5 sets out on a settlement wide basis the summary of the Requirement and Supply by Settlement. As a headline this demonstrates that the distribution of delivery and consents is not in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. At its most basic, the requirement for Skipton at 50% of dwellings suggests delivery of 334 dwellings to 30th September 2017, resulting in a net delivery of 61 dwellings annually against a minimum requirement of 115 dpa. The supply side suggests that there are planning permissions for around 800 units; however, it is not clear if those sites will come forward to deliver the housing requirement.

5.37 As a contrast some of the smaller settlements and villages appear to have sufficient completions and approvals to meet the minimum requirements of Policy SP4. We do not advocate that the Council imposes a "moratorium" on granting permission of those settlements, as clearly these settlements are contributing to current (albeit low) levels of completions. What is required is a more ambitious strategy to deliver housing in the main settlements along with a supportive approach to new housing in the smaller settlements to maintain their sustainability and viability.

5.38 Focussing upon Skipton, we consider that the planning authority's approach is not sound; it is not positively prepared, justified nor effective. For example Table 5 suggests that the Council's expectation is that the minimum housing requirement for Skipton is 1,399 units over the Plan period, then proposes sufficient land for allocation for 1,402 units; a less than 0.2% over-provision. In our view this does not indicate positive planning or sufficient flexibility.

5.39 As it is we suggest that the Council should apply a 20% buffer not the 12% proposed. This would suggest (on the current 230 unit requirement) a minimum buffer of 450 units. This would set a residual requirement in the Plan for Skipton of 1,650 units. CDC should then seek to identify this as a minimum.

5.40 Indeed as we set out in Section 5 of this representation we have substantive concerns about the likely yield of the sites proposed by the Council. Taking SK089/090 as one example, our own appraisal work suggests that the Council's estimate that site will yield in the region of 220 dwellings is unrealistic. Noting our concerns with Policy SP3 (Density) the Council has calculated the yield of the site based on net area of 6.8 has and a density of 32dph. Set out at Appendix 1 is a specialist architect's appraisal of the draft allocation (Principles Plan) which indicates a yield of 130 dwellings on the site, taking into consideration potential topography and other constraints (wayleaves, flood

risk, etc.); some 60% of the suggested yield. In isolation this would suggest the Council is not allocating sufficient land in Skipton’ with a shortfall of 90 units. If this were extrapolated across all fifteen (greenfield) housing and mixed use regeneration allocations; it could indicate a shortfall of around 570 units. This equates to between 10 and 15% of the housing requirement over the Plan period and may have consequences for the delivery of infrastructure.

5.41 A number of the allocations are hemmed in by other development or infrastructure such as roads, the A65 and A629, and the railway. However, there may be some flexibility in the Plan through reducing Green Infrastructure, social and community infrastructure or employment uses. Such an approach may conflict with other elements of the Local Plan; for example economic growth and landscape, habitat and biodiversity enhancement.

5.42 Discussion with the Council suggests that a number of the Draft Site Allocations are subject to preapplication engagement and planning applications which provides a degree of certainty. None of this evidence is presented in the draft Plan. As a consequence we consider that the Policy as drafted is unsound. We suggest that the Council reviews the draft allocations, confirms the likely yields through engagement with the developers/ landowners and their agents, prior to formal Submission and seeks to identify additional development land. The contribution of land at Elsey Croft and suggested changes to the draft Local Plan are discussed in Section 5 of this representation.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

5.35 At Table 3 CDC calculates that there is 12% difference between gross and net completions. This suggests a net to gross of 12% should be applied to the housing requirement, which is CDC’s approach as suggested in Table 5. This is unsound and it is suggested that a 20% buffer is added.

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID      039                      Organisation      North Yorkshire County Council

Section or Policy                      SP5

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to      Skipton

Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Representation Reference	039/08/SP5/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Children and Young People's Services

Strategy for Skipton - Tier 1:

We are pleased to see the identification of land for new primary school provision in Skipton in the plan.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      039      Organisation      North Yorkshire County Council

Section or Policy      SP5

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference      SK089 and SK090

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Skipton

Representation Reference      039/09/SP5/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Children and Young People's Services

SK089 and SK090 Land to the north of Airedale Avenue and Elsey Croft and east of rainlay line, Skipton:

We welcome the inclusion in these sites of 1.8 ha for the provisino of a new school in Skipton; we suggest that the development principles are reworded to state: new primary school may potentiall need to be provided on 1.8 ha of the total site area of sites SK089 and SK090 to meet the educational requirements for Skipton over the plan period.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We suggest that the development principles are reworded to state: new primary school may potentiall need to be provided on 1.8 ha of the total site area of sites SK089 and SK090 to meet the educational requirements for Skipton over the plan period.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      039                      Organisation      North Yorkshire County Council

Section or Policy                      SP5

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?                      Not Specified

Site Reference                      SK081, SK082 and SK108

Plan is DtC Compliant?              Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Skipton

Representation Reference      039/10/SP5/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Children and Young People's Services

SK081, SK082 and SK108 (incorporating aite SK080a) Land north of Gargrave Road and west of Park Wood Drive and Stirtonber, Skipton:

We welcome the inclusion in these sites of 1.8 ha for the provision of a new school in Skipton; we suggest that the development principles are reworded to state: An area of land (1.8ha) in the north east corner of the site is allocated for the potential provision of a new primary school.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We suggest that the development principles are reworded to state: An area of land (1.8ha) in the north east corner of the site is allocated for the potential provision of a new primary school.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      008      Organisation      The Wilman Family

Section or Policy      SP5

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      SK089, SK090      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Skipton      Representation Reference      008/32/SP5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

4.8 On a site specific matter for SK089/090 there is an issue with regard to the North Yorkshire Education Authority, given the requirement at Elsey Croft to provide land (1.8 has or 4.5 acres) for a primary school. We are aware that the County Council have submitted representation supporting the identification of land at Elsey Croft for a Primary School, but have done no site specific investigation. For the reasons set out in Section 5 of this representation we consider the Local Plan to be unsound. Amendments are proposed which could address this matter.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	029	Organisation	Henry Boot Developments Ltd		
Section or Policy		SP5		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Yes
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference		SK049		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Yes
Settlement Comment Relates to		Skipton		Representation Reference	029/04/SP5/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

SP5 Strategy for Skipton – Tier 1  
Support is given to the proposed allocation of site SK049 Land East of Skipton by Pass, Skipton, under policy SP5, for B1, B2, B8 uses to help meet future employment land requirements.  
Support is also given to the Development Principles for site SK049 outlined in this policy

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      029      Organisation      Henry Boot Developments Ltd

Section or Policy      SP5

Paragraph

Site Reference      SK049

Settlement Comment Relates to      Skipton

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Plan is Sound?      Yes

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Representation Reference      029/02/SP5/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

SK049 Land East of Skipton by Pass, Skipton

The allocation of Land East of Skipton by Pass, Skipton – site SK049 fro B1, B2 and B8 uses is supported.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	021	Organisation	Education and Skills Funding Agency		
Section or Policy		SP5		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	021/03/SP5/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

6. In light of Draft Policy SP5: Strategy for Skipton, emerging ESFA proposals for forward funding schools as part of large residential developments may be of interest to the Council. We would be happy to meet to discuss this opportunity at an appropriate time.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	019	Organisation	Keyhaven Homes		
Section or Policy		SP5		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		SK119		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Skipton		Representation Reference	019/08/SP5/OS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Site SK119 – Land South of Whinny Gill Reservoir

5.34We object to Site SK119 no longer being proposed for allocation. This is a sustainable site in the principal town of Skipton and which lies adjacent to a housing commitment site. The assessment of this site in the Residential Site Selection Process Paper stated that suitable access to the site cannot be achieved with North Yorkshire Highways stating that they considered the site to be landlocked.

5.35As part of our representations to the Pre-Publication Draft it was highlighted that the site adjoins an existing housing commitment site which has Reserved Matters approval and is in the same ownership. The Reserved Matters approval includes an access spur which will provide direct access into SK119. The site is not therefore landlocked with the intention being to connect the two sites.

5.36The Council's Site Response Paper (January 2018) refers to the representation we previously submitted in relation to this site and it is stated in response that. 'selected sites are considered to be deliverable / developable and capable of meeting the objectively assessed need for housing / employment land. Allocation of other sites if therefore unnecessary. However, draft local plan policy H1/EC1 does make provision for housing / employment development on unallocated sites.'

5.37In this regard the Council's reasoning for not allocating this highly sustainable Skipton site is at odds with the Council's justification for not supporting higher growth options as it suggested there are insufficient sites in Skipton to meet a higher growth level, yet in relation to this site it is suggested it is not needed as opposed to the site not being suitable.

5.38The Council's Site Response Paper also states that the site was not identified as access to it is dependent on the site with consent being developed and that if that site was developed during the plan period the site could enter the pool of sites during a subsequent review of the plan. In this regard, it is evident the suitability of the site for development is only a matter of timing, rather than there being any issue with the principle of developing the site. In this regard, it is unreasonable to assume that the adjoining consented site, which has Reserved Matters approval, will not come forward within the plan period. It is also relevant to highlight that Keyhaven Homes are due to commence the discharge of pre-commencement conditions imminently on the consented scheme. On this basis, the Council's response to our previous representations is not supported. It is maintained the site is suitable for allocation and could increase the level of affordable and market housing growth in Skipton.

5.39The Council' assessment of site SK119 (Land south of Whinny Gill Reservoir) identifies eighteen positive or neutral effects and only three negatives effects of development. One of these is a significant negative effect which relates to the Council's assessment of the site access, which we have demonstrated is not a constraint. The two minor negative scores have been attributed to the following objectives:-

SO10 – Protect and enhance the natural agricultural conditions to maintain soil quality and grow food in Craven

SO14 – Protect and enhance the open countryside and wide landscape character

5.40 Whilst negative effects are identified against sustainability objectives 10 and 14, these both relate to the site's greenfield nature and should not be considered a barrier to development. As with site SK114, this site is not materially different in use and character to the adjoining housing commitment site, which has planning permission for residential development and has therefore been deemed to be suitable for development.

5.41 As SK114 and SK119 are adjacent sites, it is unclear why the assessment has identified a negative effect against Sustainability Objectives SO11, SO16 and SO17 for site SK114 when neutral impacts are identified for site SK119. Both sites are grassed over and used for grazing and are in a similar location.

5.42 This site is not materially different in use and character to the adjoining housing commitment site, which has planning permission for residential development and has therefore been deemed to be suitable for development.

5.43 The sustainability appraisal shows the majority of effects are neutral and positive. The identified major negative effect relating to the site's accessibility is not based on correct information as the site can be accessed through the adjoining housing commitment site via the road spur which forms part of the approved plans and can be delivered within the plan period. The identified minor negative effects do not constitute a barrier to development and can be mitigated through sensitive design and development principles. The site is therefore wholly suitable for allocation for housing.

5.44 Even in the event the Council's proposed housing growth option remains unchanged, it is noted that Table 5 of the Publication Draft identifies a gross residual housing requirement for Skipton of 1,399 dwellings with an approximate yield of 1,402 dwellings based on the proposed allocations. The allocations are expected to deliver just 3 dwellings above the requirement and the site yields upon which these figures are based rest on an expectation that every site will deliver at a density of 32 dwellings per hectare. As we have highlighted in this statement, we do not consider this achievable on every site in Skipton. This presents a very real risk that if just one site does not come forward as expected then the requirement for Skipton, the principal town, will not be met. The allocation of Site SK119 will therefore provide flexibility and choice to address this and ensure that there are sufficient sites to meet the proposed distribution for Skipton.

5.45 Site SK119 should therefore be duly re-instated as a proposed allocation as the Council's reason for no longer proposing to allocate the site is based on incorrect information. The site is not landlocked, there is a suitable access into the site and the site is suitable for development. The allocation of the site will also assist in providing flexibility and choice in Skipton and ensuring market and affordable housing need can be met.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

5.46 To make the plan SOUND Site SK119 should be identified as a proposed allocation for the following reasons:-

- Positively Prepared – the inclusion of this site will assist the Council in meeting the full objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing in the principal town of Skipton
- Justified – the inclusion of site SK119 is the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. The site is suitable for development and can be delivered within the plan period alongside the existing housing commitment site. There is no justifiable reason why this site should be excluded from the pool of sites which are expected to deliver within the 15 year plan period.
- Effective – the inclusion of this site will assist in ensuring the plan is deliverable over its period by providing choice and flexibility in the supply of housing in Skipton as the Council's current strategy is reliant on all identified sites delivering as expected, which is unrealistic, particularly given the Council are relying on all sites in Skipton delivering

at a density of 32 dph.

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	To engage in discussion regarding the issue of soundness highlighted in the representation statement.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	---

Respondent ID	019	Organisation	Keyhaven Homes		
Section or Policy		SP5		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference		SK101		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Skipton		Representation Reference	019/07/SP5/TS

## Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Site SK101 – East of Keighley Road and south of Cawder Lane

5.31We SUPPORT the proposed allocation of site SK101 (East of Keighley Road and south of Cawder Lane, Skipton) for housing. This site is deliverable, being available for development and in a suitable location, forming a natural extension to the current built form of Skipton. There are no known constraints that would result in the development of this site not being viable.

5.32 We support the Council's sustainability appraisal assessment of site SK101 (East of Keighley Road and South of Cawder Lane) in the Residential Site Selection Process Background Paper which identifies only positive or neutral effects as a result of this site being developed. This is therefore a wholly suitable site for development that can meet the growth identified for Skipton and should be identified as a housing allocation.

5.33 The allocation of Site SK101 is SOUND.

## Development Principles for Policy S5 Housing Sites – Site SK101 (East of Keighley Road and south of Cawder Lane)

5.47 Keyhaven Homes support the development principles identified in relation to proposed housing allocation SK101.

5.48 The allocation of Site SK101 is deemed to be SOUND.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	To engage in discussion regarding the issue of soundness highlighted in the representation statement.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	---



Respondent ID      019      Organisation      Keyhaven Homes

Section or Policy      SP5

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      SK114      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Skipton      Representation Reference      019/06/SP5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Draft Policy SP5: Strategy for Skipton – Tier 1

Site SK114 – Land to the east of North Parade and Cawder Road Garage Site

5.26We SUPPORT the proposed allocation of site SK114 (Land to east of North Parade and Cawder Road garage site). This site is deliverable, being available for development and in a suitable location and would form a natural extension to the current built form of Skipton. In addition, there are no known constraints that would result in the development of this site not being viable.

5.27The Council’s assessment of site SK114 (Cawder Gill / Horse Close) identifies seventeen positive or neutral effects and only four negative effects of development, with no ‘significant negative’ effects.

5.28Given the sustainability appraisal shows the majority of effects are neutral and positive and the identified negative effects do not constitute a barrier to development and can be mitigated through sensitive design and development principles, it is maintained this site is wholly suitable for allocation for housing.

5.29We also support the increase in the proposed extent of site SK114. The inclusion of this additional land results in a more natural rounding off of this part of Skipton as delivering additional dwellings in the Principal Town of Skipton.

5.30The allocation of Site SK114 is SOUND.

Development Principles for Policy S5 Housing Sites – Site SK114 (Land to the east of North Parade and Cawder Road Garage Site)

5.49Keyhaven Homes support the proposed development principles in relation to site SK114 and welcome the additional reference to the potential for an alternative access to the site via an existing reservoir track from Whinny Gill Road.

5.50The allocation of Site SK114 is deemed to be SOUND.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	To engage in discussion regarding the issue of soundness highlighted in the representation statement.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	---

Respondent ID      054      Organisation      TRCPR

Section or Policy      SP5

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      SK081, SK082, SK108

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Skipton

Representation Reference      054/01/SP5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

In defining the extent of housing allocation ref. SK081, SK082 & SK108 and the associated Green Infrastructure Provision, the Council has deviated from the recommendations of the background papers to the Publication Draft Craven Local Plan (as detailed below) without providing any justification. Representations submitted on behalf of our client to the Pre-Publication Draft Local Plan (June 2017) raising this issue have failed to be taken into account and there is no response from the Council to our comments in the 'Site Response Papers (January 2018)'.

With reference to the site edged red on the submitted site location plan (previously known as either SK080 or SK080a), a generously sized green infrastructure buffer is designated adjacent to the northern boundary of the east side of the site which evidently, the Council considers to be sufficient to provide biodiversity and landscape mitigation for the YDNP and SINC. Yet on the west side of the site the Council has extended this buffer across the entire field without any explanation as to why this is considered necessary in this particular area.

In the emerging Local Plan background paper titled 'Pool of Site Options with Potential for Residential or Mixed Use and Sustainability Appraisal (April 2016)', the Council states under site reference SK080 that "The site performs well regarding any flood risk, and the southern portion of the site would seem to be suitable for development". The Council therefore acknowledges that the southern part of the site is appropriate for housing development.

In the 'Residential Site Selection Process (June 2017) background paper under site reference SK080a, the Council concludes that "the northern edge of the site is not suitable for residential development due to the presence of the SINC and also the presence of the adjacent A-road (A65), which would have some noise and air quality impacts from passing traffic. In order to mitigate against the negative effects and pressure development may have on these areas there is an opportunity for the creation of a green infrastructure corridor running adjacent to the northern boundary of the site". The Council recognises that Green Infrastructure Provision is only required along the northern boundary of the site, not across the entire site.

In draft Policy SP5, site ref. SK081, SK082 & SK108 is stated as "a greenfield site in a prominent position on the edge of Skipton, in relatively close proximity to the Yorkshire Dales National Park boundary and a SINC", yet the area of land designated as Green Infrastructure Provision on the north west side of the site is perhaps the least prominent area of the whole site.

Any glimpses of this area of land from distance views will be entirely back-clothed by the presence of the Gateway House office building to the south west of the site and therefore if the site was developed for housing there would be no impact on the Yorkshire Dales National Park.

As per our previous representations, we believe the buffer at the depth it is set along on the east side of the site should be continued for the full length of the northern boundary. This will achieve the objectives of providing biodiversity and landscape mitigation for the YDNP and SINC whilst maintaining at least 3 or 4 acres of developable land

that could make a worthwhile contribution to the housing land supply in combination with the wider proposed allocation. This is consistent with the Council’s own conclusions when assessing the site as quote above.

SITE PLAN INCLUDED IN REPRESENTATION. SAVED ON SYSTEM.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The Green Infrastructure Provision on the northern side of housing allocation Ref. SK081, SK082 & SK108 should be reduced to a buffer strip of a continuous depth along only the northern boundary of the site edged red on the submitted site location plan (previously known as SK080 or SK080a) to allow additional, much need housing to be built on part of this site.

This modification accords with the Council’s own recommendations in background papers to the Publication Draft Craven Local Plan (January 2018) titled ‘Pool of Site Options with Potential for Residential or Mixed Use and Sustainability Appraisal (April 2016)’ and ‘Residential Site Selection Process background paper (June 2017)’ which recognise that the southern part of this site is suitable for development and a green infrastructure corridor is only necessary “running adjacent to the northern boundary of the site”.

Wish to participate in examination?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Our concerns can be addressed through written submissions, unless the Inspector determines otherwise in which event we would wish to be invited to participate.
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

Respondent ID	053	Organisation		
Section or Policy		SP5	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference		SK088	Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	053/01/SP5/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We are writing on behalf of our client Gillian Baldwin in response to the consultation on the Craven Draft Local Plan documents and in support of the inclusion of site SK088 (Hawbank Fields, North of Otley Road and South of A6132) as an allocation for residential development.

There is a pending outline planning application on this site (App Ref 2017/18237/OUT), which was discussed at the Planning Committee meeting of 12th February 2018. Members voted in favour of the Officer's recommendation to delegate approval to officers, subject to a S106 agreement and relevant conditions. The scheme has already attracted a significant level of developer interest and will be taken to market once the Section 106 agreement and planning Permission are secured.

#### Skipton Draft Residential Allocations – SK088

Draft policy SP5 sets out the draft residential allocations for the settlement of Skipton, including the site at Hawbank Fields, allocated as site SK088. The supporting text for the policy sets out development principles for any proposal on the site which are summarised below:

- Application to be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment;
- Provide public open space and green infrastructure links;
- Consider landscape and biodiversity impacts, protect existing assets and include mitigation where necessary;
- Include green space along the northern boundary;
- Consider heritage and archaeological assets;
- Be accessed from the A6131;
- Relate well to the existing built form;
- Provide a mix of house types, including affordable units;
- Be accessible by sustainable modes of transport including pedestrians; and
- Be designed to protect residential amenity of existing and future residents.

The site is earmarked to be brought forward within the first phase of the Local Plan (years 1-5), it is expected that the site will yield roughly 143 dwellings. The site is located in a good position in terms of access to transport options and services. It is roughly 1km from the centre of Skipton and is within a short distance of the A65 which provides good access to the regional road network. There are also good pedestrian links and access to bus services.

The development principles above set out requirements for any application for development of the site to ensure that the proposed development is in accordance with National Policy and the emerging Local Plan and represents an appropriate form of sustainable development.

#### Conclusion

As set out within the Draft Local Plan, our application and previously submitted representations, site SK088 is a sustainable and deliverable location for residential development.

Crucially the application demonstrates that a layout can be designed to ensure that the development would not be at a high risk of flooding; that it would not have a detrimental impact upon the ecological assets and valuable habitats to the south of the site and that a design which enhances the settlement edge of Skipton and positively contributes to local landscape character can be readily achieved.

In conclusion, we strongly support the inclusion of the site SK088 as an Allocation for residential development in the emerging plan and trust that on this basis it will continue to be included as the plan progresses.

I trust that our comments will be taken into account in progressing the preparation of the local plan and I would be grateful if we could be notified of any further consultations.

The pending application shows how development could be accommodated on site in accordance with the development principles and demonstrates that the landowner is willing and actively pursuing the development of the site in the short term. The site can therefore be considered readily available. The indicative layout submitted with our outline application shows that the site can be developed in a high quality, sensitive manner while addressing the Council’s recommendations.

As set out in the Council’s assessment of the site, its location and characteristics provide an opportunity to provide high quality public open space, as required by local and national policy. Our layout provides for a significant amount of green space which has been designed to provide landscape and ecological buffers along with recreation and play space, additional planting and footpath links. It also incorporates affordable housing provision, in line with emerging policy.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID 063 Organisation A & N Fothergill & Son.

Section or Policy	SP5	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference	SK094	Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Representation Reference	063/01/SP5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The ‘Development Principles’ for housing allocation SK094, as identified by draft Policy SP5. (Pages 69 and 70 of the Publication Draft Plan).

The Council is seeking the provision of Green Infrastructure on certain allocated sites. Draft Policy ENV5, that sets out the policy approach for Green Infrastructure provision, is not objected to. However, the precise identification of the amount of Green Infrastructure provision to be made (within the ‘Development Principles’ for site allocations - as set out under draft Policy SP5), and in particular the amount of Green Infrastructure provision for allocation SK094, is objected to.

With respect to housing site SK094, the Green Infrastructure provision that is stated to be required is approximately 70% of the housing site. Much of the land is presently Flood Risk Area and it is accepted that at present the land is not suitable for development. However, works on the Skipton Flood Alleviation Scheme are at an advanced stage. The works will significantly reduce the amount of land at risk from flooding within the town. It is highly probable that the amount of land at risk from flooding on housing site SK094 will significantly reduce.

The Green Infrastructure requirement, as currently stated in the ‘Development Principles’ for the site, compromises the ability of the land to be developed for housing should the Flood Risk Area boundary change. The site is in a highly sustainable location, and there are no other obvious drawbacks from bringing it forward for development. The evidence base for the Green Infrastructure designations comes from work undertaken by Natural England in response to policy YH8 from the Yorkshire & Humber Regional Spatial Strategy. The RSS was subsequently abolished and the evidence base is from information that is approximately 10 years old. Most importantly the Green Infrastructure designations were identified prior to commencement on the Skipton Flood Alleviation Scheme.

A rationale was produced by Natural England that explains how the Green Infrastructure designations were produced. That rationale is included as Appendix A. Step 4 of that rationale explains the site characteristics or indicators that were used to select sites for inclusion in the Green Infrastructure designation.

Land within the Fothergills’ control, that forms part of housing site SK094 and is designated as Green Infrastructure, meets very few of the indicators that lead to a sites designation for Green Infrastructure. Of the key indicators used by Natural England: -

Open Space. The site is not an open space asset such as a park, woodland, or similar.

Biodiversity. This farmed pastoral land is very unlikely to make any noteworthy contribution to biodiversity.

Landscape. This low-lying site makes very limited landscape contribution.

Products from the land. The land is farmed and makes a small contribution to agriculture, although it’s contribution is not so significant that would suggest the land should be designated for Green Infrastructure.

Mitigating Flood Risk. Based on the current Environment Agency Flood Risk maps the site is at risk from flooding. However, this is based on current Flood Risk maps and takes no account of the contribution of the Skipton Flood Alleviation Scheme and how this will impact on Flood Risk within the town.

Contribution to mitigating climate change. The site is not peatlands, managed woodlands or a site that would otherwise contribute to this indicator.

Health. This is not a location that is important for Air Quality management or could be of benefit to populations with poor health.

Accessibility. A public footpath skirts the southern end of the site, but the lands contribution to this indicator is not so significant that would suggest the land should be designated for Green Infrastructure.

Recreation. The farm land does not include any formal provision for recreation.

Cultural. The site contains no cultural features.

Tourism. The site is not a tourism asset.

Poor quality environment. The land is not a poor-quality environment. It comprises ordinary and unremarkable pastoral land.

Land and property values. The designation of this land or not as Green Infrastructure would have a very minimal impact on the surrounding local land and property values.

Economic growth. Designation of this site as Green Infrastructure would have no particular impact on economic growth.

Consideration of the key indicators used to designate the land as Green Infrastructure, reveals that the reason why this site was identified was because the land has traditionally been at risk of flooding.

The Fothergills' site has been at risk from Flooding from Eller Beck and Whaller Hill / Skibden Beck that drains into Eller Beck. It has also been at risk of flooding from the Leeds to Liverpool Canal overtopping its banks as result of increased discharges to the canal from Eller Beck and Whaller Hill / Skibden Beck. Flood Risk Assessments used to inform residential development applications on the housing site confirm this.

The Skipton Flood alleviation scheme will significantly alter the areas of land that will be at risk from flooding. The scheme will attenuate water entering the town from Eller Beck and Whaller Hill / Skibden Beck. It therefore seems very probable that once the flood risk areas for the town are remodelled that the Fothergills' site will no longer be designated as an area of flood risk. Furthermore, if it the site is not designated as an area of flood risk the site should not make such a significant Green Infrastructure contribution.

In summary, due to Flood Risk alleviation works within the town, much of the land to be designated as Green Infrastructure may no longer be appropriate to be designated in this way.

The impact of the designation as currently stated in the 'Development Principals' for the site will mean that the development potential of the site for housing is significantly reduced. The site is well located for housing development and in landscape terms development on the site would have limited impact. The ability to use the site efficiently and effectively for agriculture is also much reduced as the site will become enclosed by development. Constraining development on this site through the 'Development Principles' in this way is not therefore appropriate and furthermore would put pressure on the Council to release other land for housing to help meet its housing requirements.

#### SUPPORTING INFORMATION - AN EVIDENCE BASE FOR GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE IN YORKSHIRE AND HUMBER, SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

On page 69 of the Publication Local Plan amend text in the following way: -

Delete: -

'Site Allocation Area: 10.487 ha [net developable area 3.082 ha; green infrastructure area 7.406 ha].

Number of Dwellings Generated: 99 dwellings [3.082 ha x 32 dwellings per ha].'

Replace with: -

'Site Allocation Area: 10.487 ha [expected net developable area 3.082 ha; expected green infrastructure area 7.406 ha].

Number of Dwellings Generated: Estimate: 99 dwellings [3.082 ha x 32 dwellings per ha].'

Delete: -

'A Flood Risk Assessment is required, as a fluvial and/or surface water hazard has been identified within part of the site area. Proposals for development on this site will incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), unless this is not possible or feasible;'

Replace with: -

'Approximately 70% of the site is within Flood Risk zones 2 and 3 and this constraint limits development on the site. Works undertaken by the Environment Agency, as part of the Skipton Flood Alleviation Scheme, may reduce the area of Flood Risk and more of the site will be developable than currently estimated. A Flood Risk Assessment is required, as a fluvial and/or surface water hazard has been identified within part of the site area. Proposals for development on this site will incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), unless this is not possible or feasible;'



Delete: -

The site is a greenfield site in a prominent location on the edge of Skipton. Development proposals for this site will incorporate landscape mitigation(s) including approximately 7.4 ha of green infrastructure in the east, west and south of the site, providing an opportunity for an area of open space/green infrastructure to be created, potentially incorporating a closed road cycle circuit track. This part of the site lies within flood risk zone 2 & 3, which incorporates an existing PROW along the southern boundary of the site. Proposals will incorporate the route of this PROW in order to maintain this link from the site to the wider area.

Replace with: -

The site is a greenfield site in a prominent location on the edge of Skipton. Development proposals for this site will incorporate landscape mitigation(s) including (DELETE - approximately 7.4 ha of) green infrastructure (DELETE - in the east, west and south of the site,) providing an opportunity for an area of open space/green infrastructure to be created, potentially incorporating a closed road cycle circuit track. (DELETE - This part of the site lies within flood risk zone 2 & 3, which incorporates an) There is an existing PROW along the southern boundary of the site. Proposals will incorporate the route of this PROW in order to maintain this link from the site to the wider area.

The above changes will allow a sensible decision to be made at the time a planning application is considered on the extent of Green Infrastructure to be required and the precise location(s) for it. This decision can be made using the most up to date evidence and information. Attempting to define the Green Infrastructure land now, based on the current Flood Risk Area, will lead to inaccuracies and potentially the unnecessary safeguarding of land that is suitable for development.

There is a very strong justification for this change to be made with respect to site SK094, due to the expected changes to the Flood Risk Area boundaries as a result of the Skipton Flood Alleviation scheme. However, there is justification with respect to all allocated sites, where Green Infrastructure is proposed, not to be overly prescriptive on the amount and location of the Green Infrastructure and allow decisions to be made on a case by case of the best Green Infrastructure solution based on the most up-to-date evidence.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		SP5		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference		SK140		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	017/22/SP5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles –  
Site SK140; Land at Skipton Station, Broughton Road, Carleton New Road, Sandylands Business Centre, Skipton, Heritage Significance

This site lies within the Skipton Conservation Area and there are a number of Listed Buildings both within the site itself and in its vicinity. These Development Principles reflect the recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment and will help to ensure that the site is redeveloped in a manner which will conserve elements which make a positive contribution the character of this part of the Conservation Area and the setting of the nearby Listed Buildings. We also welcome the requirement for the production of a Masterplan to guide the development of this important site.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      SP5

Paragraph

Site Reference      SK139

Settlement Comment Relates to      Skipton

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      Yes

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      017/21/SP5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site SK139; East and west of Cavendish Street, Skipton, Heritage Significance considerations

This site lies within the Skipton Conservation Area and there are a number of Listed Buildings in its vicinity.

The Heritage Impact Assessment recommended a number of development considerations which would be required to ensure that the redevelopment of this site takes place in a manner which would conserve the heritage assets in its vicinity These Development Principles reflect the recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment and will help to ensure that the site is redeveloped in a manner which will conserve those elements which make a positive contribution the character of this part of the Conservation Area and the setting of the nearby Listed Buildings.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		SP5		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference		SK114		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Skipton		Representation Reference	017/20/SP5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site SK114; Land to east of North Parade and Cawder Road Garage site, Skipton, first bulletpoint

To the south-east of this area there is a series of Scheduled Monuments. The nearest, a cupmarked rock, lies 140 metres or so from the south-eastern edge of the site. There is also a semi-circular enclosed settlement on Horse Close Hill 200 metres to the south of this area which is also Scheduled. 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 remains on this site. Therefore we welcome the requirement for an archaeological assessment

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      SP5

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      SK094      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Skipton      Representation Reference      017/19/SP5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site SK094; Land bounded by Carleton Road, railway line and A629, Skipton, fourth bullet-point

This site adjoins the boundary of the Skipton Conservation Area. This bullet-point alerts potential developer of the proximity of the Conservation Area and the need to ensure that its character is appropriately conserved.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		SP5		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference		SK081, SK081, SK082, SK108		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Skipton		Representation Reference	017/18/SP5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site SK080; SK81; SK82; SK108 North of Gargrave Road, west of Parkwood Drive and Stirtonber; bounded by White Hills and A65

This area adjoins the boundary of the Skipton Conservation Area.  
The Heritage Impact Assessment considered that the area to the north of Gargrave Road made a strong contribution to the character of the Conservation Area. It also considered that the south-western corner of Site SK108 (where it abuts the northern extension of the Conservation Area around Aireville Grange) also made a strong contribution to the Conservation Area.  
The extent of the developable area identified on Inset Map 1 together with the Development Principles set out in the third, fifth, sixth seventh and eighth bullet-points 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 Conservation Area.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      SP5

Paragraph

Site Reference      SK061

Settlement Comment Relates to      Skipton

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      Yes

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      017/17/SP5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site SK061; East of Canal, west of Sharpaw Avenue, first three bulletpoints

This site lies opposite the Skipton Conservation Area.

The Heritage Impact Assessment considered that the development of this site would be likely to have only a slight impact upon the setting of the Conservation Area provided that the development of the site complied with the recommended mitigation measures.

The first three bullet-points reflect the suggested mitigation measures and will help to ensure that the site is developed in a manner which will conserve the character of this part of the Conservation Area.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017                      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy                      SP5

Paragraph

Site Reference                      SK060

Settlement Comment Relates to      Skipton

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?                      Yes

Plan is DtC Compliant?              Not Specified

Representation Reference      017/16/SP5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site SK060; Business premises and land west of Firth Street, first bulletpoint

This site lies within the Skipton Conservation Area. The Heritage Impact Assessment of this site considered the existing mill buildings and the stone walls made a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area with the canal frontage being particularly important. The Hinchliffe Report specifically identifies four buildings for retention and conversion.

These Development Principles reflect the recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment and will help to ensure that the site is redeveloped in a manner which will conserve elements which make a positive contribution the character of this part of the Conservation Area.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      SP5

Paragraph

Site Reference      SK058

Settlement Comment Relates to      Skipton

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      Yes

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      017/15/SP5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles - Site SK058: Whitakers Chocolate Factory Site, Skipton, first bullet-point

This site lies within the Skipton Conservation Area. We support the requirement that development proposals should retain the two villa-style houses, the boundary walls on Upper Union Street, and that any structures should not exceed the scale and massing of the existing buildings.

These Development Principles reflect the recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment and will help to ensure that the site is redeveloped in a manner which will conserve elements which make a positive contribution the character of this part of the Conservation Area.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		SP5		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Final paragraph		Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	017/14/SP5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We support the inclusion of a statement which clearly ties the Development Principles into the Policy framework of the Local Plan.  
It is not sufficient to rely on the general development management Policies which are set out elsewhere in the plan to ensure that the development of each of these sites comes forward in a manner likely to deliver sustainable development.  
The development principles set out clear guidance to all concerned in the planning process about what will, and will not, be permitted on each of these sites. As such the help the decision-maker determine how they should react to a development proposal.  
The inclusion of this cross-reference to the development Principles in Policy SP5 is in accordance with the advice in Paragraph 153 of the NPPF.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	008	Organisation	The Wilman Family		
Section or Policy		SP5		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		SK089 and SK090		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Skipton		Representation Reference	008/29/SP5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Policies Map

#### SKIPTON. NEED FOR SEPARATE MAP FOR EACH ALLOCATION

5.70 A number of changes are suggested to the Policies Map for Skipton through this representation. These are explained at Section 6 and changes included at Appendix 3.

#### 6 SITE SPECIFIC PROPOSALS: SK089/090

6.1 Previous representations set out in Section 3.0 remain relevant to the consideration of the site and a series of further reports were specified at that time. However, whilst the site area has remained the same within the Draft Local Plan, the requirement has changed substantively. In this regard the Council has indicated the reservation of a substantial portion of the site for a primary school. As a consequence a number of those reports have not been commissioned until the general development principles underlying the draft Allocation have been established.

6.2 At this stage we are of the view that the Draft Allocation narrative, policy and the Policy/Proposals Map are not sound for a number reasons. Broadly this is in terms of inconsistency of narrative, policy requirements, a wider issue with the number of sites identified and the deliverability of the SK089/SK090 allocation. Our reasoning is set out below and amendments to the Policy and Proposals Map suggested in Appendix 4 and 5 attached.

#### School Use

6.3 A major change from the Summer 2017 consultation is the inclusion of an education requirement on the site. Discussion with the Education Authority (NYEA) suggests a potential requirement over the plan period for two additional Primary Schools to serve Skipton. NYEA suggest that school provision in the town is at or close to capacity and existing school sites “dated” and constrained in terms of the potential to further develop or extend; i.e. the sites are simply not large enough. NYEA advise that: “by 2029/30 there are forecast to be 1,062 primary aged pupils in Skipton Town based on forecast birth rates as of May 2017. Additionally, there are forecast to be 189 additional pupils from existing housing permissions, and 348 pupils from the proposed Local Plan allocations. By 2029/30 there is likely to be a shortfall of 480 places for primary aged pupils in Skipton Town. This figure includes the capacity provided by Skipton Ings Primary School prior to its closure in December (2017).”

6.4 NYEA consider the Local Plan as the appropriate route to identify new potential sites and they have advised CDC that it would be “prudent” to identify two sites for new primary schools. In this regard, NYEA have indicated the need for a site to the west of Skipton and a second site to the east of the town, prescribing a site of around 1.8has. As a comment this is somewhat larger than usually required, previous requests elsewhere suggest around 1.0 to 1.2 hectares is required per school. NYEA however, suggest that this is in line with Department for Education Standards to enable adequate primary provision with room for expansion, but also a combined nursery/intake facility and play areas.

6.5 Land to the north of Gargrave Road, partially within NYCC and CDC ownership has been identified as the likely site to provide a primary school to serve the west of the town. To the east of the town there are four draft allocations, with Site SK089/SK090 one identified to accommodate the primary school use. NYEA’s response to the current consultation is to “welcome” the inclusion of a site to the east of the town. They have however suggested the wording of the development principles be amended to: “A new primary school may potentially need to be provided on 1.8ha of the total site area of sites SK089 & SK090 to meet the educational requirements for Skipton over the plan period.”

6.6 It is not clear that the NYEA's comments add to the certainty and clarity required in the Local Plan.

6.7 In terms of acquisition of the site NYEA suggest that:

"We would be seeking to acquire these sites, where required, at no cost to NYCC, and in addition to the S106 financial contribution, through a S106 planning obligation. We would envisage that a Section 106 agreement would set out the timing and terms of transfer of the education land to the County Council for a term of years after which if the school is not constructed or development has not commenced, the owners may require the land to be transferred back to them."

6.8 It is clear from discussion that NYEA have not undertaken any detailed site assessment yet to inform their decision. They have however, provided an Education Site Suitability Criteria Checklist which contains a number of requirements to investigate; these include

- Suitability- slope and topography;
- Location – accessibility and catchment;
- Adjacent land uses;
- Site and surrounding area clear of pollution and contamination and similar risk factors;
- Free of encumbrances /obligations;
- Suitable and safe access; and
- Availability of services/utilities (to the boundary)

6.9 Having considered the other sites to the east of Skipton, a high level appraisal would suggest that:

- SK087 at 1.1 hectares, the site is too small and the triangular shape and location adjoining the A65 bypass raise amenity and suitability concerns
- SK088 at 4.5 hectares the site is large enough; however there is a slope across it which may deem it unsuitable;
- SK013: at 3.1 hectares the site is large enough but is long and thin and possibly not the most appropriate; and
- SK089/090 remains for further consideration.

6.10 On the face of it SK089 /SK090 is potentially large enough and the most centrally located of the options put forward. In principle the landowner considers the identification and reservation of part of the SK089/SK090 as a potential location for a Primary School as acceptable. As such it is considered that the description of uses on Page 58 and page 68/69 should be consistent; one describes C3 and D1 whilst one excludes the D1 (education use). This should be amended.

6.11 That being said, the site is not without issues against the checklist considerations including:

- topographical constraints; and
- areas that are subject to reservations on the freehold.

6.12 Along the northern and western boundaries of SK089/SK090 there are issues of severe slope which may be acceptable for housing but less so for a school site; or with a substantial impact upon build costs. The flatter part of the part of the draft allocation is toward the southern edge of the site. Also, there are two way leaves running north-south across the site comprising a gas main and a water main, each the subject of a no-build zone. There is also a watercourse which runs across the site which may result in complications for drainage and /or culverting required.

Residential Use

6.13 Whilst further work will be carried out (subject to discussion on the matter with CDC) an initial options exercise is included at Appendix 1. Development Principles Option 1 by PRA Architects sets out the site principles where a school could be located within the draft allocation. It identifies the part of the site which is due to being broadly level and avoids the two wayleaves. Applying these results in a net developable area of 4.99has.

6.14 A high level assessment of the yield of the site using a broad mix of housing types (in general accord with Draft Policy SP3) results in the following:

- 30% Low density 4 &5 bed dwellings at 20dph;
- 40% Medium Density 3 bed dwellings at 25dph
- 30% High Density 1,2 & 3 bed dwellings at 35dph

6.15 Transposing this onto the site suggests:

Density/ Area (Ha)/ Dwelling Yield

Low/ 1.5/ 30  
Medium/ 2.0/ 50  
High/ 1.5/ 52  
Total/ 4.99/ 132

6.16 Assessing the above yield would suggest a yield of 132 units with an average density 26.45ha. This is much lower than the Local Plan assumption. Applying the SP3 Policy 32dph would suggest a yield of 190 dwellings still some 15% below the Local Plan yield.

6.17 Whilst more detailed assessment may increase the yield, this would still be below the figure (of 218 units) in the draft Local Plan. Similar concerns should be applied to other sites to the east of Skipton SK087, SK088 and SK013, which may have reduced yields of 29, 120 and 82 dwellings respectively. This would compound the shortfall by 45 units.

6.18 There are two consequences to this, in that the Council will fail to deliver the housing numbers required for much needed market and affordable housing. Furthermore lower housing numbers would also have consequences for the viability of the Local Plan and the ability to deliver infrastructure; for example the new primary school.

#### Alternative Proposals

6.19 Given the concerns raised with regards to the current draft allocation we have explored two further options, these are included at Appendix 2 and 3. These are based on the scenario of “flipping” the school proposal on to the family’s land to the east.

6.20 A Principles Plan prepared by PRA Architects demonstrates what an Option 2 could look like. This suggests placing the draft school provision on land to the east which is generally level on a plateau without significant topographical issues, wayleaves or other encumbrances. In order to address any potential landscape concerns the mass of buildings and education facilities, along with hard surfaces, access roads and service areas could be focussed within the western part of the site area, adjacent the urban edge. Playing fields could be established in the eastern part of the site. In the broadest terms, this solution would not project further east than the existing urban area, or the eastward extent SK088 and SK013 when seen from strategic viewpoints such as Embsay Reservoir and Embsay Crag (as a general representation of the National Park). Indeed the school buildings would be seen against an urban backdrop.

6.21 As a consequence the potential yield using the same assumptions as set out in paragraph 6.13 above would result in the following yields:

Density/ Area (Ha)/ Dwelling Yield

Low/ 2.04/ 41  
Medium /2.72/ 68  
High/ 2.03/ 71  
Total/ 6.79/ 180

6.22 This yield still falls 20% below that set out in the Local Plan. Again as an initial response the yield may be higher; however, if the yield across SK087, SK088 and SK013 achieve similar shortfalls then the Council will fail to achieve the housing targets.

6.23 Option 3 suggests a bolder solution extending the SK089/090 allocation further to the east to include two parcels of land either side (north and south) of the public right of way – footpath. A Principles Plan by PRA Architects is included at Appendix 3. This suggests an extension to the site area of 11.58 hectares with an additional nett area for housing of 6.47has, could be achievable in addition to the 1.8has reserved for the proposed school.

6.24 There are fewer topographical issues on the land to the east, so different housing mix could be achieved:

- 30% Low density 4 & 5 bed dwellings at 20dph;
- 30% Medium Density 3 bed dwellings at 25dph
- 40% High Density 1, 2 & 3 bed dwellings at 35dph

6.25 Using the assumptions set out at Paragraph 6.13 above results in the following yields:

Density/ Area (Ha)/ Dwelling Yield

Low/ 1.94/ 38  
Medium /1.94/ 48

High/ 2.59/ 90

Total/ 6.47/ 176

6.26 Combining the outputs together would result in the following yield from Option 3:

Density/ Area (Ha)/ Dwelling Yield

Low/ 3.98/ 79

Medium/ 4.68/ 116

High/ 4.62/ 161

Total/ 13.26/ 356

6.27 Dependent upon the timescale for approval of any planning permissions it is considered that Option 3 would make up the anticipated shortfall in housing numbers in the settlement of Skipton. It is expected that the site could deliver housing across the Plan period and, subject to delivery rates, beyond. We consider that inclusion of the Option 3 scenario as the SK089/SK090 draft allocation would go some way to address concerns regarding the soundness of the strategy for Skipton in the draft Craven Local Plan. The proposed development limit should be amended accordingly.

Other Matters

6.28 Representation to the Regulation 18 consultation during the Summer 2017 suggested that a number of reports would be prepared to support the draft SK089/SK090 allocation. These included

- a masterplan;
- highways and access strategy;
- phase 1 ecology and walkover survey;
- landscape and visual appraisal;
- landscape plan;
- flood risk/drainage and services/utilities and ownership constraints mapping; and
- topographic survey.

6.29 With the inclusion of the primary /nursery school proposal, however, the majority of those studies have been put on hold until the Council provides some certainty and confirms its position with regards to the extent of the SK089/SK090 allocation and the distribution of uses within it.

Highways

6.30 That being said a Preliminary Highway Feasibility Assessment has been prepared by Local Transport Projects, (highways consultants) to consider the highways and access strategy for the enhanced site allocation and mix of uses. Their report is attached as Appendix 5 and includes modelling outputs for both the housing and primary school uses.

6.31 Draft Policy text suggests that:

“Access to SK090 is to be gained from Wensleydale Avenue, Otley Road and Elsey Croft.”

6.32 Their appraisal using, the North Yorkshire Residential Highway Design Guide (NYCC, 1999), MfS and MfS2, considers the policy content taking a view upon the following access points:

- Otley Road (A6069) to the north
- Airedale Avenue (via Hurrs Road) from the west
- Wensleydale Avenue (via Hurrs Road)
- Elsey Croft (via Moorview Way)

6.33 In concluding this suggests that subject to detailed design and clarification of third party landownership that, Elsey Croft, Wensleydale Avenue and Airedale Avenue in combination can serve the development traffic including the extended site area. It does however suggest a desirable solution would be for a new primary access on to the A6069 to the north to serve the development site, supplemented by the other access points.

APPENDIX 5 - AMMENDED SP5 TABLES

DRAFT POLICY SP5: STRATEGY FOR SKIPTON –TIER 1

Skipton is the primary focus for growth and provision is made for the following development areas to meet the housing needs, commercial and employment space in the town:

Housing Sites:

Site Ref: SK089 & SK090

Location: Land to the north of Airedale Avenue & Elsey Croft and east of railway line, Skipton

Net Dev Area (Ha): C3 13.26, D1 1.8 Total: C3 – 47.45, D1 – 3.6

Yield: 356 Total: 1540

Site Ref.: SK089 & SK090

Location: Land to the north of Airedale, Avenue & Elsey Croft and east, of railway line, Skipton

Uses: C3 Residential, D1 Education

Site Allocation Area: 22.27 ha [net developable area 13.26 ha; 1.8 ha for the provision of a new school in Skipton; green infrastructure area 7.01 ha].

Number of Dwellings Generated: 356 dwellings [13.26 ha x 26.8 dwellings per ha].

Development Principles:

A new primary school will be provided on 1.8ha of the total site area of sites SK089 & SK090 too meet the educational requirements for Skipton over the plan period.

A Flood Risk Assessment is required, as a fluvial and/or surface water hazard has been identified within part of the site area. Proposals for development on this site will incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), unless this is not possible or feasible;

The site is a greenfield site in a prominent position on the edge of Skipton, in relatively close proximity to the Yorkshire Dales National Park boundary. Development proposals for this site will incorporate landscape mitigation(s) including green infrastructure corridors. A green infrastructure corridor along the northern boundary of the site adjacent the A6069 Otley Road will be provided to maintain the existing open, rural feel of this approach to Skipton up to the railway bridge.

Existing woodland belts along the eastern and south eastern boundaries will be supplemented and strengthened. A green infrastructure corridor will also be provided to the south west of site SK090 incorporating an existing footpath running within the site adjacent to the south west boundary, providing links to the east of Skipton and beyond. A third green infrastructure corridor will also be created adjacent to the south boundary, providing a buffer between existing residential development at Elsey Croft and new residential development on sites SK089 & SK090. This area will also maintain an open feel to the existing PROW running along the southern boundary and through the eastern portion of the site.

Ground work assessment will be required as part of the on-site works to investigate areas thought to be of archaeological significance;

Development proposals will be carefully and sensitively designed to minimise visual impact on the character and appearance of the area, and include measures to minimise impacts on air quality, noise and light pollution. 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.

There is a requirement for a Biodiversity Appraisal to assess the existing ecological conditions on the site. This is to be accompanied by a standardised Biodiversity Mitigation Plan (BMP) which must cover matters of both habitat and protected species, with the aim that negative effects on biodiversity are avoided or suitably offset, and enhancement effects are implemented.

Access to site SK089/ SK090 is to be gained from Airedale Avenue, Wensleydale Avenue and Elsey Croft. A principal access from the A6069 Otley Road to the north should be considered.

Development proposals for this site must accord with local plan policies H2, INF3 and INF6 (which set out requirements for contributions towards affordable housing, education provision and sport, open space and recreation facilities) and all other relevant local plan policies.

APPENDIX 6 - HIGHWAYS ASSESSMENT - SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation Issues raised in this representation go to the heart of the soundness of the Local Plan and the delivery of the strategy for the principal settlement of Skipton. It is important that these matters are discussed in an appropriate manner in front of the Inspector so that due weight and consideration can be given.

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		SP5		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference		SK113		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Skipton		Representation Reference	017/23/SP5/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles –Site SK113; Land south of Skipton Auction Mart, Skipton, second bulletpoint

This site lies within the Skipton Conservation Area.  
These Development Principles reflect the recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment and will help to ensure that the site is redeveloped in a manner which will conserve those elements which make a positive contribution the character of this part of the Conservation Area

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      061                      Organisation      Candelisa

Section or Policy	SP6	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference	SG035	Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Settle	Representation Reference	061/01/SP6/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### PUBLICATION DRAFT LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION RESPONSE IN RELATION TO SITE SG035 F H ELLIS GARAGE, SETTLE

We write on behalf of Candelisa and the site's owners to fully support the draft allocation of the site in the Publication Draft Local Plan.

The draft allocation for this well-located brownfield site is fully justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy. The plan is also positively prepared as it relates to the proposed redevelopment of this site.

Candelisa currently has a pre-application enquiry with the Council and the detailed covering letter and heritage statement accompanying that pre-application enquiry are attached as appendices 1 and 2.

It should be noted that the Council's heritage advisor has commented on the pre-application enquiry and has raised no objections to the site's redevelopment.

The allocation of the site should be maintained in the Submission draft Local Plan.

#### Appendix 1 – Pre-application letter

##### PRE-APPLICATION ENQUIRY IN RELATION TO REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE AT SETTLE

We write on behalf of Candelisa in relation to a pre-application enquiry for the residential redevelopment of a car sales and maintenance site in Settle.

This letter together with the drawings package, design statement, pre-application enquiry form and fee forms the pre-application enquiry in relation to the proposal. Together with the architect and representatives of Candelisa we look forward to meeting with officers at the site to discuss the pre-application enquiry, in advance of submission of an application for the site. A site meeting with the council's heritage advisor and planning officer is sought.

Information on relevant heritage issues pertaining to the site is set out in this letter and the statement of the architect. However, on the basis that the scheme is at the pre-application stage and as we are seeking feedback from the council's heritage advisor on the design scheme produced, a full heritage assessment has not yet been produced. The need for and scope of a full heritage assessment to be submitted is to be discussed at a pre-application meeting.

This letter is structured into the following sections:

1. Summary
2. Relevant Information on Candelisa
3. Site Details
4. Proposed Development

## 5. Benefits Arising from Development

## 6. Local and National Planning Policy Address

## 7. Pre-application Feedback sought from Craven District Council

### 1. Summary

In summary, it may be noted that the pre-application enquiry is brought forward by Candelisa, a developer that specialises in high quality new developments, frequently working with heritage assets. This has included the award winning recent conversion and restoration of a listed building in Settle Town Centre to apartments. Working with a Settle based architect, the company brings forward a pre-application enquiry for the redevelopment of the Fred Ellis Garage site in Settle. The site is not allocated for a (retained) commercial use in either the adopted or emerging Craven Local Plans (and it may be noted that the town has extensive existing and proposed areas allocated or identified for commercial purposes). This site sits in close proximity to residential proper ties and a redevelopment has the potential to improve the amenity of existing residents.

The site has been identified in the Settle Conservation Area Appraisal 2008 as an ‘intrusive feature at the edge of the town centre’.

The redevelopment of this previously developed site can deliver a number of benefits including:

- Benefits to the Settle Conservation Area through redevelopment, acknowledging the ‘desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness’ as foreseen by NPPF paragraph 131.
- Creation of a high-quality design by an award-winning developer, improving the entrance to and perception of Settle more generally.
- Delivery of an apartment development which is well-suited to meeting the local housing needs of an ageing population.
- Supporting the vitality of Settle Town Centre and businesses by locating residential development in close proximity to it.
- Increasing the proportion of development on brownfield land with a reduction in the amount of green field land required for release to deliver Settle’s housing need.
- Replacing a commercial use of the site, which has been the subject of environmental health complaints, with a residential use. This has the potential to create an improved relationship with an amenity for the residential reuses that sit to the east and west of the site.
- Economic benefits associated with delivery of a substantial construction project, job creation, new homes bonus and council tax payments.

### 2. Relevant Information on Candelisa

Craven District Council is clearly aware of Candelisa as a developer based in Skipton and active in the Craven area.

However, it is considered important to outline the company’s experience in developing sensitive schemes of high quality design (involving heritage assets and in conservation area settings) given the conservation area setting of the proposed redevelopment site.

We provide below details of an award-winning project undertaken in Settle within a few hundred metres of the Fred Ellis site.

Other examples of developments involving listed or non- listed heritage assets (buildings and conservation areas) are provided at Appendix 2.

Candelisa’s managing director is a former architect and all of its staff are committed to delivering very high-quality design in its developments.

Cragdale Lodge, Settle Cragdale Lodge sits within just a few hundred metres of the Fred Ellis site in Settle town centre. Candel isa won a prestigious building industry award (‘best change of use of an existing building or conversion’ at the Local Authority Building Control (LABC) Yorkshire Building Excellence Awards) for its residential conversion of the former Settle police station.

The grade two listed former police station and court room, which sits within Settle’s conservation area, dates back to 1830 and was originally built as a private residence before becoming a police station and court. Candelisa converted the building into apartments, while keeping many original features.

### 3. Site Details

#### General Description and Existing Use

The site consists of a garage used for car sales, MOT testing and servicing facility that has occupied the site for some decades.

A number of images of the site are included at Appendix 1. It can be seen that the site consists of a number of utilitarian buildings of varying ages and design and materials. As noted later in this letter the site has been assessed to have a negative impact upon the Conservation Area.

The operator of the garage has noted that the buildings are uneconomical for a modern use being inefficient from a heating perspective and with offices and different uses

spread across the site in different buildings. The owner is actively exploring opportunities to relocate the business to modern purpose-built facilities in Settle, although as noted below the site is not protected in planning terms for a commercial use (so the relocation of the business is not a determining planning issue).

The site is situated in close proximity to residential properties to the rear. These residential properties pre-date the development and growth of the business on the site. Photos at Appendix 1 reflect the close proximity of the commercial uses on the site to residential properties. The business is open from 8-17.30 on a Monday-Friday and 9-16.00 on a Saturday.

Graham Tarn of Craven District Council's Environmental Health Team has confirmed that noise complaints have been received from neighbouring properties in relation to the uses on site, which include a number of noisy uses. The email at Appendix 4 from Mr Tarn confirms this.

The historic images below show that the northern part of the existing site (used for car sales) formerly accommodated residential property.

Above and below: 1909 and 1974 OS Maps show former residential uses on the northern part of the existing site.

In terms of vehicular access there is access to the site from both Duke Street passing the site and also from High Hill Grove Street to the rear of the site. These rear accesses to the site which pass through a residential area, are in use on a daily basis by commercial traffic associated with the business.

#### Planning History

Having reviewed the planning history of the site on the Council's website there are only applications for minor development such as advertisements on the site and none which are considered relevant to this development proposal.

References to Site in Local Plans (Adopted and Emerging) and Conservation Area Appraisal

- Craven 1999 Local Plan

The plan extract from the adopted 1999 Local Plan shows that the site falls entirely within Settle's Conservation Area (shown by the dashed red line on the image below).

The site is outside of an Article 4 direction area which took away rights for window replacement without planning consent, as shown by the unbroken red line.

The site was not allocated for a retained employment /commercial use in the 1999 Local Plan. It should also be noted that the site is and historically has been in a sui generis use and would not be covered by any of the plan policies relating to B-class uses. There are no other historic policies in the Local Plan which are considered of major relevance to the proposed development.

Above: Extract from CDC 1999 Local Plan showing site within Settle Conservation Area by dashed red line

- Settle Conservation Area Appraisal

The Settle Conservation Area Appraisal was published in July 2008 by Craven District Council together with Envision

The site falls within the Character Area – South and West of Centre, the relevant text and photo of which are copied below.

#### Character Area -South and West of Centre

Entering Settle on Duke Street, now the main road into the centre of the town, the proper ties standing back from the main road include large semis and terraces built around 1900. The first buildings of historic interest are the imposing Terrace of early 19th century houses included one house that was occupied as a school boarding house.

The group of smaller buildings including Undercliffe House and adjoining cottages was the original Girls High School, founded in 1907.

On the opposite side of the road to The Terrace, a modern car salesroom presents an intrusive feature at the edge of the town centre. On the bend, facing Undercliffe, is a group of Georgian houses set back from Duke Street, including the former Settle Post Office and houses now used as offices. The footpath continues into the Greenfoot car park alongside the sports fields of the North Ribblesdale Rugby Club. (RSL emphasis)

The negative impact of the subject site on the Conservation Area provides for the opportunity to enhance the designated area through redevelopment.

The Settle Conservation Area Appraisal recommended removal of the site from the Conservation Area as part of a wider deletion of part (PBC 03) of the designated area, as shown in the image below.

Above: Image from Settle Conservation Area Appraisal recommending removal of site from Conservation Area, with proposed revised conservation area boundary shown in red.

Roy Banks of Craven District Council has confirmed that this recommendation was not taken forward on the basis of objections from Duke Street residents.

It is noted that the Conservation Area appraisal for Settle includes guidance for Layout and Siting and Design of Buildings and Extensions. This guidance is incorporated at

Appendix 3 and the design of development has had regard to this guidance.

It is also noted that the Conservation Area appraisal does not assess there to be any important/ significant views into or out of the designated area through or across this site.

- Emerging Craven Local Plan

The emerging Craven Local Plan identifies the site within the Settle Conservation Area (and the conservation area boundaries) have not changed from those shown in the 1999 adopted Local Plan. As with the adopted Local Plan the site is not designated for any retained employment use.

#### 4. Proposed Development

The proposed development is the demolition of all existing buildings on- site and redevelopment of the site for residential uses consisting of 32 apartments.

The residential redevelopment of the site reflects the historic use of part of the site for housing, as noted in section 2.

32 car parking spaces are proposed, the majority of which are undercroft spaces. This provides a ratio of 1 car parking space to 1 apartment. It should be noted that the site is well - located for Settle's town centre facilities, including bus services and train station, reducing the need for owners to have (numerous or any) cars .

The design ethos of the proposed development is described in more detail in the statement of the Architect, Sandy Johnston. However, it is noted that the proposed development has been carefully designed to reflect its conservation area setting and the road entrance to Settle with high quality traditional housing to the west of Duke Street, opposite the site. Regard has been had to ensure that the proposals relate well to their historic context, in particular the listed houses opposite, while at the same time not slavishly copying existing buildings or proposing development which is pastiche.

It is also apparent that the Architect has used various different materials, roof heights and other design features in order to ensure that the buildings do not appear overly bulky or provide a monotonous street scene.

The design of the development has been undertaken with regard to the guidance from the Settle Conservation Area Appraisal on the design of new buildings within the designated area (guidance included at Appendix 3) .

Above: Street elevation facing Duke Street

Above: Southern elevation drawing showing relationship to proper ties at the opposite side of Duke Street

Amenity issues associated with the impact of development on residential properties in the surrounding area has been carefully considered. The separation distance from the eastern elevation of the new building to houses on High Hill Grove Street is c. 26m. Whilst the distance between windows on the western elevation and residential properties falls slightly below 20m reduced distances are common in urban areas and this is not considered to result in any unacceptable loss of amenity to neighbouring residents. It is also notable that there is existing overlooking from the site between commercial buildings, including first floor offices, on the site and residential properties and the redevelopment of the site will also result in a reduction in noise creation from the site.

#### 5. Benefits Arising from Development

The proposed development has the potential to deliver a large number of benefits in environmental, social and economic terms.

These benefits are summarised below and will be expanded upon in a future planning application submission.

##### Environmental Benefits

- Removal of existing development which has been assessed to be an intrusive element in the Settle Conservation Area
- Replacement of utilitarian design with a carefully designed 'gateway' development to Settle's Town Centre
- Removal of a commercial use with CDC's Environmental Health Team has confirmed has resulted in noise complaints from local residents
- The delivery of housing in close proximity to local facilities and services and transport infrastructure reducing the need to travel by car, with good safe pedestrian access along a short distance
- Use of a previously developed site for housing reducing the need for greenfield land to be used for housing in Settle
- Remediation of any contamination that might be found on site during the development process
- Additional patronage for local businesses in Settle from new residents

##### Social Benefits

- The provision of apartments varying the availability of house types in Settle

- Provision of a house type that is well-suited to the elderly, providing them with housing choice and potentially allowing them to vacate 'underoccupied' houses in the town
- Economic Benefits
- A multi -million-pound economic benefit arising from the development (at an indicative construction cost of XX the proposed development would deliver an XX economic benefit 1)
  - Creation of c.48 temporary construction jobs based on a ratio of 1.5 construction jobs per dwelling<sup>2</sup>
  - New Homes Bonus payment to Craven District Council or North Yorkshire County Council of £257,700 (based upon an indicative Council Tax banding of B £1,342.19 per apartment x 6 to calculate New Homes Bonus)
  - Ongoing annual Council Tax payment s of £42,950 from 32 apartments (compared to c.£12,000 business rate payment from use of site at present).

## 6. Local and National Planning Policy Address

### Local Planning Policy

As noted at section 2 the site is not designated for any retained employment use in the adopted Local Plan and the historic policies of the plan are considered of limited relevance to the development proposal , with emerging policies and NPPF pol icy considered of more relevance.

Whilst Craven District Council's Local Plan is still at an emerging stage and has not yet reached the Publication Stage, following review of the emerging Local Plan as it relates to the site we note as follows:

- The site is not allocated for a retained employment use in the adopted (and emerging) Local Plan.
- Draft Policy SP2: Economic Activity and Business Growth and Draft Policy EC2:

Safeguarding Existing Employment Areas refer to the safeguarding of existing employment land and existing employment land commitments for B1, B2 and B8 uses. The site is not within a B1, B2 or B8 use (and is sui generis) and the policy is not therefore relevant to it.

- The Vision for Craven in 2032 in the Local Plan refers to 'Most new homes are situated within and around market towns and villages (on previously developed land where it has been possible and appropriate),...The location, design and sustainable construction of these new homes, along with business premises and other commercial enterprises has reduced carbon emissions, fuel poverty and waste and respects the distinctive character and heritage of their surroundings, reinforcing a 'sense of place'. The new homes have good access by walking, cycling, public transport and car to local facilities, employment areas, town centres and the countryside. (RSL emphasis)
- The Vision for the Mid-Area of the plan-area (at p.24) states that:

In Settle, the historic market place and railway station on the world famous Settle-Carlisle Railway are the focal points of this well-connected hub for the Yorkshire Dales that has a concentration of shops, services, cultural facilities, creative businesses and industry. Older residents in particular are able to benefit from the town's intimate feel and large amount of facilities for its size. (RSL emphasis)

Based upon Candelisa's previous development in Set t le and the demographics of the town the proposed apartments will provide an ideal location for older residents, in close proximity to the town centre. If existing ageing res idents of Settle move to the apartment s this could free up existing family homes in the area which may be 'under occupied'.

- Draft Policy SP4: Spatial Strategy and Housing Growth indicates that Settle will receive 10.5% of housing growth in the plan-area. This growth will necessitate greenfield development however the site provides an opportunity for a substantial part of Settle's housing requirement to be provided on a previously developed site.
- Draft Policy EC2: Safeguarding Existing Employment Areas is noted but not of relevance to the proposal as the site is not designated for a commercial use. In addition, the use of the site is a sui generis one, and not a 'B-class' use site.

### National Planning Policy

The following policies of the National Planning Policy Framework are considered of principal relevance to the proposal.

Paragraph 23 calls upon councils to:

-recognise that residential development can play an important role in ensuring the vitality of centres and set out policies to encourage residential development on appropriate sites;

The creation of 32 apartments in this location will do vast amounts to enhance the vitality of Settle's town centre.

Paragraph 34 states that:

Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised.

The proposed location of the 32 apartments proposed, close to services and Settle station will reduce the need of residents to travel. The nearest bus stop to the east of Duke Street to the site is only around 100m away to the south.

Paragraph 56 states that:

The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment . Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.

Candelisa are committed to high quality design and the draft proposals have been carefully designed to promote a high-quality design at this prominent location.

Paragraph 60 states that:

Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles . It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

The proposals have been carefully designed to respond to the local distinctiveness of the built environment of Settle, particularly with regard to housing opposite.

Paragraph 111 states that:

Planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. Local planning authorities may continue to consider the case for setting a locally appropriate target for the use of brownfield land.

The proposals fully conform to this guidance.

Paragraph 131 of the NPPF states that:

In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

The proposals involve the redevelopment of a site identified as intrusive in the Settle Conservation Area. As noted in section 5, development will make a positive contribution to the economic vitality of Settle and it is also considered that the emerging design can make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness through its locally referenced design.

NB. At this pre-application stage we seek a meeting with the Council's Heritage Advisor on the emerging scheme. On that basis and given the stage of design an assessment of harm relating to the proposal is not presented and this would be incorporated in a Heritage Statement accompanying a planning application. However, based on the emerging design and the assessment of the site in the Settle Conservation Area appraisal (as intrusive) it is considered unlikely that a sensitively designed redevelopment proposal would be considered to create substantial harm, with either no harm or less than substantial harm occurring from redevelopment.

## 7. Pre-application Feedback sought from Craven District Council

Meeting with Conservation Advisor and Planning Officer

Paragraph 188 of the NPPF extols the virtues of pre-application engagement and states that:

Early engagement has significant potential to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the planning application system for all parties. Good quality pre-application discussion enables better coordination between public and private resources and improved outcomes for the community.

In line with our above comments in terms of leveraging the maximum benefits from the scheme, paragraph 190 states that:

The more issues that can be resolved at pre-application stage, the greater the benefits.

We request a meeting on-site with the Planning Case Officer who would deal with an application and the Council's Heritage Advisor. Attending the meeting would be the

Architect, Keith Southernwood of Candelisa and I.

Specifically, we would see confirmation that:

1. The residential reuse of the site is acceptable in principle
2. The emerging design ethos is acceptable
3. There are no heritage issues which would preclude redevelopment and confirmation that no harm or less than substantial harm would result
4. Required documentation for a planning application

We look forward to meeting with officers in due course.

#### Appendix 1 – Photos of Site

#### Appendix 2 – Information on Candelisa’s work in a historic setting

In addition to Cragdale Lodge, Settle, the following case studies are included to provide further information on Candelisa’s work in a historic setting (involving buildings that are heritage assets or located in conservation areas).

##### Peckett Well Mill, Hebden Bridge

Candelisa won awards for the conversion and extension of this historic grade II listed mill complex, dating from 1857 and including a multi-storey mill building adjacent to the western millpond, the engine house, weaving shed, old coach house, mill chimney and two weavers’ cottages. The development provided 12 apartments and 18 family homes.

##### Sutton Gate Lodge, Craven District

Originally a majestic Victorian country residence and then, in more recent years, a nursing home. Candelisa has now restored and extended this historic building into ten luxury, high specification apartments.

Candelisa was highly commended for its redevelopment of Sutton Gate Lodge at the Local Authority Building Control (LABC) Yorkshire Building Excellence Awards

##### Providence Quarter, Skipton

A highly prominent redundant office block in Skipton’s conservation area, Providence Place has been extensively facelifted externally by Candelisa, creating a more attractive development within the conservation area.

The redevelopment of the redundant complex has created a detached house, 39 apartments and a new office premises for Candelisa.

#### Appendix 3 – Guidance for Layout and Siting and Design of Buildings and Extensions from Settle Conservation Area Appraisal 2008

“It may be appropriate for the Council to include a policy in the Local Development Framework Core Strategy or Site Allocations DPD that advises: ‘In assessing planning applications within all Conservation Areas, Craven District Council will pay particular attention to the following:

##### Layout and Siting -

- New developments should be laid out to respect historic street patterns and plot forms;
- Buildings should be positioned where they will respect the arrangements of neighbouring buildings;
- New developments should not encroach into the settings of existing buildings;
- Views of landmark buildings should always be safeguarded, (eg. In Settle, those towards the Giggleswick School Chapel and Castleberg Crag);
- The siting of new buildings should maintain the line of the historic street frontages;
- Where historic land divisions survive these should be maintained;
- New developments should protect existing trees, hedges and other established boundaries;
- New planting on boundaries and/or replacement trees should be of native species appropriate to the locality;

##### Design of Buildings and Extensions –

- Building design should reflect the immediate neighbours in terms of height, massing, scale and fenestration (the majority of windows in Settle have a vertical emphasis);
- Building design should complement and enhance the character of the neighbouring buildings;
- Choice of materials and architectural details should be carefully related to the locally distinctive features of surrounding buildings;
- New development should use materials which are traditional to the conservation area and of high quality (the use of UPVC, concrete roof tiles or other non-traditional materials is not considered appropriate);
- High quality modern architecture that is well integrated with traditional buildings will be encouraged;”

(Emphasis added by Rural Solutions to criteria considered most relevant to this project)

Appendix 4 – Email from Craven District Council confirming Environmental Health Complaints regarding current use

## Appendix 2 – Heritage Statement submitted with pre-application

F H Ellis Garage, Settle  
Proposed Redevelopment

Heritage Statement  
November 2017

### 1.0 Introduction

#### 1.1 The Purpose of the Report

This Heritage Statement has been commissioned by Rural Solutions Ltd on behalf of Candelisa.

It provides supporting information for proposals to redevelop the site of the F. H. Ellis garage in Duke Street, Settle, which is within the Settle Conservation Area and opposite a Grade II Listed building. Craven District Council, before considering a pre-application enquiry, have asked that a specialist heritage consultant is employed to prepare a statement of significance, to have an input into the building design, and to prepare a heritage impact assessment.

This report has been prepared by Jonathan Ratter BA MA DipSurv IHBC MRICS following site visits on 30th October and 2nd November 2017.

#### 1.2 Historical Background

Settle lies on a main east-west route across the pennines at a point where the Ribble could be forded. The town developed at the foot of Castlebergh, the limestone crag that forms the backdrop to views towards the north. To the south and west of the town the underlying rock is Millstone Grit and marshy conditions meant that until a turnpike trust was established in 1753 the road from the south and east crossed Long Preston moor and took a precipitous route to Upper Settle.

The settlement has pre-conquest origins, but the street pattern and boundaries that form the basis for the layout of the present town centre and Upper Settle date from the middle ages, when Settle became more important than neighbouring Giggleswick. A market charter was granted in 1249 and there is a documentary reference to an old bridge at Settle in 1498. The earliest surviving buildings in the town date from the seventeenth century: in common with other parts of the north of England a ‘Great Rebuilding’ began at this period and continued for the next two centuries. A few houses in the town are recognisably of this date because of their chamfered mullioned windows and datestones, but others are now disguised by later alterations.

The majority of buildings within the Conservation Area date from the 18th or early 19th centuries, when there were significant changes to the town. The old route from Long Preston via Upper Settle that passed through the market square and Kirkgate towards Settle Bridge remained and is shown on Jeffrey’s map of 1771 (Figure 1), but the turnpike road that was created after the Act of 1753 took a different route. Duck Street or Duck Lane, which was previously a track leading to fields, was re-aligned and



widened and surfaced to become part of the new road from Long Preston and then re-named Duke Street in recognition of its increased status. Initially the turnpike road turned west at the market place to take the existing route to the bridge via Kirkgate, but in 1804 a new road taking a direct route between the market place and the bridge was built.

Improved communications allowed Settle to develop as a market town and a centre for a diverse range of crafts and trades. There were several old corn mills on the River Ribble and its tributaries that offered sites for the water-powered cotton spinning mills that were built as part of the early industrialisation of the textile trades, including Settle Bridge Mill, King's Mill, Runley Bridge Mill and High Mill. With this increased prosperity a number of houses for men with wealth from trade, professions or family connections were built or rebuilt in the town, several with fashionable late Georgian or Regency classical facades with sash windows. Humbler buildings adopted elements of the same style.

When a railway from Skipton to Morecambe opened in 1849-50 it included a station, later renamed 'Giggleswick', near the town, but the Settle to Carlisle Railway, which opened in 1876, had a much greater impact because the line was built through the town itself. A station with goods shed, cattle pens and water tower was built to a standard Midland Railway pattern and sandstone viaducts spanning Church Street and Kirkgate and an overbridge on Station Road became dominant features of the townscape. Although Settle continued to expand after the coming of the railways, its remote location and the distance from coalfields meant that its textile industries did not develop on the scale of those in some other northern industrial towns. A market place remains at its centre, with small shops, pubs and residential buildings making it an attractive place to visit or to live in.

### 1.3 Building Materials

The predominant building material in the central part of Settle is stone rubble, mostly local Millstone Grit sandstone but with some limestone. Before the middle of the 19th century stone of this quality would always be rendered, and although the original finish has been stripped from many buildings to reveal the rubble, numerous rendered buildings remain, mostly with a smooth render rather than a roughcast. A few of the more prestigious buildings are faced with sandstone ashlar and some later 19th century buildings use 'York Stone' - narrow uniform courses of sandstone with a rock-faced finish. Some stone slate roofs remain, and a few buildings have been covered with Welsh slate or artificial slate, but blue/grey Burlington slate predominates. Many of the windows have stone surrounds with vertical proportions, intended to take sashes. This reflects the late 18th and 19th century dates when many of the buildings were built or re-fronted and the surrounds project from rubble walls that were originally rendered.

Figure 1. Jeffrey's Map of Yorkshire, published in 1771, shows both the turnpike road and the old route from Long Preston.

Figure 2. The first edition of the six inch Ordnance Survey map, surveyed in 1847.

Figure 3. A detail of the 1847 map. 'Terrace' is the Listed terrace of 3 houses. A continuous block of buildings with a garden behind is shown on the opposite side of the road, on the northern part of the site of the proposed development.

Figure 4. The first edition of the twentyfive inch Ordnance Survey map, surveyed in 1893.

Figure 5. The second edition of the twentyfive inch Ordnance Survey map, revised in 1907.

### 1.4 The Conservation Area Boundary

The Conservation Area boundary extends to the south from the town centre to enclose buildings on both sides of Duke Street (Figure 6). The position of the boundary is not easy to justify as it includes 20th century development on the east side of the road that has no architectural or historic merit.

A Conservation Area Appraisal published by Craven District Council in July 2008 recommended several boundary changes, including the exclusion of an area labelled 'PBC 03', outlined in blue on the proposals map (Figure 7) and described as 'the undistinguished 20th century buildings at Duke Street and High Hill Grove Street'. These changes have not been implemented, but even if properties to the west of Duke Street are to be kept in the Conservation Area there seems to be no justification for retaining the 20th

century development on the east side (including the F H Ellis site) within its boundary.

Figure 6. A conservation area boundary map downloaded from the Craven District Council web site. The southern and western boundaries seem to be questionable as they exclude the Settle - Carlisle railway station and include some 20th century housing as well as the F H Ellis site.

Figure 7. An extract from the Conservation Area Appraisal published by Craven District Council in 2008 showing a proposed revision to the Conservation Area boundary to exclude the area outlined in blue.

## 2.0 The Site and its Surrounding Area

### 2.1 The Development of Duke Street

The creation of a new route to Long Preston and beyond following the turnpike Act of 1753 brought major changes to Settle. The track leading south from the market place was widened and assumed new importance as part of a road that was suitable for wheeled traffic, to replace the old packhorse route through Upper Settle. The road through the town from the market place was straight and level and several buildings were built or rebuilt in a classical style to face it. At the southern end of this widened street, where the road bends to the west and rises, there is a triangular area, now covered with asphalt, in front of buildings on the east and south sides of the road.

There do not appear to have been any buildings beyond this point. The Terrace, which is described below, was probably built in the 1830s, and the first large-scale Ordnance Survey map (Figure 3), which was surveyed in 1847, shows that there were buildings directly opposite at that date, on what is now the northern part of the F H Ellis garage site. These buildings are shown on the roadside, with a garden behind that suggests a probable domestic use. The 1892 and 1907 maps (Figures 4 & 5) also show buildings on the site but the 45-year gap between the first sixinch survey and the first twenty-five inch survey makes it difficult to be sure that the same buildings are shown. The surviving buildings next to the site have stonework detailing that suggests that they date from the later 19th century.

Old photographs said to date from the 1870s and reproduced in 'The Ancient Parish of Giggleswick', published by the Settle and District Civic Society in 1975, show 2-storey buildings on the east side of the road opposite The Terrace (Figures 9 & 10), but it is difficult to be sure whether these are the buildings that survived until they were demolished to be incorporated into the garage site in the 20th century, or whether they were replaced later in the 19th century. An undated photograph included in the book (Figure 8) shows part of the building that was demolished, and although its details are indistinct, the stonework of the chimney does suggest a late 19th century date.

The 1892 map (Figure 4) shows that although there were almost no buildings between The Terrace and the buildings opposite and what is now the Falcon Manor Hotel to the south, some development had begun. Four of the eight houses of Halsteads Terrace had been built, and what was to become High Hill Grove Street and its back alleyway are shown as paths. The 1907 map (Figure 5) shows further development of terraces, pairs, and detached houses, on the west side of Duke Street and on High Hill Grove Street. The roadside buildings on the northern part of the F H Ellis site are shown and sub-divisions of the remainder of the site are also shown, but the garage buildings do not yet exist.

Figure 8. An undated photograph from 'The Ancient Parish of Giggleswick', published by Settle & District Civic Society in 1975 shows at the right-hand side one of the demolished buildings on the site.

Figure 9. A photograph dated circa 1870 from 'The Ancient Parish of Giggleswick', published by Settle & District Civic Society in 1975 shows the demolished buildings at the roadside opposite The Terrace.

Figure 10. A second photograph dated 1870 from 'The Ancient Parish of Giggleswick', published by Settle & District Civic Society in 1975. This gives a more distant view before the west side of the road was developed.

## 2.2 Listed Buildings

There is only one Listed Building in the vicinity of the site: Figure 11 is an extract from the National Heritage List map. The Terrace (now 'The Terrace No 3, Windyridge and The Croft') is Listed Grade II and consists of three houses. It probably dates from around 1840 or shortly before and was almost certainly designed by George Webster of Kendal. He was responsible for Ingfield (now the Falcon Manor Hotel) to the south on Duke Street and for the Parish Rooms (now the Town Hall) in the market place. Both of these buildings are designed in the Jacobean style but Webster also worked in classical styles and used some Grecian detailing.

The three houses share a symmetrical façade, with the central house being emphasised by pilasters, a projecting central bay and a cornice and blocking course with urns. The adaptation of a palace façade design for urban terraces began in the eighteenth century, and this later Regency example has tall ground-floor sash windows with stone aprons, and projecting modillioned gutter cornices to the side houses. The dressings are sandstone ashlar but (unlike the Town Hall which has been stripped to reveal the rubble beneath) an unpainted render that is probably Roman cement remains.

The houses are elevated above road level and set back behind front gardens with sandstone boundary walls that have lost their railings. The 1847 Ordnance Survey map (Figure 3), that was surveyed shortly after the terrace was built, shows buildings at the roadside opposite on part of the site of the proposed development.

Figure 11. Part of the map of Settle downloaded from the National Heritage List web site. Small black triangles represent Listed buildings.

## 2.3 Topography

Although the turnpike road that became the main route into Settle from the south avoided the steep inclines and sharp bends of the old route, it was neither completely straight nor flat. As it enters the town it crosses undulating ground and follows old curving field boundaries. Beyond the Falcon Manor Hotel it rises and then drops down again in a gentle double curve, with rising ground to the west and a steep drop to relatively level ground to the east now occupied by 20th century housing and the playing fields of the Rugby Club.

## 2.4 Vistas

The southern boundary of the Conservation Area is near the brow of a hill, and on descending into the town from the south the curves in the road give changing views.

At the entrance to the Conservation Area the buildings on the left-hand side are set back behind gardens with their entrances above ground level. All date from around 1900 and are built of sandstone with slate roofs. Apart from some of the detached or paired villas at the entrance to the Conservation Area (which are not inter-visible with the development site) none of the buildings are of sufficient interest or quality to be considered for inclusion in a Local List.

When descending towards the town the former Methodist church is visible at the right (Photograph 5). Apart from the traceried window facing the road it is architecturally undistinguished, but it does make use of the change in level by having a full-height basement storey accessible from the rear. On the opposite side of the road Higher Halsteads (Photograph 3) is a terrace of four two-storey houses. Because of curves in the road the façade of The Terrace, which is the only Listed building in this part of the Conservation Area, becomes visible. Also prominently visible opposite is the light-coloured metal roof of the F H Ellis showroom, only partly obscured by a hedge (Photographs 4 & 6).

When progressing further towards the town centre Halsteads Terrace is at the left. This is a taller terrace of eight houses of two storeys over cellars with attic dormers to its steeply-pitched roof.

The F H Ellis showroom, with prominent signage and large display windows, is opposite (Photographs 15 & 17).

The road curves to the right past The Terrace, which faces an open asphalted area of car parking with a white-painted former petrol station building, before the road narrows to pass between the two stone buildings that form the entrance to the town centre (Photograph 10).

When travelling in the opposite direction, leaving the town centre towards the south, the view is terminated by an irregular row of buildings that includes the Grade II Listed Norland and Milford & Co premises (Photograph 13). The road curves towards the right and rises, with The Terrace and Halsteads Terrace visible on the right-hand side but with the open area of parking and the 20th century buildings on the garage site prominent on the left-hand side (Photographs 14 & 15). Where a building has been demolished to create the parking area there are views of the backs of terraced houses (Photograph 16).

## 2.5 Uses

Except for the F H Ellis site, which is used for car sales and repairs, and the Settle Christian Fellowship Church, the predominant use in this part of the Conservation Area is residential.

## 2.6 Boundaries

The sandstone walls that border the pavement on the west side of the road are almost continuous.

Most originally had railings that are now missing. On the east side of the road, between the garage buildings and the church, there are steel railings on top of a retaining wall. Immediately behind the railings there are larch-lap fencing panels, leylandii, and mixed hedging (Photograph 7).

## 2.7 Trees and green spaces

There are no mature trees on the site or in its immediately surrounding area, but the houses on the west side of the road have front gardens with shrubs, bushes, hedges and grass.

Figures 12, 13. The boundaries of the site superimposed on the 1907 Ordnance Survey map and on a recent aerial photograph.

Figure 14 A tilted aerial image taken from Google maps showing the relationship between the site and the town centre.

## 2.8 The Site

Figure 13 shows an aerial view with the site boundary. The northern part, opposite The Terrace, is on the site of demolished buildings and has a tarmac surface used for car parking and display.

A 2-storey flat-roofed detached building is set back from the road and used as offices (Photograph 15). Its white-painted upper storey oversails and is supported on two columns, suggesting an original use as a petrol station. Its rear and side walls are partly faced with stone, with stained timber cladding above (Photograph 19). It presumably dates from the 1960s. Its mixture of materials and window styles and the placement of openings means that it lacks coherence as a design and it strikes a discordant note. The main building is red brick with a curved metal roof. It has two storeys, with the upper storey entered at road level at the front (Photographs 17 & 18). The street frontage has a blue plastic fascia and inserted display windows. At the rear its full height is apparent. It is flanked by narrower buildings of similar utilitarian appearance., the southern one having cement-rendered blank walls. Photographs 19 and 20 show views across the site from the rear and demonstrate its negative impact on the appearance of the Conservation Area. Views of the site when travelling along Duke Street have already been discussed in Section 2.4, above.

## 3.0 The Proposals and their Impact

### 3.1 The Proposed Scheme

The sketch proposals are for a residential use as thirty-two apartments in three linked blocks. The frontages to Duke Street are to have a more traditional appearance, of three storeys with the third storey treated as an attic with windows that are less tall. The northern block, opposite The Terrace, is to be more classical in its symmetry, window detailing and pilaster strips, while the other blocks are to be more vernacular in style, with recessed glazing to openings that are reminiscent of the loading bays found in some of the 18th and 19th century commercial buildings in Settle. The rear elevations are to be more contemporary in appearance. No heritage assets are to be altered or demolished as a result of the development, and so the only heritage considerations are its effect on the setting of one Listed terrace of three houses and on the character and appearance of the Settle Conservation Area.

### 3.2 The Setting of The Terrace

The Terrace is the only Listed building that would be affected by the proposed redevelopment, and no unlisted buildings in the vicinity are of sufficient architectural or historic interest to be considered as 'Non Designated Heritage Assets'. The Terrace (Listed as 'The Terrace No 3, Windyridge and The Croft') is described in Section 2.2, above. It is late Regency in style and has an urban form, with three separate houses sharing a symmetrical front that gives them an imposing façade. Its principal rooms would have been on

the ground floor - this is emphasised by the greater height of the ground floor windows - and not on the first floor as they would have been in the 18th century. Buildings are shown at the roadside opposite on the 1847 map (Figure 3) and it is likely that they were there when the houses were first built. This suggests that the façade was intended to be viewed obliquely - the difference in ground levels would make a full-frontal view difficult even if there were no buildings opposite. The reinstatement of a building opposite will improve the setting by removing the present open car display area. Although the proposed building is 3 storeys, The Terrace is elevated above road level and was intended to be viewed obliquely in an urban context and was not designed to take advantage of any views.

### 3.3 The Conservation Area

The Conservation Area Appraisal published by Craven District Council in 2008 recommended revising its boundary to exclude most of the site and noted that it has a negative impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. However, it has remained within the designated area and lies on the main route into Settle from the south. The proposed replacement buildings will reinstate the demolished buildings at the north end of the site and give a sense of passing from the more open suburban outskirts of the town into the town centre, where the streets are lined with buildings on both sides. Separation into three blocks with differing roof heights and alignments will follow the pattern of development on the opposite side of the street, where there are terraces and pairs of houses of differing designs unified by their use of materials and overall form. The use of sandstone, slate and render for the new buildings and their detailing, including vertically-proportioned windows with stone surrounds, will help them to make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area.

### 4.0 Conclusions

The proposed development will have a positive impact on the setting of the only Listed building that is affected by the proposals, by reinstating demolished buildings on the opposite side of the road and by removing its present views of car parking with the backs of terraced houses behind.

The development will also have a positive impact on the conservation area by removing a garage site that has developed piecemeal over the 20th century in a predominantly residential area and creating a high quality development at the southern entrance to the town centre.

Because the buildings on the west side of the road are elevated above road level and Halsteads Terrace in particular has cellars and an attic storey, and because the proposed development would mark a transition between the lower density suburban development to the south and the town centre to the north, the principle of having a three-storey road frontage seems to be acceptable.

The use of natural stone and slate, with more contemporary detailing to the rear and traditional detailing facing the road, and the proposal to break the development into separate linked blocks also seem to be acceptable in principle. The outline proposals therefore seem to be suitable for discussion at pre-application stage.

### Appendix

#### Photographs

Photograph 1 Looking north from just within the southern boundary of the Conservation Area.

Photograph 2 Overdale - a villa on the west side of Duke Street close to the southern boundary of the Conservation Area. It dates from around 1900 but has some Georgian revival details.

Photograph 3 Looking north with Halsteads, a terrace of four houses dating from around 1900 at the left and the light-coloured metal roof of the E H Ellis building in the middle distance.

Photograph 4 Looking north with Halsteads Terrace at the left, the chapel of the Settle Christian Fellowship (which dates from circa 1910) at the right and The Terrace in the middle distance.

Photograph 5 The chapel of the Settle Christian Fellowship (previously the Skipton Road Methodist Chapel), at the corner of High Hill Grove Street, was opened in 1909 and makes use of the difference in levels by having a fullheight basement storey accessible from the rear.

Photograph 6 Looking north. The hedge and railings at the right hide a change in level.

Photograph 7 The roadside boundary next to the garage building is larch-lap fencing panels behind steel railings.

Photograph 8 The relationship between The Terrace, which is Listed Grade II, and the car showroom.

Photograph 9 The Terrace, which is Listed Grade II as 'The Terrace No 3, Windyridge and The Croft'.

Photograph 10 The northern end of the site at the right. The low wall bordering the pavement seems to indicate the position of the front wall of the demolished building shown in Figure 6.

Photograph 11 Buildings to the north of the site on Duke Street appear to date from the late 19th century.

Photograph 12 The right-hand two buildings on the east side of Duke Street (The Cottage and Devonshire House) are Listed Grade II.

Photographs 13 Looking south along Duke Street. The three storey building (Norlands and Milford & Co) is Listed Grade II and is described as circa 1840, altered mid 19th century.

Photograph 14 Travelling south along Duke Street, with The Terrace at the right and the F H Ellis garage site visible beyond the building at the left.

Photograph 15 The F H Ellis site.

Photograph 16 The view from the pavement outside The Terrace, looking across the garage site towards the rear of houses on High Hill Grove Street.

Photograph 17 The road frontage of the main garage building.

Photograph 18 The garage buildings viewed from the rear access road.

Photograph 19 Looking across the site towards The Terrace.

Photograph 20 The rear access to the garage site.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	062	Organisation	Francmanis Properties		
Section or Policy		SP6		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference		SG027, SG068		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Settle		Representation Reference	062/01/SP6/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

REPRESENTATION TO PUBLICATION CONSULTATION DOCUMENT IN RELATION TO 'LAND TO THE SOUTH OF BROCKHOLE VIEW AND WEST OF BROCKHOLE LANE, SETTLE'  
(SG027 AND SG068)

On behalf of our client, Francmanis Properties, we would like to SUPPORT the proposal in the Plan Publication Consultation Draft for sites SG027 and SG068, Land to the South of Brockhole View and West of Brockhole Lane, Settle and request that the plan be approved in its current form, subject to matters highlighted in Appendices 1 and 2.

The publication draft proposes to 'extend the net developable area and green infrastructure area on land to the south of Brockhole View and west of Brockhole Lane, Settle (SG027, SG068)', as shown on the image below:

Figure.1: Proposed extensions to SG027 and SG068 within Publication Local Plan (2018)

Our most recent Local Plan consultation response (July 2017) stated that there is already an existing planning permission for residential dwellings to the north east of the site (see Appendix 1). This area had been omitted from the draft Local Plan in error and should now be reinstated. In addition there is a triangle of land to the north west of the site which already has outline planning permission, but which is shown on one of maps in the Local Plan as being Green Infrastructure Provision. The map should be corrected to show this area to be Draft Housing Allocation (see Appendix 2).

Our client has previously demonstrated that the sites can be brought forward for appropriate development which enhances the transition between open countryside and existing development to the south of Settle.

A Site Concept Plan was produced for the combined site following a meeting with Katherine Wood, Principal Planning Officer at the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority in August 2016 and has been submitted to Craven District Council as part of previous Local Plan consultations.

Figure .2: Concept Plan prepared following meeting with YDNPA include shading to show area approved

The Concept Plan left the southern part of SG068 undeveloped and included a lower housing density in the southern portion of the development site in order to attain a more rural characteristic in the area beyond the existing development edge of Settle. Tree planting throughout the scheme would offer screening opportunities and views through the site to the existing barn to the east have been preserved, further strengthening the rural aspect of the area and producing a softer buffer to the site.

The sites potential for further development is acknowledged by the council in the 'Site Response Papers' (January 2018). The council's response to comments made on site SG027 notes that:

Whilst the majority of site SG027 has a planning committee resolution for approval, it is not yet a fully committed site as the Section 106 agreement in relation to affordable housing has not yet been signed. As such the full extent of SG027 will form part of the housing allocation in the publication draft of the local plan. It is agreed however that the net developable area for site SG027 and SG068 together should be amended to take into account land to the south of the site presented in the June 2017 prepublication consultation draft of the local plan. It is proposed to extend the net developable area to the south to increase the yield on the site from 34 to 57 dwellings. An area of green



infrastructure is also proposed on the southern extent of the site and represents the need for any new development to take account of the impact it would have on the nearby YDNP. Site layout should include 'fingers' of development rather than a hard boundary edge to the site, resulting in a more organic built form which would have less impact on views from the YDNP.

Furthermore, the 'Site Response Papers' confirm that the council have undertaken a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment as part of their evidence base. This report has indicated that the site is visible from the National Park, essentially due to the site's location adjacent to the National Park Boundary, but the council have acknowledged that: Although the site is within a prominent location, it is well related to the new developments on Ingfield Lane and Brockhole View and, as an individual site, is not considered to have a detrimental effect on the visual landscape value. (Our emphasis)

The Publication Draft now considers sites SG027 and SG068 jointly as they are under the same ownership. The sites are identified as having 'numerous positive aspects which have determined the sites' selection as a Preferred Site'. This revision is welcomed by and supported by our client.

The 'Summary of Issues and Recommendations' for each site contained within the Residential Site Selection Process Background Paper confirms:

Level 3 (Pass): The site is in FRZ1 (with small amount of low surface water flooding on southern boundary of site). The site is in reasonable proximity to the town centre to enable access to services and facilities. There are suitable access points.

In light of the above, the council confirm that the 'site is deemed sustainable in order to enter the Pool of Sites (with mitigation measures and recommendations). The site is a candidate for the Preferred Sites list for Settle'.

#### Comments on Soundness of Proposed Allocation

In line with paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework we provide the following comments in respect to the soundness of the proposed allocation:

Positively prepared – the council has positively engaged with the land owner and the proposal for the land will positively deliver growth.

Justified – The proposal for the land has been clearly justified in the supporting papers to the plan.

Effective – The proposal for the land will be effective as it provides for a viable plan to deliver both new housing and green infrastructure.

Consistent with national policy – The proposed balances effectively national policy's direction regarding environmental protection and housing growth.

#### Conclusion

The amendments made to and the inclusion of sites SG027 and SG068 as proposed within the Publication Draft Local Plan are considered to be deliverable and are supported by our client, the landowner.

A Concept Plan for the site has been prepared following a site meeting with the YDNPA in August 2016. The Concept Sketch Plan demonstrates that an appropriate development can be brought forward upon the site, which enhances the transition between open countryside and existing development to the south of Settle.

The council have acknowledged by way of their own LVIA that, despite the site location adjacent to the Yorkshire Dales National Park, the sites are considered to be well related to the new developments on Ingfield Lane and Brockhole View and is not considered to have a detrimental effect on the visual landscape value.

Given the above and the revised assessment undertaken by Craven District Council there is no reason why sites SG027 and SG068 should not be allocated as proposed within the Publication Draft Craven Local Plan. For the reasons set out above we consider the plan to be sound in so far as it relates to the allocation of this land, with due consideration given to Appendices 1 and 2.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID 005 Organisation Skipton Properties Ltd

Section or Policy SP6

Plan is Legally Compliant? Not Specified

Paragraph Plan is Sound? Yes

Site Reference SG025

Plan is DtC Compliant? Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to Settle

Representation Reference 005/01/SP6/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

These Representations have been prepared by Addison Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of Skipton Properties Ltd ('SPL').

Addison Planning Consultants Ltd have previously made representations to the Craven Local Plan on behalf of Skipton Properties Ltd, and their land interest at SG025, at each of the previous consultation stages. These Representations specifically address the proposed Allocation of Site SG025 under Draft Policy SP6: Strategy for Settle – Tier 2. SPL supports the Allocation of Site SG025 in Policy SP6 on the basis the development of the site would represent a sustainable and deliverable urban extension to Settle. The following background and evidence is submitted to illustrate how the proposed development could address the identified development principles (as set out in draft Policy SP6) and therefore provides evidence that the proposed Allocation is SOUND.

#### BACKGROUND

Site SG025 has been promoted as a suitable development site through the Council's Local Plan process since July 2006. A chronology of the planning history since 2006 is included with this Representation. The key points to note from the chronology are that:

- CDC granted planning permission for a 'Flood Meadow' scheme within the area identified for proposed allocation SG025 in December 2014. This scheme addressed two of the principle constraints to the delivery of development within the proposed Allocation – namely a flood risk/surface water management and structural landscape mitigation scheme.
- A hybrid planning application for a mixed-use scheme (housing and employment land) within the balance of the proposed Allocation was submitted to CDC in July 2016. The Application was recommended for approval by Officers but refused permission by CDC Members in February 2017 on the grounds of landscape and heritage impacts.
- Following the refusal of the above mixed-use scheme, SPL re-submitted the same Application to CDC in July 2017 and commenced discussions with CDC Officers and key stakeholders over potential amendments to the scheme to address the landscape and heritage impact concerns expressed by the Council's Planning Committee Members.
- Those discussions resulted in several amendments to the proposal including removal of the employment element of the mixed-use; the creation of a residential only scheme; increased landscape and public open space to address landscape and heritage impact concerns; and reduced net developable area. The principle of these amendments has been agreed with Officers, and the Amended Application proposals (submitted to CDC in August 2017) is awaiting determination by the Planning Committee in March 2018.
- In addition to the Amended Application proposals, SPL re-submitted the same "Flood Meadow" scheme as approved in December 2014, to CDC in December 2017. This was done in effect to renew the time-period for implementation of the 'Flood Meadow' scheme pending the Council's approval of the Amended Application for the residential scheme. The re-submitted 'Flood Meadow' scheme is also awaiting determination by the Planning Committee in March 2018.

#### POLICY SP6 – SITE SG025 DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES

Each of the Development Principles listed under Draft Policy SP6 – Site SG025 are reproduced below with commentary (and cross reference to evidence where appropriate) to illustrate that the Development Principles can be addressed in order to achieve the sustainable development of the site.

"The site is a greenfield site in a prominent location on the edge of Settle. Development proposals for this site should incorporate biodiversity and landscape mitigation(s) including green infrastructure corridors through the centre of the site and western edge of the site and connecting to the approved \_water meadows surface water management scheme to the south and east of the site"

“Siting and design of development on the site to conserve the significance of heritage assets (Grade II listed buildings of Falcon Manor Hotel and Ingfield Lodge and the Settle-Carlisle railway conservation area) surrounding the site and their settings.”

There is an interrelationship between the above two criteria in so far as the proposed landscape mitigation for the site addresses both landscape and heritage impact issues. A landscape concept plan has been prepared to illustrate how the landscape mitigation could be interpreted to include green infrastructure corridors through the centre of the site and the western edge of the site to connect to the approved Flood Meadows. The concept plan is overlaid on the scheme that was refused planning permission by CDC Members on landscape and heritage impact grounds in order to show the differences. This is referenced as:

- SG025 - GL0161 17 - Overlay Sketch Scheme (26-07-2016)

This landscape concept plan shows a view corridor widened from the Falcon Manor Hotel to allow for a stronger visual link with the wider open countryside and further reduce the scale and mass of built-form within the site (compared to the scheme refused planning permission). Widened view corridors will allow new landscaping to penetrate deeper into the development cells breaking down its scale and appearance when viewed from elevated sections of the National Park to the south and east. The scale of these corridors is more than capable of harnessing the growth and maturity of large broadleaved native trees. Highway access has been rationalised to further secure these spaces for landscape purposes.

The highways layout has also been rationalised to reduce its overall impact. A single central spine is now proposed with housing fronting onto new areas of open space accessed via low key lanes that will be detailed to respond to the more rural character and nature of this setting.

A view corridor from B6480 has also been introduced to allow green space with associated landscaping to penetrate deep within the residential cells reducing the scale and mass of built-form and providing visual link between the highway and wider setting of countryside. Development has also been pulled back from the B6480 to retain a landscaped frontage to the highway and existing properties.

“A Flood Risk Assessment is required, as a fluvial and/or surface water hazard has been identified within part of the site area. Proposals for development on this site should incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), unless this is not possible or feasible;”

This criterion refers to a constraint that has been addressed by the granting of planning permission for the ‘Flood Meadow’ surface water attenuation scheme. That is, an FRA has already been undertaken and approved by CDC. The Flood Meadow scheme is a Sustainable Urban Drainage system.

“The site is in a prominent location. Development proposals should be carefully and sensitively designed to minimise visual impact on the character and appearance of the area, and include measures to minimise impacts on air quality, noise and light pollution.”

This criterion is partly addressed by the proposed amended layout as referenced above. The Flood Meadow scheme also provides a landscape and recreation function to minimise the visual impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area. This includes details of plant and species and opportunities for ecological enhancements. These details have previously been approved by CDC as part of the Flood Meadows scheme. This is referenced as:

- SG025 - GL0161 13E Meadow Detailed Landscape Proposals

“Ground work assessment will be required as part of the on-site works to investigate areas thought to be of archaeological significance. This may include sub-division of the site to protect these specific areas within the site’s overall area;”

In relation to both the Flood Meadow scheme and the development scheme that was refused planning permission a Phase 1 Archaeological Assessment of the site was carried out. This concluded that the site did not contain any areas of archaeological significance. North Yorkshire County Council Heritage Unit also previously considered this issue in the context of the Flood Meadow application (the submitted assessment covered the whole site) and found there is ‘no known archaeological constraint’ (NYCC Reference 5062 PR CNY12841). For completeness, the evidence is submitted with this Representation to show there are no known archaeological constraints:

- SG025 - Archaeological Assessment

“Access to the site is to be gained from Austwick Close and Skipton Road (B6480). Development proposals on this site must accord with all relevant policies of the local plan”. The scheme that was refused planning permission by CDC Members (but not on access grounds) included a proposal to create a new access from both Austwick Close (the completed phase 1 of the development) and Skipton Road (B6480). In relation to the latter, North Yorkshire County Council as Highway Authority rigorously tested the design of the proposed new junction (a Road Safety Audit was also undertaken) and concluded that the junction could be safely delivered. The agreed junction design is included with this Representation submission for completeness:

- SG025 - Proposed Access Arrangement 8034-001F

The above commentary therefore shows how the constraints of the site and the proposed development principles as set out in Policy SP6-SG025, as identified by the Council, can be addressed through the design of the site and the technical solutions that have already been identified for access and drainage. The Amended Plans application submitted to CDC in August 2017 illustrates how the proposed scheme meets the Development Principles and can be confirmed as a deliverable Housing Allocation. The masterplan for the site and the detailed plans for Phase 2 are included with this Representation submission for completeness.

SG025 - 3901-012-PL04 Rev H - Proposed Masterplan Layout

SG025 - 3901-012-PL03 Rev M - Proposed Site Layout Phase 2

These shows that the potential capacity of Phase 2 is 65 dwellings; and it anticipated that the Phase 3 area will have a capacity of up to 70 dwellings. The indicative capacity for Site SG025 is therefore approximately 135 dwellings.

Site SG025 is therefore a suitable site for Allocation, is deliverable in the short term (as set out in the Draft Policy) with a willing developer that will deliver housing on receipt of planning permission.

#### SUPPORTING INFORMATION SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      SP6

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      SG060      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Settle      Representation Reference      017/31/SP6/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles - Site SG060 Northern part of Sowarth Industrial Estate, Settle, Heritage significance

This site adjoins the boundary of the Settle Conservation Area. The Development Requirements set out in these bullet-points will ensure that the site is brought forward for development in a manner which will conserve those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      041      Organisation

Section or Policy      SP6

Paragraph

Site Reference      SG025

Settlement Comment Relates to      Settle

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      No

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      041/01/SP6/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

I wish to make representations about Craven Local Plan.

The development SG025 is not a sound plan and should be looked at again. The site would be overlooked by walkers on the surrounding hills in the National Park. They would expect to see a pleasant green valley on the outskirts of a compact market town, not a housing estate. From the south, the view from the Settle Carlisle railway would be ruined.

Settle is a tourist town. There is very little industry there. The new houses would be occupied by second home owners and commuters from Leeds and Bradford.

The item is a flood plain, indeed the developers land surrounding the site asked if he could build a smaller number of low cost houses as the land is “subject to flooding”. The field is much lower than the land on which he was building. I feel the flood prevention work will not be successful as the water has no outlet and will undermine the railway banking.

Please look at SG025 again.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	018	Organisation		
Section or Policy		SP6	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		SG025	Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Settle		Representation Reference	018/01/SP6/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Inclusion of development at area SG025 in Settle is not sound since it is not justified and does not reflect the most appropriate strategy.

The proposed development is a large housing estate which is entirely out of character. The site is an open vista at the south entrance to the town directly adjacent to and overlooked from the National Park and alongside the railway conservation area. Construction of this housing estate will ruin it for ever.

Variations have been made to the plans to include green areas to reduce the impact on the listed Falcon Manor hotel but these limited measures cannot sufficiently reduce the overall impact.

Development of this scale is not need in Settle. What is needed are in-fill pockets of development in the town and in surrounding areas, not a large housing estate.

The site itself is fundamentally flawed as a location for housing development since it is subject to consistent flooding. The developer used the extent of flooding as the reason to reduce the proportion of social housing in the first phase of this scheme and the subsequent phases are significantly lower and wetter. Proposed flood prevention works will not work because there is nowhere for the water to go even if the developer can satisfy the railway authorities that the run off will not damage their substantial embankment which is doubtful.

In the circumstances area SG025 should not be permitted to remain in the plan.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development at area SG025 should be removed from the plan.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		SP6		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Final Paragraph		Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Settle			Representation Reference	017/24/SP6/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy SP6, final Paragraph

We support the inclusion of a statement which clearly ties the Development Principles into the Policy framework of the Local Plan.  
It is not sufficient to rely on the general development management Policies which are set out elsewhere in the plan to ensure that the development of each of these sites comes forward in a manner likely to deliver sustainable development.  
The development principles set out clear guidance to all concerned in the planning process about what will, and will not, be permitted on each of these sites. As such the help the decision-maker determine how they should react to a development proposal.  
The inclusion of this cross-reference to the development Principles within Policy SP6 is in accordance with the advice in Paragraph 153 of the NPPF.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      031      Organisation      Langcliffe Hall Estate

Section or Policy	SP6	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Yes
Paragraph	Draft Policy SP6 – Text box for Site Ref: SG079	Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference	SG079	Plan is DtC Compliant?	Yes
Settlement Comment Relates to	Settle	Representation Reference	031/01/SP6/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

- The treatment of, and Development Principles to be applied to, Site Ref: SG079 are neither justified nor effective.
- The proposed designation of a Green Infrastructure Area within the Site Allocation Area (in respect of which a separate representation has been made) is arbitrary and without proper justification, and it reduces the net developable area and thus the number of dwellings which the site can deliver.
- This is not an effective use of this housing allocation.
- A Landscape and Visual Appraisal (Wardell Armstrong, February 2017) has been supplied to the Council previously. This makes recommendations as to the extent of landscape measures which would be necessary and appropriate for this site. A copy of that report is appended to this representation.

LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL APPRAISAL INCLUDED IN SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS, SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

- Whilst it is acknowledged that the development of this site will, in its layout and design, have to incorporate, inter alia, appropriate landscape mitigation measures, the requirement for a Green Infrastructure Area (and thus the application of Draft Policy ENV5) is unjustified.
- A requirement that any development of the site shall have regard to, and mitigate any impact on, the National Park is addressed sufficiently by Draft Policy ENV1 Paragraph (d).
- The requirements to retain specific views of Barrel Sykes Farm and an undesignated former mill chimney are unnecessarily restrictive and without justification.
- The following modifications to the text box in respect of Site SG079 are therefore necessary to make the Local Plan sound:  
'Site Allocation Area: 1.745 ha (net developable area (DELETE 0.802ha) 1.096 ha (minimum)'  
'Number of Dwellings Generated (minimum): (DELETE 26) 35 dwellings ((DELETE 0.802ha)1.096 ha minimum x 32 dwellings per ha)'

'Development Principles:

- The site is a greenfield site in a prominent location on the edge of Settle. Development proposals for this site will incorporate appropriate landscape mitigation (DELETE WORDING BETWEEN BRACKETS - (s) including a green infrastructure corridor along the eastern and northern boundaries of the site) measures to mitigate impact on the National Park and the adjacent grade II listed building, Barrel Sykes Farm. (DELETE WORDING BETWEEN BRACKETS - The layout of the site will be designed to leave gaps through the site from east to west to retain views from the National Park to Barrell Sykes Farm and the undesignated heritage asset of Watershed Mill chimney beyond. The layout of the site will also ensure that views from Town Head Way north towards Barrel Sykes Farm and the Watershed Mill chimney are retained.)
- 'The existing dry stone boundary walls will be retained. (DELETE WORDING BETWEEN BRACKETS - A new dry stone wall will be created east to west across the site to enclose the northern strip of green infrastructure in order to maintain the setting of the adjacent heritage asset of the grade II listed Barrel Sykes Farm and to provide a clear definable edge to the development.)'

(NB no modifications are proposed to the other bulletpoints of the Policy)

- In addition to the above Modifications to the text of the Policy, the Proposals Map (Inset 4) will need to be modified by the deletion of the Green Infrastructure Area designation.

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	There will need to be a thorough examination of the Council’s justification for the imposition of a Green Infrastructure Area requirement on this site, which is likely to involve questioning of the Council’s landscape representative.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	---

Respondent ID      031      Organisation      Langcliffe Hall Estate

Section or Policy      SP6

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      LA004      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      Settle      Representation Reference      031/02/SP6/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Draft Policy SP6 – Text box for Site Ref: LA004

- Whilst a housing allocation in this ‘gateway’ location is supported, its physical extent is unnecessarily restricted.
- The northern boundary appears to have been drawn so as to coincide with an existing field boundary to the north of Barrel Sykes Farm’, which is on the opposite (east) side of the railway embankment. The more relevant visual reference is the Watershed Mill complex on the opposite (west) side of Langcliffe Road.
- The currently proposed northern boundary is therefore inappropriate and unjustified. It does not make an effective use of this housing allocation.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

- The Site Allocation Area should be increased by means of a northerly extension to the existing dry stone wall which more or less aligns with the northern extent of the Watershed Mill premises to the west. This would increase the site area to 0.81ha or thereabouts.

- The following modification to the text box in respect of Site LA004 are therefore necessary to make the Local Plan sound:

‘Site Allocation Area: 1.745 ha (net developable area (DELETE 0.557ha) 0.81ha)’

‘Number of Dwellings Generated: (DELETE 18) 26 dwellings (DELETE 0.557ha) 0.81 ha x 32 dwellings per ha)’

‘Development Principles:

- ‘The existing dry stone boundary walls will be retained. (DELETE - A new dry stone wall will be created east to west across the northern boundary of the site to enclose the field to the north of the site opposite Watershed Mill and to establish a new urban edge to the town.’)

(NB no modifications are proposed to the other bulletpoints of the Policy)

- In addition to the above Modifications to the text of the Policy, the Proposals Map (Inset 4) will need to be modified in respect of the position of the northern boundary of the site.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation      There will need to be a thorough examination of the Council’s justification for the propped location of the northern boundary of this site, which is likely to involve questioning of the Council’s landscape representative.

Respondent ID      017                      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy	SP6	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference	SG064	Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Settle	Representation Reference	017/32/SP6/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site SG064; Land south of Runley Bridge Farm and west of B6480, fifth, sixth and seventh bulletpoints

This site lies close to the boundary of the Settle- Carlisle Railway Conservation Area.

The Heritage Impact Assessment recommended a number of mitigation measures which would be required to ensure that the redevelopment of this site takes place in a manner which would conserve the heritage assets in its vicinity. The requirements set out in these Criteria reflect the recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment and will help to ensure that the site is developed in a manner which conserves the setting of these assets.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      SP6

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      LA004      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Settle      Representation Reference      017/30/SP6/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles - Site LA004 Land to the north of barrel Sykes, Settle, third and fourth bulletpoints

This site adjoins the boundary of the Settle- Carlisle Railway Conservation Area. Watershed Mill, the adjacent cottages and the mill chimney to the north-west of this site are important and prominent non-designated heritage assets on the northern approach to Settle.

The Development Requirements set out in these bullet-points will ensure that the site is brought forward for development in a manner which will conserve those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		SP6		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference		SG042		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Settle		Representation Reference	017/29/SP6/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site SG042 NYCC Depot, Kirkgate, Settle, first bullet-point

This site lies within the Settle Conservation Area and its access runs between two Grade II Listed Buildings (Bond End and The Victoria Hall). This bullet-point alerts potential developers of the fact that this site lies within the Conservation Area and the proximity of these Listed Buildings and the need for any proposals to ensure that the elements which contribute to their significance are appropriately conserved.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      SP6

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      SG079      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Settle      Representation Reference      017/28/SP6/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site SG079; Land to the north of Town Head Way, Settle, first, second and third bullet-points  
Sound

This site adjoins the boundary of the Settle- Carlisle Line Conservation Area. Barrel Sykes Farm, to the north, is a Grade II Listed Building.

The Heritage Impact Assessment recommended a number of mitigation measures which would be required to ensure that the redevelopment of this site takes place in a manner which would conserve the heritage assets in its vicinity.

The extent of the developable area shown on Inset Map 4 and the requirements set out in these Criteria reflect the recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment and will help to ensure that the site is developed in a manner which conserves the setting of these assets.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		SP6		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference		SG032		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Settle		Representation Reference	017/27/SP6/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site SG032 Car park, off Lower Greenfoot and Commercial Street, first bullet-point

This site lies within the Settle Conservation Area.

This bullet-point alerts potential developers of the fact that this site lies within the Conservation Area and the need for any proposals to ensure that the elements which contribute to its significance are appropriately conserved.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	009	Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)		
Section or Policy		SP6		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		SG025, SG064 and INO10		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Settle			Representation Reference	009/07/SP6/TS

#### Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY has recently responded to consultations by the Council’s Development Management Team regarding both of these sites, objecting to the amount of development at each location.

SG025 relates to land south of Ingfield Lane, Settle. The site currently consists of 11.43 Ha of greenfield land outside of the existing settlement boundary and thus currently within open countryside. It is a much-used amenity space, valued by local residents who have objected vociferously to numerous planning applications for various uses on the site and highlighted surface water flooding to be a particular problem.

It is acknowledged that the Council are only allocating 3.91Ha of this land for residential use and are including a 7.52Ha site area of green infrastructure to be included within the site in order to minimise impacts on the adjacent YDNP and the Settle-Carlisle Railway Conservation Area and the heritage assets of the Falcon Manor Hotel and Ingfield Lodge. However, CPRENY believe that the allocation of this valuable green space will undoubtedly impact upon these assets and designated landscapes as well as significantly alter the setting of Settle from viewpoints within the YDNP and from the railway. It is understood that the YDNPA expressed concern over the development of this site during a recent planning application consultation (62/2017/18067 and resubmission 62/2017/18067).

SG064 relates to land south of Runley Bridge Farm and west of the B6480. The site consists of 5.039Ha and a minimum of 2.6Ha has been allocated for B1, B2 and B8 usage – the rest presumably would be for residential use. The design brief sets out that this would be for ‘employment led mixed use development’ which would require an employment use to be permitted on the site before or at the same time juncture as any residential allocation could be permitted. Whilst the Plan does not set out the potential residential yield for this site, a recent application (62/2017/18064) proposed approximately 19 dwellings. This level of development would seem at odds with the settlement hierarchy set out in Policy SP4 at Tier 5 which directs only a “low level of growth to support a sustainable, vibrant and healthy rural economy and communities”. The textual justification at paragraph 4.53 explains that support for housing proposals (in the open countryside) will be limited to the special circumstances identified in the NPPF and the criteria in Policy SP4 point K. Policy H2 allows rural exception sites to be delivered however sets out at Point F that these schemes would be “in or adjoin any settlement in the plan area” – this location clearly is not in nor does it adjoin the boundary of Settle, therefore should not be considered as a suitable exception site location. Given the amount of employment land proposed within the draft Local Plan (SP2) and the fact that CPRENY have questioned the need to allocate 32Ha when the draft Local Plan states at paragraph 4.26 that the “realistic range of employment land requirement is relatively narrow (5Ha)”, CPRENY must question the validity of allocating this greenfield site which is currently within a prominent open countryside location.

The site is in close proximity to the Anley Crag Plantation and the River Ribble runs to the north of the of the site. The River Ribble feeds into the Long Preston Deeps Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSi). whilst the Council have stated a hydrological investigation and bird survey will be required as part of any application for planning permission, CPRENY would hope that a full HRA would be required.

CPRENY are of the opinion that both sites would impact on the surrounding designated landscapes, heritage assets and open countryside to their detriment and therefore should not be allocated for development as they are not consistent with national policy found in the Framework and cannot be justified.

#### Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation The appropriate allocation of sites is something that is important to CPRENY and its members, given the amount of constraints within CDS area, CPRENY believe it is vital that the Local Plan does not over allocate sites and chooses the most appropriate locations for development

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		SP6		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference		SG021, SG066, SG080		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Settle		Representation Reference	017/25/SP6/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site SG021, SG066, SG080; Land to the north-west and south-west of Penny Green, Settle, first bulletpoint

This site lies close to the Settle-Carlisle Railway Conservation Area.

This area was identified in the draft Conservation Area Appraisal as making some contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Therefore we support the inclusion of a requirement to conserve the significance of the heritage assets near this site and the creation of a green buffer to mitigate the impact upon the Settle-Carlisle Railway.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	032	Organisation	North Craven Building Preservation Trust (NCBPT) and North Craven Heritage Trust (NCHT)		
Section or Policy	SP6		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified	
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	No	
Site Reference	SG032		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified	
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	032/01/SP6/TS	

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

SECTION 4: STRATEGIC POLICIES AND SPATIAL STRATEGY

SP6: STRATEGY FOR SETTLE – TIER 2

We do not believe that the plan is sound/justified, i.e. that the plan is the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence, in the following regard:

Site ref SG032 Car Park, off Lower Greenfoot and Commercial Street, Settle (page 78)

We believe strongly that it is inappropriate to consider development on the Lower Greenfoot car park. If we wish to see Settle promoted as a vibrant visitor centre then it would be most unwise to reduce car park spaces for such visitors. Also, NCBPT has ambitious plans to develop the nearby Grade I listed “Folly” building and the Zion Chapel as heritage attractions for visitors and this car park provides the only convenient parking access to the buildings, especially for those with mobility problems. Additionally, it is one of the few areas of decent green space and mature trees within Settle that is freely available to everyone. The bird life there year-round is the best anywhere within Settle. The car park was created on what historically was called Paley's Puddle - it was lake. The rugby fields flood in winter despite the Club's efforts to stop it.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We propose that alternative sites are used for the potential developments proposed, assuming that there is a genuine need for such development.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	032	Organisation	North Craven Building Preservation Trust (NCBPT) and North Craven Heritage Trust (NCHT)		
Section or Policy	SP6		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified	
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	No	
Site Reference	SG025		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified	
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	032/02/SP6/TS	

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

SG025 – Land to the South of Ingfield Lane, Settle (page 80).  
 We object to the possible development in this area. This is a valuable amenity space including frequently used and admired rights of way with impressive landscape views. It is also important to recognise and respect that the fields in this area are part of the medieval settlements of Settle, Anley and Runley. Though not a heritage issue, we also believe that SG025 is a flood plain and common sense would suggest that building here would be inappropriate.  
 Building the number of houses proposed (125) will change the character of the town for ever and will destroy an area of great beauty and wildlife, not only from those at floodplain level but also for those walking on the nearby hills.  
 The inevitable extra traffic on Ingfield Lane and the main road will put an intolerable strain on the roads, and as many of the new occupants will work away it will increase the load on the A65 east from Settle.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We propose that alternative sites are used for the potential developments proposed, assuming that there is a genuine need for such development.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	032	Organisation	North Craven Building Preservation Trust (NCBPT) and North Craven Heritage Trust (NCHT)		
Section or Policy	SP6		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified	
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	No	
Site Reference	SG064		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified	
Settlement Comment Relates to			Representation Reference	032/03/SP6/TS	

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

SG064 – Land south of Runley Bridge Farm and west of B6480 (page 88)

The site is in an extremely important location, acting as a key gateway to Settle and Ribblesdale and right on the boundary of the Yorkshire Dales National Park. It is in open countryside, outside the settlement of Settle, and is highly visible from the well-used A65 and A6480. It is difficult to envisage a development which would not damage this high quality rural environment. Furthermore, the A65 is already a very busy road, and significant development here would generate yet more traffic on it, exacerbating the current difficulties. Whilst the need to generate economic activity is acknowledged, the main economic activity in the area is tourism, and inappropriate development would undoubtedly detract from the quality of the local environment.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We propose that alternative sites are used for the potential developments proposed, assuming that there is a genuine need for such development.

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	010	Organisation	United Utilities Water Ltd
---------------	-----	--------------	----------------------------

Section or Policy	SP6
-------------------	-----

Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
----------------------------	---------------

Paragraph	SG032, SG035
-----------	--------------

Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
----------------	---------------

Site Reference
----------------

Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
------------------------	---------------

Settlement Comment Relates to	Settle
-------------------------------	--------

Representation Reference	010/05/SP6/GC
--------------------------	---------------

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles for Housing Sites, Regeneration Sites and Employment

With respect to site references SG032 (13 dwellings), SG035 (32 dwellings); we are very disappointed to see no reference to SuDS within the Development Principles. The national ministerial statement on Sustainable Drainage is clear that major development sites such as these should include sustainable drainage. Even on town centre sites, the inclusion of innovative approaches to sustainable drainage should be considered by the developer and encouraged by the local planning authority. At the very least we recommend that the development principles for each of the above-mentioned sites outline 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 each of the respective Development Principles.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		SP6		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference		SG025		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Settle		Representation Reference	017/26/SP6/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site SG025; Land to the south of Ingfield Lane, Settle

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 Heritage Impact Assessment recommended that an open green buffer zone be retained to the south of the Falcon Manor Hotel and alongside the Settle-Carlisle Railway Conservation Area to reduce the harm upon their setting. The extent of the developable area shown on Inset Map 4 reflects these recommendations. Together with the requirements set out in the fifth bullet-point, these will help to ensure that the site is developed in a manner which conserves the setting of these assets.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      010      Organisation      United Utilities Water Ltd

Section or Policy      SP7

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference      HB011, HB024, HB038, LB012

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Bentham

Representation Reference      010/06/SP7/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles for Housing Sites, Regeneration Sites and Employment

With respect to site references HB011 (70 extra care dwellings), HB024 (27 dwellings), HB038 (19 dwellings) and LB012 (18 dwellings); we are very disappointed to see no reference to SuDS within the Development Principles.

The national ministerial statement on Sustainable Drainage is clear that major development sites such as these should include sustainable drainage. Even on town centre sites, the inclusion of innovative approaches to sustainable drainage should be considered by the developer and encouraged by the local planning authority. At the very least we recommend that the development principles for each of the above-mentioned sites outline 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 each of the respective Development Principles.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      038      Organisation

Section or Policy      SP7

Paragraph      Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Site Reference      HB026      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      Bentham      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Representation Reference      038/01/SP7/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The landowner supports the allocation of Site HB026 - North of Springfield Crescent and East of Butts Lane, High Bentham under Policy SP7 and has promoted land for development throughout the preparation of this Plan.

Preparations for a planning application in due course are being progressed along with engagement with housebuilders to demonstrate that the site can be developed. It is anticipated that development can be forthcoming within the initial period of the Plan.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation      We could attend on behalf of our client if considered necessary.

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      SP7

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Bentham      Representation Reference      017/33/SP7/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy SP7, final Paragraph

We support the inclusion of a statement which clearly ties the Development Principles into the Policy framework of the Local Plan.

It is not sufficient to rely on the general development management Policies which are set out elsewhere in the plan to ensure that the development of each of these sites comes forward in a manner likely to deliver sustainable development.

The development principles set out clear guidance to all concerned in the planning process about what will, and will not, be permitted on each of these sites. As such the help the decision-maker determine how they should react to a development proposal.

The inclusion of this cross-reference to the development Principles within Policy SP7 is in accordance with the advice in Paragraph 153 of the NPPF.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      001      Organisation      C/O Richard Turner & Sons

Section or Policy      SP7      Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Section 4      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      HB028      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      High Bentham      Representation Reference      001/05/SP7/OS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The fact that the Plan indicates Bentham as a Tier 2 settlement is welcomed. However, in the light of what has been said at paragraph 4.49 in the Plan in relation to the change of availability of allocations, this reference should be included within the box and may benefit in relation to being added to some of the other settlements to indicate that alternative sites could be brought forward if the strategy for a particular settlement is not being delivered. However, in the light of the comments made within this representation and our previous one, which I attach in full, it is considered that the reduced site HB028 should be allocated for residential development given the high anticipated yield from Bentham and the fact that the figures produced are regarded as a minimum. Allocating the site would not break with the overall strategy for housing numbers in the area.

In addition, as has been explained in our other representations in relation to the site, it is not less sustainable than some of the other sites that have been allocated.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND PLANS SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation      To ensure that my client's site is fully considered as part of the examination process.

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      SP7

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      HB011      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Bentham      Representation Reference      017/34/SP7/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site HB011; Primary school, east of Robin Lane, west of Lowcroft, High Bentham, second bulletpoint

The local planning authority is currently undertaking as assessment about whether or not High Bentham should be designated a Conservation Area. The boundary of the Conservation Area as shown in the draft Appraisal would run adjacent to this site.

This bullet-point will alert those considering proposals for this site about the need to consider the potential impact upon the historic environment

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	013	Organisation		
Section or Policy		SP7	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Yes
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference		HB024	Plan is DtC Compliant?	Yes
Settlement Comment Relates to	Bentham		Representation Reference	013/01/SP7/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We support the allocation of this land for housing under HB024. The land is both deliverable and available for housing development.

It is confirmed that the development principles outline in the proposed policy is deliverable.

- Access for emergency vehicles to access the adjoining site HB052 can be made available and is subject to discussions with the landowner - however, in principle this is possible.
- The PROW through the site can be protected as suggested.
- Any development of the site can be carefully and sensitively designed to minimise visual impact on the character and appearance of the area.
- The design will take into account the Forest of Bowland AONB.

Please also see the attached response submitted during the June-July 2017 consultation in relation to Policy H2 and this specific site. SAVED ON SYSTEM

Comments have also been submitted in relation to Table 6 - Settlement Hierarchy. Also attached.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	We consider this is necessary to ensure the site is considered fully. The site also needs to be considered alongside Site HB052 and we consider these should be considered together if required.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID      022      Organisation

Section or Policy      SP7

Paragraph

Site Reference      HB030

Settlement Comment Relates to      Bentham

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Plan is Sound?      No

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Representation Reference      022/02/SP7/OS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We consider the exclusion of Site HB030 is unsound.

Additional information was submitted to Craven DC at their request to provide a Concept statement.

This was in response to the Consultation Draft Summer 2014.

I have enclosed this report which we believe addresses some of the concerns raised in relation to this Draft Allocation.

This Concept Statement (attached) was produced and submitted to Craven DC and very little feedback was received - other than the site failing to be carried forward as an allocation.

We consider the decision not to allocate this land for housing is unsound - based on the further information requested and submitted.

We request the opportunity for this site to be considered further for housing/ mixed use allocation.

CONCEPT STATEMENT SUBMITTED AND SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The site should be considered further as an additional allocation to provide additional housing and mixed use development within High Bentham.

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation      To enable to a discussion on the site and inclusion as an allocation as this has been prematurely dismissed despite the Concept Statement being produced and submitted to Craven DC.

Respondent ID	039	Organisation	North Yorkshire County Council		
Section or Policy		SP7		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Bentham			Representation Reference	039/11/SP7/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Children and Young People's Services

We are pleased to see the provision in site HB038 at High Bentham that the eastern part of the site (0.3 ha of land) is allocated for the provision of an extension to Bentham Primary School.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      001      Organisation      C/O Richard Turner & Sons

Section or Policy      SP7      Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Section 4, Paragraph 4.57      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      HB028      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      High Bentham      Representation Reference      001/04/SP7/OS

#### Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Because of the positive preference of the site based upon the attached analysis from JMP Architects the site is considered to meet the sustainability objectives of the Plan.

A number of sustainability objectives were devised by the Council which each site within Bentham, including HB028, were tested against.

The main issues from the consultation on the 2016 pool of sites considered that site HB028 did not perform to an adequate standard in the sustainability analysis and the site was not deemed suitable in order to enter the pool of sites going forward. The reason for this was that the site was considered to result in a negative heritage impact with further concerns about location, access, agriculture and landscape, which were considered determining impediments to selection.

This effectively has resulted in a change being made to the plan with the site not being identified as a preferred housing site within the pre-publication draft and neither does it remain within the pool of sites for High and Low Bentham.

This is very disappointing for my client, who had put forward the site in good faith as part of the original consultation on the Plan. However, we have further considered the site including the points made and also the other sites within Bentham to see how they compare with HB028.

In total 20 sustainability objectives have been set out by the Council and my colleagues at JMP Architects, in agreement with my client, have amended the scale of the site and feel that this, together with an analysis of those sustainability objectives against the reduced site (see attachment A) produces a much more favourable conclusion for site HB028.

Some concern was raised by the Council around agricultural business issues but the Auction Mart and the fields immediately surrounding it have been retained for their current use on the attached plan and are no longer put forward for allocation at this time.

You will see that the site location plan attached indicates a reduced site. Crucially, this takes the site away from one of the major concerns, which related to the potential expansion of the Conservation Area and the potential for negative impact from development on the fields closest to the village. This in our view in itself puts the site in a different light in relation to the sustainability objectives and by comparison some of the other sites that have been allocated in the plan.

JMP Architects provided an analysis of HB028 (attachment B) against the 20 objectives devised by the Council. There is also a footpath which runs through the site which provides access to the railway station and in our view this is something that has not been fully appreciated in the original appraisal of the site. South of the railway line the path runs over land in my client's ownership.

In relation to heritage, and also already mentioned, the site no longer adjoins the recommended Conservation Area and neither does it result in any significant conflict with the heritage asset at St Margaret's Church. The document from JMP sets out the current scores for the site HB028 but you will note from this document that reducing the size, as detailed on JMP drawing L3489-01 (attachment C), would result in very different sustainability objective results and these are set out in the attached document. This results, in our view, in objective 8 turning from a minus into a plus.

Objective 12 relates to the historic environment, including heritage assets, and it is understood that this is a key reason why the site has been removed as a housing site from the Local Plan. However, the new reduced size of the site results in objective 12 becoming a plus rather than a neutral score.

It is also the case with regard to objective 13 because, as can be seen from the sketch layout attached, the site does not include the more sensitive areas but does offer the ability to enhance a section of the site in landscape and ecological terms that is nearest to an area that the Council have identified as sensitive.

With regard to objective 14 the reduction in the size of the proposed site allows a large area of open land to be maintained, which assists in protecting and enhancing the

open countryside and wider landscape character. While the layout sketch is purely indicative dwellings are set in a position to limit the views of the development from St Margaret's Church. The access is designed so that anyone entering the site could have a direct view towards the Church. When viewed from the Church the worst case scenario is that 2 or 3 dwellings may be visible.

Strategic objective 17 is given as a zero score but it must be recognised that this would be something that could be dealt with through the planning application process. However, in basic terms it must be noted that the site is on a generally south facing slope and this provides advantages that some other sites do not. Consequently, strategic objective 17 could have a plus score.

Overall we are of the view that JMP's assessment changes the performance of the site in relation to the Council's own sustainability objectives and serious consideration must be given to the allocation of the reduced area given that even if the housing number requirements set out above are accepted these are recognised as minimum requirements. Flexibility must be paramount given the number of sites that are anticipated to be delivered within the first five years of the plan period. Flexibility is also important if a higher number of open market house can help to deliver much needed affordable housing.

What this means is that the site does not perform in a dissimilar way to other sites put forward in the plan but, for instance, while the location of site HB044 would appear to be similar in distance from the centre, the connectivity of site HB028 for occupiers is much better. Crucially HB044 appears to rely on development on other sites being realised before a suitable access could be achieved. Consequently, it is difficult to see why site HB044 is allocated with a short term delivery time period within 1 – 5 years. Of the sites allocated HB044 is the second largest and because of the above mentioned issues questions must be asked of its deliverability within the 1 to 5 year period given its importance in terms of numbers to housing provision in Bentham.

Similarly site HB052 is considered as being deliverable within the 1 – 5 year period. However, it is further away from the settlement than HB028 so, in our view, scores no better in terms of the sustainability objectives and is indicated as coming forward within the 1 – 5 year period which, in our view, is perhaps optimistic.

In our view, and as can be seen from the sketch that I have provided by JMP, site HB028 could provide something in the order of 40 units in the 1 – 5 year period or the medium term period that the plan covers. It is certainly our view that it would be easier to bring this site forward within the 1 – 5 year period than some of the sites that have been shown as allocated for housing.

It is noted that a footpath traverses part of the site and provides access to the opposite side of the railway and to the railway station which gives the site good connectivity and its location in relation to the settlement would, in our view, encourage future residents at the site to take this footpath as an option to the railway station as opposed to driving through Bentham itself. A development of the site could also provide improvements to the footpath.

Allocation of Land for Housing, Craven District Council Site Ref: HB028 (part) – Land South West of Pye Busk, High Bentham.

The site for allocation (HB028) has been reduced to only include the land South West of Pye Busk Close, as shown on drawing L3489 – 01.

This revised site allocation has direct access onto the existing highway network and has an existing footpath crossing the site. Due to the sites proximity to the main B6480 and Pye Busk Close service and utility connections will not be an issue. The site no longer adjoins the recommended conservation area as outlined in the conservation area appraisal and the reduction in site area significantly reduces any conflicts with the existing heritage asset to the South West, St. Margaret's Church.

Craven District Council Local Plan Sustainability Objectives for the current HB028 site are as follows:

SO1 – 0

SO2 – 0

SO3 – minus

SO4 – minus

SO5 – plus

SO6 – plus

SO7 – 0

SO8 – minus

SO9 – plus

S10 – minus  
S11 – minus  
S12 – minus  
S13 – 0  
S14 – minus  
S15 – plus  
S16 – minus  
S17 – minus  
S18 – 0  
S19 – plus  
S20 – plus

Reducing the site as detailed on drawing L3489 – 01 would in our opinion result in the following Sustainability Objective results:

SO1 – 0  
SO2 – 0  
SO3 – minus  
SO4 – PLUS, the site has an existing access point off Pye Busk Close and an existing footpath crosses the site which would be integrated into any future design proposal. This footpath links the site to Cowslip Hill to the south east and on to the railway line and connected footpaths to the train station beyond.  
SO5 – plus  
SO6 – plus  
SO7 – 0  
SO8 – 0, as mentioned above the site has an existing footpath which crosses the site which links into footpaths connected to the railway line and train station beyond. The vehicle access off Pye Busk Close would also provide pedestrian access directly onto the B6480. When assessed against sites a similar distance from the town centre, for example HB024, HB025 and HB52, this site is at least on par in terms of connectivity.  
SO9 – plus  
SO10 – minus  
SO11 – minus  
SO12 – PLUS, the allocation site no longer adjoins the conservation area as recommended in the conservation area appraisal. The reduction in the allocation site also maintains the area of land between the existing heritage asset (St. Margaret’s Church) and the recommended conservation area. In terms of location to the recommended conservation area the proposed site now performs similar to allocated sites HB025 and HB026.  
SO13 – PLUS, any proposal would look to significantly enhance the biodiversity and ecology of the site. This would include detailed landscape proposals and arboricultural, wildlife habitat and species enhancements.  
SO14 – 0, the reduction in the proposed site allows a large area of open land to be retained which aids in maintaining and protecting the open countryside and wider landscape character.  
SO15 – plus  
SO16 – minus  
SO17 – 0, this is an item which could be dealt with during the detailed planning stage and in our opinion, is easily justifiable. The inclusion of renewable energies (solar PV, ground source etc.) and highly energy efficient buildings (Passivhaus Standard) could all be considered.  
SO18 – 0  
SO19 – plus

SO20 – plus

Reduced site HB028 in comparison to other allocated sites:

HB024

- Same classification of land as HB028 – grade 3 agricultural.
- Both HB024 and HB028 have a direct access onto the existing highway network.
- Both HB024 and HB028 have a public footpath crossing them.
- Location / distance from the settlement is very similar.
- Neither site adjoins the recommended conservation area.

HB025

- No current access onto existing highway network. Highways authority recommends access only off Butts Lane which limits the site to the north.
- No existing footpaths on site.
- Neither HB025 or HB028 adjoin the recommended conservation area.
- Location / distance from the settlement is very similar.

HB044

- Same classification of land as HB028 – grade 3 agricultural.

HB044 has no direct access to the existing highway network and would rely on the development of other sites nearby been realized before a suitable access could be achieved. Question how this can be deliverable in the 1 to 5-year time frame as the current local plan states.

- New footpath proposed on site HB044, site HB028 has an existing footpath which links into the railway line and train station beyond.
- Location / distance from the settlement is very similar, however connectivity from HB028 for the public would appear to be much better.
- Neither site adjoins the recommended conservation area.

HB052

- Same classification of land as HB028 – grade 3 agricultural.
- Both sites have a direct access onto the existing highway network.
- Public footpaths cross both HB028 and HB052.
- HB052 is further away from the settlement than HB028.
- Neither site adjoins the recommended conservation area.

N.B. REPRESENTATION INCLUDES SITE PLAN - SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

The site is considered to be sustainable when measured against the Council's sustainability objectives.

The reduced size of the site addresses any concerns about heritage impacts. Consequently it is suggested that site HB028 is allocated for housing.

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation To ensure that my client's site is fully considered as part of the examination process.

Respondent ID	022	Organisation		
Section or Policy		SP7	Plan is Legally Compliant?	Yes
Paragraph			Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference		HB025, HB036, HB038	Plan is DtC Compliant?	Yes
Settlement Comment Relates to	Bentham		Representation Reference	022/01/SP7/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We support the allocation of the following three sites which are all deliverable and available for residential development:

- HB025
- HB036
- HB038

The policy includes development principles which can be achieved.

The previous consultation invited comments which we responded to so we have attached these to this consultation for completeness and to save repetition.

#### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	We consider it necessary to be able to discuss the above mentioned sites should High Bentham and the housing allocations be discussed to ensure the correct information is made available and to allow any questions in relation to these sites to be answered.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	---

Respondent ID	020	Organisation	RSPB Northern England		
Section or Policy		SP8		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference		SC085		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	020/02/SP8/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

South Pennine Moors (Phase 2) SPA

We welcome the commitment to conduct a full Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) in relation to Policy SC085 at Glusburn, due to the close proximity of this preferred development site to the South Pennine Moors (Phase 2) SPA boundary. Golden plover are a qualifying SPA citation species and Curlew qualifies as part of the Breeding Bird Assemblage. As above it could be suggested that the preferred development site is less likely to support foraging Golden plover and Curlew, due to the relative proximity to a residential area, however an assessment of this will still be required as part of the EclA.

Survey and Mitigation

We recommend that for all preferred development detailed above, a reconnaissance visit is made to assess their likely suitability to support Golden plover and Curlew, i.e. whether or not they are pasture fields. If the sites are deemed to be potentially suitable, a daytime search of the fields for species presence should be conducted from mid-March onwards. We note that the local RSPB Group were consulted on whether they held any records of Golden plover in the Skipton area. It should be noted that RSPB Local Groups do not hold bird records and that any mention of species records may be anecdotal, unless a formal survey was completed. If birds likely to be associated with the SPAs are located on the preferred development sites, then formal surveys will be required to be undertaken to accurately ascertain the numbers of foraging birds using the land. For Golden plover, this will also need to include night-time surveys to account for foraging males. We would be happy to be consulted on the methodology required for such a survey if required.

If foraging SPA species are found to be using the preferred development sites mentioned above, there will also be a requirement to appropriately identify and acquire suitable land elsewhere within the area as part of the Biodiversity Mitigation Plans, in order to mitigate against the loss of important functionally linked foraging land.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      030      Organisation      Glusburn Holdings Ltd

Section or Policy      SP8

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      SC037(a), SC085, SC014      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Yes

Settlement Comment Relates to      Glusburn and Crosshills      Representation Reference      030/02/SP8/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

With regard to Site Ref SC037(a) - land at Ashfield Farm, Skipton Road, Crosshills - we note that the Residential Site Selection Process background paper indicates that the Council consider this site comprises previously developed land. the 'Narrative of Site Analysis' includes the comments that "The site has been used previously as farm buildings, and therefore it is a brownfield site which is suitable for development and preferable over a greenfield site". (Our emphasis)

The National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') includes a definition of previously developed land (within the Glossary at Annex"), which confirms that "land that is or has been occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings" is excluded from this definition. On the basis of the content of the Residential Site Selection Process background paper therefore it appears that the site may be greenfield rather than brownfield land. As a result we object to the allocation of this site.

It is also noted that, whilst Draft Policy SP4 proposes housing provision of approximately 8 net dwellings per annum in Glusburn/Crosshills, the content of Draft Policy SP8 in the Pre-Publication Draft Local Plan confirmed that the Council anticipate that all 58 units due to come forward from the two site allocations in the area will be delivered in the short to medium term (within 5 years). As a result the Draft Local Plan makes no provision for any housing to come forward in Glusburn/Crosshills in the medium and long term (from years 6 to 15).

This would also have a knock-on effect of meaning it is unlikely that any new affordable housing would be delivered in the area in the medium and long term. On the matter of affordable housing, the nature of development envisaged at Site Ref. SC085 is such that it may not be viable for that development to accommodate a policy compliant level of affordable housing - or indeed any affordable housing at all (given the complexities and potential high cost of converting listed buildings).

Further to our separate representations regarding Draft Policy SP4 including in relation to the role of Glusburn/Crosshills and it's existing infrastructure, it is considered that the village can and should accommodate more housing development in the plan period and that the Draft Local Plan should be amended to include an additional housing allocation(s) to achieve this; to increase the supply of both open market and affordable housing in this Local Service Centre throughout the plan period.

Furthermore we promote the allocation of land in our client's ownership, comprising land to the south and west of Hayfield Mills (SC014), for housing development. The land in question is surplus to requirements (unlike the adjoining active employment site/buildings) and readily available for development.

The site provides a sequentially preferable and lower impact alternative to deliver more homes than potential alternative additional housing sites that have been considered in the past, including greenfield sites on the edge of the urban area.

It comprises previously developed land in a highly sustainable location, in close proximity to the centre of the village and its amenities and a frequent bus service. It is also a far less prominent location than other potential additional housing allocations on the edge of the village, such that its development would have much less negative impact on

the likes of the local landscape and the character and appearance of the village and surrounding countryside.

Enclosed with these representations is a copy of the indicative site layout that accompanied planning application reference 32/2010/11224 and demonstrates the site can accommodate approximately 67 dwellings (49 houses, 18 apartments) in a manner that would have an entirely acceptable impact from a technical perspective (e.g. impact on trees, ecology and residential amenity) and would also deliver an area of open space incorporating a play area. It is also anticipated that it would be viable for a scheme of this nature to deliver a policy compliant level of affordable housing.

Planning application 32/2010/11224 was withdrawn after it became clear shortly after submission of the application that the Environment Agency's (EA's) Flood Map had been amended to indicate that the site is at greater risk of flooding than had previously been envisaged, which in turn affected the apparent suitability of the site for housing development. More recently this matter has been the subject of further investigation by Waterco on behalf of our client, who have prepared a Flood Risk Assessment, undertaken hydraulic modelling and a Flood Map Review. A copy of the last of these documents/assessments accompanies these representations and the previous assessments prepared by Waterco can be provided on request to inform the Inspector's assessment of this site.

Ultimately Waterco consider that the site's development in the manner shown on the indicative site layout enclosed is deliverable from a flood risk perspective, including in the context of the Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance and subject to mitigation measures such as localised land raising (which they consider would not have a material harmful effect on other properties nearby from a flood risk perspective, based on their assessments to date).

It is recognised that EA agreement would be in this respect, but Waterco are confident this could be achieved at planning application stage. We also understand that updated EA data will also be made available in due course, which may result in positive changes to the EA Flood Map in respect of our client's site without the need for further site specific modelling and assessment.

In the meantime we assert that the extensive work undertaken by Waterco to date demonstrates that housing development of the land to the south and west of Hayfield Mills is deliverable from a flood risk perspective and that this land should be considered for allocation for housing development accordingly- particularly mindful of the sustainability credentials of this site.

The Residential Site Selection Process background paper confirms that the Council has rejected this site immediately due to the EA Flood Map, but in light of the findings of the previous detailed work by Waterco we would encourage giving consideration to the allocation of this site, particularly as Waterco consider the site to be deliverable from a flood risk perspective and mindful of the site's status as previously developed land in a sustainable location.

In light of the main merits of our client's site and our separate comments about the need for and benefits of allocating additional land in the area for housing development, it is asserted that the Draft Local Plan should be amended to encourage the bringing forward of the previously developed land at Hayfield Mills that is surplus to requirements.

Taking account of the evidence submitted previously about the potential layout and capacity of the development of our client's site (including the enclosed indicative layout featuring 67 dwellings, which was submitted with planning application reference 32/2010/11224 and informed by the various technical reports/assessments that accompanied that application such as an Arboricultural Statement, Noise Assessment Report and Transport Statement - copies of which can be provided on request), it is considered that the land to the south and west of Hayfield Mills could make a material contribution to the housing delivery in the district, in an accessible location within a Local Service Centre.

With reference to the tests of soundness, it is submitted that Draft Policy SP8 is:



1. Not positively prepared - as it features a low level of housing growth/development in Glusburn/Crosshills (and more specifically excludes previously developed land in a sustainable location at Hayfield Mills that is surplus to requirements) that does not fulfil the potential that this area has to accommodate further development as part of a sustainable pattern of growth, including mindful of its existing size/population, range of amenities and consequent status as a Level 3 retail centre.
2. Not justified - as it is considered that the proposed reduction in the level of housing growth/development in Glusburn/Crosshills as compared to earlier drafts of the Local Plan and exclusion of the land at Hayfield Mills in question is not justified.
3. Not effective - as it stymies the potential for Glusburn/Crosshills to fulfil its role as a local service centre and make a more meaningful contribution to housing delivery in the district and a sustainable pattern of growth and enhance the prospects of delivering the number of homes required (both in Glusburn/Crosshills and district wide) in the plan period, including by way of encouraging/facilitating the bringing forward of the land at Hayfield Mills for development for housing purposes.
4. Not consistent with national policy - as it does not take the opportunity to enhance the potential to deliver sustainable development including a sustainable pattern of growth in the district, including by way of encouraging the beneficial redevelopment of the previously developed land at Hayfield Mills that is surplus to requirements and readily available for redevelopment.

FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT AND SITE LAYOUT PLAN INCLUDED WITH REPRESENTATION. SAVED ON SYSTEM

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

It is considered that Policy SP8 should be amended to include the allocation of land to the south and west of Hayfield Mills - which comprises previously developed land in a sustainable location that is surplus to requirements- for housing development of up to 67 dwellings, either in place of or in addition to the apparent greenfield site allocation at Ashfield Farm, Skipton Road, Crosshills.

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	Given the nature of our representations in response to Draft Policies SP4, SP8, EC2 and Inset Map 2, we consider that it would be beneficial to have the opportunity to explain and expand on our comments in relation to this proposed development site - and for related discussions to take place on the range of issues involved and the Council’s justification for excluding the site from its proposed housing allocations despite its clear sustainability credentials and the Council’s own support for the site earlier in the Local Plan preparation process - as part of the oral examination.
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent ID      006      Organisation

Section or Policy      SP8

Paragraph

Site Reference      SC061

Settlement Comment Relates to      Glusburn

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Yes

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      006/01/SP8/OS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Dear Sir/Madam

I am not contesting the legality of the local plan i am just asking you to reconsider the exclusion of SC061 land west of Glusburn Cornmill from the plan as I believe the reasons not to include the land are mistaken and therefore merit another look . In the result it states the site has `surface water problems to the south ` but to the south is the beck and the beck has never flooded nor is there standing water on the land and indeed the land is higher than the land on the other side of the beck namely Malsis School which has been passed for planning . Also it states that `to gain access to the site and begin development a number of trees would have to be removed ` these trees were not present 10 years ago and are Alder which are a pioneer species which have self propagated and grow like weeds and are not quality woodland or species like the ones being removed in the malsis development in fact if the land was passed for inclusion and later developed at the far west of the land which could not be developed I would be more than willing to plant quality species extending the wood and creating a pleasant conservation area for local wildlife and the community .

I hope you can see that this brown field site should be included as it can serve no other purpose than to be developed and provide a pleasant environment to live in .

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      SP8

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      No

Site Reference      SC085      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Glusburn and Crosshills      Representation Reference      017/36/SP7/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site SC085; Land at Malsis, Glusburn, Inset Map 2

Unsound

This site contains three Grade II Listed structures - Malsis Hall, its lodge and its gate piers and railings.

The Heritage Impact Assessment considered that the open parkland contributes to the setting of these buildings and that development within its grounds would have a very large adverse impact upon the setting of Malsis Hall and the Lodge.

Whilst we support the Development Principles relating to the conversion of the buildings and protection of the Parkland around the buildings, Inset Map 2 identifies most of this site (including large stretches of the Parkland) as a “Draft Housing-led Development Allocation”. This gives the impression that residential development could, potentially, occur on any part of this site.

In order to make it explicit which areas are appropriate for future development (and demonstrate that this allocation would be likely to lead to sustainable development in terms of the conservation of the historic environment), the developable area should be limited to the extent of the existing buildings (as originally identified on the corresponding Map on the Pre- Publication Draft).

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Amend Inset Map 2 so that the developable area of Site SC085 is limited to the extent of the existing buildings (as originally identified on the corresponding Map on the Pre-Publication Draft)

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		SP8		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Glusburn and Crosshills		Representation Reference	017/35/SP8/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy SP8, final Paragraph

We support the inclusion of a statement which clearly ties the Development Principles into the Policy framework of the Local Plan.  
It is not sufficient to rely on the general development management Policies which are set out elsewhere in the plan to ensure that the development of each of these sites comes forward in a manner likely to deliver sustainable development.  
The development principles set out clear guidance to all concerned in the planning process about what will, and will not, be permitted on each of these sites. As such the help the decision-maker determine how they should react to a development proposal.  
The inclusion of this cross-reference to the development Principles within Policy SP8 is in accordance with the advice in Paragraph 153 of the NPPF.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      SP9

Paragraph

Site Reference      IN010

Settlement Comment Relates to      Ingleton

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      017/39/SP9/CN

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site IN010; Caravan Park, north of River Greta, first bullet-point

Factual correction

Although this site lies adjacent to the Ingleton Conservation Area, the caravan site makes little contribution to its character and the redevelopment of the site could provide an opportunity to enhance the Conservation Area.

Therefore we welcome in the first bullet-point for the requirement for the siting and design of development to conserve the significance of heritage assets. However, there are no designated heritage assets actually on the site itself.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site IN010, first bulletpoint amend to read:-

“... to conserve the significance of nearby heritage assets ...”

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	051	Organisation	Natural England		
Section or Policy		SP9		Plan is Legally Compliant?	No
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		IN010, IN022, IN028, IN029, IN035		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	051/08/SP9/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Landscape Visual Impact Assessment

Development Principles

One of the key conclusions of the report is to suggest the need for detailed LVIA at project stage for a number of sites. We note that this has been carried forward in the plan in some cases and welcome this but note that a number of sites do not have this requirement. We advise that following sites should also include the requirement for LVIA at the project stage in the development principles:

- IN010
- IN022
- IN028
- IN029
- IN035

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      SP9

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      IN028      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Ingleborough      Representation Reference      017/40/SP9/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site IN028; Between Ingleborough Park Drive and Low Demesne, first bullet-point

This site lies close to the boundary of the Ingleton Conservation Area. This bullet-point alerts potential developers of the proximity of the Conservation Area and the need for any proposals to ensure that the elements which contribute to its significance are appropriately conserved.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017                      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy                      SP9

Paragraph

Site Reference                      IN006

Settlement Comment Relates to      Ingleton

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?                      Not Specified

Plan is DtC Compliant?              Not Specified

Representation Reference      017/38/SP9/CN

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site IN006; CDC Car Park, Backgate, Ingleton, first bullet-point

Factual correction

Although this site lies in the Ingleton Conservation Area, the car park makes little contribution to its character and the redevelopment of the site could provide an opportunity to enhance the Conservation Area.

Whilst we welcome the requirements of the first bullet-point relating to the Conservation Area there are no Listed Buildings actually on the site itself.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site IN006 first bulletpoint amend to read:-

“... to conserve the significance of this part of the Conservation Area and nearby Listed Buildings”

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      SP9

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Final Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      017/37/SP9/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Policy SP9, final Paragraph

We support the inclusion of a statement which clearly ties the Development Principles into the Policy framework of the Local Plan.

It is not sufficient to rely on the general development management Policies which are set out elsewhere in the plan to ensure that the development of each of these sites comes forward in a manner likely to deliver sustainable development.

The development principles set out clear guidance to all concerned in the planning process about what will, and will not, be permitted on each of these sites. As such the help the decision-maker determine how they should react to a development proposal.

The inclusion of this cross-reference to the development Principles within Policy SP9 is in accordance with the advice in Paragraph 153 of the NPPF.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	009	Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)		
Section or Policy		SP9		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	No
Site Reference		IN010		Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to		Ingleton		Representation Reference	009/08/SP9/TS

#### Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Proposed site IN010 relates to an existing caravan park, north of the River Greta at Ingleton. The Council expect the site to deliver 11 dwellings on the 0.35Ha site. The development guidelines for this site do not set out whether or not this is to be considered a rural exception site for 100% affordable housing given the edge of settlement location.

This site was originally located to give visitors access to the nearby waterfalls. The site is immediately adjacent to the Ingleton Conservation Area to the north west of the settlement. The Conservation Area currently forms the edge of the built form of the village abutting a river which currently forms a natural boundary to the settlement. Should this site be included within the Local Plan, it would be introducing dwellings and buildings into an area of the countryside and essentially expanding the settlement to the eastern side of the river.

It is acknowledged that there is an existing employment site adjacent to the proposed residential allocation, however, CPRENY believe that by allocating this land for residential and 'joining up' the village with the employment site, would in effect open the door to future expansion opportunities and potential windfall applications to this western edge of the settlement and thereby are not complementary to the settlement's form, character and appearance.

CPRENY are also aware that there have been a number of planning applications for caravan sites across North Yorkshire which have sought a Change of Use application to become residential development and are concerned that this allocation may set a dangerous precedent for Craven District. Whilst it is acknowledged that some of these sites may well go some way to demonstrating a 5-year housing land supply, these sites are often located within rural countryside locations (as is the case for IN010) and as such are sites where residential development would usually be considered unsustainable. The development of this site would not be consistent with Tier 5 of the spatial strategy (draft policy SP4) which sets out that 'individual' homes in the countryside will be limited to the special circumstances as identified by the NPPF and therefore cannot be considered consistent with national policy.

#### Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reason for Participation	The appropriate allocation of sites is something that is important to CPRENY and its members, given the amount of constraints within CDS area, CPRENY believe it is vital that the Local Plan does not over allocate sites and chooses the most appropriate locations for development
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	---

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      SP9

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference      IN049

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Ingleton

Representation Reference      017/41/SP9/CN

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site IN049; Former playing fields, Ingleton Middle School, Ingleton

Factual correction

Field House, to the west of this site, is a Grade II Listed Building. Therefore we welcome the requirements in the first bullet-point that siting and design of development should conserve the significance of the heritage assets near this site and their settings.

However, the development of this site is unlikely to have any impact upon the Ingleton Conservation Area. Therefore this bullet-point needs a slight amendment.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Development Principles – Site IN010, first bulletpoint amend to read:- “... to conserve the significance of the Listed Building opposite”

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	008	Organisation	The Wilman Family		
Section or Policy		VIS		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	008/07/VIS/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

SECTION 3 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

5.7 Here the document sets out the Vision for the Plan area to be achieved by 2032. Largely the narrative reflects a strategy of promoting the growth of existing settlements as the focus for homes, jobs and services, and making the area a distinctive and attractive place to live. In line with the comments elsewhere we would suggest that the Vision should be dated to 2035.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      019      Organisation      Keyhaven Homes

Section or Policy      VIS

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      Yes

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      019/02/VIS/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Section 3: Sustainable Development

Vision for Craven in 2032

5.2We support the emerging vision for Craven which acknowledges Skipton is the largest settlement in the District and identifies it as the main focus for growth in Craven.

5.3The vision for Craven is considered to be sound.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☒      Reason for Participation      To engage in discussion regarding the issue of soundness highlighted in the representation statement.

Respondent ID	046	Organisation	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Bolton Abbey		
Section or Policy		VIS		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Not Specified
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to	Bolton Abbey			Representation Reference	046/03/VIS/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Section 4: Detailed comments on content of the PDCLP 2018 as it relates specifically to Bolton Abbey (including clarification on minor changes since the Third Pre-Publication Draft Local Plan).

VISION FOR CRAVEN IN 2032 P.24-26  
The relevant section of the vision to Bolton Abbey states that:

‘The tourism economy is flourishing, based on the area’s rich heritage, cultural and environmental assets, such as the Leeds & Liverpool Canal, the Embsay with Eastby – Bolton Abbey Steam Railway, Bolton Abbey, the Settle-Carlisle Railway, Broughton Hall Estate, Skipton Castle and Woods, the Craven Museum and Gallery and the Yorkshire Dales National Park.’ (our emphasis)

CST is an important contributor to the tourism economy of the area, with 450,000 visitors a year coming to its CVA. Its ongoing liaison with CDC and other organisations reflects its commitment to delivery of an enhanced tourism offer with job growth and economic benefits. Bolton Abbey is situated at an important ‘southern gateway’ to the Yorkshire Dales National Park which receives c.3.5 million visitors per year and will continue to contribute in an increased way to the tourism economy of the designated area, provided that the draft policy approach (EC4a) to development at Bolton Abbey is maintained moving forward.

Whilst CST does not own or operate the Bolton Abbey Steam Railway there is clear linkage between the success of the railway and the provision of enhanced visitor facilities at Bolton Abbey.

CST therefore SUPPORTS the vision as it relates to the tourism economy.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	009	Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire CIO (CPRENY)		
Section or Policy		VIS		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph		Section 3 Vision		Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	009/02/VIS/TS

#### Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

CPRENY welcomes the reference in brackets within the second paragraph of the vision statement, setting out that:

“most new homes are situated within and around market towns and villages (on previously developed land where it has been possible and appropriate), between extensive public open spaces, connecting people to the countryside and creating corridors for wildlife.”

This is considered to be in conformity with the NPPF which sets out at paragraph 111 that planning policies should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value, which reiterates a core planning principle set out again at paragraph 17 of the Framework.

CPRENY also welcome and support the sentence setting out that: “Craven’s high-quality landscapes and treasured environmental assets are conserved and are enjoyed by everyone.”

This is in general conformity with the NPPF at paragraph 17 which sets out that planning should “take account of the different toles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the green belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it” and also the general thrust of Section 11 which seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment.

#### Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		VIS		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	017/06/VIS/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Vision – South area

We support the vision for this part of the Plan area especially the intention that the tourism economy based upon the area’s rich heritage will be flourishing.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation



Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      VIS

Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Plan is Sound?      No

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Representation Reference      017/05/VIS/TS

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Vision – Mid area, first Paragraph

It is important that the growth of Settle takes place in a manner which retains the elements identified in Paragraph 2.28 of the Plan which make it such a distinctive town. This should be reflected in this part of the Vision.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Vision, Mid Area, first Paragraph third line

amend to read:-

“.. and families.

The growth of the town will have been achieved in a manner which has retained both its intimate feel and its distinctive character”

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	017	Organisation	Historic England		
Section or Policy		VIS		Plan is Legally Compliant?	Not Specified
Paragraph				Plan is Sound?	Yes
Site Reference				Plan is DtC Compliant?	Not Specified
Settlement Comment Relates to				Representation Reference	017/04/VIS/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Vision - north area

We support the vision for this part of the Plan area especially the intention that:-

- Ingleton’s rich heritage, cultural and environmental assets will have been used to boost the tourism economy of the area.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☐ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      017      Organisation      Historic England

Section or Policy      VIS

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph      Plan is Sound?      Yes

Site Reference      Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to      Representation Reference      017/03/VIS/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

We support the proposed overarching Vision especially the intention that:-

- The District will be a distinctive and attractive place to live, work and visit
- New development will have respected the distinctive character and heritage of their surroundings and reinforced the sense of place
- Craven’s high-quality landscapes and treasured environmental assets will have been conserved and will be enjoyed by everyone.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation

Respondent ID	012	Organisation	Gladman Developments Limited
---------------	-----	--------------	------------------------------

Section or Policy VIS

### Paragraph

Site Reference

Settlement Comment Relates to

Plan is Legally Compliant?	No
----------------------------	----

Plan is Sound?	No
----------------	----

Plan is DtC Compliant?	No
------------------------	----

Representation Reference 012/03/VIS/GC

## Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

### 3.1 Vision

3.1.1 The vision for Craven in 2032 is set out at section 3 of the publication version of the Local Plan. Gladman are pleased to note that the vision continues in a positive manner and seeks to provide for economic growth and housing to meet the full needs of the district.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination? ☒ Reason for Participation

Respondent ID      039      Organisation      North Yorkshire County Council

Section or Policy      VIS, POB

Plan is Legally Compliant?      Not Specified

Paragraph

Plan is Sound?      Not Specified

Site Reference

Plan is DtC Compliant?      Not Specified

Settlement Comment Relates to

Representation Reference      039/02/VISPOB/GC

Details of Representation - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

#### Strategic Policy and Economic Growth

The NYCC Council Plan 2017-2021 sets the ambition that 'North Yorkshire is a place with a strong economy and a commitment to sustainable growth that enables our citizens to fulfil their ambitions and aspirations' with priorities of 'creating high quality places and increased housing provision' and 'creating the right conditions for business growth and investment'. Within North Yorkshire the District Councils are vital in ensuring that these ambitions can be achieved. For that reason, we welcome and support the Vision and Objectives of the Draft Publication Local Plan.

Proposed Modifications - verbatim as submitted to Craven District Council

Wish to participate in examination?      ☐      Reason for Participation