

ROECLIFFE AND WESTWICK NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN: PRE SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) FEEDBACK ASSESSMENT

STAKEHOLDERS RESPONSES

| Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed Modification to Plan |
|---|--|--|
| Harrogate Borough Council | | |
| 1. Make plan more succinct by moving some text on consultation to Consultation Statement for Submission version. | Agreed | Move identified text to Consultation Statement. |
| 2. Significant weight should now be given to the draft Harrogate District Local Plan (2014-2035). Revise to reflect this. | Agreed | Modify references and review against current draft Local Plan. |
| 3. NPPF revised in February 2019 – Plan should reflect this latest iteration. | Agreed | Modify references and review against NPPF 2019. |
| 4. Foreward – avoid confusion with Vision Statement | Agreed | Consultant to review both and ensure consistency. |
| 5. Chapters 2-7: could be edited to make more succinct for Submission version. | Agreed where text can be removed to the Consultation Statement. | Edit text with guidance from consultant |
| 6. Policy A1 Design and development | Noted and agreed. | Modify policy to allow for a degree of flexibility in relation to contemporary design and regarding development outside the Conservation Area. |
| 7. Policy A2 Design of extensions | Noted. | Clarify policy to enable flexibility. |
| 8. Policy A3 Community involvement | Noted and agree modification. | Re-word existing policy as proposed and extend to all developments including industrial. |
| 9. Policy B1 Small scale housing developments | Agree to make amendment as per policy GS3 | Consultant to modify policy as proposed. |
| 10. Policy C1 Maintaining village facilities and services | Agreed to reference LP policy HP8 | Modify text |
| 11. Policy C2 Non designated heritage assets | Proposed modifications noted and agreed. List of assets has been thoroughly researched | Modifications as agreed to be made by consultant. |

| Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed Modification to Plan |
|---|--|---|
| | and we do not wish to add now. | |
| 12. Policy E1 Local Green Spaces | Noted and agreed | Consultant to modify wording in line with latest best practice. |
| 13. Policy E2 Green infrastructure | Noted and agreed | Consultant to modify Plan as proposed. |
| North Yorkshire County Council | | |
| <p>NYCC Plan sets out ambitions for the county upto 2023. Economic growth plans including aims to achieve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A larger business base and increased jobs; - Equal access to economic opportunity. - Increase the median wage. <p>Key enablers for this include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Creating high quality places, increased housing provision and green infrastructure. - Delivering a modern integrated transport network. - Enhancing the environment and development tourism and the green economy. - Delivering a modern communications network. | Noted. NDP is in tune with the aims and objectives set out here. | No change. |
| Archaeology – recommends changing Policy A to “Preservation and Enhancement of the Historic Environment” and add references to archaeological sites to the objectives and policy wording. | Useful comments and worth altering policy section A and policy A1 accordingly. | Consultant to provide modifications. |
| <p>Ecology – useful if more clarity is provided on nature conservation designations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Claypit Ponds are referred to on p43 as SSSI but this is not so. b. Bishop Monkton SSSI lies partly in the parish. c. SINCs noted in the parish are Roecliffe Pond; Roecliffe Meadows; Cherry Island Wood; Riverside fields ant Brickyard Farm. d. | Noted amendments | Amend text to ensure accuracy. |
| Highways -p35 needs re-phrasing. | Noted | “The main locations that those responding to the surveys expressed concern were...” |
| Highways – p38 needs re-writing. | Noted | Modify as suggested for accuracy. |
| Environment Agency | | |
| No comments received. | - | - |

| Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed Modification to Plan |
|--|--|---|
| Historic England | | |
| No specific comments but note the parish has one Grade II* and three Grade II listed buildings; part of the Newby Grade II* Registered Garden and a Scheduled Monument – the Roman Fort and Settlement 400m north of Brickyard Farm (currently being re-evaluated). | Noted | No change. |
| Natural England | | |
| No comments made | - | - |
| The Coal Authority | | |
| No comments made. | - | - |
| Gladman Developments Limited | | |
| Policy A1: Design and development - Should note be a one size fits all policy or overly prescriptive. Design should be considered on a site by site basis. Suggest more flexibility in the policy to ensure high quality and inclusive design is not compromised by aesthetic requirements alone as this could impact on viability. | Reflects community comments about enabling some degree of innovation and best practice in design and standards. | Consultant to advise on modifications. |
| Policy A4: Key views - New developments can be located in areas without eroding key view and can be sensitively designed to provide new views and vistas. In addition, a view should have some form of physical attribute. No evidence to justify these. | Needs justification of individual views. | Steering Group to provide an assessment of each view as an additional evidence paper. |
| Policy B1: small scale housing developments – Gladman do not consider the use of development limits to be an effective response to future development proposals. Gladman also consider it necessary that within the Plan period, it may be necessary for greenfield development to come forward to assist with meeting local housing need. Recommend modification to allow for a degree of flexibility in presumption of sustainable development. | Disagree. Development limits enable SD so that new homes are accessible to village services. Disagree. No housing planned by HBC for the village so any growth should be small scale and within the village envelope. | Policy to be amended in light of HBC comments earlier -consultant. |
| Policy C2: non designated local heritage assets – concern that policy elevates their significance. Suggest that wording is redrafted to the effect of an application on the significance of the asset and a balanced judgement is taken regarding scale of harm or loss and the significance of the asset. | Noted. This is sensible guidance and policy should be reworded in line with latest practice. | Consultant to advise on modification to wording. |
| Savills (on behalf of Rocliffe Estate) | | |
| P33 – misleading statement. | Noted | Correction to be made |

| Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed Modification to Plan |
|---|---|--|
| Green Corridors – some areas are used for access by farm equipment so important that the continuation of estate activity in these areas is not precluded. | Noted | Clarify in policy |
| P48 – Thorns Lane is not a bridleway and only a PRoW for a short section (footpath) | Noted | Correction to be made |
| P50 – Policy D1 – new planting would need state consent. Creation of circular walks could promote anti social behaviour and crime. Any changes would need careful thought and consultation. | Noted | Modify policy to reflect concerns. |
| P59 – section 9.12 – insufficient engagement with local farms. | R14 consultation widely publicised. We do not think that anyone has been denied opportunity for engagement. | No change |
| P67 – section 10.2 - Improving Thorns Lane is noted as a project. This needs consultation with the estate. | Noted | Amend text to reflect. |
| P67, point 14 – any changes to designations on farmed land would need consultation with the estate. | Noted | Modify text to clarify intentions NOT to designate further Green Belt. |

Stakeholders