

Table 3 Developers and Landowners

Gargrave Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan – Consultation Responses – Date 2015

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council Consideration	Amendments to NP
Paul Drinkall Via Windle BeechWinthrop, Skipton Auction Mart,Skipton 1.1			G7 Designated Local Green Spaces Nos 5 & 6 off Marton Road	Object to designated green spaces 5 & 6	With regards to the Designated Local Green Spaces No's 5 & 6 off Marton Road, we make the following comment for your consideration: It is acknowledged that whilst these particular fields contain areas of special interest, this should not preclude the rest of the site from future development. We would like to proposed that the references made in the Local Development Plan in response to these two locations detailing the following: "Following any future archaeological excavations sympathetic development may be considered within the boundaries of these two fields providing it does not detract from the local area and/or any relevant importance of the site."	Not accepted. See separate tables providing further information and justification for including these areas in the list of local green spaces.	No change.

					Whilst the work is carried out by the local community is respected, it is important to remember that future development should be provided in sustainable locations. It is therefore important that a site such as this which is close to the village amenities, has good access to the public highway and is partially surrounded by existing buildings, should not be excluded.		
Jrp Architecture Planning Landscape on behalf of Mr D Shuttleworth 2.1	All			Comment	<p><u>Gargrave Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan – November 2015</u></p> <p>This response is made on behalf of Mr D Shuttleworth in relation to the draft plan and its potential effects on his land holding off Chew Lane, Gargrave.</p> <p>In the first instance it appears that there are issues with the Parish Council website. The web address www.gargravepc.org.uk is showing as web site not found. There is also no information of the consultation exercise on the Craven District Council website. A published 'Quick Guide to Neighbourhood Plans' by Locality refers to the legal requirement that proposed Neighbourhood Plans are publicised and the subject of public</p>	Not accepted. The website has been tested and is working.	No change.

					consultation before being submitted to the local planning authority.		
2.2			SEA / HRA	Comment	<p>It is not clear from the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, nor the Gargrave Parish Council website (as we cannot access it) whether a screening assessment has been undertaken in terms of the potential for the neighbourhood plan requiring a strategic environmental assessment ('SEA').</p> <p>The five basic conditions for testing Neighbourhood Plans are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the order (or neighbourhood plan). 2. The making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. 3. The making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>An SEA and HRA screening report was prepared by Craven DC and published for consultation for at least 5 weeks with the relevant consultation bodies.</p> <p>The 5 basic conditions will be tested by the Examiner. The Basic Conditions Statement sets out how the Plan meets the basic conditions.</p> <p>For further information about this process please contact CDC.</p>	No change.

					<p>in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).</p> <p>4. The making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.</p> <p>5. Prescribed conditions are met in relation to the Order (or plan) and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order (or neighbourhood plan).</p> <p>The fourth basic condition relates to SEA – the independent examiner testing the Neighbourhood Plan will use this condition to test whether the making of the neighbourhood plan is compatible with European Union obligations (including under the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive). We request further detail of whether SEA screening has taken place and if so, what the screening opinion was.</p>		
2.3	All			Comment	<p>General Comments:</p> <p>Rejection of Proposed Sites in Craven Local Plan (September 2014)</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Several of the original Craven DC Preferred</p>	No change.

					<p>There has been a wholesale rejection of the sites proposed in the Craven Local Plan First Draft, with no explanation provided as to why?</p>	<p>Option sites have been retained in the NDP.</p> <p>The supporting text in Section 6.1 sets out evidence for local concerns about the proposed sites put forward by CDC in 2014 and the response of the NDP working group / Parish Council to provide a positive, alternative approach.</p>	
2.4			G1	Comment	<p>Settlement Boundary</p> <p>The boundary has been re-drawn for the settlement of Gargrave with no logical explanation as to why? It would appear that the boundary is arbitrary to include the proposed housing allocations. This is not sound and potentially renders the Neighbourhood Plan fundamentally flawed. The boundary should follow logical, rationale and sustainable boundaries.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The settlement boundary has been identified following a site assessment process and thorough approach to public consultation and engagement.</p> <p>Identification of settlement boundaries and site allocations are appropriate planning policy tools for NDPs as they demonstrate a positive approach to planning led by local communities, within the</p>	No change.

						national and local strategic planning policy context.	
2.5			G1	Object	<p>Housing Numbers</p> <p>We welcome that the Neighbourhood Plan is not in conflict with Craven District Council in respect of the proposed housing figure for the settlement.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan is proposing 75 dwellings. This figure is still being quoted by CDC as the required need for Gargrave and was presented to Craven Spatial Planning Sub Committee – 19th October 2015 as part of a paper on Objectively Assessed Need.</p> <p>Information provided in the Five Year Housing Land Supply Methodology and Report May 2015 (Revised December 2015) provides an examination of completions over a longer timeframe. This shows that there has been persistent under delivery of housing in Craven.</p> <p>The Five Year Land Supply Report sets out the results of the five year land supply calculations. The five year requirement (excluding any buffer, which should be 20%) is 745 dwellings and the identified supply is 729 dwellings. This shows that the</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Plan has been amended in line with advice from Craven DC to reflect the most up to date position with regard to housing numbers.</p>	

					<p>Council does not have a 5 year housing land supply in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>The current numbers indicate 5 units per annum for Gargrave (75 in total), however this is a very sustainable and accessible village and there is no reason why the numbers cannot be increased to 7 or 8 per annum (105-120 dwellings over the Plan period) to cover for any potential shortfall and excessive expectations in other locations. Especially in the light of a lack of 5 year supply and persistent under delivery by the Council.</p>		
2.6			G2	Object	<p>Site Assessment</p> <p>A general comment in respect of the presentation of the site allocations is that the use of a block colour (red) makes it difficult to establish the extent of the land proposed and the site boundaries.</p> <p>We have not seen a site assessment matrix or scoring criteria to identify why these sites are preferable to other sites proposed in the SHLAA or the Parish Council's "Call for Sites." We do not know whether these sites are deliverable in accordance with paragraph 47 and footnotes 11 and</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The blocks of colour are widely used in NDPs to identify site allocations.</p> <p>Information about the site assessment process is set out in the site assessment report which is available on the neighbourhood plan website.</p>	No change.

					<p>12 of the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework).</p> <p>Overall the residential sites proposed will not provide the numbers required and allow no flexibility in future development of the village in subsequent plan reviews.</p>		
2.7			G2/1	Comment	<p>Site Specific Comments</p> <p>Site Reference</p> <p>G2/1</p> <p>Comments</p> <p>Can the site be adequately accessed?</p> <p>Are there any amenity issues from the adjoining Public House – noise, disturbance etc.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NYCC advised that access is acceptable onto West Street.</p> <p>Other residential properties are in the vicinity of the public house. Noise and disturbance are controlled by processes outside planning eg environmental health.</p>	No change.
2.8			G2/2	Comment	<p>G2/2</p> <p>A North Yorkshire County Council owned site, which is presently in use as an Elderly Persons home. Is the site available and deliverable? – given there is an identified shortage nationally of care establishments.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NYCC are considering vacating the site and providing alternative facilities.</p>	No change.

2.9			G2/3	Comment	G2/3 Can the site be adequately accessed? The development of this infill site would impact on surrounding properties.	Noted. NYCC advised that access is acceptable onto the main road but demolition of a property may be required.	No change.
2.10			G2/4	Comment	G2/4 Potential access issues onto a National Speed Limit road. Despite its current planning position it is unlikely that 29 units will be provided on this site. A much lower density is required. Noise from the road will be a problem both in gardens and homes thereby conflicting with the objective of providing quality accommodation.	Noted. This site is now shown as a commitment as it has planning consent.	No further change.
2.11			G2/5	Comment	G2/5 Visual impact issues and potential screening of the site from the wider locality as it extends well outside the existing settlement boundary. It is too large and for the majority of the area it fronts existing green fields. It extends too far up Mosber Lane where there are no frontage properties opposite.	Noted. The site is supported by Craven DC. Highways issues are considered to be acceptable by NYCC. Access onto Church Lane is acceptable but no footway in situ. Works will be required to extend the	No change.

					<p>The site is highly un-sustainable with poor pedestrian connections to the settlement core with no footpath until Marton Close.</p> <p>Marton Road is poor in terms of forward sight lines for traffic.</p>	<p>footway and provide lighting.</p>	
2.12			G2/6	Comment	<p>G2/6 The site does not relate to the existing settlement and is not a logical allocation.</p> <p>Designated Environment Agency flood zone 3 – guidance states development should be directed to areas of a lower zoning.</p> <p>The site is highly un-sustainable with poor pedestrian connections to the settlement with no footpath until Marton Close. Unlit road subject to National Speed Limit.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The GNP is encouraging sustainable development leading to good planning outcomes within the designated plan area and with respect to the Old Sawmill Site considers development will bring many benefits.</p> <p>Paragraph 104 of the NPPF 2012 states 'Applications for minor development and changes of use should not be subject to the Sequential or Exception Tests' but should still meet the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments.'</p> <p>Following a site specific flood risk assessment concerns for risk and consequences of flooding can be resolved. Measures</p>	No change.

						<p>to deal with Fluvial Flood Risk, Surface Water Flood Risk, SUDS Compliance and Flood Resilience may be required of an appropriate development and can be designed in.</p> <p>The Old Saw Mill is an historic building which needs attention for its preservation. It's change of use through a sympathetic renovation and conversion will preserve it for now and the future enhancing our built environment.</p> <p>The Old Saw Mill Site scored 85 in the GNP Sustainability Site Assessment which is significantly higher than the score of 80 set for inclusion as a proposed site in the GNP. In The GNP Informal Consultation The Old Saw Mill Site received 36 representations of support and 8 of objection making it a supported site overall by the community. The</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

						<p>redevelopment of The Sawmill Site brings an opportunity to improve the visual impact of the site within this Special Landscape Area.</p> <p>The PC considers that redevelopment of this site brings opportunities of much needed improvement to many aspects of this site and should comply with the NPPF 2012 and its treatment of flooding.</p> <p>Redevelopment of this site will lead to good planning outcomes for Gargrave.</p>	
			G7 8	Comment	<p>We consider that GA028 and GA029 are preferable sites to those proposed, and are realistic prospects being available and deliverable within the Plan period. The sustainable location of GA028 and GA029 in relation to the existing village. There are mitigation measures possible for GA028 and GA029 which will overcome any potential concerns. The long distance views into the site will be dealt with by effect planting and design. The use of Chew Lane for dog walkers</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>This area makes an important contribution to protecting the setting of Gargrave when viewed from the YDNP.</p> <p>The justification for including it as a local green space is provided in the accompanying assessment tables.</p>	No change.

					will not be restricted and there is potential for providing a cycle and pedestrian route immediately to the north of Chew Land as a safer and more pleasant option and improvement of the National Cycle Route.		
2.13	4.2.3			Comment	Other Comments Section 4.2.3 - The reference to GA028 and GA029 neglects to mention that in the summary of consultation by Craven DC in the summer of 2013 the feedback was favourable' for both these sites.	Noted. The Parish Council disputes this. A report was prepared on the "Results of Residents" Feedback Forms in which over 90% of respondents were against development on these sites.	No change.
2.14	18			Comment	Page 18 - There is no logic in excluding larger sites. The reference to them being 'estates' is inaccurate and deliberately misleading	Noted. Smaller developments are considered to be more in keeping with the existing character of the village.	No change.
2.15	55			Comment	Page 55 - The second sentence relating to building near assets should be deleted. The Planning system will ensure that good practise is employed in determining all sites in whatever location.	Not accepted. The objectives are supported by Craven DC.	No change.

2.16			G7 8	Objection.	<p>Proposed Allocation of the Site as Local Green Space</p> <p>We do not consider the allocation of the site as Local Green Space meets the tests outlined by Craven District Council. A separate representation was made to the Council as part of the Local Green Space Designation - Call for Sites Consultation to highlight why this site should not be considered as part of this process.</p> <p>This representation concluded:</p> <p><i>The site does not pass the methodology for Local Green Space designation set out by Craven District Council. Although the site is located in close proximity to the community of Gargrave it is not well connected visually with the settlement. It does not contain any heritage assets or hold any special cultural significance. It is not publicly accessible and has no history of community use.</i></p> <p><i>The reasons for designation put forward in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan all relate to the use of Mark House</i></p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The justification for including it as a local green space is provided in the accompanying assessment tables using the CDC methodology / criteria. This is published as a separate, accompanying document. This details how the area meets the criteria in the NPPF for local green spaces and it is recommended that the area is therefore retained for consideration by the Examiner.</p>	No change.
------	--	--	---------	------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

				<p><i>Lane, Chew Lane and Eshton Road for walking and do not relate to the site itself.</i></p> <p><i>The sites inclusion by the Parish in the Neighbourhood Plan appears a deliberate attempt at avoiding the site being used for housing or mixed use in either this Plan or subsequent Plans. The proposed allocation is an abuse of the Local Green Space designation and would, if adopted in this way, have a detrimental effect on the use of the designation on other sites.</i></p> <p><i>The site has normal protection from the Local Planning Authority in terms of other existing designations</i></p> <p><i>(Special Landscape Area & Conservation Area) and good planning practice; and does not require an artificial designation as Local Green Space.</i></p> <p>The representation is appended to this letter for information purposes.</p> <p>The landowner would like to be kept informed of the progress of the</p>		
--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

					<p>Neighbourhood Plan and we look forward to receiving further information and answers in relation to the various questions posed in this consultation response.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely Laura Mephram MRTPI Associate Director JRP</p>		
<p>D Clark</p> <p>3.1</p> <p>Representations regarding proposals for "Local Green Space"</p>			<p>Designation: The Croft – SHLAA Site GA005 (Site 7 on Map 1, Draft NDP Proposals)</p>	<p>Comment / Object</p>	<p>1.0 Executive Summary</p> <p>1.1 An ageing population looking for smaller homes is a recurring theme.</p> <p>1.2 Ideally these are wanted on small sites close the Village Centre.</p> <p>1.3 There is opposition to outlying sites-referred to as 'urban sprawl' in residents's fee-back.</p> <p>1.4 The Croft was one of the sites receiving most support within the Village.</p> <p>1.5 The Croft is the closest to the centre and well placed for public transport.</p> <p>1.6 The status of The Croft as 'Important' Open</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP demonstrates that the housing target of at least 100 new homes over the Plan period, provided by Craven DC can be met comfortably through the proposed site allocations and NDP policies.</p> <p>The Croft is a valued open space within the Conservation Area and its contribution to the character of the Conservation Area is recognised in the Conservation Area Appraisal. A proposal to develop the site for housing was dismissed on appeal. The reasons for the appeal being dismissed included the</p>	<p>No change.</p>

					<p>Space does not stand up to scrutiny.</p> <p>1.7 The site is currently well protected by its location with the Conservation Area.</p> <p>1.8 The Parish Council wishes to continue the historic pattern of development – this was largely by infilling the crofts and other open spaces within the built-up area.</p> <p>1.9 The decision to ignore the sites close to the centre and promote outlying sites, appears perverse.</p> <p>1.10 This is compounded by the decision to seek ‘Local Green Space Designation’ for these sites, effectively protecting them from any future development.</p> <p>1.11 The decision also ignores practical issues such as on-going maintenance, especially for The Croft, which is not connected to agricultural land.</p>	<p>site’s significance as a small green space, contributing to the historic character of the village core.</p> <p>Further detail is provided in the accompanying document, the local green spaces assessment using Craven DC methodology.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

					2.0 Relevant extracts from the Draft NDP Para Page Extracts Relevant to The Croft P5 Executive Summary P6 The references to the sites shown in Map 1 are not followed consistently throughout the draft NDP. Attachment A sets out the alternative references used together with other key information about each site.	Noted. It is recognised that there is some confusion arising from different sets of numbering for sites reflecting the changes to the plan during its preparation. This has been addressed in the submission draft.	No change.
3.2		3.0		Comment	3.0 p13 A portrait of Gargrave 3.2 p13 Age Structure – figures from the 2011 census are quotes on P.13. The Parish has a population of 1.755 residents living in 833 households. Attention is drawn to a relatively high proportion of elderly residents – 30.4% over 65 compared to a national average of 16.4%. Life expectancy is also slightly longer than the average.	Noted. The submission NDP recognises the need for additional housing for an ageing population and this is supported in an additional policy.	No change.
3.3		3.0		Comment	3.3 p.14 Gargrave ‘Assets’ are listed in some detail – Built Heritage, Natural Heritage, Open Spaces, Wildlife & Habitats, Views. No reference is made to the Croft.	Noted. The Croft area is identified as a local green space and there is no need to replicate its significance elsewhere in the Plan.	No change.

					4.0 p17 Key Planning Issues	Noted.	No change.
					4.1.3 p17 Refers to a document "Results of Residents Feedback" – this was an exercise that took place in September 2014, comments are set out in Attachment B.		
					4.2.1 p.18 Housing for the Elderly viewed as important.		
					4.2.3 p.18 The location of new housing developments is discussed. Some residents comments are highly relevant – avoidance of "sprawling village boundairies" and "small scale developments preferred over large housing estates". This section also refers to the site "scores in the Site Appraisal Report" which recommends sites to be taken forward (and rejects the District Council suggested sites) – see reference to para 6.1.7 below.		
					4.4.1 p.21-27 Protecting the Environment & Green Spaces / Plan Objectives – no specific mention of the Croft, no attempt to define the quality of 'valuable green spaces'.		
3.4			6.1 – 6.3	Comment	6.1 p.29 Housing : Objectives	Noted.	No change.

				<p>6.1.7 p.31 Sites assessment Report 2015 – the Croft, site GA005 scored reasonably highly (80) with several points open to question, see Attachment C for alternative assessment(98)</p> <p>6.1.8 p.32 Sites scoring ‘at least 80 points could be brought forward’.</p> <p>6.1.14 p.45 Draws attention again to the need for smaller properties to reflecting an ageing population.</p> <p>6.1.17 p.46 Draft Policy G3 refers specifically to a requirement for ‘properties designed to be suitable for the elderly (lifetime homes standard), which are located close to key facilities.</p> <p>6.3 p.55 Protecting the Environment, Green Spaces & Character of Gargrave : Objectives</p> <p>6.3.3 p.56-61 A series of OS maps are included ‘to demonstrate that the proposals in the NDP are a continuation of the historical pattern of the village’</p> <p>The OS maps actually demonstrate the opposite – the development of the village over the</p>	<p>The site is considered inappropriate for new housing development – a proposal for housing on this site was dismissed recently on appeal and the site is proposed as a local green space because it is demonstrated that it meets the criteria set out in the NPPF.</p>	
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

					last 100 years has been mainly by infilling the 'home crofts' within the core village area; the current proposals are to extend the village along Marton Road and the A65- referred to as urban sprawl by several respondents in the Residents Feedback.		
3.5		6.3		Object	<p>6.3.11 p.66-67 Lists 'several important open spaces' within the village including The Croft.</p> <p>6.3.12 p.67-68 The table schedules the proposed Local Green Spaces. The Croft is included and given the same status as the formal Greens and the Churchyard; no attempt is made to analyse the quality of the green space which is the remains of the former Church Gate Farm home croft. The site is surrounded by the backs of the Church Street and Riverside dwellings and partially screened by a variety of fences and hedges. The Croft is no longer connected to other agricultural land, has limited views and is private land with no public access. See Attachment C. para.8b for further information and analysis.</p> <p>The schedule also refers to 'Historical site / Archaeological Dig'</p>	Noted. See 3.4 above.	No change.

					See Attachment C para. 11c for further information.		
3.6			Appendices	Comment	<p>App 3 p.100-107 This is a Summary of Comments (for and against) taken from responses to an informal consultation on the emerging draft NDP, Summer 2015. It does not define who was consulted or how many responses were received.</p> <p>No reference is made to The Croft, site GA005 (07 in the draft NDP), presumably not included in the sites covered by the consultation.</p> <p>p.107 General points are recorded – of interest to The Croft are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Smaller sites thought more in keeping with character and integrate better. 9. Allotment arrangements asked for. 14. More parking required (the first time parking problems are mentioned!) 	Noted. Further information about eh consultation process is provided in the accompanying consultation statement.	No change.

<p>Johnson Brook</p> <p>Johnson Brook Address Johnson Brook Planning and Development Consultants Coronet House Queen Street Leeds LS1 2TW Tel 0113 887 0120 Contact Email clive@johnsonbr ook.co.uk</p> <p>(Relevant Extracts to NDP from Brochure only considered in this table – Full copy of Brochure can be provided by PC on request)</p> <p>4.1</p>			<p>Land off Skipton Road, Gargrave (G2/8, GA025)</p>	<p>Comment / Object</p>	<p>1. Introduction This is a response to the Draft Gargrave Neighbourhood Development Plan (hereafter referred to as 'Neighbourhood Plan' or 'NP') on behalf of our Client, Richard Morton of KCS Development Ltd. Our Client has land interests in site GA025 (NP ref G2/8), Land north of Skipton Road and seeks to promote the land for a residential allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan for circa 45 dwellings. Craven District Council (CDC) are currently undertaking work to produce a new Local Plan. It is anticipated that the final plan will be submitted to the Secretary of State at the end of 2016 and, following an Examination in Public (EiP), adopted in 2017. Whilst the Local Plan will set the scale and type of development apportioned to Gargrave, the Neighbourhood Plan can be used to provide further detail by introducing policies to guide the location and siting of housing and employment development and tourism, leisure and recreation opportunities throughout the village. In order to promote this development site a team of experienced consultants are working alongside</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------	-------------------

				<p>KCS Development Ltd. The team consists of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Johnson Brook – Planning, Landscape and Heritage Consultants • Halliday Clark – Architect • BSP Consulting – Flood Risk Assessment • JBA – Flood modelling • Cannon Highways / Bryan G Hall – Highways • Prospect Archaeology - Archaeology • Tim Smith – Freelance Ecologist • JPG – Civil and Structural Engineering Consultants <p>Previously Johnson Brook, on behalf of KCS Development Ltd, have provided up to date site information through the Call for Sites exercise undertaken by the Gargrave Neighbourhood Plan Working Group (GNPWG) in February 2015. Following the publication of the resident’s feedback, collated from a pamphlet and questionnaire exercise, Johnson Brook wrote to the GNPWG and their planning consultants, Kirkwells, to make further representation. A submission was also made during the informal consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan ‘First Working Draft’ in June 2015.</p> <p>Our Client has liaised closely with the GNPWG and Kirkwells throughout the NP process. We support the principal</p>		
--	--	--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

					of the NP and many of its policies (see Section 6 for commentary).		
4.2			G1	Object	<p>6. Neighbourhood Plan Policies Response</p> <p>Policy G1 new Housing within the Settlement Boundary</p> <p>It is our view that the development limits should be redrawn to exclude site G2/5, as we do not consider this an appropriate housing allocation, and should instead be extended to the east to incorporate the sport facilities and site GA025.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The site does not relate well to the existing settlement and is not included as a preferred option by Craven DC. It should not be included within the settlement boundary.</p>	No change.
4.3			G2	Object	<p>Policy G2 Site Allocations - New Housing</p> <p>We object to the allocation of G2/5, Land west of Walton Close. There are serious highway safety issues raised in relation to the development of this site (see section 5B and Appendix three) and as such consider that site GA025 is a more appropriate site for residential allocation. This site also provides no significant benefits in terms of sport and recreation and improved connectivity to open space networks.</p> <p>Like G2/5, site GA025 has a capacity for 45 dwellings and as such the housing delivery figure from the NP would not be compromised.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The PC has received highways comments from NYCC on all proposed sites, and the comments provided suggestions for improving highway safety if the site was brought forward for development.</p> <p>Concerns about highways issues in relation to G2/5 together with the response of NYCC Highways are set out in Tables 4.1 and 4.2 in more detail.</p>	No change.

4.4					Policy G3 Local Needs Housing and Ensuring an Appropriate Range of Tenures, Types and Size of Houses We agree with criteria 1 and 3 of this draft policy but object to criterion 2 which is wholly inconsistent with the last paragraph on page 46 of this policy, with which we are in agreement.		
4.5			G4	Support	Policy G4 New Employment Development at the Systagenix Site We agree with the inclusion of this policy and consider that the Systagenix Site is an appropriate location for new employment development.	Not accepted. The references to supporting further development on this site have been deleted in the submission NDP following consideration of comments from the Environment Agency, both on the Draft Plan and in response to the SEA process.	No change.
4.6			G5	Comment	Policy G5 Tourism and Rural Business Development We raise no objection to the inclusion of this policy.	Noted.	No change.
4.7			G6	Support	Policy G6 Promoting High Quality Design We support the inclusion of a policy which seeks to promote high quality design within new development. We recognise the importance of local distinctiveness and seek to enhance	Noted.	No change.

					and reinforce this within the development proposals for site GA025.		
4.8			G7	Comment	Policy G7 Local Green Space We raise no objections to the allocated Local Green Spaces.	Noted.	No change.
4.9			G8	Support	Policy G8 Protecting and Enhancing Local Recreational Facilities We support Policy G8 which seeks to protect and enhance local recreational facilities. We welcome the phrase “development which contributes towards the improvement of existing, or provision of, new recreational facilities will be encouraged” We take this opportunity to reiterate that the development proposals seek to make enhancements to the existing neighbouring Sports Club and Grounds through an improved and safer access point and financial contributions for improvements to club facilities.	Noted.	No change,
4.10			G9	Objection.	Policy G9 Protecting and Enhancing the Rural and Landscape Setting of Gargrave	Not accepted. This is line with the NPPF which sets out that new	No change.

					<p>We disagree with criterion 1 as worded. The reference to Flood Zone 3 should be deleted. Any replacement criterion should be clearly based on the development capacity of the different landscape character types identified in the two currently existing landscape character assessments (see paragraphs 4.7 to 4.9 of this report).</p>	<p>development should be steered towards areas of lower flood risk.</p> <p>Following consideration of detailed comments from Craven DC and the Environment Agency, a number of changes have been made throughout the plan supporting text and policy to clarify issues around flooding and flood risk.</p>	
4.11			G10	Support	<p>Policy G10 Supporting Public Transport Improvements and Encouraging Walking and Cycling</p> <p>We support this policy and once again reiterate that the proposed development is able to meet a number of the criterion within the draft policy including providing mechanisms for traffic calming measures through the proposed 'Gateway', providing pedestrian links to the Canal Towpath and facilitating the development/ expansion of local sporting facilities through improved access and financial contributions.</p>	Noted.	No change.
4.12			G11	Objection.	<p>Policy G11 Criteria for Assessing the Suitability of Future Potential Development Sites</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>This policy has been deleted.</p>	No further change.

					Overall we consider that the wording of this policy is very generalised which will make it difficult to apply. Criterion 2 in particular lacks any clarity and is not consistent with the contents of flood risk policy and the location of development contained in the Framework.		
4.13			G12	Objection	Policy G12 Development in Areas of Flood Risk from Water Courses and Surface Water Again we consider that the whole of this policy wording is confused and inconsistent with the policy approach in the Framework.	Partially accepted. The Policy has been revised taking into consideration comments from Craven DC and the Environment Agency.	No further change.
4.14			G13	Objection	Policy G13 Design for Flood Resilience and Resistance We are in general agreement with this policy. However the statement that flood resilience measures “must” include all of the four bullet point measures is not necessarily appropriate in each individual development case.	Partially accepted. The Policy has been revised taking into consideration comments from Craven DC and the Environment Agency.	No further change.
4.15			G14	Support	Policy G14 Design to Reduce Surface Water Runoff We support the content of this policy	Noted.	No change.
4.16			All	Comment	7. Concluding Statement	Noted.	No change.

				<p>Site GA025 is wholly suitable as a sustainable residential allocation. We have demonstrated why the site is not suitable as a mixed employment and residential development (see appendix 2). The NP proposes a much more appropriate solution to the location of future employment within Gargrave which we support.</p> <p>The site is in a sustainable location and is well located in terms of access to local jobs and services in Gargrave. The site is both available and deliverable with a willing seller and developer.</p> <p>The site scores very well on the site assessment scoring methodology devised by the GNPWG using the most up to date information.</p> <p>The highways analysis undertaken demonstrates that there are significant highway safety issues associated with site G2/5, currently a preferred option for housing.</p> <p>Assessment work carried out to date has resulted in an approval in principle of a safe access into the site from the A65 by NYCC Highways. Discussion are ongoing with the Environment Agency to further</p>	<p>The site is not considered suitable for development as it does not relate well to the existing settlement. The site is not a preferred option in the CDC emerging new Local Plan and the NDP for Gargrave can demonstrate that the housing requirement of at least 100 units over the Plan period can be met through other, more appropriate site allocations and policies.</p>	
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

					<p>demonstrate that the entire site lies in Flood Zone 1.</p> <p>The design proposals incorporate a good mix of house types and respect the strong vernacular of the core of the village. The proposals create a sense of place and maintain the local character and distinctiveness of Gargrave.</p> <p>The proposals bring other benefits: New gateway access on the A65 which will help calm entry traffic from east while not adding to congestion. Improved and safer access to existing sports facilities through development site, Financial contributions to neighbouring sports facilities for improvements. Linkages to greenscape corridor along the Canal.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--