

**GARGRAVE PARISH COUNCIL**

**AND**

**GARGRAVE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING GROUP**

**RESULTS OF RESIDENTS' FEEDBACK FORMS**

## **CONTENTS**

Background	page 3
Results of Residents Feedback Forms Question 1	page 4
Responses to Question 2	page 5
a) Site GA012	page 5
b) Site GA025	page 7
c) Sites GA028/GA029	page 9
d) No support for proposed sites	page 13
e) Support for all sites	page 14
Responses to Questions 3 & 4	page 14
Responses to Question 5	page 16
Conclusions	page 19

## **Gargrave Parish Council and Gargrave Neighbourhood Plan Working Group**

### **Results of Residents Feedback**

Gargrave Parish Council recently sent round a Planning Update which gave details of the Local Plan and the proposed Neighbourhood Plan. The pamphlet also contained a feedback form which asked residents to respond to various questions, to put forward their views on Craven District Council's proposed sites for development for Gargrave and to make suggestions for what should be included in Gargrave's Neighbourhood Plan. This document summarises the results of that feedback.

### **Background**

#### **What is the Local Plan?**

This is the Craven-wide development plan in the process of being prepared by Craven District Council (CDC). It gives guidelines as to the level of development expected to take place for all towns and villages in the district. CDC has published their preferred sites for development. The preferred sites, (which were shown in the pamphlet), propose sites where CDC would like to see housing, employment and mixed housing/employment land. CDC has specified that the proposed development for residential properties in Gargrave is 75 houses in 15 years. So far there has been limited information as to what the "employment" and "mixed development" will consist of.

**The consultation period for the Draft Local Plan will be from Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2014 to Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2014. You can contact CDC directly with concerns, queries or objections about any aspect of the Draft Local Plan. [See "useful information" at the back of this document for contact details].**

#### **What is the Neighbourhood Plan?**

Neighbourhood planning commenced in 2012 following the Localism act of 2011. It brought about a new tier of planning available to local communities – the Neighbourhood Plan. Communities are now able to influence planning decisions for their neighbourhood through Neighbourhood Plans. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot change the numbers of houses/development allocated to Gargrave by CDC, but it can influence some important issues for the long term.

The Gargrave Neighbourhood Plan Working Group (GNPWG) has been set up by the Parish Council to assist in the production of a Neighbourhood Plan for Gargrave. Some of the questions in the feedback form ask for suggestions for issues residents would like to see addressed in a Neighbourhood Plan.

#### **Why send out the pamphlet and feedback form?**

The pamphlet has hopefully raised awareness of the stage the Local Plan is at, and has informed residents of CDC's proposals for Gargrave. It also raises awareness of the Neighbourhood Plan. By asking for feedback the parish council will be able to respond to CDC in a way which reflects village opinion, and the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group will gain information on what community planning matters are of importance to residents.

## **Results of the Residents Feedback Form**

### **General**

The feedback form asked for responses to 5 broad questions and has produced results both quantitative (numbers only) and qualitative (comments, thoughts and opinions) about the proposed sites, and what people would like to see included in the Neighbourhood Plan. Pamphlets were delivered to all addresses in Gargrave including businesses. In all 186 feedback forms were returned to the parish council. There were a huge amount of comments received from residents regarding both the proposed sites and Neighbourhood Plan. Obviously not all comments could be included in this feedback. The approach has instead been to identify common themes arising in the comments where residents have voiced similar views or concerns, e.g. worries about traffic issues.

### **Responses to Question 1**

In question 1 for each of the four sites proposed by CDC an option was given to circle “yes” or “no” as to whether the resident supports this particular site or not. Some feedback forms contained no response to a particular site or sites so there are not 186 (total number of forms returned) responses for each site. Percentage figures are obtained as per total responses, not total number of forms returned.

<b>Site GA012</b>		
Total number of responses to this site 177		
	Number support/object	Percentage
Support this site	114	64.4
Do not support this site	63	35.6

<b>Site GA025</b>		
Total number of responses to this site 180		
	Number support/object	Percentage
Support this site	88	48.9
Do not support this site	92	51.1

<b>Site GA028</b>		
Total number of responses to this site 178		
	Number support/object	Percentage
Support this site	49	27.5
Do not support this site	129	72.5

<b>Site GA029</b>		
Total number of responses to this site 178		
	Number support/object	Percentage
Support this site	49	27.5
Do not support this site	129	72.5

## Responses to Question 2

Residents were asked to comment on the preferred sites in Question 2.

### a) Site GA012

This is the only site out of those proposed for development by CDC which received overall (but not overwhelming) support. 65.9% of residents who responded said they would support development on this site.

### **GA012 Comments Supporting Development**

Support was based broadly on the view that the site already has some development so it would be suitable for enhancement and further development, as long as this is in keeping with the surrounding buildings and environment (rural character of the area) and that the types of employment development allowed are restricted.

Some characteristic comments included:

*“It’s already an area of employment and could be further developed for employment”*

*“it’s already being used for static caravans – may be appropriate for employment use”*

*“it is already partly developed for light industrial use. I would not object to a further development of this site.”*

*“Limited development to enhance that area but retaining the canal side warehouse and associated buildings, would be appropriate for business use”*

GA012 is seen as a good use of already partially developed land in contrast to building on greenfield sites:

*“GA012 is already partially developed . . . GA025, 28 and 29 are all greenfield sites and I would not wish to see them built on”*

Less positive support included:

*“it’s the least unacceptable of the (proposed) sites”.*

Some residents placed caveats on their support for development:

*“The site could be enhanced but would need careful planning because of situation and National Park”.*

*“If development relates to employment in tourism yes, otherwise no”*

*“. . . the proposal to enhance such uses is considered appropriate. It is felt however that significant detail should be set out in policy documents as to the types of employment uses to be permitted. For example it is considered industrial, retail, warehouse and/or distribution centre uses should not be permitted . . . whereas low-key tourism opportunities would be more appropriate provided they do not adversely affect the existing retail use in the village.”*

This is the only site which received a significant amount of support from for employment development.

#### **GA012 Comments Against Development**

Comments against development of this site were on various grounds. Some residents considered that the loss of an important tourist facility and the knock on effect on existing businesses in the village should prevent this site being developed

*“leisure facility for touring caravans – shouldn’t be developed”*

*“Caravan park is promoting tourism which is of benefit to the local economy –it should remain in its current form”.*

Some residents commented that there are already units empty on the developed part of the site; their point was that more development should not take place if existing business development units are unused:

*“Employment – existing units in GA012 still vacant after many years”*

This also ties in to a concern about the impact on existing businesses:

*“This seems less desirable as it would presumably have a knock on effect on business in the village and take away a cheap alternative accommodation for visitors in the area”.*



Some residents commented on poor access to the site via Eshton Road over a narrow canal bridge which it was felt “would not cope”.

*“ . . . the bridges were never intended to take heavy traffic.”*

*“The narrowness of the bridge impedes traffic flow”*

Some residents expressed a concern that development of this site would encourage development of surrounding sites:

*“. . . It has defined borders to the west and south but it is porous to the east and there is very significant seepage risk across a wide swathe of land . . .”*

## **b) Site GA025**

This site divided opinion with a narrow majority against development. There was very limited support expressed for mixed housing/employment development, and in fact many of those who expressed support for this site added a caveat that they felt that housing development was acceptable but not employment/mixed development.

### **GA025 Supporting development**

The strongest support for the site appears to be because it is seen as having the best access of the proposed sites, being adjacent to the A65:

*“Just off the main road so has easy access in and out”*

*“GA025 can have access directly off the A65 and does not have the same access and traffic issues associated with development of GA028; GA029 and GA012”*

*“GA025 is the only site that will not cause traffic problems”*

The fact that the site is on the edge of the village made it a more attractive proposition for development for many residents:

*“This site will not detract from any residential property, being separated on two sides by open areas”*

*“offers a natural extension to building in the village”*

*“on the outskirts of the village so development does not interfere with the rest of the village”*

Many who supported the site made qualifying statements for their support. The most common comments of this kind were that development would be supported only if it is of high quality, in keeping with the rest of the village and that it should be residential rather than mixed use.

*“GA025 offers a good site . . . provided strong design standards are incorporated in the policy documents to ensure development of the site maintains the quality and character of the surrounding area.”*

*“Could be acceptable providing it is developed with good design and taste. Not industrial.”*

*“nice housing could be a benefit however I’m not sure about employment in this area”*

*“. . . support this site on the basis of it being on the edge of the village. . . not sure about the statement ‘mixed housing and employment though’*

There was only one comment in favour of all employment development of this site:

*“Probably better as all employment due to good access from main road. Potential for canal side and leisure facility. Too detached from the village for residential use”*

### **GA025 Against Development**

The fact that this is a greenfield site featured heavily in opposition, as did its proximity to recreational facilities – cricket pitch and football field.

One response said that development would “despoil” the “beautiful site” of the cricket pitch and football field which are a village amenity.

*“Development would spoil the open aspect of and views from the cricket pitch and football fields”*

*“ . . .an unnecessary incursion out into the countryside on an important approach to the village that could be replaced by the series of smaller sites within the built framework of existing settlement”*

*“detached from Gargrave’s existing development. It would enclose the cricket and football fields, both important parts of the community in Gargrave”*

*“a development . . . in complete isolation”*

Several people commented that the cricket club would be affected from an insurance point of view:

*“The cricket (club) do move the crease around on the pitch but do predominantly site it nearer the field than the houses on Airedale Avenue . . . to keep insurance claims to a minimum. Properties built on the other side of the cricket pitch would be at greater and more frequent risk of damage . . and therefore more claims against the club”.*

The fact that the site is on the approach to the village is seen as an important factor, and that the development is on the outskirts of the village and would be extending the village boundary too far, leading to sprawl. “Stick out like a sore thumb” was how one resident put it. Together with the development of site GA020 one resident commented this would “bookend” the village:

*“I am frustrated by the choice of GA025 which would bookend the village if the site at the Anchor goes ahead”.*

Another wrote

*“Development of this site will almost inevitably, in time, lead to development of sites to the east and covetous developers’ eyes being cast on the sports pitches”*

*“Outside the existing village boundary – next to go would be the cricket field! Green aspect approaching the village would be lost. Over-development”*

Flooding problems on this site were referred to:

*“In the past the cricket pitch and surrounding fields have flooded causing problems to nearby housing, building on a flood plain would only exacerbate the problem”.*

*“prone to flooding”*

*“. . . serious problems already caused by flooding on this land and the field next to it. . . if built on GA025 would compound this problem as a large area of natural drainage would be removed”*

A number of residents were concerned at traffic safety issues, particularly at peak time. It was felt traffic problems would be exacerbated.

*“Within a 100 yards there would be 3 exits onto the main road, one from the proposed site, cricket field, and Airedale Avenue, with Systagenix exit on the opposite side of the road.”*

Some residents pointed out that it is the only site away from overhead cables where the Air Ambulance is able to land.

### **c) Sites GA028 and GA029**

Of all the proposed sites these received the most opposition. They also received the most comments of all the sites. Comments for these sites tended to be negative. There were far fewer comments in support. In some cases comments opposing development of these sites ran to several pages. It is not possible to include all the points made but it is possible to discern some patterns in support of and against development.

Almost all of the responses (either in support of or opposing development) grouped these sites together. Although the proposed sites put forward by CDC forms two sites, it is actually one large field which runs alongside the canal and Chew Lane Beck which it is proposed to divide for development –one for housing development (GA028) and one for mixed housing and employment

development. Accordingly the sites will be dealt with together in this feedback, apart from some comments where support was expressed for GA029 or GA028 alone, and these will be identified.

### **GA028/GA029 Comments Supporting development**

Some residents felt that the location of these sites formed a good boundary for new development in the village:

*“Chew Lane and the stream running along it form a natural boundary for the expansion of the village”*

*“Are the best sites in terms of the expansion of the village – i.e. not ‘ribbon type’ expansion along the A65.”*

*“They are ‘in’ the village and not extending the village out. The village is big enough after all the new housing of recent years”*

Once again residents who supported these sites qualified their comments:

*“Careful development for housing of part of these areas retaining open/green spaces would be appropriate”*

*“Larger houses with more garden – we have too many 2up/2 down and rented houses”*

*“If used for housing – again would require careful planning to protect position and in keeping with other properties. Also any developments in Gargrave should include green areas and trees”*

*“ I would prefer to see family homes and/or affordable homes only on the sites”*

*“Would prefer to see this as only residential. Access roads not suitable at the moment for larger vehicles associated with light industrial use.”*

Some felt the quieter roads in this part of Gargrave would more easily take the extra traffic generated:

*“Eshton Road quiet – take more traffic”*

*“GA028 would be a development minimising any disruption to existing properties with safe access as not next to a main road . . .”*

*“ . . . seems to be a logical way of expanding the village from an infrastructure and services point of view”*

*(Supporting GA029 only) “If we have to agree to something it should only be for employment, Gargrave does not need more houses or residents, local services cannot support them”*

### **GA028/GA029 Comments Against Development**

The vast majority of comments made about these sites were opposing development. It is clear that many residents feel extremely strongly that these sites should not be developed. From the hundreds of comments there were some broad groupings which could be discerned:

#### **Access**

The most common concerns regard the canal bridges on the approach to this site from West Street and Eshton Road.

*“The bridges were never intended to take heavy traffic; the narrowness of the bridges impedes traffic flow; access to the bridges is along narrow ancient lanes bordered by houses with on street parking, is likely to prove even more difficult to both residents and those using the lane”*

*“from a highway perspective these two sites are accessed by narrow lanes that are already much busier due to the development of Gargrave House. This would extend the village over the LL (Leeds Liverpool) canal into an area popular with walkers, cyclists and horses (riders)”*

*“Where would all the extra traffic go? The 3 bridges that cross the canal are all listed structures and I don’t think they could cope with all the extra traffic that developing these sites would cause”*

*“will struggle with the small bridges over the canal”*

*“Access/egress from this site from West Street is severely restricted with little vehicular passing places”*

*“The bridges, West Street and Chew Lane are capable of single file traffic only”*

**Safety** was also raised as a concern in relation to access to the sites, especially in the context of the area being used for recreational activities such as walking and cycling:

*“Traffic issues – would be significantly increased. Chew Lane is part of Sustrans cycle route regularly used by cyclists”*

*“potential damage/risk/danger to the numerous tourists/hikers/cyclists/walkers/oaps/and dog walkers and mobility users and horse riders who all use the Pennine Way, canal bank and Chew Lane.”*

### **Overall Character of the Area**

Some questioned the basis for CDC’s decision to name these as preferred sites, particularly raising their position in the conservation area and proximity to listed buildings:

*“The National Planning Framework advises that sites should only be developed in rural areas where the development can function well, improve the quality and character of the area and contribute to the conserving and enhancing of the natural environment . . . Site GA028 will go against these requirements”*

*“The site falls within a conservation area, which according to Craven D.C. means ‘areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.’ Building on this site would not ‘enhance’ it.”*

*“GA028 and GA029 . . . are within the conservation area with difficult access over historic, narrow canal bridges next to listed canal locks and listed buildings”*

*“The site is separated from the canal by a strip of land owned by the Canal Trust, contained within a conservation area and populated by mature woodland largely of indigenous species i.e. subject to TPO (Tree Preservation Order)”*

## **Amenity**

The amenity aspect of this area is very important to those residents who oppose development here. This was seen from a number of different viewpoints which will be summarised by sample comments below:

### **Tourist amenity**

*“Why would we destroy what brings people to Gargrave? – these are the people who spend money in the cafes or pubs, who shop in the Co-op and who camp/caravan/boat/ here for their leisure!”*

*“an area popular with walkers, cyclists, and horses and would damage the rural aspect of Gargrave enjoyed by residents and tourists alike.”*

*“used by walkers to access the Pennine Way”*

*“Will impact on Gargrave’s main visitor attractions – the canal; the Pennine Way; the cycle route.”*

*“Beautiful green fields, Pennine Way, National Cycle Route, important for recreation and tourism”*

*“It is an open field with a running stream next to it, which is located in a key tourist area of the village, being adjacent to the canal, next to the Pennine Way, next to a Sustrans cycle*



*route and within 1000 yards of the National Park boundary. To develop this site will spoil the character of the area."*

*" . . too large a development would completely dominate, overpower and destroy a quiet corner of the village thus reducing tourist income to businesses"*

*" . . . without exception they (tourists) are drawn to the area because of the attractiveness of its setting, the green spaces within and around it, the many historic buildings and general ambience. These are not just holidaymakers on narrow boats or walkers on the Pennine Way but people from other parts of Yorkshire and Lancashire who come for the day to enjoy the serenity of the surroundings and go for a gentle stroll."*

### **Residents' amenity**

*"There are very few places available to the village, young or old, or those without transport or ability, within walking distance of their homes. To build on these places is . . beyond comprehension."*

*"The natural open space currently existing contributes to public amenity along the canal towpath, the Pennine Way, Pennine Cycleway and Higherland Lock."*

*"Chew Lane is an amenity to villagers young and old. Children walk, scoot, cycle with their parents here."*

*"This area is bounded by Chew Lane which is and has been for many years a regular walking area for villagers. . ."*

*"I object to this area being developed for building of any kind . . . a little country lane which is a haven for humans and for all forms of natural life."*

*"The walk along Chew Lane is the only old style country walk with no buildings along it which is easy for people with difficulty walking and it is too pleasant to spoil with large scale building"*

### **Environment**

It is clear that the area is much valued for its environmental qualities and because it is an easily accessible site.

*“Along that lane we have herons, and other wildlife we will lose, as well as wildflowers”*

*“Would spoil a piece of Gargrave that is full of wildlife”*

*“There would be negative impact on trees, woodland, hedgerows and wildlife.”*

*“Current landscape and habitats would be lost for ever and the character of the area with listed buildings (Higherland House, Gargrave House).*

*“The site would pose a threat to wildlife, trees, woodland and hedgerows abutting the canal and beck on Chew Lane.”*

*“My children’s and my favourite walk and part of Gargrave is along the lane running next to the beautiful nature filled stream . . . please don’t let this happen.”*

*“Why spoil the village? These fields should not be touched.”*

*“preserve the trees on Chew Lane and Chew Lane Beck. A kingfisher and heron have been observed on the beck this year”*

#### **d) No support for Proposed Sites**

A significant number of responses were entirely negative about the proposed sites. These can be divided into two broad categories. Firstly those who do not support any of the sites as they do not think they are suitable; secondly those who do not feel they can comment as they do not have enough information. Many residents commented that they do not know what is being proposed by “employment –opportunity for enhancement” or “mixed – housing and employment”. It will be vital for this information to be obtained from CDC and residents informed.

*“Employment areas – type of employment unknown. This could be 24/7 manufacturing or distribution. Development could lead to pollution, noise and untidiness.”*

*"It is difficult to comment. What is "mixed development"? What sort of numbers are we talking about? Would comment if CDC had told us what they are planning."*

*"I don't know what 'opportunity for enhancement' means in this instance."*

*"Employment areas – we need examples of the type of employment and size and style of buildings. Do we need more employment buildings when some units in the village remain empty?"*

*"A more detailed definition of "mixed housing and employment" is required. What % of each is proposed/envisaged on GA029 and GA025? What precisely are the 'employment opportunities'? Offices? Workshops? Manufacturing premises?"*

*"CDC consulted Gargrave last July. No mention was made of land to be used for employment purposes. How can we comment when we have NO information on what this use will be and are left to guess the probable impact on our roads, services and environment."*

#### **e) Support for all sites**

A proportion of residents who supported all the proposed development sites. Of the comments made, most seemed to focus on location of the sites and the fact they were seen as not extending the village boundary too much.

*"Sites are a tight block for development"*

*"I feel the preferred sites by CDC are the best because they are 'in' the village and not extending the village out"*

*"I think it looks like a sensible development of the village over the next 15 years"*

#### **Responses to Questions 3 and 4**

Residents were asked to name sites from Map 1 in the pamphlet (the SHLAA sites) they felt would be good sites for development or sites where they would particularly oppose development. The questions were as follows:

Where a resident named a site, either supporting development or opposing development a note was made of this. Obviously a resident could name as many sites as he/she wished to, although there could be only one "vote" per site. The numbers for each site were counted up and appear in the chart above. For ease of reference each indication of support or opposition for a site will be termed a "vote".

There were in total more votes opposing development for various sites (704) than supporting development (345). Of the 23 available sites 20 received more votes opposing development than supporting; two received support for development and one received an equal number of "votes".

The results of most interest in the chart are those sites that received either very high votes for or against development and/or where there is a big differential between supporting and opposing "votes".

### **Sites not supported**

The site that received an almost overwhelmingly negative response is GA030 which received 64 votes against development and very few supporting votes. Comments revealed that this was seen as too large a development area on the outskirts off the village which would have a negative impact on the overall character of Gargrave. Similarly sites GA005; GA009; GA014; GA017; GA022; GA023; GA027; GA028; and GA029 also each received over 30 votes opposing development and far fewer supporting "votes". It is very clear that development is opposed in these locations.

### **Sites supported for development**

One site where support for development outweighed opposition is site GA020. This site, (next to the canal and school) has already received planning permission for residential development.

The other site which receives support for development is site GA031 on Marton Road, although this site did also receive 26 opposing "votes". Those supporting development cite the fact that there is already existing development on the site next to this which could be extended although these comments were often qualified by stating that development should not cover the entire site.

Site GA001 received an equal number of opposing and supporting votes.

Comments revealed both support and opposition for different types of development, most noticeably for "infill" development of existing small sites within Gargrave; and those who preferred to see development take place at a distance from the centre of Gargrave on the outskirts of the village. There are strongly held views supporting each of these types of development and equally

strong views opposing it – those who support development on the edge of the village tend to oppose infill development and those who support infill sites oppose extending the existing boundary of the village.

Brownfield sites were much preferred over greenfield sites. Employment development is not supported in greenfield sites but has more support on brownfield sites. Many residents felt comfortable with employment development on GA012 where there is already some of this type of development. One resident suggested use of the existing Systagenix site for the development of a small business park.

## **Responses to Question 5: The Neighbourhood Plan and General Comments/Concerns**

Issues that residents would like to see addressed in a Neighbourhood Plan include the following:

### **Residential Development and Local Business/Tourism development**

Generally there seems to be some support for some residential development and development of tourism related business and other local business employment development. Small developments of high quality housing, in acceptable areas, would generally appear not to be opposed – including high quality affordable housing and high quality family homes in particular.

*“There may be some need for increased housing both high and low value and also supported for the elderly. Enhanced tourism e.g. camping and canal related would be welcome but further industrial type development would not”*

*“housing for young families of limited means. Without children the village will die!”*

*“Please no cheap high density rubbish designs”*

*“I believe Gargrave should develop tourism, and not deter visitors by investing in more industry”*

*“Local economy – encourage local businesses”*

*“I think it is important to provide employment opportunities”*

### **Business development in the Centre of the village and vacant units**

Many residents expressed concern that the proposals to have more employment development in Gargrave was not appropriate, given that there are existing business units standing empty. There is also a desire to see existing business and employment supported, especially in the centre of the village, before considering more development:

*“Thought is needed about retaining and extending shopping possibilities within the village”*

*“Some more small shops e.g. bakers, butchers, fish and chip shop”*

*“Reversion of the gradual decay of the High Street should also be a concern”*

*“Currently a number of industrial and office units are vacant so careful development will be required if we are not to add to this problem”*

*“Eshton Wharf still has 2 of 3 floors of office space unoccupied after 10 years”*

*“Look at all the empty shops – why are we going to build more?”*

*“ . . . (the plan should) resist the conversion of more shops into offices”*

*“Environment, housing, economy including local shops that have closed and are now left unoccupied”*

*“Mention is made in GA029/GA025 of employment opportunities – is this really feasible as there are so many vacant industrial /business premises available?”*

*“can’t understand why offices are needed when some are available in the village to let.”*

### **Overdevelopment and preserving the character of Gargrave**

It is clear that overdevelopment is a concern and large-scale development is not desired:

*“My concerns stem from Gargrave becoming a sprawl, with no community to speak of, where business no longer exists in the centre of the village and it is no longer an attractive place to live.”*

*“I would like to see the Neighbourhood Plan exclude any greenfield site development for any reason”*

*“It is not necessary to build on greenfield sites with a beautiful rural aspect. To develop business use there is even more unacceptable.”*

*“Development should not extend the present boundaries of the village”*

*“I don’t want to see any large housing estates or business developments”*

*“housing - but keeping the rural agricultural nature of the area”*

*“Any new housing for first time buyers should NOT be ‘shoe boxes’. They should also have adequate gardens or associated social area for children to play safely and designated parking”*

### **Green Spaces and the environment**

Protection of Green spaces was mentioned many times as an important issue for the plan to address:

*“we must preserve any recreational grounds within the village for all those moving in as well as current householders – playgrounds, cricket club etc”*

*“I’d like to see that any development has green areas incorporated in keeping with Gargrave’s existing development”*

*“We need to provide good recreational spaces”*

*“Housing; Environment; Recreational space please!”*

Many residents would like to see the development of more community spaces such as allotments or community gardens; or more dedicated recreational facilities or spaces, especially for health:

“The plan should address the provision of allotments . . .

*“Allotments or a communal garden would be beneficial to the village (a communal hub bring the community together)”*

*“Holistic approach – housing, workspace, cycle ways, pathways, so that walking and cycling to work are encouraged.”*

Environment was also a highly rated issue:

*“ENVIRONMENT! ENVIRONMENT! ENVIRONMENT! This is currently being ignored. I would also like to see more scrutiny and control over the conservation areas within the village.”*

*“Environment – create more spaces for wildlife to flourish”*

*“In addition to protecting Gargrave’s green environment and wildlife we should be striving to protect its community and promoting different aspects such as the High Street, its heritage, its school etc.”*



*“I would like to see more work done towards preserving and enhancing wildlife”*

*“Any environmental impact should be carefully considered, the three sites to the north of the canal and bounded by Eshton Road to the East support a wealth of wildlife”*

## **Infrastructure**

There are concerns that any development will have a negative impact on the village infrastructure, particularly traffic and parking, sewage system, and impact on the village school.

## **Traffic and parking**

*“Parking in the village is becoming contentious, especially during holiday periods”*

*“Introduce some traffic calming measures that will be adhered to going through the village”*

*“The volume of traffic in our small lanes will be unacceptable”*

*“Introduce traffic calming into the village”*

## **Sewage system and drainage**

*“The sewers in Gargrave have not been upgraded. Water treatment works cannot manage the population now never mind more houses”*

*“It is essential adequate drainage and vehicle access is provided”*

*“The plan needs to look at sewerage as we have numerous bottle-necks already”*

*“Gargrave’s drains and sewers will not cope”*

*“ do not agree to any future development of Gargrave until the Victorian sewage pipes have been updated to accommodate extra sewage.”*

*“before building any more houses or commercial buildings . . . think the sewage system in Gargrave should be looked into.”*

Many residents want to see improved transport links

*“Transport! The railway link could easily be improved. Less trains stop at Gargrave than Hellifield yet Gargrave is larger and is on the Pennine Way. More trains would benefit residents and visitors.”*

The School

*“The school will not take all the new children”*

*“I would like to know how the village will cope with all the extra housing e.g. the village school being big enough for the extra children, shops and demand for shops, transport to towns and other villages (we already struggle)”*

## **Conclusions**

No sites received complete support from residents who returned the feedback forms. There does appear to be some support for careful development of GA012 for employment purposes as long as it is in keeping with the surrounding area and as long as the meaning of “enhanced” development is made clear and is acceptable to residents. Access to this site concerns many.

Opinion is divided for development of GA025. Comments regarding this site generally did not support employment development even if they were supportive of residential development in this location.

There would be strong opposition to any development of GA028 and GA029

In all cases clarification is required from CDC as to what “employment” and “mixed –residential and employment” are likely to consist of and importantly size/numbers proposed.

There is the option to explore other sites for development as residents have suggested other locations. The chart produced for the feedback to questions 3 & 4 shows the levels of support of those who responded for each of these. It would be more acceptable to many who replied to have smaller development sites within the existing village boundary (infill sites) and this option should be explored further. Again opinion is divided on this issue, and many expressed concern at the thought of development in remaining small plots in Gargrave.

In all cases the type and quality of development is seen as important to residents. High quality low density development is preferred whether this is for affordable or for higher priced houses. Brownfield sites are preferred to greenfield in general. Economic/business development is supported by some residents and there is a strong desire to ensure this is restricted in nature and does not impact negatively on the village. A priority for many is focussing on existing businesses, particularly on the High Street where there are empty business premises, rather than building business units elsewhere. Empty units on the industrial estate and Eshton Wharf are also a concern. Type of development is certainly an area where the Neighbourhood Plan could have a big influence, along with supporting economic development that residents are in favour of.

Preventing unnecessary sprawl is an important issue as is addressing infrastructure concerns. The size of the proposed sites alarms many residents and have prompted fears of overdevelopment and development “creep” into surrounding areas. The parish council should seek clarification of the type and size of development CDC would support in these areas to be able to pass on this information to residents. Many feel they simply cannot comment as they do not know what is being proposed. The proposals in their current form to not attract majority support from those who responded although some residents did express support for all proposed sites.

The ability of the sewage system and roads to cope with new development was mentioned many times.

The lack of good transport connections was an issue many would like to see addressed, in particular bus and train services.

The environmental and amenity value of sites is very important to residents. For some residents this is the most important concern and it featured strongly in suggestions as to issues a Neighbourhood Plan would address. In particular the area around the canal and Chew Lane is seen as valuable for its amenity to both residents and tourists. The possibility of any development harming tourist “assets” and putting off visitors to Gargrave is a concern to many residents. The Pennine Way, the National Cycle Way, the Canal, the river and greens, and the proximity to the National Park are seen as “pull factors” encouraging tourists to visit as are the generally rural and agricultural feel of the village. The character and heritage of the village is greatly treasured and many express their wish to see this protected. There is a desire to protect existing leisure sites such as the cricket and football grounds, the greens and the tennis club.

### **Useful Information**

**You can contact CDC directly about the proposed sites or any aspect of the Draft Local Plan. The consultation period is Monday 22 September to Monday 3 November so if you want your say, do it now!**

Planning Policy Team – [localplan@cravenc.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@cravenc.gov.uk) or on 01756 706472

Or write to them:

1 Belle Vue Square

Broughton Road

Skipton

North Yorkshire

BD23 1FJ

You can view the draft Local Plan here:

[www.cravenc.gov.uk/article/4455/New-Local-Plan](http://www.cravenc.gov.uk/article/4455/New-Local-Plan)

There is a feedback form to comment on the Plan at this location.

Hard copies of the Plan are available at CDC offices at the above location.

Hard copies can also be viewed at libraries in Skipton, Cross Hills, Embsay, Settle, Bentham and Ingleton and via the mobile library service.

### **Neighbourhood Plan**

You can contact Gargrave Parish Council by e-mail:

[gargravepc@yahoo.com](mailto:gargravepc@yahoo.com)

Or write:

Gargrave Parish Council

Gargrave Village Hall

West Street

Gargrave

BD23 3<sup>RD</sup>

#### Other useful contacts

[www.cpre.org.uk](http://www.cpre.org.uk) useful information on all planning matters, how planning system works, neighbourhood planning, localism etc.

[www.locality.org](http://www.locality.org) government website on all things to do with localism.