



# Craven Local Plan Examination

---

## Summary of Representations Received Relating to the Draft Craven Local Plan Policy Map Changes and Craven District Council Responses Where Required

---

09/05/2019



PM Ref	Representor	Summary of Key Issues Identified in the Representation	CDC response (where required)
PM04	CTS (Rural Solutions) 046	CAVEATED SUPPORT for Main Modification PMO4 (from Schedule of Policy Map Changes) which seeks to amend notations in all relevant inset maps for Key Locations for Tourism Development as identified in EC4, changing the notation concerned “from a blue ‘T’ in a black circle to a red triangle” so as to improve the clarity of inset maps; whilst CST considers it appropriate to include a red triangle on the Bolton Abbey Inset Map as proposed by CDC, it is concerned that a Development Management Officer or other could mistakenly think the proposed red triangle on a purple line run is pointing towards something on the map which it is not intended to; as such, and for the avoidance of doubt, CST would suggest that the red triangle is moved to another location on the map where it is surrounded by white space (and not intersected by a purple line) as shown in its detailed representation.	The Council considers it appropriate to move the red triangle to a centrally placed location within the Bolton Abbey Visitor Area which is surrounded by white space, for the avoidance of doubt.
PM05	CTS (Rural Solutions) 046	CAVEATED SUPPORT for Main Modification PMO5 (from Schedule of Policy Map Changes) which seeks to amend the full plan area policies map to reflect changes to the notation for Key Locations for Tourism Development as identified in EC4A, changing the notation concerned from a blue ‘T’ in a black circle to a red triangle (at Skipton, Gargrave and Embsay); whilst CST considers it appropriate to include a red triangle on the Bolton Abbey Inset Map as proposed by CDC, it is concerned that a Development Management Officer or other could mistakenly think the proposed red triangle on a purple line run is pointing towards something on the map which it is not intended to; as such, and for the avoidance of doubt, CST would suggest that the red triangle is moved to another location on the map where it is surrounded by white space (and not intersected by a purple line) as shown in its detailed representation.	See Council’s response to representation 046 on PM04 above.
PM06	Francmanis Properties (Planning Potential) 062	The parcel of land to the north east of the draft allocation, bound by the existing housing commitment to the north and Brockhole Lane to the east (currently shown without notation) should be included as part of the wider existing housing commitment to the north. The site falls under the same ownership as allocations SG027 and SG068 and benefits from an extant permission for residential development (ref: 62/2015/16414). The housing commitment designation is seen as a logical and appropriate amendment to the draft policy map, removing	The extant permission ref. 62/2015/16414 is for 4 dwellings, as such it has not been included on the policies map, which only shows housing commitments of 5 dwellings and above.

		<p>any avoidance of doubt at a later stage.</p> <p>Include the housing commitment from the extant permission for housing development, ref. 62/2015/16414 on the policies inset map for Settle.</p>	
PM08	Historic England 017	<p>We are particularly concerned by the amendments which have been made to the Policies Maps as part of these Main Modifications. Our concern relates to the deletion of the areas of green infrastructure provision on the housing allocations.</p> <p>Regulation 9(1)(c) of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations, 2012 requires the Policies Map to “illustrate geographically the application of the policies in the adopted development plan”.</p> <p>The consequential changes which have been made by the Council to the graphical depiction of the Housing Allocations shown on the Policies Map have significantly reduced the clarity and effectiveness of the Local Plan Policies. No longer is it clear to users of the Plan where development will or will not be permitted or where the open spaces on these site will be required – so important for ensuring that the development of these sites takes place in a manner which not only conserves the significance of heritage assets within their vicinity but also delivers sustainable development in terms of the other environmental assets of the District.</p> <p>Since the Policies Map is not a Development Plan Document (and therefore it is not something which the Local Plan Inspector considers in terms of Main Modifications), the Council could revert back to the approach adopted in the Submission Plan. Whilst it is accepted that the Inspector felt uncomfortable with defining specific areas to remain undeveloped, this concern could be overcome by renaming them on the Maps as <i>‘Indicative area of proposed green infrastructure’</i>. The Policies Map would then actually deliver what it is required to do under the Regulations – i.e. illustrate geographically the application of policies of the plan.</p>	<p>Green infrastructure (GI) has been identified on all relevant allocated sites as indicative thin green diagonal lines over the whole site, as recommended by the Inspector at the examination hearing sessions in October 2018. This was to alleviate concern over hard borders around specific areas of GI (as set out in the Submission Draft Craven Local Plan), which could be too restrictive to the development of site layouts at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Development principles for relevant site policies have been strengthened to include a description of where the GI is to be placed on site, and why.</p>

PM08	K Hamflett 075	<p>The maps last year distinguished between two areas, one for development and one for green screening. The new map seems to no longer make this distinction. Please could you clarify this for me?</p>	<p>Green infrastructure (GI) has been identified on all relevant allocated sites as indicative thin green diagonal lines over the whole site, as recommended by the Inspector at the examination hearing sessions in October 2018. This was to alleviate concern over hard borders around specific areas of GI (as set out in the Submission Draft Craven Local Plan), which could be too restrictive to the development of site layouts at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Development principles for relevant site policies have been strengthened to include a description of where the GI is to be placed on site, and why.</p>
General	K Hamflett 075	<p>The key on the maps that can be downloaded off your website are unreadable, at least they are on my PC as I cannot zoom in sufficiently.</p> <p>The representation suggests greater clarity is needed to the key to the before and after versions of the settlement maps as set out in the “Changes to the Policies Map, Before and After Maps” document.</p>	<p>The larger settlement maps were originally at A1 size. A screen shot was taken of both the before and after versions of these maps, to enable them to fit on an A4 page within the “Changes to the Policies Map, Before and After Maps” document. As such the quality of the image, including the key was compromised. To remedy this problem a clear A4 Master Key was devised and</p>

			preceded all of the maps in the "Changes to the Policies Map, Before and After Maps" document.
--	--	--	--