

Yorkshire Dales Local Plan: Consultation No. 6 – Land for housing development

Summary of consultation June 2023

Background

Consultation No.6 launched on 24th March 2023 and ran for 7 weeks. The consultation sought to explore how a proposed housing target of 850 dwellings could be delivered up to 2040, through a combination of allocated housing development sites (capable of delivering 5 or more houses), together with smaller-scale ‘windfall’ housing developments (infilling and ‘rounding off’ of settlements within a defined development boundary).

The consultation sought responses to four questions:

Q1. Are the potential housing development sites that have been identified appropriate for development? If not, why not?

Q2. Are there any alternative sites that should be considered for housing development?

Q3. Are the housing development boundaries shown on the accompanying maps appropriate? If not, what changes are needed and why?

Q4. Are the important open spaces identified on the accompanying maps appropriate? If not, what changes are needed and why?

Consultation respondents

A total of 793 individual responses were received. Respondents consisted of the following groups (a full list of respondent groups is provided at Appendix 1):

Group	Number of respondents
Residents or likely residents ¹	662
Residents’ groups	2
Parish bodies	20
Landowners ²	55
Government bodies ³	5
Unitary Authority	2
Unitary Authority Councillor	1
Other interest groups	20
Non-resident individuals ⁴	26
Total	793

¹ Made up of 554 confirmed residents and 108 other respondents that did not confirm residency but where the nature of the representation made indicated residency within the National Park.

² Including agents representing landowners

³ Non-departmental public bodies

⁴ Typically, visitors to the area, former residents, or those that chose to remain anonymous

While many responses were concerned with a single issue, others covered a range of issues. This means that some responses raise multiple separate substantive representations. Responses have therefore been analysed and divided into representations that have been recorded and categorised separately.

Nature of response

Almost two thirds of representations made were objections that sought a change to the Local Plan.

Nature of response	Proportion of representations
Object / change sought	64%
Observation	20%
Support / no objection	16%

Response by theme

Representations made, according to the four main questions posed by the consultation, are as follows:

Theme	Proportion of representations
Potential housing site allocations (Q1)	48%
Alternative housing site allocations (Q2)	14%
Housing development boundaries (Q3)	9%
Important open space (Q4)	10%
Policy approach & other issues	19%

Each of these categories are presented in more detail in the following sections.

Potential housing site allocations (Q1)

This issue accounted for nearly half of all representations.

Representations recorded in this category are those where a specific site is referenced in objections and where the nature of comments relate principally to site-specific matters.

Representations regarding the broader principle of housing, or comments relating to a whole settlement or sub area (without reference to a specific site) are accounted for separately under 'policy approach' in the final section of this report.

The bulk of representations made in response to Question 1 recorded an objection against a potential site allocation:

Subject	Proportion of representations
Objection to potential site allocation	77%
Observation about potential site allocation	13%
Support or qualified support for a potential site allocation	8%
Landowner making representations in support of potential site allocation	2%

Out of 793 respondents in total, 542 expressed an objection against one or more of the 33 potential site allocations.

Out of 33 sites included in the list of potential allocations, 27 recorded some level of objection. Support for any of the proposed site allocations was very limited in comparison.

A full breakdown of respondents commenting on sites (objection/observation/ support) is contained in the table below.

The most significant level of objection to individual sites was in Embsay, with both sites (EMB2 & EMB3) receiving a similar level of objection.

This was followed by Threshfield (THR1 & THR4), again with a similar amount of opposition to both.

Fuller analysis of issues raised in relation to specific allocated sites is contained in Appendix 2.

Site	Number of respondents		
	Objection ⁵	Observation	Support ⁶
Airton (AIR1)	3	1	1
Austwick (AUS1)	1	2	1
Barbon (BAR1)	10	3	3
Barbon (BAR2)	8	4	3
Bolton Abbey (BOL1)	0	1	1
Carperby (CPY1)	1	1	1
Embsay (EMB2)	380	4	1
Embsay (EMB3)	377	3	1
Grassington (GRA1)	13	2	2
Grassington (GRA5)	8	4	2
Grassington (GRA6)	10	2	0
Grassington (GRA7)	9	3	0
Hawes (HAW1)	0	1	1
Hawes (HAW2)	3	2	0
Hawes (HAW3)	3	2	0
Hawes (HAW4)	0	1	2
Horton in Ribblesdale (HOR1)	11	3	1
Horton in Ribblesdale (HOR6)	2	3	1
Long Preston (LON5)	5	4	2
Long Preston (LON8)	3	1	0
Millthorp (MIL3)	2	4	1
Nateby (NAT2)	0	4	2
Newbiggin on Lune (NLU1)	0	3	1
Newbiggin on Lune (NLU2)	0	2	2
Orton (ORT1)	1	2	4
Reeth (REE3)	1	5	1
Sedbergh (SED2)	2	3	3
Sedbergh (SED9)	1	3	3
Sedbergh (SED15)	2	5	4
Sedbergh (SED16)	1	4	2
Threshfield (THR1)	90	3	16
Threshfield (THR3)	3	3	16
Threshfield (THR4)	99	6	12

⁵ Figures relate to the number of respondents that recorded an objection against each site. Some respondents objected to multiple sites.

⁶ Includes qualified support for a site (for example subject to a reduced site area, or further constraints investigation) and support from landowners for their own site.

Alternative sites (Q2)

This issue accounted for 14% of all representations received and concerned:

- sites that had been considered by the Housing Land Availability Assessment, but not shortlisted as potential allocations; and,
- wholly new sites not previously considered by the Housing Land Availability Assessment.

They can be categorised as follows, with further analysis of each in the sections that follow:

Subject	Proportion of representations
Landowners suggesting additional site allocation candidates	3%
Landowners requesting rejected sites be reconsidered and reinstated	13%
Alternative sites suggested by members of the public (previously considered and rejected)	20%
Alternative sites suggested by members of the public (not previously considered)	35%
Members of the public supporting the rejection of specific sites	25%
Observations about rejected sites	4%

Landowners suggesting additional site allocation candidates

Landowners have forwarded a total of 6 suggestions of land for potential housing development that are realistically capable of being considered as site allocations, rather than as smaller-scale infilling or 'rounding off'⁷.

One of these (a potential extension to THR1, Land east of Wharfeside Avenue, Threshfield) is already a matter of public record, having been included within the Housing Land Availability Assessment that accompanied the consultation.

The remaining five are relatively small scale sites in East Witton, Horton in Ribblesdale (2), Long Preston & Thoraby.

Landowners requesting rejected sites be reconsidered and reinstated

Landowners have also made representations seeking the reconsideration of 20 sites (including parts of sites where reduced in size) that were not included in the list of potential sites in Consultation No. 6. In some cases this is on the basis that the site be reinstated as an allocation, while in other cases there is the option of including them in revised housing development boundaries, resulting in some overlap with Q3:

⁷ These smaller sites are covered under Q3 later in the report.

Site Ref	Location	Change sought
AIR1	Land at Hallgarth, Airton	Request to consider larger area of field
AIR2	Land between Hambledon House & Gatesgarth, Airton	Request to reinstate site
BUR1	Land south of Fell Hotel, Burnsall	Request to reinstate site
CAR1	Land west of the Coverdale Memorial Hall, Carlton	Request to reinstate site
CPY1	Land at East End Farm, Carperby	Request to consider croft adjoining (to the west of farmstead)
CRA3	Land between Fell Lane and Back Lane, Cracoe	Request to allocate site, rather than treat as infill
DEN1	Land west of Glebe Fold, Dent	Request to reinstate site
EAS1	Land east of Cruik Barn, Barden Road, Eastby	Request to reinstate site (amended site area)
EAS2	Land east of 23 Kirk Lane, Eastby	Request to reinstate site (amended site area)
EMB1	Land at Holly Farm, Embsay	Request to reinstate site
EWT1	Land north of Low Thorpe Farm, East Witton	Request to reinstate site
GIG1	Land west of Stackhouse Lane, Giggleswick	Request to reinstate site
GRA4	Land adjacent to Ash View/Garsdale, Grassington	Request to consider larger area
LON1	Land between Hartley Green and Back Lane, Long Preston	Request to reinstate site (amended site area)
LON2	Land east of 20 Main Street, Long Preston	Request to reinstate site
LON4	Land south of Tranmere Cottage, Hoyle Hill, Long Preston	Request to reinstate site
LON7	Land north and west of Megs Croft, Long Preston	Request to reinstate site
SED3	Land north of Toll Bar Workshops, Station Road, Sedbergh	Request to reinstate site (amended site area)
SED4	Land at former Baliol School, Cautley Road, Sedbergh	Request to allow residential development on employment site
SET1	Land north of allotments, Ingfield Lane, Settle	Request to reinstate site

Alternative sites suggested by members of the public (previously considered and rejected)

Members of the public have also requested that some sites so far rejected be reconsidered. Many of these suggestions are premised on attempts to identify more suitable alternatives to other shortlisted sites that were the subject of objections:

Site ref	Location	Respondents suggesting site as alternative
CPY1	Land at East End Farm, Carperby (the croft area)	1
CRA1	Land east of Cracoe Primary School, Cracoe	1
CRA2	Land opposite Cracoe Grange Farm, Cracoe	1
CRA4	Land east of Whitakers Barn, Cracoe	1
CRA5	Land between Toppan Farm and Cracoe House Cottage, Cracoe	2
EAS2	Land east of 23 Kirk Lane, Eastby	1
EMB1	Land at Holly Farm, Embsay	1
HOR2	Land west of Cragg Hill Road, Horton-in-Ribblesdale	1
HOR3	Land east of Cragg Hill Road, Horton-in-Ribblesdale	1
SED3	Land north of Toll Bar Workshops, Station Road, Sedbergh	4
THR2	Land north of Skirethorns Lane and east of B6160, Threshfield	1
THR6	Land south of Skirethorns Lane, Threshfield	8
THR7	Land east of the B6160 at Simon Seats View, Threshfield	30
THR8	Lane east of the junction between the B6160 and Monkholme Lane, Threshfield	27

Alternative sites suggested by members of the public (not previously considered)

Members of the public have also suggested other alternative sites, heretofore not considered for housing development in the Housing Land Availability Assessment. Again, many of these suggestions are premised on attempts to identify more suitable alternatives to other shortlisted sites that were the subject of objections. The additional sites, most suggested, in order of popularity, are listed below:

Site	Respondents suggesting site as alternative
Threshfield – Lower Quarry (allocated employment site)	47
Threshfield - NYC Highways Depot	44
Linton Camp (allocated employment site)	24
Threshfield & Grassington - others ⁸	13

⁸ Including land at Grassington Hospital, Land behind Piecefields, Land behind the Spar/Threshfield filling station, Land further along Skirethorns Lane, Land either side of the road between Monkholme and the old

Members of the public supporting the rejection of specific sites

A number of members of the public submitted representations endorsing the rejection of certain sites and reserving the right to submit objections should they be reinstated. These were:

Site ref	Location	Respondents endorsing rejection
AIR2	Land between Hambledon House & Gatesgarth, Back Lane, Airton	5
CAS3 & CAS4	Land south of Casterton School courts and swimming pool, Casterton; Land east of Fern Croft & Smithy How, Casterton	1
CRA1	Land east of Cracoe Primary School, Cracoe	2
CRA2	Land opposite Cracoe Grange Farm, Cracoe	2
CRA4	Land east of Whitakers Barn, Cracoe	1
CRA5	Land between Toppan Farm and Cracoe House Cottage, Cracoe	1
MIL1 & MIL2	Land west of Blandses Farm, Millthorp; Land east of Derry Cottages, Millthorp	1
NAT1	Land rear of Nateby Service Station, Nateby	1
STI1	Land west of Cock Hill, Stirton	10
TBY1, TBY2, TBY3	Land at & south west of Manor Farm, Thorlby; Land opposite Evergreens & Twin Ashes, Thorlby	7
THR2	Land north of Skirethorns Lane and east of B6160, Threshfield	2
THR6	Land south of Skirethorns Lane, Threshfield	2
THR7	Land east of the B6160 at Simon Seats View, Threshfield	2
THR8	Lane east of the junction between the B6160 and Monkholme Lane, Threshfield	3
WWT1	Land east of Grassgill, West Witton	24

railway, Long Ashes, Land along road from Grassington Bridge to Threshfield Primary School, land beyond Wharfedale RUFC.

Housing development boundaries (Q3)

This issue accounted for 9% of all representations received. Although many more responses referenced housing development boundaries, this was often in the context of, and as an extension to, objections about potential housing site allocations (Q1). Those that made specific representations in relation to the role of housing development boundaries in controlling small-scale windfall developments can be categorised as follows:

Category	Respondents / summary of issues raised	
Comment on general approach to defining boundaries	6%	These responses were divided evenly between those who: • were generally supportive of the approach; • thought the approach was too restrictive; and
Comment on approach to the whole of a specific settlement	42%	The bulk of these respondents were generally supportive or made general observations, outweighing objections by a ratio of four to one. Objections were principally based on the boundaries being deemed to be too restrictive.
Requests to exclude specific area from development boundary	20%	The majority of these responses sought the removal of an area of land with identified development potential ⁹ . This included areas in Cracoe, Langthwaite, Horton, Austwick, Buckden and Grassington. The three plots with the most objections are discussed further in Appendix 3.
Requests to include specific area in development boundary	26%	The majority of these responses were from individuals seeking inclusion within the boundary of a plot deemed to have development potential. Landowners submitted 19 suggestions, while other respondents suggested 2. In a limited number of cases there is overlap with sites suggested under Q2 above, where either an allocation or a development boundary change might be made. A further number of responses requesting areas to be included in development boundaries sought changes primarily for accuracy reasons, without any suggestion of future development potential. These changes related to plots of land in Airton (1), Barbon (4), Castle Bolton (1), Cracoe (3), East Witton (1), Fremington (1), Grassington (1), Hetton (1), Horton in Ribblesdale (2), Linton (1), Scosthrop (1), Sedbergh (1), Settle (2), Thoraby (1), Threshfield (2), West Burton (2). Finally, a small number of responses sought to ensure that specific housing site allocations/ongoing developments were included within development boundaries, for the avoidance of doubt about their developability.
Support for area included in development boundary	6%	Landowners supporting the inclusion of their land (with development potential) within development boundaries.

⁹ Land that had either been submitted through the call for sites or that had been the subject of recent planning applications

Important open space (Q4)

This issue accounted for 10% of all representations received and can be categorised as follows:

Category	Respondents / summary of issues raised	
Comment on overall approach	3%	Split between objections and support.
Comment on whole settlement	34%	Most respondents were either supportive or offered observations. Ten respondents objected either because of the identification of areas without any public access, a failure to routinely designate features such as footpaths, or a general lack of open space in the settlement.
Request specific area added	54%	The majority of these responses objected on the basis that a potential housing site allocation/infill site should instead be designated as important open space. Sites most often referred to were in Embsay (EMB2&3), Threshfield (THR1&4) and Cracoe (CRA3/CRA.g). The remaining responses identified other candidate spaces that were deemed to meet the criteria for designation.
Request specific area removed	9%	Split evenly between those seeking the removal of an area of important open space that might prejudice the delivery of a housing development site (allocation and infill), and those seeking removals for other reasons.

Policy approach

This issue accounted for 19% of all representations received. The consultation did not seek to explore issues of policy principle covered by previous consultations, for example the housing target, the need for more housing, the spatial strategy or the type/tenure of housing provided. Nonetheless, the potential practical implications of some of these issues, as expressed through potential sites allocations, development boundaries and important open spaces, meant that respondents also sought to explore the policy principles underpinning housing land supply.

Almost two thirds of the representations made under this issue were objections. The bulk of these were made in connection with potential housing site allocations and sought to explore wider issues, beyond site-specific suitability for development, that underpinned the need for more housing. In line with the volume of site-specific objection, many of these representations were connected to the localities of Embsay, Grassington and Threshfield. A range of issues were raised, many of them linked, including:

- Conflict with National Park purposes arising from developing greenfield sites that were considered to impact negatively on special qualities, climate change and biodiversity aims;
- Skewed apportionment of housing, with potential site allocations disproportionately concentrated in Craven and Grassington, Threshfield and Embsay in particular;
- A failure to focus housing development opportunity in the areas needing it most, with a perception that too many proposed sites were in settlements seen as thriving, with population growth, a more balanced age profile, full school rolls etc, rather than in settlements/areas that were the subject of greater threats to community sustainability. This, in turn, was seen as a further threat to community sustainability, since people would relocate away from the remoter settlements;
- Issues of scale with individual housing sites, with many respondents declaring support for smaller, more sensitive and evenly distributed housing sites, but not for larger scale developments. Relying on larger sites is described as 'lazy planning';
- A preference for continued reliance on small-scale windfall developments to deliver housing in the National Park, rather than site allocations.
- Deficient infrastructure and services to support new development, with road/transport, school, water and sewage facilities featuring prominently;
- A lack of existing employment, and a lack of a strategy to increase employment and economic development opportunities, so as to attract a working-age population;
- A perception that houses would still become holiday/second/retirement homes and would not be affordable enough so as to attract younger households;

- Fears over whether the affordable housing provided would be truly affordable, or otherwise whether developers would seek to negotiate down the proportions of affordable housing on viability grounds;
- Wider issues with the type of housing provided, including provision for older persons' accommodation and high environmental sustainability requirements.

Other issues raised were:

- The need to address issues with other land use allocations in the Local Plan, notably existing employment site allocations. This included:
 - objection to any continued allocation of land north of the Dales Centre in Reeth;
 - a request for the remaining employment land allocation at Askrigg to be retained;
 - a request for land allocations for 'entry-level' farming to allow sustainable local food production;
 - potential redeployment of Threshfield Quarry to provide some live-work units;
 - potential redeployment of Baliol School (Sedbergh) for a broader range of (non-employment) uses;
- Special considerations applicable to potential site allocations and the wider evidence base for the Local Plan (largely raised by public bodies e.g. flood risk, Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, nutrient neutrality, assessments of heritage significance, potential loss of sporting facilities, potential impact on horse riders etc);
- A lack of public profile for the consultation, especially the lack of direct notification of residents affected by potential site allocations.

Appendix 1 – list of groups¹⁰ responding to Consultation No.6

Airton Parish Meeting	Long Preston Parish Council
Arkengarthdale Parish Council	Nateby Parish Meeting
Askrigg & Low Abbotside Parish Council	National Trust
Austwick Parish Council	Natural England
Bainbridge Parish Council	Network Rail
Bolton Estate	North Craven Heritage Trust
British Hedgehog Preservation Society	North Yorkshire Council
British Horse Society	Orton Parish Council
Burton-cum-Walden Parish Council	Pennine National Trails Partnership
Clapham-cum-Newby Parish Council	Richmondshire Ramblers
Coal Authority	Scostrop Parish Meeting
Cracoe Parish Meeting	Sedbergh Economic Partnership
Craven Pothole Club	Sedbergh Parish Council
Council for the Protection of Rural England	Skipton Properties Ltd
Diocese of Carlisle	Sport England
Embsay Action Group	Stirton Water Trust
Embsay Hogwatch	Stirton-with-Thorlby Parish Meeting
Embsay with Eastby Environmental Action Group	The Devonshire Group (Chatsworth Settlement Trustees)
Embsay with Eastby Parish Council	Threshfield Development Concern Group
Environment Agency	Threshfield Parish Council
Friends of the Dales	Threshfield Quarry Development Trust
Friends of the Lake District	United Utilities
Grassington Parish Council	Upper Wensleydale Sports and Recreational Association
Historic England	Wensleydale and Coverdale Parish Forum
Home Builders Federation	Westmorland & Furness Council
Kettlewell Parish Council	Wharfedale Homes
Home Builders Federation	Wharfedale RUFC
Linton Parish Council	

¹⁰ Not including respondents that were a named individual member of the public or landowner/agent

Appendix 2 – Summary of site-specific representations

Airton (AIR1) Land at Hallgarth, Airton	This site is already allocated in the current Local Plan and has recently been the subject of a planning application for three dwellings (approved at April Planning Committee subject to a Section 106 legal agreement). Objectors include the Parish Meeting and two members of the public. These objections reference the recent planning approval and object to any increase in units or erosion of the important open space surrounding the site. The landowner has supported the expanded site allocation, while also requesting that the wider Hallgarth field (originally submitted through the call for sites and dismissed on landscape sensitivity grounds) be reconsidered for a larger development. Historic England comment that the impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings needs to be taken account of.
Austwick (AUS1) Land at Pant Lane, Austwick	This site is already allocated in the current Local Plan and has recently been the subject of a planning application for eight dwellings (approved at April Planning Committee subject to a Section 106 legal agreement). One objection, from Clapham-cum-Newby Parish Council, has been received. This raises issues with the capacity of Austwick Sewage Pumping Station that result in discharges into a watercourse that the flows through Clapham parish. Austwick Parish Council itself has not raised any objection to the site. Historic England comment that the impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings needs to be taken account of.

	United Utilities has said that the site (together with a number of others) is part of a public water supply catchment area and that a risk assessment of impacts and potential mitigations is likely to be required.
Barbon (BAR1) Land west of Studds Hall, Barbon	Issues raised by objectors to these two nearby sites include road safety (on road parking, lack of carriageway width, existing volumes of traffic, poor visibility), light pollution, the importance of the plots as an open space, the loss of the drystone wall/hedgerow to create access, flooding and drainage issues (with natural springs noted close to BAR2), impact on residential amenity/views and a lack of services in the village (including mains sewage). Past planning refusals for development of BAR1, including one dismissed appeal, have been referenced. One member of the public, in objecting to BAR1, has stated that BAR2 would be a more discreet alternative, while another view expressed is that BAR1 has potential, but that the whole frontage should not be developed. The landowners of BAR1 have written in support of the site, as well as BAR2. Westmorland and Furness Council has strongly supported all potential allocations, subject to further detailed site investigations.
Barbon (BAR2) Land west of Moorthwaite Lane, Barbon	United Utilities has said that both sites (together with a number of others) is part of a public water supply catchment area and that a risk assessment of impacts and potential mitigations is likely to be required. Historic England comment that the impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings needs to be taken account of.
Bolton Abbey (BOL1) Land west of Mitford Cottages, Bolton Abbey	This site has attracted little comment. The landowner has supported its inclusion, stating that it will have an important role to play in the masterplan for the wider Bolton Abbey Core Visitor Area. Historic England has commented that the impact of the site upon the nearby Scheduled Monument, listed buildings and conservation area need to be taken account of.
Carperby (CPY1)	The landowner has written in support of the site but believes that an opportunity has been missed to extend the developable area into the adjacent croft and have contended its exclusion

Land at East End Farm, Carperby	on landscape sensitivity grounds. One other comment has been received stating that the farmstead site should not be regarded as brownfield land, is unlikely to deliver affordable housing, and has poor highway visibility, deeming the adjacent croft to be a better development option. Historic England comment that the impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings, and the conservation area, needs to be taken account of.
Embsay (EMB2) Land north of Brackenley Lane and Dales Avenue, Embsay	These sites, situated opposite one another, have received by far the highest level of objection. The vast majority of responses make reference to both sites and, but for a very small minority, objectors seek to demonstrate that no development whatsoever on these sites (even significantly reduced in scale), or anywhere else in the village, could be acceptable. A residents' group – Embsay Action Group – has submitted a detailed response, principally in relation to EMB2. Embsay with Eastby Parish Council has objected to both sites. The majority of other responses relate to both sites and include a number of responses from local children.
Embsay (EMB3) Land south of 53 Brackenley Lane, Embsay	The main issues raised include: • the lack of any capacity for intensification of use of Brackenley Lane, with restricted width, poor junctions and conflict between vehicles and pedestrians/cyclists. Other access points are seen as clearly unviable and scope to improve Brackenley Lane extremely limited; • the lack of capacity in the wider road network, with flooding issues resulting in the village being largely cut off at times and already subject to significant traffic movements; • the amount of recent development in village, particularly along Shires Lane where large sites are being developed. The village is seen as having more than satisfied its 'quota' of housing, as set out in the Craven District Local Plan, and there is a perception that cumulative impacts of development are being ignored owing to the village's division between separate planning authorities; • additional strain on village infrastructure, with the impacts of recent developments not yet fully felt; • a lack of services in the village to serve additional residents, including shops, healthcare and public transport, with the school already over-subscribed forcing children from the village into schools in Skipton, Cracoe and other locations;

- the loss of views and enjoyment as a result of development on the sites, including the impact on the Lady Anne's Way, with the two fields seen as an important recreational resource for local people, deserving of protection as important open space;
- landscape impact, with the landscape sensitivity study seeing as under valuing views of Embsay Crag across the sites, as well as failing to consider the wider urbanization of the settlement through cumulative developments;
- loss of wildlife and harm to protected trees within the site, including concerns raised by the Embsay Environmental Group and Embsay Hogwatch;
- surface water run-off, particularly from EMB2, which regularly floods Brackenley Lane and some adjacent properties. This is exacerbated by the combined sewer system leading to surcharges into watercourses;
- a feeling that Embsay is becoming a suburb of Skipton and losing its village identity;
- Embsay being seen as thriving with many families and a full primary school, so doesn't suffer from the same issues as other parts of the National Park, and development on the periphery of the Park not being seen as the solution to community sustainability issues in the National Park's interior;
- a disproportionate amount of growth in one village and in the Craven District of the National Park;
- the overall scale of potential development on the site, which is seen as excessive in a National Park;
- EMB2 having been previously rejected by the Authority when producing the 2012 Housing Development Plan;

The landowner of EMB2 – The Devonshire Group (DG) – has written in support of the site, noting its intention to continue to support the allocation of the site throughout the later stages of the plan making process. DG acknowledges that the site will be contentious but nonetheless considers it to be appropriate and has submitted further information as part of its response, including a Vision Document including two Masterplan options for the design of the site, including an area of public open space and an initial assessment of some of the highway access issues raised. It has asserted that, although there may be concerns about school capacity, 72 of the 207 children on the school roll attend from outside the catchment area, suggesting that capacity could be available for resident households in future years. It contends that past growth of

	Embsay has contributed to it becoming a thriving community and there is no reason why additional development could not contribute further to this. It highlights the contrasts with the tenure of housing required on this site versus those outside the National Park and the fact that development would still be some years away and potentially phased. Natural England has highlighted that the site is in close proximity to North Pennine Moors Special Area of Conservation, North Pennine Moors Special Protection Area and West Nidderdale, Barden & Blubberhouses Moors Site of Special Scientific Interest. As a result, impacts will need to be considered through the Habitats Regulations Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal in relation to impacts on air quality and qualifying bird species. Historic England comment that the impact on the setting of the conservation area and nearby listed buildings needs to be taken account of.
Grassington (GRA1) Land north of Wharfe View, Grassington	Objections to this site include the limitations of the roads/junctions leading to the site, as well as the restricted access into the site itself. Objectors reference the fact the site has previously been dismissed from consideration (when the Authority was preparing the 2012 Housing Development Plan). Impact on the historical landscape setting of Grassington are commonly expressed. Inadequate infrastructure serving Grassington, especially for sewage disposal, is another factor commonly referenced, with fears of additional surcharges into the River Wharfe resulting from more development. Loss of farmland, wildlife, and impact on views for walkers using rights of way around the site, are also mentioned. Local residents state that there are empty properties adjoining the site and doubt the need for more affordable housing. They also refer to the predominance of elderly residents in the area and express concerns about the impact of development on these residents. Grassington and Linton Parish Councils are opposed to the development of the site The landowner has written in support of the site but has expressed disappointment that it has been reduced in size following the landscape sensitivity assessment. One member of the public has expressed support for the site.

Grassington (GRA5) Land south east of Aynham Close, Grassington	Objections to this site relate to landscape impact (with a perception that development will ruin the entrance the village) and result in the loss of part of an attractive and historically significant walled field system. Loss of important farmland, loss of views and existing surface water run-off issues, that have caused flooding on and adjacent to the site, are also referenced. Highway safety is also raised owing to the volume of vehicle movements along Hebden Road (including HGVs, farm vehicles and tourist traffic) with poor visibility owing the pronounced bend in the road and conflicts with other nearby junctions. More broadly, concerns are raised regarding the ability of Grassington's infrastructure and services to sustain more housing, together with doubts over whether any of the houses provided will be genuinely affordable. The landowner has written in support of the allocation, referencing information and reports prepared to demonstrate that the site could be developed in such a way as to overcome constraints and deliver housing to meet the Local Plan's aspirations. The landowner has however requested that the allocated area be expanded to include the areas where landscape planting and biodiversity gain are proposed on the site's southern, eastern, and northern boundaries to ensure they are delivered holistically alongside the development. These areas were excluded from the site area consulted on owing to landscape sensitivity concerns and for the avoidance of doubt regarding the developable area. Grassington Parish Council has reserved judgement on this site until it has more information to make a decision. One member of the public has responded in support of the site.
Grassington (GRA6) Land west of Garrs End Lane, Grassington	These site adjoining one another and GRA7 is currently allocated for housing development in the 2015 Local Plan and is the subject of a current planning application that proposes 23 houses/flats. Objectors have given a range of reasons for the sites being unsuitable, including impact on residential amenity, loss of views, wildlife habitat and part of the network of open spaces within the village, which form part of its rural character. Access to the sites is one of the most prominent objections, given the narrowness of approaches, poor visibility at junctions and the levels of use already experienced in connection with residential and commercial properties in the area. This is also seen as a conflict with many recreational users of the lanes around the sites. Issues with
Grassington (GRA7)	

Land north of Moody Sty Lane, Grassington	drainage capacity and physical limitations on improving drainage are also cited, together with the fact that there are issues with surface water flood risk. Impact on residential amenity and concerns about parking provision are also raised. Grassington Parish Council is opposed to the development of the sites. Some respondents are more accepting of some development on the sites, only at a lower density given the need to respect the character of the area and overcome some of the highway capacity limitations. Historic England comment that the impact on the setting of the conservation area needs to be taken account of.
Hawes (HAW1) Land south and west of Woodburn, Burtersett Road, Hawes	The landowner has written in support of this site but has asked that the development boundary be extended to include it.
Hawes (HAW2) Land south of Northgate House, Burtersett Road, Hawes	These sites adjoin one another. HAW 3 is allocated in the current Local Plan while HAW2 is suggested as a potential extension at a greater depth, wrapping around the rear of adjoining houses. Objections relate to the impact on the landscape, including gateway views, the loss of an upland wildflower meadow (with wildlife and farming value), impact on dark skies and the loss of the paved footpath across the site and the recreational enjoyment this provides. The scale of the development, its 'backland' nature, fears of a modern estate feel to development, and impact on residential amenity, are also cited as reasons why development would not be in-keeping or appropriate.
Hawes (HAW3) Land east of Northgate House, Burtersett Road, Hawes	
Hawes (HAW4)	Two members of the public have written in support of this site (in preference to sites HAW2 & HAW3).

Land at Kirkbrides Way, Hawes	
Horton in Ribblesdale (HOR1) Land between Hillside and recreation ground, Station Road, Horton in Ribblesdale	Objections to this site centre largely on flood risk. Modelled flood risk shows Flood Zone 2 extending up to and slightly overlapping the eastern boundary of the site. On this basis the Environment Agency has commented that this small area should not be used to accommodate any housing. Objectors have submitted photos that clearly show that there have been flood events that have seen a larger area inundated with water that would cut off vehicular access to the more elevated part of the site during a flood event. The landowner has written in support of the site and has added that, if required, additional land in the same ownership could be incorporated into a scheme designed to address flood risk concerns arising from the housing development. Objectors have raised concerns about the impact of displacing flood waters through any bunding or similar feature to protect access into this site, as well as the impact this will have on financial viability. Other issues raised by objectors are loss of views (especially from the Station towards Pen-y-Ghent), impact on residential amenity, constrained access over the bridge, impact on dark skies and compounding existing issues experienced due to high levels of visitor pressure in the village and the use of the lower field for occasional car parking. The landscape sensitivity of the site, part of which forms a drumlin, is seen by some objectors to have been underrated. More broadly, objectors feel that Horton is not a suitable location for new housing, with little employment and having lost its school and other services in recent years, leading to more car-reliance for residents. Historic England comment that the impact on the setting of the Settle-Carlisle Railway Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings needs to be taken account of.
Horton in Ribblesdale (HOR6) Land west of B6479 opposite Rowe Garth, Horton-in-Ribblesdale	This site is already allocated for development in the 2015 Local Plan and has a recent Planning Committee resolution to approve 11 dwellings (including a barn conversion). Objections to this site are largely in conjunction with HOR1 and mention the broader issues surrounding the suitability of Horton as a location for more housing. The only site-specific factors

	mentioned are the safety issues for pedestrians along the road through the village, given the lack of a pavement and high level of HGV use in association with the quarry. Historic England comment that the impact on the setting of the Settle-Carlisle Railway Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings needs to be taken account of.
Long Preston (LON5) Land rear of Moorfields & Guy's Cottages, Long Preston	Objectors cite recent developments in the village and question the need for more housing. Impact on wildlife and surface water run-off are also highlighted, together with loss of views and green spaces surrounding the village. Highway safety is a prominent feature of objections, especially access onto the busy A65 with HGV and tourist traffic, where visibility and carriageway width is limited. A lack of infrastructure in the village generally, but more particularly restricted water supplies and drainage facilities are also mentioned. The Parish Council has not objected to the site, but has observed that only single storey properties may be appropriate and has highlighted the potential impact on views from footpaths in the Ribble floodplain, and the open aspect enjoyed by adjoining properties. The landowner has written in support of the (upper) site and highlighted that the additional (lower) area of land, previously dismissed on grounds of landscape sensitivity, remains available should it be required. The only other support for the site is in preference to sites proposed elsewhere in the village. A potential opportunity has been identified to use the site to accommodate a safer off-road route for the Pennine Bridleway through the village, avoiding the A65. United Utilities has commented that the site is affected by wastewater assets that would need factoring into scheme design. Historic England comment that the impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area and setting of nearby listed buildings needs to be taken account of.

Long Preston (LON8) Land between Nos 36 and 38 Main Street, Long Preston	This site is already allocated for development in the 2015 Local Plan and is the subject of a current outline planning application for 9 dwellings. Long Preston Parish Council has echoed its objections to the current planning application which include the loss of green space/wildlife and exacerbating parking issues and traffic safety concerns. Local residents have raised similar issues and have added the loss of the footpath across the site and disruption caused during construction. Historic England comment that the impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area (including views across the site) and setting of nearby listed buildings needs to be taken account of.
Millthorp (MIL3) Land opposite Derry Cottages, Millthorp	This site is allocated for development in the 2015 Local Plan and was the subject of a planning application that was refused in 2020. Objections relate to the loss of views and impact on the landscape and settlement character, with a fear that development would create ribbon development and create a feeling of there being two distinct parts of the village – a traditional village core and a more modern extension. Constrained road access, with subsequent safety concerns were also raised, together with loss of wildlife and a general concern that Millthorp lacks the services to support more development. Fears regarding a lack of affordable housing provision, based on the previous planning application, are also expressed. There is some support for the reduction in the site area, which resulted from the recommendations of the landscape sensitivity assessment. This has also been seen as something that could exacerbate the impact of development by making it appear more detached from the settlement, with calls for any reduction in site area to be focused on the eastern end of the site. United Utilities has said that the site (together with a number of others) is part of a public water supply catchment area and that a risk assessment of impacts and potential mitigations is likely

	to be required. It has also commented that there is an easement in relation to wastewater assets within the site that will need to be respected as part of any development layout. Westmorland and Furness Council has strongly supported all potential allocations, subject to further detailed site investigations. Historic England comment that the impact on the Sedbergh conservation area, which embraces Millthrop, needs to be taken account of.
Nateby (NAT2) Land opposite Fell View Garage, Nateby	No objection to this site has been received with Nateby Parish Council recording no comment. Natural England has stated that, since the site is in close proximity to River Eden Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and River Eden and Tributaries Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), it will need to be considered in the Habitat Regulations Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. This includes consideration of potential air & water quality impacts, together with potential nutrient impacts, given that the Eden catchment has been designated as a 'nutrient neutrality' catchment. United Utilities has said that the site (together with a number of others) is part of a public water supply catchment area and that a risk assessment of impacts and potential mitigations is likely to be required. Westmorland and Furness Council has strongly supported all potential allocations, subject to further detailed site investigations. Historic England has commented on the proximity of Wharton Hall, a listed building and scheduled monument some 500m distant from the site.
Newbiggin on Lune (NLU1)	Friends of the Lake District has commented that a smaller site area may need to be considered as the site seems to be important to the character of the village.

Land west of Ash Dene, Newbiggin-on-Lune	United Utilities has said that the site (together with a number of others) is part of a public water supply catchment area and that a risk assessment of impacts and potential mitigations is likely to be required. Westmorland and Furness Council has strongly supported all potential allocations, subject to further detailed site investigations. Historic England has commented on the proximity of a medieval settlement and chapel site (scheduled monument) 130m distant from the site.
Newbiggin on Lune (NLU2) Land at The Warehouse, Newbiggin-on-Lune	Friends of the Lake District has supported this site. Westmorland and Furness Council has strongly supported all potential allocations, subject to further detailed site investigations. United Utilities has highlighted an adjacent pumping station and associated wastewater assets affecting the site, which could impact on the developable area. It has also identified a potential flood risk from the public sewer that will require assessment and consideration in the detailed design, masterplanning and drainage details for the site to ensure any exceedance paths are appropriately managed, that there is no risk of flooding and that flood risk will not increase.
Orton (ORT1) Land east of Ashfield Court, Orton	One objector expresses concern that development would introduce residential development into the rural setting of the settlement and the Conservation Area. It references some of the concerns raised in the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (which led to the site being reduced in size) and a previous appeal decision that upheld Eden District Council's decision to refuse development of a similar area. The landowner has written in support of the site but has requested that proposed protection (as important open space) of the verges along the site frontage be removed.

	Orton Parish Council has commented that it has no objection to the housing proposed within the village, but would prefer any new housing to be affordable homes for local people and not second homes. Historic England comment that the impact on the setting of nearby listed building and conservation area needs to be taken account of. United Utilities has said that the site (together with a number of others) is part of a public water supply catchment area and that a risk assessment of impacts and potential mitigations is likely to be required. Friends of the Lake District have commented that this site will require careful thought so as not to cause harm to the landscape setting of the village. Westmorland and Furness Council has strongly supported all potential allocations, subject to further detailed site investigations.
Reeth (REE3) Land north of Back Lane, Reeth	This site is allocated for development in the 2015 Local Plan is currently on the market. Objections centre primarily on the issues created accessing the site, with the point of access on the threshold of a junction, highways affected by parked cars, farm vehicles and traffic to the caravan site, sports facilities and medical centre. Displacement of parking that currently takes place on the site is also highlighted in an area that already has parking pressures from a lack of off-street provision and a number of visitor accommodation premises. The impact on nearby listed buildings, together with the archaeological potential of the site, and its historical significance as the orchard for the former workhouse are also mentioned by objectors. The site is said to have flooded in recent years and is deemed to be important for wildlife following its steady colonisation over years of disuse, including a number of trees, some perhaps dating back to the former orchard. Any acceptance of development on this site among objectors is premised on a much lower density of development to fit around the constraints highlighted and ensure sufficient parking facilities within the site. This has led other objectors to question viability of the

	site for affordable housing, given the current asking price and the cost of mitigating some of the issues raised. The landowner has written in support of the site stating that it meets the tests of being suitable, available and achievable. Historic England comment that the impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of nearby listed buildings needs to be taken account of.
Sedbergh (SED2) Land south of Station Road and east of Busk Lane, Sedbergh	Objections to this site suggest that it is premature to allocate the sports pitches for residential development and that a more precautionary approach is required until such time as it has been demonstrated that the loss of the pitches has been properly compensated for. It is also seen as precluding other alternative uses of the site, including expanding the School's facilities, resulting in pressure on other, more impactful sites. Concerns are also raised about achieving safe access, impact on key views and the setting of historical buildings at the heart of the School campus, and whether housing provided would serve the needs of the wider community or just the School. Other points raised are the need to protect the trees on the site. Historic England comment that the impact on the setting of nearby listed building and conservation area needs to be taken account of. It considers this to be the site having the highest potential impact on heritage assets out of all 33 proposed in the consultation. United Utilities has said that the site (together with a number of others) is part of a public water supply catchment area and that a risk assessment of impacts and potential mitigations is likely to be required. Westmorland and Furness Council has strongly supported all potential allocations, subject to further detailed site investigations. Sedbergh Economic Partnership also supports all the sites identified in Sedbergh.

Sedbergh (SED9) Land at Kings Yard, Bainbridge Road, Sedbergh	This site was considered at Planning Committee in December 2022 and a scheme of 7 dwellings was approved subject to a legal agreement securing 2 as local occupancy dwellings. It was included in the consultation on the basis of it having been submitted through the call for sites and in the event that the current scheme is not implemented. Sedbergh Economic Partnership consider that allocating the site could reduce the number of dwellings considered necessary to achieve housing growth in Sedbergh, so should not be listed as a “new development site” in view of the existing planning permission. One objector raises concerns regarding traffic and parking along Bainbridge Road which development would exacerbate, leading to safety concerns. Other sites are seen as preferable. Other comments mention the potential to use the site as an opportunity to provide residents only parking spaces to tidy up street parking, alongside a sensitively designed residential development with some small integrated workshops, while preserving a long-established de-facto pedestrian route across the site. Historic England comment that the impact on the Sedbergh Conservation Area needs to be taken account of. United Utilities has said that the site (together with a number of others) is part of a public water supply catchment area and that a risk assessment of impacts and potential mitigations is likely to be required. Westmorland and Furness Council has strongly supported all potential allocations, subject to further detailed site investigations. Friends of the Lake District also support the site. Sedbergh Economic Partnership also supports all the sites identified in Sedbergh.
Sedbergh (SED15)	Objections to this site refer to exacerbating the impact of the large development on land to the west, the loss of prime agricultural land, loss of views, impact on residential amenity, issues with

Land west of Guldrey Fold, Sedbergh	the sewage system and highway safety implications. Doubts over the affordability of the housing provided and the employment available locally are also expressed. Other comments do raise concern with the potential cumulative impacts of development on this side of the town, in view of the large ongoing development to the west, and have variously called for a smaller site area, or a carefully landscaped and designed scheme to offset these impacts. Historic England comment that the impact on the Sedbergh Conservation Area and Queens Gardens needs to be taken account of. United Utilities has said that the site (together with a number of others) is part of a public water supply catchment area and that a risk assessment of impacts and potential mitigations is likely to be required. Westmorland and Furness Council has strongly supported all potential allocations, subject to further detailed site investigations. Other representations have commented that the site represents a logical development opportunity. Sedbergh Economic Partnership also supports all the sites identified in Sedbergh.
Sedbergh (SED16) Land north of Medical Centre, Sedbergh	The only objection to this site expresses fears that it will result in this already busy and densely developed area becoming more 'cluttered'. Other comments recognise that this is the least sensitive part of the current area of open space, but that the developable area should be reduced in size. The site is also seen as reducing the need to expand the town's footprint further. Historic England comment that the impact on the Sedbergh Conservation Area needs to be taken account of. United Utilities has said that the site (together with a number of others) is part of a public water supply catchment area and that a risk assessment of impacts and potential mitigations is likely

	to be required. It has also commented that there is an easement in relation to wastewater assets within the site that will need to be respected as part of any development layout. Westmorland and Furness Council has strongly supported all potential allocations, subject to further detailed site investigations. Sedbergh Economic Partnership also supports all the sites identified in Sedbergh.
Threshfield (THR3) Land rear of Manor House Farm & Village Institute, Threshfield	This site is already allocated for housing development in the 2015 Local Plan. It has attracted some objection based upon the impact on adjacent listed buildings, the amenity of adjoining properties and overall settlement identity and distinctiveness. The site is also seen as providing a wildlife habitat having been colonised by a variety of species since going out of use. Narrow access, made narrower by parked cars, with poor visibility at junctions (and conflict with users of the Village Institute) is also a reason for objection. Objectors do not deem Monkholme Lane to be a minor thoroughfare, but a route that is busy at times and set to become busier if other development proceed. Additional surface water run-off, non-native landscaping and impact on Dark Skies are further reasons given. There is also a perception among objectors that this site may have been overlooked by many respondents, given the larger scale development proposed elsewhere in the village and the fact that many surrounding properties are not permanently occupied. Objectors also point to the fact that the site has not been developed since its original allocation, suggesting it is not a viable proposition. In contrast, some support for the site has been expressed, with it being seen as sensitive infill, with an opportunity to improve derelict land and remove what is seen by some as an 'eyesore'. Many of these supportive comments are premised on THR3 being seen as a less prominent and harmful site than THR1 or THR4. Threshfield Parish Council has added its support for this site on the basis of it having the least visual impact and being previously developed land. Historic England comment that the impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings needs to be taken account of.

Threshfield (THR1) Land east of Wharfeside Avenue, Threshfield	These sites each received a similar level of opposition. Although THR1 attracted a slightly lower level of objection, most respondents felt that neither site was suitable. As in Embsay, but for a very small minority, objectors sought to demonstrate that no development whatsoever on these sites (even significantly reduced in scale) could be acceptable. Some limited support was expressed for both sites, with slightly more support expressed for THR1. A group established by local residents - Threshfield Village Development Concern Group – has been established <i>“to ensure that any sites to be allocated for housing development in Threshfield through the new Local Plan process are appropriate and proportionate in size to the existing settlement”</i>. It is said to represent around 120 households in the village and has submitted a detailed response as well as a review of the landscape sensitivity assessments used to inform the site selection process. Many residents have responded individually, as well as through TVDCG.
Threshfield (THR4) Land north of Upper Wharfedale School, Wharfeside Avenue, Threshfield	The main issues raised are: • the landscape sensitivity of the two sites has been underrated, with the review commissioned by the TVDCG stating that THR1 should have a ‘high’ classification and THR4 a ‘moderate-high’ classification. Many objectors have highlighted the visibility of the sites and views that can be gained across them and have raised fears about a housing estate at an important ‘gateway’ being the first impression of visitors to the area; • the landscape sensitivity of the adjoining site – THR5 – is also deemed to have underrated, with the review commissioned by the TVDCG stating that it should have a ‘moderate-high’ classification, which would prevent any access to THR1 or THR4 off Station Road. • the lack of capacity for further vehicular use of Wharfeside Avenue, given pressures already experienced in relation to school, rugby club and residents’ use; • the lack of potential to widen or otherwise mitigate impacts of additional vehicle movements along Wharfeside Avenue, given that trees lining the avenue are protected and only part of the road forms part of the adopted highway; • issues gaining access from Station Road given volumes of traffic, nearby junctions and a lack of visibility;

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the costs and viability concerns raised by undergrounding the overhead lines across the sites;• the landowner's preference for developing THR1 (including a potential extension to this site) over THR4 is seen as effectively meaning that THR4 cannot be considered to be available for development, with a further round of consultation being called for as and when there is a firm proposal as to which site (if any) is to be taken forward;• a range of constraints to development and infrastructure improvements required to support a large housing scheme, the mitigation of which may act to undermine development viability and reduce affordable housing provision;• doubts over whether affordable housing will be genuinely affordable given prevailing house prices and difficulties accessing mortgages;• impact on wildlife (including barn owls and bats), dark skies, protected trees and the general character amenity/recreational value of Wharfeside Avenue, especially those who use it as an accessible route to enjoy the countryside around the village;• impact on archaeological remains identified nearby in recent years (prehistoric henge features);• impact on the environs of Wharfedale RUFC, the surrounds of which are seen as vital to the Club's appeal and heritage;• impact on verges along Station Road (should access be gained from here), which many objectors have requested be protected as important open space;• loss of good quality productive farmland;• impact on residential amenity and property values, together with impact on school students;• a general lack of infrastructure within the area to cope with additional development, including roads, public transport, shops, medical services and sewage treatment, with particular concerns raised over existing sewage discharges into the River Wharfe;• a lack of local employment meaning that attempts to attract working-age people will be undermined, with many houses being lost to the retirement market;• a fear that development of either site would, in time, lead to development of remaining areas not taken forward in this Local Plan; |
|--|--|

- the scale of development not being appropriate to the size, character or function of Threshfield and tantamount to building a new village;
- development of this scale having no place in a National Park, being contrary to National Park purposes and making a mockery of past planning refusals for minor developments;
- the geographical imbalance in sites shortlisted, resulting in an excessive focus on development in Threshfield, in contrast to other service centres (notably Sedbergh), with Threshfield already having experienced significant growth since the 1960s, and not being deemed by some as suitable for classification as a 'service centre';
- a focus on development on the Craven District is seen as failing to address population decline, age imbalances and community sustainability issues in the parts of the National Park where these issues are most keenly felt (notably Richmondshire), with a perception that the Threshfield area is in fact thriving with a more balanced demographic;
- a concern that developing a large number of affordable houses in a compressed timeframe, which could lead to issues finding sufficient qualifying occupants, leading in turn to eligibility criteria being relaxed to allow households from elsewhere to occupy the housing provided;

Threshfield Parish Council has said it is 'not collectively opposed' to THR1, subject to access restrictions being resolved. The Parish Council 'cannot collectively agree' on an enlarged THR1 site while THR4 'is not collectively supported'. Linton Parish Council does not support THR4.

The landowner has written in support of both sites, but with support for THR4 contingent on having first assessed the feasibility of developing an extended THR1 site. This reflects the position explained in the HLAA document that accompanied the consultation.

Supporters of the sites have cited the benefits of development including providing affordable housing so that younger people have an opportunity to remain in the community and ensure the community remains balanced and supports a range of local businesses and services. Supporters have, in some cases, qualified their support by expressing a preference for THR1 over THR4, or a preference for a reduced scale of development, together with suitable infrastructure improvements. Mention is also made of the potential to consider a broader range

of uses on the sites, including assisted living/extra care facilities, a new medical centre or improved school facilities.

Many objectors to THR1 and THR4 have emphasised their acceptance of some additional housing development in Threshfield, but have asked that this be directed to smaller, more suitable sites. As set out in the summary of responses to Q2, the most common suggestions of alternatives are Threshfield Quarry, Threshfield Highways Depot and Linton Camp, together with sites THR7 and THR8. The Threshfield Quarry Development Trust, which currently leases the Quarry from Tarmac, has stated that this area could be used 'as housing land for live/work' units to incentivize redevelopment of the lower quarry.

Natural England has commented the sites are in proximity to a Special Area of Conservation and two Sites of Special Scientific Interest. This will mean that impacts will need to be considered through the Habitats Regulations Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal in relation to air quality and recreational pressure.

Historic England comment that the impact on the setting of a nearby listed building – St Margaret Clitherow Roman Catholic Church - needs to be taken account of.

Appendix 3 - Requests to exclude sites with development potential from development boundary

The three sites most commonly objected to in relation to proposed development boundaries are as follows:

Site	Issues raised
CRA3 (CRA.g) Land between Fell Lane and Back Lane, Cracoe	This site was submitted during the call for sites and, although the HLAA identified some development potential for this site, in view of a number of constraints that were felt to limit capacity, it was decided to include it within the draft development boundary, rather than as a potential site allocation. Twelve residents, together with the Parish Meeting, have objected to its inclusion within the development boundary, noting: • inappropriate approach to assessing visual impacts of development, which is seen as being too focused on views from the main thoroughfare through the village, and gateway views at entrances to the village, rather than views at the heart of the village enjoyed by its residents; • impact on settlement character from developing one of the last remaining undeveloped crofts, seen as tantamount to a village green for Cracoe that should be protected as important open space; • historical significance of the croft, believed to have been used for grazing by pilgrims with associated ‘beggars’ windows’ in properties adjacent to the site, together with the former Wesleyan Chapel (now converted residential use), which the croft formerly belonged to; • impact on the recreational experience for walkers using surrounding lanes to access rights of way leading to Cracoe Monument and Rylstone Cross; • impact on the residential amenity of surrounding properties; • narrow lanes surrounding the site making access difficult for residents and bin collections/oil tankers etc., together with poor access onto the B6265; • flooding experienced along the lanes surrounding the site; • existing issues with sewerage infrastructure being made worse; • impact on wildlife; • a restrictive covenant that precludes “<i>any noisy noxious or offensive trade or business of any kind</i>”

	The landowner has written in support of the site's inclusion within the development boundary and furthermore has requested that it be specifically allocated for development, deeming it to have capacity for 6 dwellings.
Former school field, Langthwaite	This site was not submitted through the call for sites, but has been the subject of two recent planning applications for the creation of staff accommodation, one of which remains under consideration (R/01/31R). The land is currently designated as important open space owing to its former use as a school playing field, but owing to the closure of the school, the recent consultation proposed removing this designation and extending the development boundary to include it. Six objections have been submitted by local residents and Arkengarthdale Parish Council has also objected to the inclusion of this plot of land within the development boundary. Objections are based on: • loss of one of the most 'iconic' views in Arkengarthdale which warrants continued important open space protection; • impact on the newly establishing business 'The Retreat' opposite, where outlook and setting are seen as key to the business' appeal; • impact on the Swaledale & Arkengarthdale Barns and Walls Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings; • the strength of feeling expressed during recent planning applications; • a lack of facilities to support development and the remoteness of the settlement.
HOR5 (HOR.e) Land east of Chapel Lane and south of B6479, Horton-in-Ribblesdale	This land is already within the development boundary for Horton in Ribblesdale, as set out in the 2015 Local Plan. The recent consultation simply proposed retaining it as such, having rejected the possibility of allocating the site given that it had not been suggested for development by the landowner and had a number of constraints that might limit its capacity to deliver enough houses to warrant allocation. Three members of the public have objected to its inclusion within the development boundary, based largely on concerns about the impact of development on the sitting of the Grade I listed St Oswald

	Church opposite. Wider concerns about the lack of facilities to support development in the village are also referenced (as they have been in relation to the two possible site allocations in the village – see Appendix 2).
--	--