28

7CK

7832

RICHMONDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Richmondshire District Council
Local Plan Core Strategy
Proposed Submission
August 2012

Representations Form

RICHMONDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
Rec'd 13 SEP 2012

Please read the guidance notes before completing this form

This form comprises two parts:
Part A - Personal details
Part B - Your representation(s)

Both Part A and Part B of this form need to be completed in order for your representation(s) to be valid. Please complete a separate sheet (Part B) for each representation you wish to make. Further copies of this form can be downloaded from www.richmondshire.gov.uk/localplan.aspx
You do not need to fill out Part A for each representation, provided that all representations made are securely attached.

Your completed form must be returned to the following address to reach us no later than 4pm on Friday 14 September 2012:

Planning Policy
Richmondshire District Council
Swale House
Frenchgate
Richmond
DL10 4JE

Alternatively, you can email localplan@richmondshire.gov.uk and submit this form as an attachment.

Please note, all representations will be made available for public inspection on our website www.richmondshire.gov.uk/localplan.aspx with personal details (i.e. email address, telephone number and signature) removed.

PART A - Personal details

	YOUR DETAILS	AGENT'S DETAILS
Title	MR.	N/A
First name	GODFREY	
Last name	KANE	
Job title (if applicable)		
Work/Organisation (if applicable)		
Address	72 BRENTWOOD LEYBURN NORTH YORKSHIRE	
Postcode	DL8 5HT	
Telephone no.		
Email address	—	

PART B - Your representation(s)
Please use a separate form for each representation

7832

Name/Organisation: NONE

Q1 To which part of the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document does this representation relate? (Spatial Principle, Sub Area Strategy or Core Policy)

Policy number (e.g. SP2, CRSS or CP8) DON'T KNOW - ALL MATTERS RE LEYBURN

Page/paragraph number(s) — " —

Please Note: Your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to fully support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations. After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

Q2 Do you consider the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document is ...?

	Yes	*No*	*Don't know*
(a) Legally compliant	☐	☐	☒
(b) Sound	☐	☒	☐

If you answered '*No*' to (a) or (b) above, please continue to Q3, otherwise continue to Q5

Q3 Do you consider the Core Strategy unsound because it is NOT...? ***(please refer to guidance notes)***

- ☒ *Justified*
- ☒ *Effective*
- ☒ *Consistent with national policy*
- ☒ *Positively prepared*

Please give details of why you consider the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible:

SEE ENCLOSED SUPPORTING DOCUMENT DATED 11/9/2012
ALSO COPY LETTER FROM CPRE DATED 19/8/2012

continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Q4 Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q3 where this relates to soundness. You need to say why this change will make the Core Strategy legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible:

7832

INSUFFICIENT DETAIL HAS BEEN PROVIDED ON LEYBURN AND THIS NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED.

continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Q5 If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document, please use the space below to set out your comments:

7832

continue on a separate sheet if necessary

If your representation is seeking a change to the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

☐ *No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination*

☒ *Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination*

If you have selected '*No*', your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

IT MAY BE NECESSARY OR HELPFUL TO HM INSPECTOR TO EXPAND ON MY WRITTEN PRESENTATION.

If you wish to be notified of future stages of plan preparation, please tick the appropriate box(es) below:

☒ *Submission for Examination*

☒ *Inspector's Report Publication*

☒ *Adoption*

Please notify me by:

☒ *Post*

☐ *Email*

Please Note: The Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature: [redacted] **Date:** 11 SEPTEMBER 2012

Richmondshire Local Plan
Core Strategy Proposed Submission

Public Representation by G Kane, 72 Brentwood, Leyburn, N Yorkshire DL8 5HT

Having looked at the submissions to the public of the Local Plan I would wish to observe the following and make it subject to a further Enquiry. My comments relate both to "legal compliance" and "soundness".

1 Environmental matters

There is concern about good air quality in Leyburn which can have a detrimental impact on tourism. Hospital cover has decreased since the last Local Plan following the closure of the Duchess of Kent and a proposed reduction in services at the Friarage.

2 Brentwood

I am concerned that the Medical Centre and the school on Wensleydale Avenue have already caused traffic problems and these will be increased.

3 Leyburn Medical Practice

This building was controversial at the time and residents' comments were ignored, although these have now proved to be accurate. We are concerned that a possible change of use on this site will be detrimental to the residential area. It might be possible to consider a residential home for Alzheimer and dementia patients.

4 Safeguarding Market Town image

The Local Plan for Leyburn is sketchy on detail and more comprehensive details are required. Leyburn is considered to be the gateway to the Dales and is the most important base for the tourist industry which is of considerable importance to the business community of Leyburn.

5 Unneighbourly industries

I feel that the HGVs coming through Leyburn town centre needs to be avoided and I do not feel that this needs to carry on. The obvious alternative is the Tank Road. The matter of pollution from the quarries has never been addressed and a wheelwash should be installed.

6 Leyburn industrial area

We should define what is B1 and B8 and continue the exclusion of B2 in the Station Yard and adjacent to it. The Station itself is a listed building in a Conservation Area and needs to be protected. There is room for improvement.

7 Proposed Expansion of Leyburn

Leyburn has already been substantially expanded at Dale Grove in terms of housing and an expansion on Bellerby Road of 365 further homes is too much. The disadvantages would be that it would change the fundamental nature of Leyburn as a traditional Market Town and increases the pressure on Brentwood; the sewage system, which is already problematic, needs to be dramatically improved and the position of the Infants' School, which would increase traffic because of additional pupils, would again cause problems on Maythorne and Brentwood. Town centre parking will also be impacted, existing parking problems will be exacerbated and there will clearly be an overall increase in traffic altogether. Such proposed additional housing should be near employment areas, such as Colburn, not in a rural area like Leyburn. The infrastructure as it stands in Leyburn will not carry the proposed housing development.

8 Conclusion

I am concerned at the overall impact of this proposed development in what is essentially a small Market Town. In my opinion the Local Plan for Leyburn is not detailed enough.

G Kane

Leyburn, 11 September 2012

15 Millway
Ampleforth
YORK YO624DR
e-mail

19th August 2010

Dear Mr. Kane

Our National Office has forwarded your letter of 6th August to me. The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) in North Yorkshire has number of smaller district groups, and our Wensleydale Branch will be responding to this consultation. I have therefore sent your letter on to the Chairman, Dr Kristin Whalley of Brook House Farm. Newbiggin, Leyburn DL8 3TD and she will respond. I am sorry that this roundabout journey means that you will not get a prompt reply.

Looking at the draft plan it would seem that Leyburn's provisional allocation of new houses will be 377 over the 15 year period – i.e. some 25 a year - the figure of nearly 500 refers to the larger area served by the town. Over 150 of these should be "affordable" homes for local people, which would go some way towards meeting a growing need.

The overall figure for new housing in Richmondshire – 200 a year – comes from the Regional Spatial Strategy which the new government has now abolished. It was based on projections of population growth which some (including CPRE) challenged as too high, and was arbitrarily raised by the then government, so it might well not be reached - Richmondshire seems to have accepted it in the absence of any better forecast.

Yours

(John D. Farquhar CPRE North Yorkshire County Branch)