

Email 110119 from Youngs RPS re Local Green Space consultation

From: Richard Morgan

Sent: 11 January 2019 16:40

To: Tony Blackburn

Subject: RE: Craven Local Plan - Local Green Space at Skipton and Hellefield

Dear Tony,

Thank you for your email with attached letters. With regard to Site SK-LGS64 in particular, we wish to provide further comments on behalf of our client, the Trustees for Roman Catholic Purposes Registered (TRCPR) who has an interest in the land being part owner:

We wholly agree with the Inspector's conclusion that the proposed Local Green Space at this location does not meet the terms of the NPPF in so far as it is a blanket designation across an extensive tract of land and accordingly, should be deleted. In its response to the Inspector, the Council has acknowledged the Inspector's recommendation but rather than delete the designation has sought to amend it, including two areas referenced SK-LGS50 and SK-LGS53.

We do not support the Council's proposed modifications. With respect to SK-LGS50, the Council suggests that this site 'has historic significance, is rich in wildlife and has recreational value'. However, we do not consider any of these tests are met when considered against this site specifically. Whilst the land is in reasonably close proximity to the Park Hill Scheduled Monument, it is not evident how this site in particular could be considered to be of historic significance. In terms of the site's contribution to the setting of the town, the site is already within the conservation area boundary and so it is unnecessary to apply further layers of policy constraint. The Council suggests that this site is known to be rich in wildlife, yet the vast majority of the site is open farmland and is not affected by the Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) further to the east or west of the site. We acknowledge there is a Public Right of Way that runs through the site, again however, this recreational feature is safeguarded by this existing designation.

The site is largely identifiable as open countryside, and at 5.5ha is arguable still an extensive tract of land. Finally, the site is not demonstrably special to a local community. Whilst there is existing housing the west of the site, it is otherwise on the very edge of the settlement boundary and therefore some distance from most of the built up area of Skipton and the community it supposedly serves. It is notable that the site was not put forward by anyone in the community to give evidence of local support.

We consider site SK-LGS50 conflicts with paragraph 77 of the 2012 NPPF, and the advice contained within the PPG, and should be deleted. We would be grateful if these comments could be forwarded to the Inspector and the Council for consideration.

Kind regards,

Richard Morgan MRTPI
Senior Planning Consultant

Direct Dial: [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

Priestpopple, Hexham, Northumberland, NE46 1PS
Residential | Rural | Commercial | Planning

www.youngsrps.com