

Roy Banks

From: Robert Bryan [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 November 2018 18:24
To: Ruth Parker
Cc: David Feeney
Subject: Re: Responses to questions requested by Mr R Bryan

Ruth

Thank you for the email below. I wish to respond via the District Council to the concerns raised by some local people that certain representations on the Plan have not been taken into account. I would ask that you forward this response to those persons whose emails I have forwarded to you. Please also copy the Parish Council into this email and your following responses to the public.

I also advise that all the emails we have exchanged since the commencement of the examination be displayed on the Council's web site as it relates to the Neighbourhood Plan under a title "Examination Correspondence". Please redact my telephone number and as appropriate any other personal information from the correspondence which is displayed on the web site.

The response below from the Parish Council indicates that the Consultation Statement accurately reflects the formal public consultations under Regulation 14 which were carried out in the periods 5.11.15 -21.12.15 and 8.2.16-21.3.16. I note that at that stage nor at the final formal consultation stage under Regulation 16, administered by the District Council from 25.6.18 to 6.8.18, were there any concerns that there was misrepresentation in the Plan or the Consultation Statement. Furthermore, no documents have been produced which indicate that there has been misrepresentation of these formal stages. I would be pleased to receive any evidence of representations not accounted for in the Consultation Statement.

The Parish Council, below, admit that table 3 in the Plan may not be an fully accurate reflection of informal consultation responses i.e. prior to the regulation 14 stages but that was an "honest mistake". I am pursuing this further with the Parish Council.

I consider the formal consultation responses and the reporting of them is the determining factor in deciding whether there has been significant misrepresentation or unfairness.

Given that the formal consultation under regulation 14 appears to be accurately represented and the District Council has confirmed I have received all the representations submitted as part of the further regulation 16 consultation I do not consider, at this stage, there has been substantive misrepresentation. I would add that the Consultation Statement illustrates that there were objections documented in relation to the site "Land west of Walton Close References: GA031,G2/10 ,G2/5 and G2/4). and that the Parish Council explain their reaction to the objections.

I will continue with this examination and refer to these issues in my examination report.

I do however, require that the Parish Council amend Table 3 , page 39 to accurately reflect the support and objections received at the informal consultation stages and a further column, introduced, reflecting those received at the formal Regulation 14 stages.

regards

Robert Bryan

Robert Bryan, BA Hons., MRTPI

On 27 Nov 2018, at 08:36, Ruth Parker <rparker@cravenc.gov.uk> wrote:

Robert

I forward you a response from Gargrave Parish Council regarding the information you requested. Apologies for the delay in forwarding you this email, I was in meetings all day last Wednesday and then have been out of the office until today.

Kind regards
Ruth

Ruth Parker
Planning Officer (Planning Policy Team)

t: 01756706232

e: rparker@cravenc.gov.uk

<image93f29c.PNG>

1 Belle Vue Square, Broughton Road, Skipton, BD23 1FJ
www.cravenc.gov.uk

This e-mail, including any attachments, is confidential and intended only for the attention and use of the named addressee(s). It may contain information covered by legal, professional or other privilege. If you are not an addressee, please inform the sender immediately and destroy this e-mail. Do not read, copy, use, retain or disclose this e-mail or any part of it. Its contents do not necessarily represent the views or opinions of Craven District Council. All reasonable precautions have been taken to ensure no viruses are present in this e-mail. Craven District Council cannot accept responsibility for loss or damage arising from the use of this e-mail or attachments and recommend that you subject these to virus checking procedures prior to use.

Please be aware that all communications sent to or from Craven District Council may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

From: Gargrave Parish Council
Sent: 21 November 2018 13:06
To: Ruth Parker
Subject: Responses to questions requested by Mr R Bryan

We apologise for the delay in getting back to you but set out below are the responses to the urgent matters Mr Bryan is requesting to date.

In Table 4.2 there is a representation from David Steele see 57.1 objecting, and M and C Lord see 66.1. There are also several anonymous representations in Table 4.1 and 4.2 which may or may not be from the other residents listed in 2a. Interestingly M and C Lord " Support the sites preferred by the plan for new housing". However these may not be same people as Mr and Mrs Lord.

All the responses in paper form are in those tables referred to above.

Please find attached the ranking form which was prepared from the comments received at the Informal Consultation May/June 2015. You will see from this document that GA31 which was re-numbered G2/10 ranked No. 1.

It is from this document we believe the transference of data, possibly the Vision data onto the submitted NP on Table 3 of the proposed housing sites on Page 39 a mistake has occurred which is an honest mistake which was unfortunately missed.

We can confirm that Reg. 14 is a true record.

In relation to the question relating to whether the Eshton Road site could be included in the Gargrave NP, because it has been selected in the CDC Local Plan, as part of the Informal Consultation June 2015 the GA009 site was commented on with the other sites. However, at this time our housing requirement did not need this site. A few months later NYCC came to our Village Hall with a presentation about their rolling programme across the County for Extra Care Facilities. The villagers were already aware that Neville House Nursing Home G2/2, GA04, had been put forward for re-development but was now considered too small for NYCC new approach of at least 60 dwellings per site. CDC maintained this site on their Local Plan going forward and as our NP would require re-consultation, however we altered our village boundary to include this site. We accept this is a needed facility within the area.

Should you require further information, do not hesitate to contact us.

Kind regards

Kath

Kath Ashby
Clerk
Gargrave Parish Council


www.gargravepc.org.uk

(office hours Mon 10am - 2pm)