

Gargrave Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan – Consultation Responses – December 2015

Table 4.1 Local Residents

Consultee Name and Ref. No. (Note addresses have been deleted but the PC has retained a record)	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council Consideration	Amendments to Submission Neighbourhood Plan
Peter Poulter 1.1	General				Very well researched and presented document. Thoughtful and imaginative proposals.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
1.2			G1	Support	Well researched – especially the rejection of GA025. A sensitive presentation of the need to provide housing initially through infill and brownfield sites safeguarding the edges of the village from development. through porous boundaries	Noted with thanks.	No change.

1.3			G3	Support	Particularly the need for affordable housing	Noted.	No change.
1.4			G5	Support	Because tourism is a very important part of the village economy, sensitive development preserving the character of the village is necessary. It is what tourist come for.	Noted.	No change.
1.5			G4	Comment	Good planning to propose focus of employment/industrial development on factory site. The text does not say just where it would be. Hopefully to the East of the factory base. If on the grazing to the west of the factory entrance – it would spoil the approach to the village and reduce argument for rejection of GA025 for residential development.	Not accepted. The Policy and references to the site have been deleted following concerns from the Environment Agency that the site is at risk of flooding, and advice from Craven DC that the existing employment use is protected in the Local Plan but further built development on the site would not be acceptable.	No change.
1.6		6.4		Comment Omission	There seems to be no reference to the need for update/expansion of sewage provision. Much re: flood management. Nothing about this.	Noted. Adequate sewerage provision is a matter for the development management process as and when planning applications come forward. Consultation bodies such as Yorkshire Water will have a view on this and technical	Amend 6.4.8: Insert additional wording: “The Parish Council will also continue to raise the need to address sewerage problems with relevant bodies. The Parish Council will, as part of standing orders, always comment on the need for the development management process to consider sewerage and drainage.”

						requirements. Paragraph 6.4.8 refers to sewerage as a concern to local residents. Wording could be added to suggest that the Parish Council will continue to raise this in comments on planning applications.	
Peter Ward & Family 2.1	Map			Support	Good choice of Green Spaces.	Noted.	No change.
2.2	Map			Support	Good choice of sites spread around the village.	Noted.	No change.
2.3				Comment	Hopefully CDC will support Gargrave NP.	Noted.	No change.
2.4				Support Comment	No 8 Green Space is very important to the village and will be supported by all and CDC.	Noted.	No change.
2.5				Comment	Building should not be allowed on land that floods.	Noted. The planning policies and proposals in the Plan support development on land at lowest risk of flooding.	No change.
Mr & Mrs S Whitley 3.			All	Comment	We support the plan entirely.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
Mrs M Hammond Map 1 Gargrave Draft			G2/3	Object	There have been several attempts to build on G2/3, the last one – just after we moved here in 1999. I am not sure of the date that planning was put in by the then owners of	Not accepted. The Parish Council has sought North Yorkshire County Council Highways comments on all the	No change.

NP Proposed Map 4.				POINTS to note	KNOWLES HOUSE. This was eventually thrown out after the decision that there was only a narrow drive down to Knowles House and the exit was onto the A65 opposite ESHTON ROAD – already 6 cars using that drive and planning would have added another 6. No of PROPERTIES on small site (last time 1 DORMER BUNGALOW) ACCESS TO SITE – not suitable existing GATE - only able to get large MOWERS THROUGH, and vehicles have to go across land belonging to the COTTAGE.	proposed housing sites. Comments from North Yorkshire County Council for this site included that access was acceptable from the A65 but demolition of a property is needed. The site should therefore be retained in the Plan.	
Peter Hardyman 5.1	General		All	Support	A comprehensive document with historic and geographic background to support the development of policies. A big effort by the Group. Thank you.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
5.2		4.2.3	G2	Support	Strongly agree the location of new housing.	Noted.	No change.
5.3		4.3.4	G4	Support	Support further industrial development on/adjacent to Systagenix.	Noted. The Policy has been deleted – see Table 1.	No further change.
5.4		4.4.1	G8	Support	Support the importance of the sports fields.	Noted.	No change.
5.5		4.5.2	G10	Support	Support the need for traffic calming in village centre.	Noted.	No change.
5.6		4.5.3	G10	Comment	Rail connections to Manchester, Clitheroe etc are required via Hellifield.	Noted. This is a matter for the rail operator. The Parish	No change.

						Council will pursue this with the rail operator.	
5.7		4.5.3	G10	Comment	Lack of access to Northbound platform. Access should be provided for those unable to use steps.	Accepted. This could be added to the list of priorities in G10.	Amend G10. Add “improved accessibility for all to northbound platform at Gargrave Station” to list.
5.8		5.1	Visions	Support	Strongly support the Draft Visions.	Noted.	No change.
5.9		6.1	Objectives	Support	Strongly agree with Housing Objectives.	Noted.	No change.
5.10		6.2	Objectives	Support	Strongly support the Employment Objectives.	Noted.	No change.
5.11		6.3	Objectives	Support	Strongly support Objectives for Protecting the Environment.	Noted.	No change.
5.12		6.4		Comment	Footpath improvements are a very important contribution to sustainability.	Noted.	No change.
5.13		6.3.10		Support	Strongly support High Quality Design.	Noted.	No change.
5.14		6.3.11		Support	Strongly agree with discussion of Open Spaces.	Noted.	No change.
Alison Wiffen 6.			G8	Support	This is a very popular walk and much used by cyclists; it is the Pennine Way and a vital facility both for people who live in Gargrave and those who visit. Also this area flooded recently – wouldn’t want to build my house there!	Noted.	No change.
Ian Reed-Peck 7.1			G2/1	Support		Noted.	No change.
7.2			G2/2	Support		Noted.	No change.
7.3			G2/3	Support		Noted.	No change.

7.4			G2/4	Support		Noted. The site will be shown as a commitment in the Plan following advice from Craven DC.	No further change.
7.5			G2/5	Support		Noted.	No change.
7.6			G2/6	Support		Accepted.	No change.
7.7			G7	Support	Support selection and maintenance of all 8 local green spaces.	Noted.	No change.
7.8			G8	Strongly Support		Noted.	No change.
Mrs Maureen Marguerite Reynolds 8.			G2/5	Object	This housing site is a danger to children because of the closeness of Railway Lines. No footpath to village and flooding of site.	Not accepted. The site does not adjoin the railway line and boundary treatment will be negotiated through the development management process, and is likely to incorporate the requirements of Network Rail. The site is an area at low risk of flooding. There is a pavement along part of Marton Road. Advice from NYCC Highways advised that access is acceptable onto Church lane but there is no footway in situ. Works will be required to improve the existing major	No change.

						road and extend the existing footway / street lighting to serve the site.	
Penny Palin 9.1				Overall comment	I strongly support the Gargrave Neighbourhood Plan as published on 5 th November 2015 for public consultation.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
9.2	p16	3.7		Comment	Tour de France was 2014 not 2015	Accepted.	Amend date to 2014.
9.3	p31	Table 1		Comment	The title for the table is misleading; it references another document to be found on the GPC website. Suggest "Extract from Call for Sites etc. ..."	Not accepted. The title of the Table is not misleading and is the same as that in the Site Assessment Report which is referred to in the text.	No change.
9.4		6.3		Comment	A couple of points: a) Sustainable/Sustainability are buzz words used extensively in planning documents, but is only generally defined in the NPPF with reference to economic, societal and environmental requirements b) GPC & the WG have done a great job compiling evidence to support site	Accepted. Insert additional section of text after 6.1.11 setting out the Government's approach to sustainable development and how this has been used to inform the selection of proposed housing sites.	Amend Section 6.3. Insert additional text after 6.1.11: "The overall strategy of the NDP and proposals for site allocations support the role of the planning system in contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. This is set out in paragraph 7 of the NPPF and is noted in Section 2.0 of the Gargrave NDP. In summary, in addition to policies guiding new development, and taking into consideration existing commitments, the proposed housing sites will contribute towards meet the objectively assessed housing need for Gargrave required by

					<p>assessment, but it is distributed throughout several documents (referenced and available on the GPC website) and the reader, to be able to properly understand what is happening in the process, has to go hunting for all the supporting information.</p> <p>So it would be useful to include a summary (section 6?) explaining 'sustainability' in its several aspects and how the NP has addressed them e.g. link to the criteria used in Table 1 and the several policies on flooding to indicate clearly how the final site list was arrived at.</p>		<p>Craven District Council. The proposed sites are considered to be those which are most sustainable, in that they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - are located within the settlement boundary and close to existing services, facilities, employment opportunities, and transport networks, - do not have unacceptably adverse impacts on built or natural heritage assets, - generally are in areas of lowest risk of flooding and - do not use the best and most versatile agricultural land. <p>The proposed sites also take into consideration the requirements and criteria set out in the other policies in the Plan.</p>
9.5	P39		G2	Support		Noted.	No change.
9.6	Site G2.1			Support		Noted.	No change.
9.7	Site G2/2			Object	<p>Gargrave residents are very supportive of Neville House and the future provision for its residents must be assured. Unless a suitable site is developed for alternative accommodation within the settlement boundary I cannot support new housing on this site.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The Parish Council understands that North Yorkshire County Council are considering other sites in Gargrave for provision of new and improved care home facilities. However this work is at an early stage and an identified site</p>	No change.

						<p>has not yet been approved. The proposed housing site may only come forward if and when suitable re-provision was provided.</p> <p>The site is considered sustainable and is located close to local facilities including the school. If and when it becomes available it would be suitable for redevelopment for housing.</p>	
9.8			G2/3	Support		Noted.	No change.
9.9			G2/4	Comment	<p>I note that planning permission has already been granted for this site and that it has already been counted in the 51 sites mentioned in 6.1.3 or alternatively in the 52 sites referred to in 6.1.10. Thus, if G2/4 is not to be double counted, the number of new houses provisionally estimated for G2/1 to G2/6 should be reduced from 101 to 72. The total, using the figure of 52 from 6.1.10, is then 124 – still in excess of the likely number required in Gargrave from CDC’s latest strategic review.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The site does not contribute to double counting but should be shown as a commitment rather than a site allocation as suggested by Craven DC. The Submission Plan will be revised accordingly.</p>	No further change.

9.10			G2/5	Support		Noted.	No change.
9.11			G2/6	Support		Accepted.	No change.
9.12	p52	6.2.11		Support	Add that brownfield sites must be redeveloped before greenfield sites are considered.	Accepted. Insert further text as suggested.	Amend 6.2.11 Insert additional text after “in general”: “and brownfield sites should be redeveloped before greenfield sites are considered.”
9.13	p68	Table 3 Item 8		Comment	Paragraph 6.3.22 emphasises the particular importance and ambience of this area where old, new and future ‘ways criss-cross and draw visitors and residents alike. This deserves a mention in the table.	Accepted.	Amend Plan. Insert additional text in table: “The fields in the area to the north of the village off Chew Lane are recognised in the Gargrave Conservation Area Appraisal as an open space that makes a strong contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area (see Map X). The area has a particular importance and ambience as old, new and future ways criss-cross and draw visitors and residents alike.”
9.14	P69 & p70 Map 8		G7	Support	Very important to retain and protect all these green spaces for future societal and economic (commercial) sustainability.	Noted.	No change.
Wendy Hall (Mrs) 10.1			G2/6	Object Strongly	In light of recent river levels I think it would be potentially dangerous to build here as I think it would impact on houses backing onto the river in Gargrave when river levels high. May cause flooding which hasn’t previously occurred.	Not accepted. 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.	No change.

						<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 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 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>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

10.2			G2/4	Support	Need to consider extending 30MPH limit further i.e. past Twin Locks Garden Centre.	Noted. This matter is being pursued by the Parish Council.	No further change.
10.3			G2/5	Support	Must consider increase in traffic along Marton Road. Will there be some smaller, starter homes?	Noted. Planning policies in the Plan support a mix of house types, sizes and tenures and promote the need for more smaller housing.	No change.
Mr & Mrs C Aspden 4 Marton Close 11.			Sites G2/6 & G2/5	Object	Lack of footpath from site, volume of traffic, junctions at Marton Close and Walton Avenue are concealed. With excess traffic would cause danger. Also floodline, at Marton Road around High Mill have been highlighted on weened of Sat Dec 5 th as the road was flooded. Site near football ground would be far more sensible! (AND safer for FAMILIES)	Not accepted. Site G2/6 is retained – see 10.1 above. Site G2/5 is supported by Craven DC and should be retained in the Plan as it meets sustainable development objectives. Advice from NYCC Highways advised that access is acceptable onto Church lane but there is no footway in situ. Works will be required to improve the existing major road and extend the existing footway / street lighting to serve the site.	No change.

<p>J.A. Simpson</p> <p>12.1</p>			<p>G2/5</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>For a scheme that was supposed to find infill sites on a small scale, this site is out of proportion entirely '47' houses.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>In order to meet the housing requirement set out in the emerging Craven Local Plan a range of sites, including some larger sites, is required in the Plan. It would be difficult to demonstrate that at least 100 new homes could be provided over the Plan period if the Plan relied only on small infill sites and did not allocate some larger sites.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>12.2</p>	<p>Local Green Spaces</p>		<p>G7</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Sites 5-6-7 would be truly infill. Site 8 would accommodate all the village housing needs.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Sites 5, 6 and 7 make a strong contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area (as set out in the Conservation Area Appraisal) and meet the criteria for local green spaces as set out in the NPPF. They are generally supported in responses from local residents.</p> <p>Site 8 is retained as a local green space because it meets the criteria in the NPPF – see separate, accompanying document</p>	<p>No change.</p>

						assessing the proposed local green spaces using Craven DC's methodology.	
Anon 13.1			G2/2	Support	When is Neville House going to close?	Noted. This is not known at the current time.	No change.
13.2			G2/4	Support		Noted. This site will be shown as a commitment following advice from Craven DC.	No change.
13.3			G2/3	Not sure	How is this accessed?	The Parish Council has sought North Yorkshire County Council Highways comments on all the proposed housing sites. Comments from North Yorkshire County Council for this site included that access was acceptable from the A65 but demolition of a property is needed. The site should therefore be retained in the Plan.	No change.
13.4			G2/6	Support		Noted.	No change.
13.5			G2/5	Not sure	Maybe a smaller development here. 45 seems a lot.	Noted. The figure of 45 is an estimate based on an assumed density of 25 dwellings per hectare,	No change.

						<p>which reflects the rural character of the area.</p> <p>The revised figure of 30 dph follows discussions with CDC.</p> <p>The final figure for the site will be determined through the development management process.</p>	
<p>Sarah Peel Gargrave CE(VC) Primary School</p> <p>14.1</p>			G2/4	Support	<p>We share a boundary with this development and it would be essential to have the correct perimeter to ensure safeguarding of people on the school site.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The site has been deleted from the site allocations in the Plan as it already has planning consent and it is therefore shown as a commitment.</p> <p>The development management process provides opportunities for comments such as this to be considered in more detail.</p>	No change.
14.2			G2/2	Support	as above.	Noted.	No change.
14.3	All				<p>If some/all of these go ahead it is essential that the school is involved and aware of projections of numbers so that Governors can plan ahead for staffing and premises.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The school will have an opportunity to comment on planning applications through the development management process.</p>	No change.

						North Yorkshire County Council will continue to be involved in strategic planning to ensure any growth in student numbers is provided for at the appropriate time.	
P.M Wilson 15.			Map 1 G2/5	Object	<p>As a resident living in the High Mill area I use Marton Road daily – it is difficult enough at present with access and traffic – not to mention farm vehicles. Access from various side exits is difficult now with cars parked along the road side. Flooding is also a problem as water already seeps out from the field opposite the Residential Home – this would probably be worse with more houses built adjacent to the field.</p> <p>We have already had sewerage problems – the system as I understand is old and already unable to cope with the amount of effluent. This is not an area for young children. No footpaths, no play areas – the main road has to be crossed for the school.</p> <p>The access to Church Lane for Marton Rd at the pub is poor – narrow & most drivers already cut the corner!</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The site is considered to be a sustainable location, on the edge of the built up area and with good access to local facilities and services. It is not in an area of high flood risk. Drainage from the site should improve with development as sustainable drainage systems should be incorporated in line with Craven DC and Environment Agency requirements and also the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Marton Road includes some pavements along part of the section. Improvements in traffic management and safety in Gargrave are proposed in</p>	No change.

						<p>the other policies in the Plan.</p> <p>Advice from NYCC Highways advised that access is acceptable onto Church lane but there is no footway in situ. Works will be required to improve the existing major road and extend the existing footway / street lighting to serve the site.</p>	
Anon 16.			Map G2/5	Object	<p>I do not agree to this site being built on – it floods frequently and we have enough traffic on Marton Road.</p> <p>Plenty of farm traffic which is a danger as they go so fast. Our Sewers back up and cannot take anymore. I cannot believe you are thinking of 49 houses being built.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The site is considered to be a sustainable location, on the edge of the built up area and with good access to local facilities and services. It is not in an area of high flood risk. Drainage from the site should improve with development as sustainable drainage systems should be incorporated in line with Craven DC and Environment Agency requirements and also the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Marton Road includes some pavements along</p>	No change.

						<p>part of the section. Improvements in traffic management and safety in Gargrave are proposed in the other policies in the Plan.</p> <p>Advice from NYCC Highways advised that access is acceptable onto Church lane but there is no footway in situ. Works will be required to improve the existing major road and extend the existing footway / street lighting to serve the site.</p>	
Chris + Sandy Lloyd 17.	Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan 2014-2030 All			Support	I support the Neighbourhood Plan in its entirety and look forward to it being full endorsed by CDC!	Noted.	No change.
Mr B Wolstenholme 18.1			Site G2/5 on Map 1	Object to Development	<p>This will only increase traffic on an already busy B road, Marton Road. Careful consideration must be given to access to this proposed site.</p> <p>Heavy lorries and tractors already present a hazard with speeding in particular.</p> <p>As a pedestrian one can only escape onto grass verges.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The site is considered to be a sustainable location, on the edge of the built up area and with good access to local facilities and services. It is not in an area of high flood risk. Drainage from the site</p>	No change.

					<p>Sometimes this is difficult with cars parking on the verge.</p>	<p>should improve with development as sustainable drainage systems should be incorporated in line with Craven DC and Environment Agency requirements and also the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Marton Road includes some pavements along part of the section. Improvements in traffic management and safety in Gargrave are proposed in the other policies in the Plan.</p> <p>Advice from NYCC Highways advised that access is acceptable onto Church lane but there is no footway in situ. Works will be required to improve the existing major road and extend the existing footway / street lighting to serve the site.</p>	
18.2			G2/5	Object to this Development	<p>Traffic coming from Scalber Lane has problems due to traffic on Marton Road. Harvest Time is a real problem with late night working. Further development will enhance this</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>Advice from NYCC Highways advised that access is acceptable onto Church lane but there is</p>	No change.

					problem. Also adding to Martin Road Traffic will be vehicles from and to the 22 Timber/Log Cabins already agreed.	no footway in situ. Works will be required to improve the existing major road and extend the existing footway / street lighting to serve the site.	
J.C. Adams 19.	Map 1 Gargrave Draft NDP Proposals Map		G2/5	Object	<p>Marton Road is a 'Country Road' with limited access into the village. Farm vehicles already make the road hazardous. There is no pedestrian access into the village (esp school and shops) Areas 3 or 8 tick most boxes re access, safe walking to school and other village amenities.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The site is considered to be a sustainable location, on the edge of the built up area and with good access to local facilities and services. It is not in an area of high flood risk. Drainage from the site should improve with development as sustainable drainage systems should be incorporated in line with Craven DC and Environment Agency requirements and also the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Marton Road includes some pavements along part of the section. Improvements in traffic management and safety in Gargrave are proposed in the other policies in the Plan.</p>	No change.

						Advice from NYCC Highways advised that access is acceptable onto Church lane but there is no footway in situ. Works will be required to improve the existing major road and extend the existing footway / street lighting to serve the site.	
Mike Treasure 20.	All				It would be wrong of me to comment as we are not directly affected! Although I was very happy and delighted that No 8 was designated as Local Green Space. I know from past experience that you all involved should be congratulated and indeed thanked for all your hard work, time and effort put in and probably long house. Thank you.	Noted.	No further change.
B M Holmes 21.1			G2/4	Support		Noted. This site will be shown as a commitment following advice from Craven DC.	No further change.
21.2			G2/2	Support	Assuming satisfactory outcome for present residents of Neville House.	Noted.	No change.
21.3			G2/1	Support		Noted.	No change.
21.4			G2/3	Support		Noted.	No change.
21.5			G2/5	Support		Noted.	No change.

21.6			G2/6	Support		Noted.	No further change.
Anon 22.	All			Support	I would like to commend the members of this Neighbourhood Plan for their hard work and the time they gave to the project to enable it to be brought to this satisfactory conclusion. THANK YOU!	Noted.	No change.
Charlotte Ackroyd 23.1			G2/6	Support	Plan well thought out, I support this idea.	Noted.	No change.
23.2			G2/5	Support		Noted.	No change.
23.3			G2/4	Support		Noted. This site will be shown as a commitment following advice from Craven Dc	No further change.
23.4			G2/3	Support		Noted.	No change.
23.5			G2/2	Support		Noted.	No change.
23.6			G2/1	Support		Noted.	No change.
Thomas Harrison 24.				Support	Excellent Plan Houses well placed, well done.	Noted.	No change.
Kevin Jackson 25.1	Pg 21 Para 4.4.1			Comment	The Greens: This should be re-worded as they are already protected as an 'Open Space', as they make up the registered Village Green (VG62), which is	Accepted. Insert additional text as suggested to first point The Greens and final point under Playground etc.	Amend 4.4.1. Insert additional text to first point The Greens: "These areas are already protected as an 'Open Space', as they make up the registered Village

					protected by the 'Open Spaces Act 1906'.		Green (VG62), which is protected by the Open Spaces Act 1906 and under national and Craven District planning policies." Insert additional text to final point Playground etc: "These areas are already protected as 'Open Spaces', under national and Craven District planning policies."
25.2	Pg 66	Para 6.3.11		Comment	This section needs re-wording. 'The greens are all owned and managed by the Parish Council'. The following needs to be added; 'and they are registered as Village Green (VG62) which affords them protection from development under the 'Open Spaces Act 1906'.	Accepted. Amend Plan using wording as suggested.	Amend 6.3.11. Add additional wording after "Parish Council": "and they are registered as Village Green (VG62) which affords them protection from development under the Open Spaces Act 1906."
25.3		Table 3 NPPF 1 2 3		Comment	The 'Open Spaces' 1, 2 & 3 should be differentiated from the other open spaces, as 1, 2 & 3 make up the registered Village Green (VG62). The law pertaining to the Village Green is the 'Open Spaces Act 1906', which sets it apart from the other open spaces.	Partially accepted. The supporting text (see 25.3 above) has been amended in line with the suggested changes. This is not one of the criteria set out in the NPPF however and therefore it would be appropriate to include reference to it in the Table.	No change.
25.4	Map: Green Spaces			Comment	Differentiation should be shown as the Green Space 1,2 & 3 make up the registered Village Green (NG62) which is protected under the 'Open Spaces Act 1906' whereas the other green spaces are not.	Not accepted. The supporting text (see 25.3 above) has been amended in line with the suggested changes.	No change.

						The Map shows the designated local green spaces and it would not appropriate to differentiate between them according to all the other types protection which they may enjoy.	
Barbara Martin 26.1	Map 5 Local Green Space			Support	Very important Green Space	Noted.	No change.
26.2	Map G2/5 New Housing			Support	Very good idea. In area of housing already.	Noted.	No change.
26.3	Map G2/4				I cannot visualize this being a good place to live but subject to access, possible.	Noted.	No change.
26.4	Map 8 Local Green Space			Support	Chew Lane is an important walking area for many people and has good trees and beck	Noted.	No change.
26.5	Map G2/6 New Housing			Support	This plot is ready for new use.	Noted.	No change.
Andrew & Norma Smith 27.	The Draft Plan				Well done. A very thorough and comprehensive review by the working group. It seems to have the best interests of the village at its heart. CDC clearly went for the easy options of sites GA028, 29, 25 and 12 to fulfil their required housing/employment numbers. It just shows what a bit of	Noted with thanks.	No change.

					common sense and insider knowledge can produce when one looks at your amended plan. Hopefully, CDC planning dept will take note of local feelings.		
Judith Haisley Mukae 28.1	Map 1			Support	Support decreased development as a protection of current owners. Seventy-five S/B maximum new homes/Residents.	Noted. The Submission Plan has a revised housing figure of at least 100 new homes in line with the emerging Craven Local Plan.	No change.
28.2	5.2 Infrastructure			Object	Do not want cyclist to share towpath with walkers. The nature of the canal area is much less enjoyable if one must always be looking out for cyclists. As it is some riders are very aggressive on the roads.	Not accepted. Cyclists are welcomed by the Canals and Rivers Trust to enjoy and use canal towpaths as well as walkers. See also: https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/our-towpath-code	No change.
Judith Harrison 29.1			G2/5	Object	Marston Road is too narrow to accommodate any more traffic. 49 houses (approx. 75 extra vehicles) will increase the volume of traffic. Skell Hill junction and all other access points already have issues with fast moving traffic, farming vehicles etc. which will increase the likelihood of accidents.	Noted. The site is considered to be a sustainable location, on the edge of the built up area and with good access to local facilities and services. It is not in an area of high flood risk. Drainage from the site	No change.

					<p>Access is very poor on Walton Close, with poor visibility for fast moving traffic. No footpath for access to the village for schools and shops. Already safety issue that isn't being addressed. Railway Line at the rear of proposed development. Children playing or accessing the Railway Line. Railways noise and freight. Trains use the line through the night. This will have a noise effect for the new development. Flooding at gate entrance – bottom of site. No 31 Marton Road – To the Mill have a very big chance, due to the field currently holding the water. There are already problems with surface water on the road already, flooding in areas. Sewers back up already on Marton Road. Another 49 houses will have a detrimental effect. No playground for children this side the village, where are the children going to play safely. This has always been an issue on this side the village.</p>	<p>should improve with development as sustainable drainage systems should be incorporated in line with Craven DC and Environment Agency requirements and also the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Marton Road includes some pavements along part of the section. Improvements in traffic management and safety in Gargrave are proposed in the other policies in the Plan.</p> <p>Advice from NYCC Highways advised that access is acceptable onto Church lane but there is no footway in situ. Works will be required to improve the existing major road and extend the existing footway / street lighting to serve the site.</p>	
29.2			G2/5 continued	Comment	<p><u>Alternative Site</u> Next to the Sports pitches is not being considered for some strange reason. <u>WHY?</u> Entrance directly onto the main A65. Footpath into the village to the</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The site next to the cricket field does not adjoin the existing built up area and</p>	No change.

					school with no need to cross the road. No other properties will be interfered with, for example, flooding, noise, overlooking etc. Playground round the corner, drains need sorting out to stop flooding at Raybridge Road end. The owner of the land is going to make a large donation to the Football & Cricket Clubs for shared access.	is in an area which floods frequently. Other sites such as those identified in the Plan are considered to provide a more sustainable option. If a planning application comes forward for the site it will be considered through the development management process.	
Mr & Mrs Storr 30.1			G2/1	No objection	Infill, no problem.	Noted.	No change.
30.2			G2/2	Object	Care Home in a Village requirement – much needed.	Noted. The Parish Council understands that North Yorkshire County Council are considering other sites in Gargrave for provision of new and improved care home facilities. However this work is at an early stage and an identified site has not yet been approved. The proposed housing site may only come forward if and when suitable re-provision was provided.	No change.
30.3			G2/3	No Objection	No objection in principle	Noted.	No change.

30.4			G2/4	No Objection	No objection in principle but access into Main Rd is a problem	Noted. The site will be shown as a commitment following advice from Craven DC.	No further change.
30.5			G2/5	Object	Large site would be overdevelopment of village into Greenfields – also have concerns re surface water drainage and increased traffic	Noted. The site is considered to be a sustainable location, on the edge of the built up area and with good access to local facilities and services. It is not in an area of high flood risk. Drainage from the site should improve with development as sustainable drainage systems should be incorporated in line with Craven DC and Environment Agency requirements and also the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan. Marton Road includes some pavements along part of the section. Improvements in traffic management and safety in Gargrave are proposed in the other policies in the Plan.	No change.

						Advice from NYCC Highways advised that access is acceptable onto Church lane but there is no footway in situ. Works will be required to improve the existing major road and extend the existing footway / street lighting to serve the site.	
30.6			G2/6	Object	As G2/5	Not accepted. See 10.1 above.	No change.
30.7	All.				Notwithstanding concerns re individual sites consider development generally would be excessive and erode the character of village. Specific concerns re traffic movements, surface water flooding (already a problem) and the capacity of the foul drainage system.	Not accepted. The proposed housing sites have been chosen following extensive consultation with local residents and are considered to be the most sustainable. The level of proposed development (at least 100 houses over the Plan period) supports the housing requirement in the emerging Local Plan for Gargrave.	No change.
Nigel Horsfield 31.		6.3.11		Support	I particularly support the proposals on green spaces as described in paragraph 6.3.11. I support the plan as a whole.	Noted.	No change.
Joan Horsfield		6.3.11		Support	I have read the plan and support it as a whole & in	Noted.	No change.

32.					particular support the proposals made in PARA 6.3.11		
Mrs H Bartle 33.			All	Support	I support the whole of the Neighbourhood Plan	Noted	No change.

E Bartle 34.			All	Support	I whole heartedly support the Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted	No change.
Sally Timmins 35.1			G2/3	Object	The access to this plot-down a small driveway is not suitable for the traffic of several houses. The access is also now crosses more than one person's land and it is very unlikely they would both give permission. The only other access would be from the village green. It has been turned down in the past and the road has only got busier since then.	Not accepted. The driveway is one of 2 potential access points to the site. The Parish Council has sought North Yorkshire County Council Highways comments on all the proposed housing sites. Advice from NYCC Highways advised that access from the A65 is acceptable but it needs demolition of a property.	No change.
Sally Timmins			G2/5	Support	I think that this part of the village should take a great share	Noted.	No change.

35.2					of the village traffic – other areas are really under pressure.		
Sally Timmins			G2/6	Support	“ “ “	Noted.	No change.
35.3							
Mr & Mrs D Scrimgeour			G2/4	Support	Good place for houses	Noted.	No further change.
36.1						The site will be shown as a commitment in the Plan as it already has planning permission.	
36.2			G2/2	Support	If Neville House has to go, fine for housing.	Noted.	No change.
36.3			G2/5	Support	Good place for housing	Noted.	No change.
36.4			G2/6	Support	Better than what is there now	Noted.	No change.
36.5			G2/1	Support	Fine will be of site	Noted.	No change.
SP Syms			All	Support	I agree with the N-Plan	Noted.	No change.
37.							
David J Syms			All	Support	We accept the N.P. in all its entirety. However should there be a need to change any part of the plan in the future, the system of amendments could be used as in – all documentation, within the Legal process.	Noted.	No change.
38.						The NDP should be reviewed as and when the new Craven Local Plan is adopted.	

Colin & Marie Chapman 39.1			G2/4	Support	Best location for village centre & Bus and Road A65	Noted. The site will be shown as a commitment in the Plan as it already has planning permission.	No further change.
39.2			G2/3	Support	“ “ “	Noted.	No change.
39.3			G2/5	Object	Because the Secondary (Marton Road) carries a lot of traffic from Marton & Bank Newton already.	Noted. Site G2/5 is supported by Craven DC and should be retained in the Plan as it meets sustainable development objectives. Advice has been provided by North Yorkshire County Council regarding traffic / access issues. Advice from NYCC Highways advised that access is acceptable onto Church Lane but there is no footway in situ. Works will be required to improve the existing major road and extend the existing footway / street lighting to serve the site. The site should therefore be retained in the Plan.	No change.
39.4			G2/6	Object	Also please keep more houses in the village centre.	Not accepted. See 10.1 above.	No change.

Helen Chapman-Young			G2/3	Support	Perfect for Roads and also within walking distance to shops & bus route.	Noted.	No change.
40.1							
40.2			G2/4	Support	“ “ “	Noted. This site will be shown as a commitment following advice from Craven DC.	No further change.
40.3			G2/5	Object	Marton Road is a busy secondary Road and has enough traffic through to Bank Newton	Site G2/5 is supported by Craven DC and should be retained in the Plan as it meets sustainable development objectives. Advice has been provided by North Yorkshire County Council regarding traffic / access issues. Advice from NYCC Highways advised that access is acceptable onto Church Lane but there is no footway in situ. Works will be required to improve the existing major road and extend the existing footway / street lighting to serve the site.	No further change.

						The site should therefore be retained in the Plan.	
40.4			G2/6	Object	“ “ “	Not accepted. See 10.1 above.	No change.
Jennifer Richards 41.			G2	Comment	On the plans there are 6 site allocations for new housing, will any be housing association? And I don't think the village needs 6 plots for housing, the village needs improvements ie a new part and activities for children.	Noted. The Plan includes policies to promote a mix of house types and tenures, including affordable housing. The proposed sites have been identified following extensive consultation with local residents and through this allows local people to have a say in where development should be accommodated within the village. Housing numbers are set by Craven DC through the emerging new Local Plan.	No change.
Muriel Cork 42.			G2/3	Object	This site was turned down a few years ago because of access to the main road. It is a very difficult entry on to the main road at present so another big entry would be very dangerous.	Not accepted. The driveway is one of 2 potential access points to the site. The Parish Council has sought North Yorkshire County Council Highways	No change.

						<p>comments on all the proposed housing sites. Advice from NYCC Highways advised that access from the A65 is acceptable but it needs demolition of a property.</p> <p>The site should therefore be retained in the Plan.</p>	
Neville House 43.			G2/2	Object	As I look at the building on this site it would for the staff and people who live there nice to be more informed about this development. It looks very bad when NYCC have not informed use.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The site was put forward as a SHLAA site to Craven DC. Consultation with staff and residents about future proposals is a matter for NYCC.</p>	No change.
Alan/Janet Sturgess 44.1			G2/4	Object	Utterly unsuitable for pedestrian access to school for children. No footpath or road crossings. Canal path deadly in winter. <u>An idiotic proposal.</u>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This site has planning permission already will be shown as a commitment following advice from Craven DC.</p>	No further change.
44.2			G2/5	Support	Very logical as extension to existing mini-enclave with good access to road. One of the best proposals alongside G2/2	Noted.	No change.

44.3			G2/2	Support	Good access for roads and school. Possibly the best option alongside G2/5 suggestion.	Noted.	No change.
44.4			G/1	Support	Seems OK – a bit of a squeeze but logical to fill in an area in village that isn't a green site.	Noted.	No change.
44.5			G2/3	Support	Looks OK but unclear where access road would be. If that's no problem, it's close to main road and yet also on edge of village. Could be ideal.	Noted. The driveway is one of 2 potential access points to the site. The Parish Council has sought North Yorkshire County Council Highways comments on all the proposed housing sites. Advice from NYCC Highways advised that access from the A65 is acceptable but it needs demolition of a property. The site should therefore be retained in the Plan.	No change.
44.6			1-8 inc	Support	All green spaces essential with plenty of other options for housing.	Noted.	No change.
44.7				General Comment	We don't just need 3-4 bedroom houses, we need smaller housing that is affordable without being shoe-boxes.	Accepted. The Plan promotes a mix of house types, sizes and tenures and encourages developers to build smaller properties.	No change.

P Bell 45.	Map Nos 1 & 2			Support	These are attractive green areas used by both residents and visitors who of course bring custom to local shops.	Noted.	No change.
Anon 46.				Object	We object to the development of site G2/2 Neville House. This is and has been for many Years much appreciated by residents and staff alike and is so needed by the community. Any development on this site would mean a large increase in traffic along Neville Road which is already yellow lined on one side due to its narrow width. It would also overlook retirement bungalows on Neville Crescent and more importantly the school playground and field. This is most unsatisfactory. Site 5 and 6 would be more suitable.	Not accepted. The Parish Council understands that North Yorkshire County Council are considering other sites in Gargrave for provision of new and improved care home facilities. However this work is at an early stage and an identified site has not yet been approved. The proposed housing site may only come forward if and when suitable re-provision was provided.	No change.
P Nelson 47.1			G2/5	Object	As per letter from David Aldersley	Noted. Site G2/5 is supported by Craven DC and should be retained in the Plan as it meets sustainable development objectives. Advice has been provided by North Yorkshire County Council regarding traffic / access issues. Advice from NYCC Highways advised that	No further change.

						access is acceptable onto Church Lane but there is no footway in situ. Works will be required to improve the existing major road and extend the existing footway / street lighting to serve the site. The site should therefore be retained in the Plan.	
47.2			Field next to Sports Field owned by J Philip	Support	Better alternative to above	Not accepted. The site does not adjoin the built up area and is not located close to village services and amenities. It is also in an area which floods.	No change.
Jane Drake 48.1			G2	Support	I support the preferred site allocations for the development of new housing.	Noted.	No change.
48.2			G7	Support	I support the local green spaces particularly local green space 8 which has a greater amenity value than the text in the draft plan would indicate and meets the criteria of the NPPF more than other green spaces proposed.	Noted. See separate accompanying document on local green spaces which provides an assessment using Craven DC's methodology.	No change.
48.3	6.3.11			Comment	Local green space 8 should be mentioned here with the others. It should be outlined	Noted.	Amend 6.3.11. Add additional text:

					that 8 is within the villages conservation area and provides a much valued amenity used by many groups, foot, cycle, horse riding etc. It is bordered by the National Cycleway, the Pennine Way and is an important space to the approach of the National Park. The canal wharf sited in 8 is an important heritage asset and should be preserved.	Add in further text as suggested.	"The area to the north of the village around Chew Lane provides a much valued amenity used by many groups, foot, cycle, horse riding etc. It is bordered by the National Cycleway, the Pennine Way and is an important space to the approach of the National Park. The canal wharf sited is an important heritage asset and should be preserved."
48.4	6.3.11			Object	"Pasture Land" South of 3 to 27 Skipton Road. It is unclear where this is and cannot be identified via the numbered green spaces 1 to 8. This should not be included.	Accepted. Delete reference to "pasture land".	Amend Plan. Delete text relating to "pasture land" in 6.3.11.