

Table 4.2 Local Residents

Gargrave Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan – Consultation Responses – December 2015

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Council Consideration	Amendments to the Submission Plan
Josephine Drake 49.1			All	Comment	My first comment is to thank all those involved in the Gargrave Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan, and I fully respect all their hard work. I like the method of choosing the sites by scoring against sustainability criteria.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
49.2			G7	Comment / Support	I support the designating of Green Spaces. 6.3 page 55 onwards. Many have special significance for the residents and wider users of the village, on the canal, on the Pennine Way, other local footpaths and amenities. Numbers 8,1,2, and 5 and 6 deserve	Noted.	No change.

					particular preservation for the well- being of the village.		
49.3			All	Comment	As has recently been seen, flooding is of significance in a village with a river, a canal, and in a hollow receiving considerable run off from surrounding fells and should be given serious consideration.	Noted. The Plan recognises the issues around flooding in the village and seeks to guide new development to areas at lowest risk of flooding.	No change.
49.4			G2	Comment	Arising from the criteria I support G2/4 G2/5 and G2/6 and G2/2 if this can extend provision for the elderly in Gargrave. Objectives in 6.4 page 80 are most important.	Noted. Other policies in the Plan support a mix of house types, sizes and tenures including housing for the elderly.	No change.
49.5			All	Comment	I understand that whatever is put forward in the Plan will upset someone, I think the overall ruling factors should be based on criteria that support the development of the village as a whole, trying to retain its rural village assets to serve the best interests of the majority. I think the Draft Plan shows that these factors have been given due and fair consideration and I support it.	Noted.	No change.

					December 21 st 2015 11.00am		
Rufus Drake			G2	Support	I agree with the preferred site allocation for new housing.	Noted.	No change.
50.1							
50.2			G7	Support	I support the local green spaces. In particular local green space 8 which offers more amenity as outlined as appropriate in the NPPF than other green spaces which have been proposed.	Noted.	No change.
50.3		6.3.11		Comment	Local green space identified as 8 on the plan is not mentioned. This is an omission and needs rectifying. It needs mentioning that it is within the Conservation Area and is a space providing important amenity value to the approach from and view to the National Park Heritage Assets including listed buildings surrounding the canal, wildlife and users on foot, cycle and horse riding value this green space. It is bordered by National Cycle Routes and the Pennine Way.	Noted. These points were made by other respondents and the text has been amended accordingly.	No further change.
50.4		6.3.11		Object	The description referring to pasture land south of 3 to 27 Skipton Road does not connect with any of the local green spaces numbered 1 to 8	Noted. This text has been deleted.	No further change.

					on the plan. It is not referred to in tables. I do not understand how "Pasture Land" complies with the requirement outlined for local green space in the NPPF		
Helen Wilson 51.1			G7 1	Support	An important environmental part of the village	Noted.	No change.
51.2			G7 2	Support	The 'greens' are essential to the character of the village.	Noted.	No change.
51.3			G7 8	Support	Scenic picturesque boundary to the canal, wild life, trees a natural boundary to the village.	Noted.	No change.
Tony & Joan Wimbush 52.		4.5.2 (Roads)		Object	Specific provision should be made to reduce the speed limit on the A65 to 20mph to take account of increasing volumes of traffic, parked cars, narrow pavements and large, heavy wagons.	Accepted. Insert additional text as suggested.	Amend 4.5.2. Insert additional text: "Residents would like to see the speed limit on the A65 reduced to 20mph to take account of increasing volumes of traffic, parked cars, narrow pavements and large, heavy wagons."
Derrick Evans 53.1				All	In the main I fully support this Development Plan except for the item identified below:-	Noted.	No change.
53.2	Page 18	4.2.3	G2/2	Object	Neville House, Neville Crescent The Neighbourhood Plan has a role in determining the site for new housing.	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	No change.

						<p>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.</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>	
53.3	Page 26		Objectives Item 2 Bullet Point 7	Comment	The impact of any development on residential amenities in the N.P. should be considered.	Noted.	No change.
53.4			All	Comment	Any development new to the village should not result in the loss of employment.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP includes policies to support local employment. Existing employment sites are protected in Craven District's local planning policies.</p>	No change.
53.5			G2/2	Comment	<p>Neville House has 20 + residents and 20 + Members of staff.</p> <p>This will be at risk!!</p>	<p>Noted.</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</p>	No change.

						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.	
John & Lena Blackwell 54.			All.	Support	We fully support the proposed "Neighbourhood Development Plan".	Noted.	No change.
Brenda Storey 55.	Map 1		G2/5	Object	<p>The cars already parking on Marton Rd is very dangerous. If new houses are built this country Rd will become a nightmare. It is very difficult to approach out of the High Mill Road now. Farm tractors etc come Down and also the road will need serious attention pre building – winding!</p> <p>Also last year (2014DBC) we had a dreadful problem with a sewerage issue when sewerage block back down Martin Road into houses and gardens and had to be cleared. Three (3) days later by a tanker.</p> <p>The road, sewerage and traffic are already a worrying problem. (Dav66 Parkin) etc needs to be a no parking area now. And a 20 mile per hour zone.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Site G2/5 is supported by Craven DC and should be retained in the Plan as it meets sustainable development objectives.</p> <p>Advice has been provided by North Yorkshire County Council regarding traffic / access issues.</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> <p>Adequate sewerage provision will be required as part of the development management process.</p>	No change.

						The site should therefore be retained in the Plan.	
S T Slater 56.			Map G2/2	Object	What Access/Egress will traffic have onto this proposed development Neville Road already congested.	<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 has not yet been approved. The proposed housing site would only come forward if and when suitable re-provision was provided.</p> <p>North Yorkshire County Council has provided comments on traffic and access in relation to all proposed sites.</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>	No change.

						The site should therefore be retained in the Plan.	
Derek Steele 57.1			G2/4	Object	I object to this site unless there is a safe access provided into the village for pedestrians (especially children) i.e. neither along the A65 nor the Canal Bank.	Not accepted. The site has planning permission and will be shown as a commitment rather than a site allocation as suggested by Craven DC.	No change.
57.2			G2/2	Support		Noted.	No change.
57.3			G2/1	Support		Noted.	No change.
57.4			G2/3	Support		Noted.	No change.
57.5			G2/5	Support		Noted.	No change.
57.6			G2/6	Support		Noted.	No change.
P Barnes 58.			All	Support	I agree	Noted.	No change.
Mrs Janet Turner 59.1			All	Support	The planned document and are aware there may be slight alterations. Well done all involved.	Noted.	No change.
59.2				Support	I support the exclusion of GA25 for reasons given.	Noted.	No change.
Mr Hugh D Turner 60.1		4.2.3		Support	I support the four key principles set out in the paragraph	Noted.	No change.
		4.5.3		Support	Additional services at times more convenient for use by village residents and safer access to the northbound platforms are the priorities in my view.	Noted.	No change.
60.2		5.2		Support	I support the draft objectives	Noted.	No change.
60.3		6.1.11		Support	I support the list of proposed housing sites in Table 2	Noted.	No change.

60.4		6.1.8		Support	I support the exclusion of site GA025 from Table 2	Noted.	No change.
Anon 61.			G2/5	Object	Road too narrow for further volume of traffic. Poor Access to Walton Close (Poor Visibility) Will cause more flooding due to hard surfaces sewers already back up. Nowhere for children to play.	Not accepted. 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.
Kathryn Ashby 62.1			General	Support	I strongly support the draft N Plan.	Noted.	No change.
62.2	Map			Support	I support all sites for development shown in the map.	Noted.	No change.
Mike Palin			General	Support	I strongly support the draft Gargrave Neighbourhood	Noted.	No change.

63.1					Development Plan 5 th November 2015.		
63.2	P6 Map 1			Support	I strongly support all the sites for development (G2/1 to G2/6) and the green spaces (1 to 8) shown on this map.	Noted.	No change.
Raymond Payne 64.			All	Support	<p>My appreciation of the many hours of work, the skill, research and the expertise which have clearly gone into the production of the Development Document is bolstered by my approval of all but one of the six main sites put forward. It is a pity, though, it does not include the thanks of the Council, either with a list of names or collectively, for the large contributions made by many volunteers who have given freely of their time.</p> <p>I have been told that NYCC have twice been approached with regard to their proposal for Neville House and it is my view that as their intentions have not been made clear this site should not have been put forward. It is a <i>sine qua non</i>. We are being asked for our opinions of a pig in a poke.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Parish Council understands that NYCC have put the site forward twice and the CC was not approached by the Parish Council in the first instance. The CC are currently considering new sites in Gargrave for relocating care home provision. Consultation on the future of Neville House is a matter for NYCC.</p>	No change.
Mr & Mrs D Newell	MAP 1			8 Support	We fully support this site as a local green space as a	Noted.	No change.

65.1					boundary to the canal and conservation of the natural inhabitants.		
65.2	MAP 1			1-7 Support	We fully support these sites as local green spaces as they are important boundaries/areas for both nature and residents.	Noted.	No further change.
65.3	MAP 1			G2/1 – G2/6 Support	We support the sites allocation for new housing development.	Noted.	No further change.
Michael & Christine Lord 66.1	MAP 1			Support	Support the sites preferred by the plan for new housing.	Noted.	No further change.
66.2	MAP 1			Support	We support the sites preferred by the plan for Local Green Spaces.	Noted.	No further change.
Ian James Smith & Ethel Smith 67.1	MAP 1			Support	We support the proposals in general.	Noted.	No further change.
67.2	MAP 1		G2/4	Comment	We think this area is a good one to develop before the smaller ones in the village e.g. G2/3	Noted. The site has planning permission and will be shown as a commitment rather than a site allocation as suggested by Craven DC.	No further change.
67.3	Re Gargrave			Object	Object to any green field site development on grounds of unsustainability. Suggest address the underlying problem of overpopulation before trying to cure the symptom of too few houses. Also to occupy those houses which are still unoccupied.	Not accepted. The NDP has to demonstrate that it supports the delivery of at least 100 new houses in line with the requirements of Craven DC and as set out in the new Local Plan.	No change.

					Development of site G2/1 is acceptable But that's the only one.		
Anon 68.1			G2/1	Support		Noted.	No change.
68.2			G2/2	Support		Noted.	No change.
68.3			G2/3	Support		Noted.	No change.
68.4			G2/4	Object	Didn't agree with permission in the first place. Issues with road – close to canal. Concerned re type & look of housing & destruction of natural habitat eg trees.	Noted. The site has planning permission and will be shown as a commitment rather than a site allocation as suggested by Craven DC.	No further change.
68.5			G2/5	Object	Would support if site were <u>smaller</u> – this looks to be a vast area? numbers of houses. Close to Pennine Way. Concerned with destruction of habitat. Given size & possible number of houses, will the road & pub junction take extra traffic.	Not accepted. 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	No change.

						/ street lighting to serve the site. The site should therefore be retained in the Plan.	
68.6			G2/6	Support		Noted.	No change.
68.7			G9		Will these new 'housing estates' be improved by building in an appropriate style & also planting of vegetation to act as a "shield" ?	Noted. Policy G9 encourages appropriate planting in landscaping schemes.	No change.
Mrs Moyra Sonley			G2/1	Support	This fills a gap without being obtrusive	Noted.	No change.
69.1							
69.2			G2/2	Comment	I wonder what will happen to the residents of Neville House	Noted. This a matter for NYCC but the Parish Council understands that the Council is considering other sites in Gargrave for re-provision. 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	No change.

						when suitable re-provision was provided.	
69.3			G2/3	Support		Noted.	No change.
69.4			G2/4	Comment	There will be traffic coming on and off the main road which is a very busy road already. Will the speed limit be lowered further up than it is now, so that is already going more slowly by the time it gets to this development?	Noted. The site has planning permission and will be shown as a commitment rather than a site allocation as suggested by Craven DC. Traffic management and speed restrictions are a matter for North Yorkshire County Council.	No further change.
69.5			G2/5	Support but	There is no footpath along a good part of Marton Road and one assumes there will be some pedestrian usage as well as extra vehicles coming up and down the road.	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.	No change.

						The site should therefore be retained in the Plan.	
69.6			G2/6		As above in G2/5	Not accepted. See 10.1 above.	No change.
Mrs Marie Dexter 70.1			G2/5	Support with reservations	The excessive amount of traffic resulting from this development would cause problems in the future as the road is not adequate and a section is without a pavement.	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.
70.2			G2/2	Query? The alternative to Neville House?	The demise of NEVILLE HOUSE would be a great loss to the villagers who as they become elderly and infirm, are able to stay in familiar surroundings.	Noted. The Parish Council understands that North Yorkshire County Council are considering other sites	No change.

						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 would only come forward if and when suitable re-provision was provided.	
Brian Probert Resident of Gargrave House 71.1		6.1.11		Typo?	Site numbers do not match map G2/6 sb G2/4, G2/10 sb G2/5, G2/11 sb G2/6	Not accepted. Table 2 refers to former Site Option numbers. However it is proposed to amend the Table to include clarity.	No further change.
71.2		6.4.2		Comment	Cyclists and pedestrians do not always mix well on towpaths. Perhaps need a study of respective numbers... cont.	Not accepted. The Canals and Rivers Trust supports the use of canal towpaths by both cyclists and pedestrians. See also: https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/our-towpath-code	No change.
71.3					On different stretches. I suspect there are more walkers on the stretch in the village. Also, most of the cyclists in Gargrave seem to be faster riders on training bikes who would not necessarily	Noted. See 71.2 above.	No change.

					Use a towpath. Might be worth asking cyclists in the tea shop.		
71.4	Appendix 111			Comment	This would be cleared if the original map was included.	Not understood.	No change.
71.5	General			Support	Other than the above, not much to disagree with and generally a very informative and well researched document.	Noted.	No change.
Julie Pickles 72.			G2/5	Strongly Object	<p>Despite previous objections I am shocked to find this green field the preferred site. As residents of Marton Road/Walton Close, I ask the Parish Council to not so readily dismiss our objections on this occasion as we really are best placed to highlight the reasons why this is not the right area to develop.</p> <p>Even a small increase in traffic volume could be so very dangerous. Marton Road is very narrow, there are cars parked on both sides opposite junctions. All times of the day and night. There is a high volume of farm vehicles. Heavy plant at certain times in the farming calendar. It is a fast road. I have witnessed many 'near misses' just from my living room window. I have a full view of the brow of the hill and it is only a matter of time before there is an</p>	<p>Site G2/5 is supported by Craven DC and should be retained in the Plan as it meets sustainable development objectives.</p> <p>Advice has been provided by North Yorkshire County Council regarding traffic / access issues.</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> <p>The site should therefore be retained in the Plan.</p>	No change.

				<p>accident. A speed limit may not be of any help, they are rarely adhered to on roads like these and rarely policed. Walton Close is already too narrow. From witnessing how and where people park, I fear something like a Fire Engine would stand no chance of access. Cars park on the bend, sometimes double par, at various times of day and night. Visitors often have to move their cars to let residents out. Some park half on the road, half on the pavement and people have to walk onto the road to get round them. With my own degenerative condition, it will be inevitable I will need a wheelchair/mobility scooter in the near future. There are also several elderly residents who also may too. Adding more traffic + parking could be catastrophic, leading to social isolation. There are no pavements on Marton Road. It is already an access issue for disabled people, who make it worse? Safety has to be of the upmost importance here. There is also the issue of the wildlife in this area to be considered. In this field and beyond there are several families of owls and other</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					birds of prey. We have bats and woodpeckers. All thriving, very unique and special to the area. To bulldoze that for more housing in a village full to bursting, a dead High Street, a School that is full, a Doctors that is full, limited public transport, lack of employment, a sewerage and drainage system barely coping.... This is not nimbysm... THIS IS THE WRONG PLACE!		
Anon 73.1			G7 8	Support 100%	I fervently hope that this land is never developed. It is a vital open space as the views it affords of Sharphaw and Thorpe Fell are breathtaking and beneficial to people's mental and spiritual well-being.	Noted.	No change.
73.2			G7 1,2,3,4,5,6 & 7	Support 100%	It has been proven by scientific research that people need to have access to green spaces. If only by looking upon them instead of constantly glued to the variety of hypnotic little screens.	Noted.	No further change.
73.3			G2/5 G2/6	Support Support	Noted.	Noted. Site G2/5 is supported by Craven DC and should be retained in the Plan as it meets sustainable development objectives.	No change.

						<p>Advice has been provided by North Yorkshire County Council regarding traffic / access issues.</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> <p>The site should therefore be retained in the Plan.</p> <p>Site G2/6 Noted.</p>	
73.4			G2/4	Support	When this land is developed there needs to be a suitable footpath created linking the right of way which was wrongly blocked up linking the Anchor Road with Neville Road and a safe way down into the village.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The site has planning permission and will be shown as a commitment rather than a site allocation as suggested by Craven DC.</p>	No further change.
73.5			G2/1	Support	If the development is low key and does not impact adversely on surrounding properties and enjoyment of their gardens.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy G1 could be strengthened by including reference to the need to protect residential amenity.</p>	<p>Amend G1.</p> <p>Add in additional criteria: “Local residential amenity is protected and new development does not have an unacceptable impact on</p>

							neighbouring properties through disturbance from traffic, noise, overlooking etc.”
73.6			G2/2	Object	This is currently the site of Neville House residential and nursing home which is a valuable asset to the village in terms of relatives visiting residents who are often from Gargrave or district and employment, not only within Neville House but the grounds are always kept immaculate. Since I moved to Gargrave 26 years ago Eshton Hall, Gargrave House, Grave Park, Bridgeholme and the Beeches have all closed. We should be safeguarding our remaining place of safety and security which cares for the growing number of people, not only the elderly, with varying disabilities. Neville House also opens its doors to the village residents on many occasions for social functions and fundraising and its staff are wonderful.	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 would only come forward if and when suitable re-provision was provided.	No change.
James Enever 74.1			G7 Open Spaces 5,6 and 7	Do not support	The arguments for keeping areas 5,6 and 7 free from housing seem to be to be more about protecting the views of a few privileged people.	Not accepted. The open spaces are noted in the Conservation Area Appraisal as making a strong contribution to the conservation area’s character and appearance	No change.

						and they meet the criteria for local green spaces set out in the NPPF.	
74.2			Area 8	Question of whether it should be a green space	Again the argument to me would only be valid if the land was owned by PC and could be used by the public.	Not accepted. This area makes an important contribution to protecting the setting of Gargrave when viewed from the YDNP. The justification for including it as a local green space is provided in the accompanying assessment tables.	No change.
74.3			Housing areas G2/1 – 6	General Comment about the housing	I believe that there should be some provision/allocation for self-built houses, for individuals who cannot afford the high prices particularly for family home.	Accepted. Add in additional wording to G1 supporting self build opportunities.	Amend G1. Insert additional text: “Developments which support opportunities for self build projects will be encouraged, subject to other planning policies” .
74.4			Housing areas G2/1 – 6	Comment on housing type	The document concentrates on ‘quality’ housing and affordable housing. I believe that there should be a focus on some houses which are in the village centre being terraced and small. This in keeping with the village. Recent houses have all been large, whether terraced or detached.	Accepted. Policies in the Plan support design which is sensitive and appropriate to the existing character of the village and Conservation Area. More detailed design policies have been added to the revised, Submission Plan.	No further change.
74.5			Towpath Improvements to Skipton	Strongly Support	I believe that many more people would cycle to Skipton if the towpath was to the same standard as in Leeds	Noted. Cycle path improvements are supported in the Plan.	No change.

					Metro area. This would benefit the health of residents and be good for tourism within Gargrave.		
74.6			'Calming' the High Street	Strongly Support the proposals	I suspect widening of footpath will never happen because of a perceived car parking problem i.e. shop users refuse to walk and no-one polices present parking restrictions.	Noted. The Plan supports improvements in traffic management and pedestrian safety and the Parish Council will continue to work to secure improvements wherever possible.	No change.
74.7			Tourism	Plan does not add up	Some sort of co-ordinated approach to give tourists an overview of rental accommodation, hotels, b & b, shopping and eating would help. The Library could be very useful in enabling this and co-ordinating it.	Noted. This is a planning document and can only include planning policies to guide new development. However the Parish Council would support a co-ordinated approach to tourism.	No change.
74.8					Plan is not readable on Internet so I went into Library. I do not have paragraph nos to hand.	Noted. The Parish Council provided hard copies in a number of locations and promoted these to encourage as many local people as possible to read the Plan.	No change.
Martin Banks 75.			All G2/5	Comments	First of all I would like to say that the neighbourhood plan looks to be a comprehensive, well-constructed document which puts forward the case for and against each of the proposed	Not accepted. Site G2/5 is supported by Craven DC and should be retained in the Plan as it meets sustainable development objectives.	No change.

				<p>sites in a clear and concise manner so can I say well done to the authors. Not that I agree with some of the recommendations of course!</p> <p>a. I refer to the proposal to build more houses in the plan reference G2/5 Marton Road, Walton Close. In particular Marton Road is too narrow to accommodate any more increases traffic. There are already well known issues with the extremely narrow turn in at the Mason's Arms, there is no pavement where the road narrows after the Beeches entrance and a big safety issue for pedestrian access to the village and its amenities. The traffic is already mounting the grass verges of the houses as they are unable to pass each other. The narrowest part is just before the turning to Riversway is poorly lit, no pavement and today's huge articulated lorries and agricultural vehicles are unable to pass without difficulty. In addition of course there are is an on-going issue with</p>	<p>Advice has been provided by North Yorkshire County Council regarding traffic / access issues.</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> <p>Development proposals would be required to address sewerage and drainage issues to the satisfaction of the relevant bodies.</p> <p>The site next to the cricket field is not supported as it has flooding issues and does not adjoin the existing built up area and there are other sites which are closer to village amenities and services, and which would be better related to the existing village.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>speeding which has been taken up with the police.</p> <p>b. Poor access to Walton Close and poor visibility for traffic exiting Riversway.</p> <p>c. Access to the railway line which is a safety issue for children of all ages as well as the environmental issue of the noise etc generated by the trains.</p> <p>d. Marton Road is affected by flooding being next to the river at the western end and closed only last week due to high water levels.</p> <p>e. There are issues with the existing sewerage system without having more residents there.</p> <p>f. This area of the village carries a large part of the heritage of the village such as the church, pub, Pennine Way and historic listed buildings and sites which should be preserved.</p> <p>None of these factors affect the site next to the cricket/field field where the Systagenic commercial development marks the eastern boundary of the</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p>village on one side of the road and effectively Raybridge Lane marks the village boundary on the other side. You can't spoil the view on entering the village because there isn't one since it is dominated by the factory. There are no narrow roads, pavements are provided and very easy access to the main A65 and no crossing it to go to school. No environmental issues, not overlooked by anyone, the playground is easily available for mothers and children, least impact to the village.</p> <p>For these reasons I think this site should be considered for development if possible.</p>		
Matthew Ingham			G2/5	Object	<p>Sir, Madam,</p> <p>I write with reference to the proposal by Gargrave Parish Council to offer the land adjacent to Marton Road for housing development.</p> <p>I have learned today, that the Parish Council claimed that there were only two</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The results of the informal consultation in Summer 2015 indicated that the site was well supported and only 3 objections were submitted at this stage.</p> <p>Site G2/5 is supported by Craven DC and should be retained in the Plan as it</p>	No change.

					<p>objections to use of this land for development.</p> <p>This cannot be true. I submitted my formal objection directly at the public consultation, and I'm aware of at least at three other objections. In other words, at least 50% of formal objections have not been recorded by the parish council.</p> <p>As it stands, there are other apparent flaws: The village boundary, for instance, appears incorrect on the submitted map. And then there's the suitability issue. The area proposed is clearly the least suitable site available, for reasons of access, flood-risk, environment, and utility. I will send a more detailed response shortly. For now, please register my objection</p>	<p>meets sustainable development objectives.</p> <p>Advice has been provided by North Yorkshire County Council regarding traffic / access issues.</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> <p>Development proposals would be required to address sewerage and drainage issues to the satisfaction of the relevant bodies.</p>	
Lisa Martin 77.			G2/5	Object	<p>Apologies for this not been on the correct form but I was unable to download.</p> <p>I have many concerns regarding the proposed plans to build residential properties</p>	<p>Site G2/5 is supported by Craven DC and should be retained in the Plan as it meets sustainable development objectives.</p>	No change.

				<p>to the west of Walton Close. The main concerns I have are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access is poor on Walton Close already with poor visibility when trying to drive forwards onto Marton Road, also there is insufficient parking already for all the vehicles on Walton Close so an access route to the new development would reduce parking for 4 vehicles. This would then further narrow Walton Close as more occupants would have to park vehicles on the road side. 2. Marton Road is too narrow to accommodate any further traffic incurred from additional housing. The addition of new homes on this site will increase volume of traffic, Skell Hill and all other access points already have issues with fast moving vehicles, farm vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists. The likelihood of an accident occurring will increase dramatically. 3. No footpaths on Marton Road which is an issue will become a bigger issue for new families with no safe access to the village amenities and school. 	<p>Advice has been provided by North Yorkshire County Council regarding traffic / access issues.</p> <p>Development proposals would be required to address sewerage and drainage issues to the satisfaction of the relevant bodies.</p> <p>Development proposals would be required to address suitable boundary treatment subject to the satisfaction of Network Rail or other relevant bodies.</p> <p>The site next to the cricket field is not supported as it has flooding issues and does not adjoin the existing built up area and there are other sites which are closer to village amenities and services, and which would be better related to the existing village.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>4. The railway line at the rear of the proposed development will also cause an issue, the noise of the freight trains running through the night will cause noise pollution to the new development as well as the safety issues regarding children having easy access to the railway lines.</p> <p>5. Flooding is likely to increase on Marton Road with the development of the land. Presently the field does hold the water but if this land is developed then there is additional risk of flooding at the bottom of the proposed site adjacent to the mill. This road already floods badly during bad weather making it inaccessible at times.</p> <p>6. The sewers may not be able to cope with additional housing. They already back up with the current occupancy so further development will only exacerbate this problem.</p> <p>7. Lack of safe areas for children to play in this part of the village will run the risk of children playing on the roads or close to the railway lines which will have devastating consequences.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Alternative Site Adjacent to Sports Pitches.</p> <p>This site would be more suitable for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Entrance directly on to the main A65. 2. There is an existing footpath into the village for ease of access to the village amenities and school with no need to cross any busy main roads. 3. Easy access to the bus routes and bus stops. 4. No disruption to existing properties, increased traffic, noise and light pollution etc. 5. Playground facilities within easy reach. 6. No risk of flooding. 7. The owner of the land is going to make a large donation to both the village football and cricket clubs for the shared access which will hugely benefit the village teams. <p>Regards Lisa Martin</p>		
Carole Aspin			G2/5 G2/6	Object	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>I have concerns about the proposed site G2/5 and the site G2/6. I am particularly concerned about the number</p>	Partially accepted.	No further change.

				<p>of proposed houses and the expected number of cars that this will generate. I estimate that 49 houses will have about 1.5 cars on average per household (data from Traffic survey 2012. Gov.uk). Looking at the roads available, the access way to main roads will be down Marton Road onto Church Street. Marton Road is a very narrow road and at several places there is not space for two cars to pass with any ease. Accessing Marton Road is difficult from Beech Close and I presume other access points because of the speed of cars coming down the slope near Walton Close and the limited distance that can be visualised to see oncoming traffic. I have had my garden gates destroyed twice because of cars realising too late they were unable to pass. One of the narrowest points is as Marton Road meets Church Street, where there is significant traffic coming down the hill from Broughton to access the A65. Marton Road is used extensively by farm tractors and milk collection vehicles, which makes the problem of a narrow road more difficult. There is no pavement on</p>	<p>meets sustainable development objectives.</p> <p>Advice has been provided by North Yorkshire County Council regarding traffic / access issues.</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> <p>Development proposals would be required to address sewerage and drainage issues to the satisfaction of the relevant bodies.</p> <p>Development proposals would be required to address suitable boundary treatment subject to the satisfaction of Network Rail or other relevant bodies.</p> <p>The site next to the cricket field is not supported as it has flooding issues and does not adjoin the existing built up area and there are other</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>either side of the road from the proposed developments to Marton Close. From Marton Close there is a narrow one person only pavement on one side of the road. This is the route used by my children and others to access the school buses. It is extensively used by residents to walk dogs and to walk into the village and railway station. Marton Road has limited street lighting and visibility of pedestrians is poor in the dark and in poor weather conditions. As the road is so narrow, I am not sure that there is the potential to build a pavement. I do not think this is a safe road at present but I am very concerned if significantly more traffic were to use the road. I also have concerns about building on land which will reduce the amount of absorption area for run-off water following rain. At present after a heavy rainfall the water rushes down either side of Marton Road and houses towards Church Street have flooding problems. I think this would increase if a large grassed area uphill were to be covered with housing and driveways. I am not against</p>	<p>sites which are closer to village amenities and services, and which would be better related to the existing village.</p> <p>G2/6: See 10.1 above.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>house building within the area but I think there should be consideration to the impact on road safety, both for car users and pedestrians. I note that the development plan at 6.1.2 point 6 states the development plan 'will not create conditions prejudicial to highway safety.' I would favour a much smaller development at the above sites - maximum 8 -10 houses or the use of one of the sites that access the main A65 directly. The site near the sports pitches has a long view of the oncoming traffic and the traffic has slowed down coming over the canal bridge area from Skipton or from coming through the village. There would be very little money which would need to be spent to allow safe access. I think the options to improve road safety are limited on Marton Road and would need significant capital investment.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Carole Aspin</p>		
Chris and Joyce Varley			All	Support	Dear Madam	Noted.	No change.
79.1							

					We live at Raybridge House in Gargrave and have done for nearly 30 years. We have seen the Neighbourhood Plan prepared by the Parish Council and approve of its contents.		
79.2			Site by cricket field	Comment / object	We would however strongly object to any proposals for development on any of the following:- A: the field to the east of the cricket field. This is low lying and development would result in increased water run off and increased risk of flooding on the A65. Flooding on the A65 on the Skipton side of the village is worse since Highways carried out roadworks, and Raybridge Lane is a nightmare at times.	Accepted. This site is not supported in the Plan as a site allocation.	No change.
79.3			G7	Support	B: the field off Church Lane behind the Vicarage. This is a beautiful green space and should be retained as such.	Noted.	No change.
79.4			G7	Support	C: the field on the left hand side of Marton Road as one turns from the Masons Arms. This is also a beautiful and treasured green space and should be kept. Yours faithfully	Noted.	No change.

					Chris and Joyce Varley 20 December 2015		
Dr Morrie W Charlton 80.1			G2/1	Support	Infilling and not detracting from the general village.	Noted.	No change.
80.2			G2/2	Support	Whilst this satiates local housing need and infills a brown field site it reduces local provision for the elderly. As this is a strategic plan the issues of an aging population need to be addressed.	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 would only come forward if and when suitable re-provision was provided.	No change.
80.3			G2/3	Support	Infilling extension – provided the owners of adjacent properties are agreeable – it is supported by them then this minimises impact on village	Noted.	No change.
80.4			G2/4	Support	Minimises the impact on village – almost a fait accompli re development. There is a condition regarding this development – the extension of the 30mph speed limit	Noted. The site has planning permission and will be shown as a commitment rather than a site allocation as suggested by Craven DC.	No further change.

80.5			G2/5	Support	Minimises impact on village – affordable housing.	Noted.	No change.
80.6			G2/6	Support	This should not mean the loss of caravans/mobile homes that are affordable. There is not a necessity for affordable housing as this site is some distance from the village and realistically requires a car.	Noted. Affordable housing policies are included elsewhere in the NDP.	No change.
80.7			All	Comment.	A sound plan that minimises a deleterious impact on the village. Realistically the strategic plan should be linked to local amenities and transport provision. Local amenities/services are likely to be reduced as a consequence of budget cuts.	Noted. Policies in the Plan support improvements in local infrastructure.	No change.
David & Jacquie Aldersley 81.1			G2	Support / Comment	Alternative site Next to sports pitches which is not being considered for some strange reason? This site would be more suitable for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Entrance directly onto the main A65. 2. Footpath into the village for school with no need to cross main road. 3. No other property will be interfered with e.g. flooding, noise, overlooking etc. 	The site next to the cricket field is not supported as it has flooding issues and does not adjoin the existing built up area and there are other sites which are closer to village amenities and services, and which would be better related to the existing village.	No change.

					<p>4. Playground round the corner.</p> <p>5. Flooding at Ray Bridge Road end, drains need sorting out.</p> <p>6. The owner of the land is going to make a large donation to the football and cricket club for shared access.</p>		
81.2			G2/5	Object	<p>Marton Road too narrow to accommodate any more traffic. 49 houses approx. 75 extra cars.</p> <p>Entrance very bad. Poor visibility onto fast moving traffic.</p> <p>No footpath into village for school children. Very poor lighting.</p> <p>Railway Line at rear of site. Kids will play on line, whatever you do to stop them.</p> <p>Flooding of 31 Marton Road to the Mill. Field holds water but still floods now!</p> <p>Sewers back up now so another 49 houses would be asking for trouble. If they say they will repair them why not now!</p> <p>Railway noise at night from frequent trains & passenger trains.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Site G2/5 is supported by Craven DC and should be retained in the Plan as it meets sustainable development objectives.</p> <p>Advice has been provided by North Yorkshire County Council regarding traffic / access issues.</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> <p>Development proposals would be required to</p>	No change.

					<p>No play area for the children so railway would be their first call to play.</p>	<p>address sewerage and drainage issues to the satisfaction of the relevant bodies.</p> <p>Development proposals would be required to address suitable boundary treatment subject to the satisfaction of Network Rail or other relevant bodies.</p>	
Richard Hird 82.1			All	Comment	<p>I have been confused to date and the documents on the web site do not make clear my concerns.</p> <p>What is the agreed date with CDC that existing developments can or cannot be included in the Plan. It's a fundamental question; and I cannot see that any plans are relevant if this is not known.</p> <p>The last discussion the village was asked to comment on, on reflection did not know this and was putting forward developments that were clearly wrong.</p> <p>Can you say with confidence that areas like G2/4 where plans have been done can be included in this DP?</p> <p>In brief comments made by someone who works in the CDC planning department,</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Plan period will be 2012 – 2032 in line with the new Craven Local Plan. This has changed from the previous period but has provided on the advice of Craven DC.</p> <p>The Parish Council is working closely with Craven DC to ensure the NDP is in general conformity with the new Local Plan as well as the adopted Local Plan.</p>	Amend Plan period to 2012 – 2032 throughout document.

					cast double on whether we are co-ordinating our thoughts with those of the planning department. I see no mention of any discussion with the Planning department in the documents. What are the Planning department thoughts? And how do they differ from ours? Have any discussions have been had? Comments on the proposed sites		
82.2				G2/1	No comment	Noted.	No change.
82.3				G2/2	No comment	Noted.	No change.
82.4				G2/3	No comment	Noted.	No change.
82.5				G2/4	See point above; but have no comment regarding the development	Noted.	No change.
82.6				G2/5	This seems a major development not in keeping with the rest of the village. It will put further pressure on traffic on Marton road, especially where it meets the village. It is also good green belt piece of land. Would probably be ok if it was not so large.	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	No change.

						be required to improve the existing major road and extend the existing footway / street lighting to serve the site.	
82.7				G2/6	I understand only three houses are earmarked for this zone, which should not cause any concerns.	Noted.	No change.
Lesley Reznicek 83.1	Map 1 Gargrave Draft NDP		G2/1	Support		Noted.	No change.
83.2			G2/2	Support		Noted.	No change.
83.3			G2/3	Support		Noted.	No change.
83.4			G2/4	Reluctant Support	As planning consent for 29 houses is already approved, I support with two key considerations. 1 careful consideration of drainage as this is a wet field. 2 safe access onto the main A65 as traffic approaches Gargrave quickly – move 30 mph signage.	Noted. The site has planning permission and will be shown as a commitment rather than a site allocation as suggested by Craven DC.	No further change.
83.5			G2/5	Serious Objections	The proposal for a maximum of 45 houses on Marton Road has not been seriously thought through. I note at meetings that Parish Council	Not accepted. Site G2/5 is supported by Craven DC and should be retained in the Plan as it	No change.

					<p>members objected to building off Eshton Road because of the danger of the bridge but at least there is a pavement over the bridge.</p>	<p>meets sustainable development objectives.</p> <p>Advice has been provided by North Yorkshire County Council regarding traffic / access issues.</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> <p>Development proposals would be required to address sewerage and drainage issues to the satisfaction of the relevant bodies.</p> <p>Development proposals would be required to address suitable boundary treatment subject to the satisfaction of Network Rail or other relevant bodies.</p>	
83.6					<p>Traffic from Rivers Way and Walton Avenue access Marton Road as the road narrows. Farm vehicles and</p>	<p>See 83.6 above.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

				<p>milk pick up lorries are up and down Marton Road at excessive speed.As the road narrows between Rivers way and Marton Close there is no pavement and only access for a single lane of cars. People have to walk up and down here as cars screech to a halt to let vehicles coming the other way have access.</p> <p>This difficult section of the road has improper drainage and takes all the water coming down Marton Road so it wet and slippery and cars skid. The gate at the corner of Marton Road and Rivers Way has been replaced as a result of such a skid.</p> <p>The influx of another 45 cars, and many houses have more than one car is not a safe proposition. There is already additional traffic from the newly open lodge area further up the road and from the extra houses proposed at G2/6 the saw mill.</p> <p>I do feel it has been a case of put the houses out of sight (albeit an eyesore from the Pennine Way) without real</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					consideration of the infrastructure on Marton Road. (Please note the road cannot be widened as there are houses on each side)		
83.7			G2/6	Support	I will support this providing G2/5 is reviewed and the number of houses proposed 45 reduced to no more than 15.	Noted. Housing numbers are a matter for the development management process but the estimates for each site are based on appropriate average densities (25dph) which have been revised following discussions with CDC.	No change.
83.8			G7 8	See Comments	I support all green spaces suggested but cannot understand why 8 is a preferential green space to the area between G2/5 and green space 6 for the following reasons: 1 This section includes the Pennine Way and as you approach Gargrave from the top of these fields beyond the railway bridge, you have the most stunning view of the village of Gargrave. Ramblers have commented to me on this. It also gives an impressive view of the moat	Noted. The reasons for including this area as a site allocation for housing are set out in the Plan. The site allocation is supported by Craven DC and the policies have been amended to help protect landscape and built and natural heritage assets.	No change.

					<p>which we should preserve for future generations. It is part of the heritage which should be on the neighbourhood plan. It also aids our tourism.</p> <p>2 It is a wild life haven with frogs, toads, a population of hedgehogs which are on the endangered species list and a wide variety of birds including, bramblings, bullfinches, goldfinches and a growth in the number of sparrows which are dwindling elsewhere. Its claim for green space status is stronger than 8 which I also support.</p>		
84. Mr & Mrs Stephen Coetzer	Map 1 Gargrave ave No 5 & 6			Object	<p>Object to additional low cost housing on Marton Road as the road is too narrow to accommodate extra traffic, flooding due to poor drainage system & no footpath and poor access with limited and poor visibility of moving traffic.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The Plan supports a range of house types, sizes and tenures including affordable housing.</p> <p>Site G2/5 is supported by Craven DC and should be retained in the Plan as it meets sustainable development objectives.</p> <p>G2/6 Not accepted.</p> <p>The GNP is encouraging sustainable development leading to good planning</p>	No further change.

						<p>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 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</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>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>	
Winston Shutt	Map 3			Object	Why has the Settlement Boundary of the village been	Noted.	No change.

85.1					moved, and with whose permission?	The Parish Council have the power, through the Neighbourhood Plan process, to determine the settlement boundary. The proposed settlement boundary is based on the previous one in the old Local Plan, and revised to include proposed housing sites, recent development and existing commitments.	
85.2	Map 8			Object	Local Green Space no.8 Should not be a green space – it is next to open countryside anyway. Should still be considered available for housing.	Noted. The justification for retaining the site as a local green space is set out in the accompanying supporting document which assesses all the proposed local green spaces using Craven DC methodology.	No change.
85.3			G2/8	Object	Site G2/8 should not have been removed from plan for housing. Is much more suitable as a larger site than G2/5 is, with direct access to the A65, not using the Listed, weight restricted, historic and only river bridge.	Noted (Not understood by GNPWG) Not accepted. The site is significant in that it makes a strong contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the open area to the north of village enhances	No change.

						the setting of the village when viewed from the National Park. Development of the site for housing is not supported by the Parish Council.	
85.4			G2/5	Object	This site is not suitable for this scale of development. Its lack of suitability has been ignored in favour of an out of sight out of mind attitude. This site contradicts most of the Neighbourhood Plan's policies on new housing development.	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Site G2/5 is supported by Craven DC and should be retained in the Plan as it meets sustainable development objectives.</p> <p>Advice has been provided by North Yorkshire County Council regarding traffic / access issues.</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> <p>The site should therefore be retained in the Plan.</p>	No change.
85.5			G2/5	Object	One of the fields adjacent to G2/5 has had land drains constructed, which shares a drainage ditch with G2/5 and together cause flooding	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Development proposals would be required to address sewerage and drainage issues to the</p>	No change.

				<p>across Marton Road. Milton House is a Grade 2 listed building (one of the historic ones the plan claims to want to protect) which was built in a position where it would not flood from the river, but had an excellent view of it. Man-made surface water drains and ditches have caused the road, car park and gardens to flood on numerous occasions, to the extent that a soakaway had to be installed on the carp park, at great expense. Sometimes, however, this has not been enough and NYCC have supplied sandbags a number of times, most recently after speaking with NYCC flood authority.</p> <p>Developing the site, even with SuDS, will further increase surface run-off, due to the slope of the site, towards Marton Road and consequently Milton House Nursing Home. All this excess water will be caused through acts of Man, not God.</p> <p>Road drains do not have adequate capacity for extra loading. Sewers are already over capacity, with properties</p>	<p>satisfaction of the relevant bodies.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

				<p>on Marton Road suffering from garden sewer flooding.</p> <p>In all, there would need to be new sewers, rather than connecting into current ones, new road drains, rather than connection into old ones, pavements, as there are currently none, road widening, as it is too narrow for extra domestic and construction traffic and a pavement.</p> <p>Alternatively common sense could prevail and a site more suitable be used, such as G2/8, where the lower number of houses would be more in-keeping with the village, and not over allocate housing numbers, something the previous plan wanted to avoid.</p> <p>From a very concerned Nursing Home owner, 20 residents and all staff employed there.</p> <p>Cc Craven District Council, NYCC</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Carol Shutt 86.				As above	Identical comments to the one above from Winston Shutt	Noted. Refer to 85. Above.	No change.
Graeme Southam 87.1			G2/5	Object	I object to the development of properties on Marton Road for the reasons listed below: Increase of traffic Width of Marton Road Amenities Flooding Road access	Not accepted. 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. Development proposals would be required to address sewerage and drainage issues to the satisfaction of the relevant bodies.	No change.
87.2			G2/5	Object	Impact on current utilities – sewer system	See 87.1 above.	No change.

					<p>The additional properties on Marton Road would have to join the existing sewer system. The sewer system does not have the capacity to cope with a further 49 households. The sewer is located under properties in Marton Road and Riversway, which means any issues with the sewers will have a major impact on the current residents.</p>		
87.3			G2/5	Object	<p>Increased volume of traffic.</p> <p>An additional 49 properties will significantly increase the number of vehicles using Marton Road. Most families have two cars which means an additional 98 cars constantly using Marton Road for access.</p> <p>This will impact on the junction with Church Street and the main junction with the A65.</p> <p>This will also mean an increased risk to traffic, with more cars joining and leaving Marton Road there will be the potential for more accidents, particularly on the brown of</p>	<p>Not accepted.</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> <p>The site should therefore be retained in the Plan.</p>	No change.

					the hill on Marton Road by Walton Close and the properties and road access nearby such as Riversway.		
87.4			G2/5	Object	<p>Width of road.</p> <p>The width of Marton Road is narrow, often requiring cars to give way to oncoming traffic. There is no opportunity to increase the width of the Road as properties line the road on both sides. Likewise the width of the road does not allow for pavements for pedestrians. This will mean walking on Marton Road will be more dangerous, due to the increased number of cars. The increased number of families and children walking to the village and to school busses or the local primary school will be at risk.</p> <p>Visitors to the village walking the Pennine Way and surrounding areas will also be at greater risk.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</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> <p>The site should therefore be retained in the Plan.</p>	No change.
87.5			G2/5	Object	<p>Amenities for Families</p> <p>There are no amenities on the Marton Road side of the village. All playing areas,</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The proposed site is located a short walk away from a range of local facilities and</p>	No change.

					<p>sports facilities and shops are a walk away. Children are likely to stay near their own home and play in the streets, with the potential for playing on a busy Marton Road. Alternatively they may stray on to farm land or onto the railway line which will adjoin part of the development.</p>	<p>amenities including The Greens, School and village shops.</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> <p>The site should therefore be retained in the Plan.</p>	
87.6			G2/5	Object	<p>Flooding</p> <p>The proposed development is on a field that becomes swamped in heavy rain. Currently water washes off the field, once saturated, and creates a flood on Marton Road by number 41 and opposite the Nursing Home. Building on the farm land will create a higher chance poor drainage and so a greater likelihood of flooding. The flooding will have a huge impact on the Nursing Home and residents of High Mill.</p>	Not accepted – see above.	No change.

87.7			G2/5	Object	<p>Access to the development.</p> <p>Access to the development will be opposite the Nursing Home and so will have impact on emergency services accessing and supporting the residents and staff of the home.</p>	<p>Not accepted – see above.</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> <p>The site should therefore be retained in the Plan.</p>	No change.
87.8			G2/5	Comment	Clearly there were significant reasons why this site was not recommended by the Craven District Council as appropriate for development.	Not accepted. Craven DC has advised that they support the allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.	No change.
Helen Paulger 88.1			G2/5	Object.	<p>Properties in Marton Road suffer already from</p> <p>flooding (run off, and inadequate road drainage made worse by the years of neglect). Surface water from Marton Road pours down the slope to High Mill Cottages;</p> <p>raw sewage from overflowing sewers unable to cope even with current demands.</p> <p>It is unwise, to say the least, to contemplate adding more</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Site G2/5 is supported by Craven DC and should be retained in the Plan as it meets sustainable development objectives.</p> <p>Advice has been provided by North Yorkshire County Council regarding traffic / access issues.</p> <p>Advice from NYCC Highways advised that access is acceptable onto Church</p>	No change.

				<p>housing until these problems have been resolved.</p> <p>New building means:</p> <p>Reduction in flood storage capacity (where will the compensatory water storage be sited?) and more housing connected to an already dodgy sewage system.</p> <p>more traffic. At the moment, in order to pass parked vehicles on Skell Hill drivers find themselves on the wrong side of the road in the face of oncoming traffic. And it's proposed to add a busy junction on the crest of a hill?</p> <p>proposed access. Is it Marton Road, Mosber Lane, Walton Close?</p>	<p>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> <p>The site should therefore be retained in the Plan. Development proposals would be required to address sewerage and drainage issues to the satisfaction of the relevant bodies.</p>	
88.2			G2/6	<p>Object</p> <p>Saw Mill site lies within flood zone 3 "High Risk". On bank of a flashy river. Proposed constructions would adversely affect ...</p> <p>Loss of flood storage capacity. Compensatory water storage must be provided elsewhere.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>See 10.1 above.</p>	No change.

				<p>Run off implications. Surfact water drainage already a problem at Saw Mill. Road viaduct floods in wet weather.</p> <p>Flood flows in the river downstream of Saw Mill. At High Mill Cottages we consider earlier interference to the water course in past years at the Saw Mill, the trout farm, and the weir were contributing factors in Sept 2000 when retaining wall swept away and 2 to 3 metres of garden lost.</p> <p>cf Saw Mill planning applcn 30/2004/4762. Environment Agency “strongly recommended” the provision of watertight doors and windows and removal of all airbricks.</p> <p>Mill Pond development. In the past, surplus river water went into the mill pond, which eased pressure downstream. Now, the chalets would be flooded. Planning applcn 30/2007/7637 promised a “full woodland management scheme”. In fact, most trees have gone, which reduces</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p>amount of water taken up. And there's a high water table.</p> <p>Finally, I doubt the properties would get insurance.</p>		
<p>Martin Hancock</p> <p>89.1</p>	4			Object	<p>Who appointed the NWPG and under whose authority do they act? I have not previously been made aware of them and until otherwise advised do not recognise their role/responsibility in relation the proposed plan.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The Parish Council has a statutory power to prepare a Neighbourhood Development Plan through the Localism Act. The GNPWG was set up at an early stage to guide the preparation of the Plan on behalf of the Parish Council and interested local residents were invited to join the group. The Group has reported back to the Parish Council at all key stages of the Plan and members of the Parish Council also sit on the Group. This is good practice in neighbourhood planning and is widely used across the country. The role of the Group is set out in the Parish Council approved terms of reference, but the decision making body remains the Parish Council.</p>	No change.

89.2	5			Object	Re “housing which meets local needs” – as defined by whom and on what basis?	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Strategic housing need is set out in the Craven Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2015.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan consultation process has also provided evidence of local needs for more smaller units and for housing to meet the needs of older people. This is set out in Section 6.1 in more detail and has been updated in the Submission Plan to take account of the updated SHMA above.</p>	No change.
89.3	Para 1.5 – 1.8			Object	Please supply all details of consultation undertaken – dates, locations, what channels were used. The notification of formal public consultation flyer put through our letterbox a few weeks ago is the first I have heard of any of these proposals for development; I therefore dispute the suggestion that we have been made duly aware of the proposals or, until now been given any chance to comment.	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The Consultation Statement will provide further information about the informal and formal consultation processes, both of which have been extensive and well in excess of that required in the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations.</p>	No change.

89.4		2.4 “ a social role”		Object	<p>How is “strong vibrant and healthy” defined? What is meant by this – please provide full and clear details.</p> <p>What date has been used to determine “ the needs of present and future generations”? how has this been gathered and analysed” What evidence do you have that I have been consulted on this, as part of the “present” generations? Please provide full and clear details.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the National Planning Policy Framework. This sets out national Government Planning Policy and interpretation is for those who use the document to guide planning decisions.</p>	No change.
89.5		Para 2.6		Object	<p>Who has decided that Gargrave will be expected to provide 5 dwellings pa over 15 years, and on what basis?</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The housing requirement for Gargrave is based on objectively assessed needs and is set out by Craven District Council as the local planning authority in the emerging Local Plan. The Housing requirement has been increased to at least 100 dwellings.</p> <p>This is explained in the NDP, including at para 2.6.</p>	No change.
89.6		Para 2.6		Object	<p>If would be disingenuous at best to suggest that the proposed 75 dwellings will be added to the village at a nice even increment of 5 per year given the desire any</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Plan cannot stop development or realistically include a Policy to guide phasing. However the Plan</p>	No change.

					prospective developer would have for scale in a development and the economies that would accompany this – what safeguards are in place to avoid all 75 being built in the first two years of the proposed development window, for example?	will be monitored over time and as a number of sites of different sizes and in different locations are proposed, it would be in the landowners / developers interests to provide new housing over a period of time to avoid “flooding the market”. The Plan will be monitored over time and may be revised following the adoption of the new Local Plan.	
89.7		3.7		Comment	The Yorkshire Grand Depart was in 2014. Given this egregious factual inaccuracy, it is hard to take any of the data in the rest of the document seriously – what assurance can you provide that any of the data contained is accurate or that any faith can be placed in it?	Accepted. This typo has been amended.	No further change.
89.8		4.1.1.		Object	We never received the questionnaire you claim to have sent and therefore have not been adequately consulted. Please provide evidence that it was delivered to our address.	Not accepted. The Questionnaire was widely promoted and copies were delivered to local households. The Parish Council has no “proof” that a copy was delivered to this particular	No change.

						household in 2014 but there was significant publicity in and around Gargrave encouraging residents to return forms, and there was a relatively high response rate.	
89.9		4.2.2		Object	Who specifically requires Gargrave to support the growth figure proposed?	Noted. General conformity with strategic local planning policy is one of the Basic Conditions for NDPs.	No change.
89.10		4.2.2		Comment	The final sentence of this para appears to directly contradict the whole premise of the document and proposal – please clarify exactly what it means.	Not accepted. The final sentence refers to the fact that the NDP has to support more new housing development in line with the emerging Local Plan. The wording could be amended slightly to improve clarity.	Amend 4.2.2 final sentence to read: “The Neighbourhood Plan should therefore support the housing requirement set out in the emerging new Craven Local Plan whilst taking account of local residents concerns about how such growth can be accommodated”.
89.11		4.2.3		Object	The sites referenced (GA028, 029 and 025) are not shown anywhere in the document – please forward maps showing clearly where they are located.	Not accepted. The process for site selection is set out in 6.1.7 – 6.1.9, including reference to consideration of the above sites. Maps of all the SHLAA sites are included in the Call for Sites Assessment Report - see Neighbourhood Plan website.	No change.

89.12		6.1.3		Comment	Presumably this means that the proposal is a net 25 additional dwellings over the next 15 years, which added to the 51 existing commitments will result in the proposed 75? Please clarify.	Noted. This is explained in para 6.1.10 although the revised housing requirement figure is now 100 units over the Plan period (2012 – 2032).	No change.
89.13	General			Object	Marton Road already carries too much traffic and is dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists, as well as being increasingly noisy and intrusive for those living along it – the idea that up to c50 new dwellings ought to be added along the road will hardly help the situation – how are you proposing these issues are resolved?	Not accepted. 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. Development proposals would be required to address sewerage and drainage issues to the satisfaction of the relevant bodies.	No change.
Nigel and Jane Fletcher 90.			G7 Local Green Space No. 7	Object	Following the death of our parents, Tim and Veronica Fletcher, my sister and I are the present owners of The Hollies, 5 Church Street and 3 Church Street, Gargrave. We are in the process of selling both houses through Dale Eddison.	Noted. The Parish Council wrote to all known owners of the proposed local green spaces in 2015 and asked for their comments.	No change

				<p>It has been brought to my attention, by a resident of Gargrave, that the area behind these properties (GA005) has been put forward by Gargrave Parish Council to be considered for Local Green Space Designation. I have not been informed of this by the Parish Council nor Craven District Council and only found out by chance.</p> <p>This area of land has effectively been an extension of the back garden of my family home and I object to it being Designated Local Green Open Space on the grounds that it does not meet the criteria.</p> <p>According to the Methodology For Assessing Sites from Craven District Council applications will be assessed according to the following tests: <u>Test 1</u> Does the site already have planning permission for an incompatible alternative use? No <u>Test 2</u> Is the site reasonably close to the community they serve?</p>	<p>The site No. 7 has been included in the plan for a number of reasons.</p> <p>It meets the criteria in the NPPF ie it is in close proximity to the community it serves, it is demonstrably special – the site is identified in the Gargrave Conservation Area Appraisal as making a strong contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area (ie it has historic significance) and it is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>Public access and public ownership are not criteria of the NPPF.</p> <p>Further information is provided in the accompanying background document assessing the local green spaces using the Craven DC methodology.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>This site does not serve the community. It is, as stated above, effectively an extension of the back garden of The Hollies . If the question means 'is the site in the village?' the answer is yes.</p> <p><u>Test 3</u> Is the site local in character and not an extensive tract of land? I am not sure what 'local in character' means, but it is not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p><u>Test 4</u> Can the site be shown to be demonstrably special to the local community? To meet this requirement an area must fulfil one or more of the following criteria Beauty - No Historic Significance – No Recreational value – No Tranquillity – No Richness of wildlife – No Other Reason – No</p> <p>If designated can the Local Green Space be capable of enduring beyond the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan period? The NPPG states that how a Local Green Space will be “managed in the future is an important consideration, if the features that make it special or locally significant are to be conserved”.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>I do not understand why this small patch of land, which does not have planning permission, has been put forward for Designated Local Green Space Status. With this status the land will be impossible to sell and as my sister and I no longer live in Gargrave who is going to be held responsible for the management and maintenance of this land in the years to come? If we continue to own it but live in London who will sort out problems if it becomes unsightly or travellers camp on it, or rubbish is dumped in it?</p> <p>It baffles me why the back garden of my family home has been chosen along with areas such as the village greens and church yard to be considered for Designated Local Green Space Status.</p> <p>My parents were both pillars of the village and were huge supporters of Gargrave, having served on the Parish Council, Parochial Church Council, Village Hall, Over 60s and tennis club to name but a few of their many village commitments. Many people</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>in the village know me well as I was born and brought up in Gargrave and I am very upset that this has been done behind my back.</p> <p>I look forward to receiving any comments and an acknowledgement that you have received this email. Yours faithfully, Nigel Fletcher</p>		
Hazel Shutt 91.1				Comment	Where has the Parish Council web site gone? Hopefully everyone downloaded everything they needed before it vanished.	Noted. The Parish Council website should be functioning normally at http://www.gargravepc.org.uk/ Links to the neighbourhood plan pages are provided on the front page.	No change.
91.2			General	Comment	It is a shame that after all that grant money and considerable time spent by the working group, a generally good plan with sound values and aims has been thoroughly contradicted by its poor choice of site for the majority of the Plans outstanding housing development. This on the preferences of such a small number of residents? How many people were	Noted. The informal public consultation was open and above board and everyone was invited to comment on the emerging plan either at the drop in event, or using a representation form or in writing. The results of the public consultation informed the choice of preferred option sites	No change.

					<p>eligible to comment in the May/June consultation? What proportion of the eligible commenters does this small number of residents supporting site G2/5 represent? What about the supporters of site G2/8?(CDC 025 next to cricket pitch). The cover of the Plan shows some lovely photos – coincidentally views of, or from, three locations that will be adversely affected by the extra construction and domestic traffic, if site G2/5 is developed.</p>	<p>presented in the Draft plan, but other planning considerations such as accessibility, highways comments, relationship with the built up area of the village and flooding also informed the proposed list of sites in the Draft Plan.</p>	
91.3			All	Comment	<p>The plan states that will not over-allocate housing sites – and yet it has. Perhaps a smaller 29 home site (G2/8) would be more in-keeping with the village, and still provide a good number of homes.</p>	<p>Noted. The housing requirement for Gargrave has been increased to at least 100 new homes over the Plan period. The NDP has to include some flexibility as some allocated sites may not come forward for a variety of reasons and the Plan has to demonstrate that it plans positively to meet the need for sustainable development. Therefore the Plan shows that it can provide for more than the minimum figure through site allocations and other policies in the Plan.</p>	No change.

91.4			G2	Comment	<p>Gargrave settlement boundary – should include former site G2/8 next to cricket pitch. If you are aiming for Environmental protection and sustainability, what better way than to live opposite where you work – as the Plan supports further employment development at Systagenix site? It is closer to cycle safely to Skipton when the new Sustrans route is complete, and leave the car at home. The site lends itself to renewable energy production – solar panels on homes roofs are not shadowed by other homes or mature trees. According to you only two only two people objected to the use of site G2/5 – this is incorrect. Speaking to neighbours, more objected in writing than that, either at the ‘event’ in May, or before the June deadline, via the Parish Council.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>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.</p>	No change.
91.5			G2/5	Comment	<p>Kirkwells Site Assessment Report GA031 Open land/grazing area on the edge of the village. The site has reasonably good accessibility to services. There is a significant difference in levels across the site and there is a policy constraint as</p>	Noted.	No change.

					it is identified as Special Landscape Area in the adopted Development Plan., within Conservation Area and adjacent to the curtilage of Grade II Listed Buildings. Does not relate well to the existing village form.		
91.6			G2/5	Object	<p>I am objecting to the inclusion of Site G2/5, Land off Walton Close, as a site for 45 houses. For my objections I refer to the 'Draft Policies for New Housing Within the Settlement Boundary, G1'.</p> <p>Policy 1. Sites are well related to the existing village, capable of good integration with the existing grain of Gargrave and adjoin the built up area.</p> <p>The site is not well related to the existing village, as confirmed by Kirkwells site report above. It is far too large a site to be capable of good integration into the village. It does not adjoin a 'built up' area, it is only attached to a small development of 12 homes and is next to open countryside on other boundaries.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>Site G2/5 is supported by Craven DC and should be retained in the Plan as it meets sustainable development objectives.</p> <p>Advice has been provided by North Yorkshire County Council regarding traffic / access issues.</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> <p>Development proposals would be required to address sewerage and drainage issues to the</p>	No change.

				<p>Policy 2. Sites have good accessibility, having consideration for relevant footpaths, pavements and cycleways.</p> <p>The site is not easily accessible by foot, there is no pavement in either direction, even towards the village centre, pedestrians must walk along the road. The road narrows in numerous places to less than two lanes, making the road less than ideal for all road users, especially when faced with milk tankers and agricultural vehicles.</p> <p>Any development at this site would increase both domestic and construction traffic along Marton Road and at tricky junctions onto Church Street and the A65. On Marton Road we already have to contend with drivers ignoring the 30mph speed limit, and laws determining which side of the road they should drive on.</p> <p>Policy 3. They do not have an adverse effect on areas or buildings of historic or</p>	<p>satisfaction of the relevant bodies.</p> <p>Historic England made representations on the Draft Plan but did not express any concerns about the site's potential impact on heritage assets.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

				<p>architectural interest, or areas of nature conservation value.</p> <p>A housing estate is not compatible in proximity to, and in full view of Milton House, as a Listed Building. Also any large development south of the river increases traffic over the Listed and Weight Restricted Gargrave Bridge. As Kirkwells report states, the site is also in a Special Landscape Area and within a Conservation Area, so contravenes this policy.</p> <p>Draft Policy G9 states that historic stone bridges such as Gargrave Bridge should be protected. Large developments south of the river would use this bridge as access to the closest main road. In what way does deliberately increasing traffic loading protect this bridge? This is the only river crossing for vehicles for a good distance either way, pedestrians would also struggle to cross if the stepping stones were underwater. For those south of the bridge a closure, scheduled or not, would mean loss of access to the bus</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>stops, shops, doctors, schools, post office etc. Those north of the bridge lose access to the trains and the church. While those with their own transport can do a long round trip, those without are stuck.</p> <p>Policy 4. They do not lead to the loss of open spaces and recreational areas.</p> <p>Site G2/5 is open land at the edge of the village, so will lead to the loss of open space if developed.</p> <p>Policy 6. They are not at significant risk of flooding and they can demonstrate they will not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.</p> <p>The site already contributes to flooding on Marton Road which has, in the past, flooded a number of properties, including the grounds of Milton House.</p> <p>Draft Policy G14 promotes the use of SUDS where applicable. Due to the topography of site G2/5 surface water storage may not be applicable, as it would have to be at a ground level higher than nearby</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>properties, increasing risks to them. Even if used, when design rainfall is exceeded, run-off can within SuDS enter highway drains, which discharge to the Aire, so further increasing flood risk for the village. The shape of the site may mean that another access road is needed, most likely at the bottom of the site where it meets Marton Road. This would funnel surface water towards the listed Milton House.</p> <p>Policy 7. They have suitable provision for vehicular access and do not impact adversely on existing highway networks and particularly narrow lanes in the village centre.</p> <p>The road narrows in numerous places to less than two lanes, making the road less than ideal for motorists, especially when faced with milk tankers and agricultural vehicles. Cyclists on the Sustrans route, pedestrians joining the Pennine Way along the well-used Mosber Lane (which also runs alongside the site) and those walking from the canal, all the tourists the</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>Plan wants to attract, use this road so increasing traffic would be counterproductive. Tight and busy junctions on the Sustrans route would also be subject to extra traffic. Marton Road is not gritted. The A65, however, is.</p> <p>Policy 9. They do not impede important views of adjoining landscapes or buildings of note.</p> <p>As confirmed by Kirkwells the site is in a special landscape area, so development here would not be appropriate. Nor would it be an appropriate view for residents of a Listed Building. From the Pennine Way, just before it meets Mosber Lane, you look down across site G2/5 and Milton House and the mill are in view. Also over the trees to the north of the village you can see the Dales.</p> <p>In regard to accessibility to sewers, sewer capacity for site G2/5 may not be adequate. When Milton Park Holiday Lodges were planned, it was said that the proposed number of lodges had to be reduced due to lack of sewer</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>capacity, the same sewer to which Walton Close is connected.</p> <p>2.0 Planning Policy Context.</p> <p>2.4 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)⁴ published in 2012. This sets out in paragraphs 6 and 7 that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, and the planning system has to perform an economic role, a social role and an environmental role:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy. <p>Site G2/5 does not adhere to this role. Its development does not protect and enhance the natural built and historic environment, being next to</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>listed historic buildings, being a currently protected landscape, being accessed by unsuitable infrastructure. Homes here would not use natural resources or mitigate climate change as prudently as on Site G2/8. Site G2/5 is north-west facing, with mature trees on its upper boundaries. This reduces the viability of solar panels, especially in winter months, as one home overshadows the next, also increasing fuel usage for lighting and heating.</p>		
91.7			G2/6	Object	<p>Draft Policy G9 Protecting and Enhancing the Rural Landscape Setting of Gargrave New development is required to take into careful consideration the landscaping setting of Gargrave. Proposals should demonstrate a positive contribution to the following landscape design principles:</p> <p>1. The open, undeveloped</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Not accepted.</p> <p>See 10.1 above.</p>	No change.

					<p>nature of the floodplain landscape should be conserved and development proposals will not be acceptable in areas prone to flooding (Flood Zone 3).</p> <p>Bearing in mind many homes along the river received Environment Agency Partner letters advising homes were at risk of flash floods, is it wise to ignore your own policy and create additional surface water run-off upstream of the bridge and village?</p>		
91.8	Map 8			Object	<p>LGS 6 – This is a Green Space because of a view of the Church? When is Church Close being demolished, and the surrounding TPO mature trees being felled?</p> <p>LGS 8 – This is farmland next to other farmland, doesn't need to be designated green space</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Local Green Space 6. – views of the church are not include in Table 3 but the site is recognised for its significance in terms of the setting of the scheduled monument to the south.</p> <p>The justification for all the local green spaces is provided in the separate accompanying document which assess the proposed local green space using the Craven DC criteria.</p>	No change.
Julian Shutt 92.				See above.	Identical wording to Hazel Shutt's above.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>See responses to 83. Above.</p>	No change.
June Banks	All			Comment	The plan has not been fully	Noted.	No change.

93.					<p>accepted. I suggest that residents do some research on Agenda 21 which is as you know, a United Nations document. Read & quote; Behind the Green Mask&quot; by Rosa Koire.</p>	<p>The Plan has been subjected to an SEA Screening Opinion undertaken by Craven DC and this has been consulted upon with the 3 consultation bodies. SEA (Strategic Environmental Assessment) is a European Directive requirement and supersedes LA21.</p>	
-----	--	--	--	--	---	---	--