

CRAVEN LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector's Matters, Issues & Questions for Examination

Responses on behalf of The Langcliffe Hall Estate in respect of S9079 & LA004

1. S9079 - Land North of Town Head Way

1.1 Q18 What is the justification for the extent of Green infrastructure proposed to the north and east of the site?

1.2 Response It is noted that Natural England have recommended the need for a site specific Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). This is accepted from the Responder, who has previously commissioned a LVIA which has been submitted to the LPA.

The Responder does not disagree that there are potentially some sensitivities in respect of parts of the site in terms of visual impact. However the LPA's designation of swathes of Green infrastructure inside the northern and eastern boundaries is arbitrary.

The extent of any such green infrastructure should be addressed at the planning application stage, when a LVIA will need to be carried out with reference to the actual development proposal.

1.3 Q19 What is the justification for retaining the existing dry stone boundary walls and creating a new dry stone wall to enclose the herd to the north?

1.4 Response Whilst the Responder does not object to the retention of existing boundary dry stone walls, this and the new dry stone wall requirement are unnecessarily prescriptive.

Again, they are matters to be addressed at the planning application stage.

1.5 Q20 What is the justification for requiring the layout of any

future development to retain views of the Westhead Mill Chimney, and to specifically “leave gaps” through the site from east to west?

1.6 Response The Responder considers there to be no justification for the preservation of views of the Mill Chimney.

As for leaving east-west gaps, again this is a matter to be addressed (if justified) at the planning application stage, when consideration of the proposed layout can be informed by a LVIA.

2. **LA004 - Land North of Barrel Sykes**

2.1 **Q22** **What is the justification for requiring the layout of any potential future development to retain views of the Westhead Mill Chimney?**

2.2 Response Again, the Responder fails to see the significance of retaining views of the Mill Chimney: which is neither of historical, architectural or aesthetic value.

2.3 **Q23** **What is the justification for restricting building heights to 2-storeys and specifying that houses be front facing and set back from Langcliffe Road?**

2.4 Response The Responder fails to understand why these development constraints are considered necessary. No justification or explanation has been given by the LPA.

2.5 **Q24** **What is the justification for retaining the existing dry stone boundary walls and creating a new dry stone wall to enclose the herd to the north?**

2.6 Response Whilst the Responder does not object to the retention of existing boundary dry stone walls, this and the new dry stone wall requirement are unnecessarily prescriptive.

Again, they are matters to be addressed at the planning application stage.

P Wilson & Company LLP
Chartered Surveyors

September 2018