

ASPECT OF NP COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
Vision	<p>I like the identification of issues which are outside the Parish Council's remit but where lobbying is appropriate</p> <p>it is very comprehensive.</p> <p>In line with expectations</p> <p>1) Whilst agreeing with much of the draft plan, I do not agree that more car parking is required that will simply attract more traffic. 2) In addition, I would criticise the draft plan for the lack of reference to the danger to walkers posed by the narrow footpath on Yew Tree Lane, 3) and for the complete failure to identify the benefits of a regular bus service.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED – the only additional car parking proposed in the NP is in Policy TTT3 (off-road parking in excess of adopted standards for new developments in areas with existing on-street parking problems, i.e. to alleviate a village problem) and in Policy TTT4 (weekend/evening use of Park and Stride facility by Pannal Community Park visitors).</p> <p>2) NOTED – the issue is one of cutting back the vegetation. The PC identify hedges etc for cut back on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>3) NOTED – this was raised and discussed at the previous NP consultation. The village bus service was withdrawn due to lack of use. The 36 is easily accessible to most. That said, it is considered worth investigating the potential of a 'demand responsive transport' approach to village needs with a view to inclusion of suitable initiatives within the final NP.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) ACTION – consider potential of 'Demand Responsive Transport' initiatives to address local public transport needs.</p>

	<p>Given the housing crisis nationally, I cannot support the level of control of both large and small scale housing which the vision aims for</p> <p>1) I do not agree with any further building here and am very upset about any building on Greenfield sites. 2) I wish to see the rat run traffic removed from spring lane and burn bridge road not the roads further widened to allow for more speeding traffic as has happened when spring lane was widened when it was resurfaced . 3) The village is far too big after new development I only support new building on brownfield sites for first time buyers retirement homes or rental homes 4) I do not want to see any highway improvement schemes in Spring Lane which will ensure traffic travels faster and ruins the rural feel of my road.</p> <p>I agree and support the vision and aims. I hope that this is able to be achieved.</p> <p>Agree with part but not all.</p> <p>HBC - Dunlopillo supposed to include car parking spaces to encourage park and ride. NYCC looking at Park and Ride</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP’s approach is in conformity with the HBC Local Plan for Pannal and its position in the settlement hierarchy. It also reflects the community view.</p> <p>1) NOTED – it is not clear which ‘further building’ or ‘building on greenfield sites’ is being referred to here – the NP proposes no new building anywhere in the parish, only a Park and Stride facility to alleviate a longstanding, serious village parking problem – a policy very well supported by the community. 2) NOTED – much consideration has been given to these issues in drawing up the NP and the plan already does as much as it possibly can in this regard. 3) NOTED – the NP policy approach to new housing development is in conformity with adopted Local Plan policy as it must be and cannot be any more restrictive than it is. 4) NOTED – the NP includes no such scheme.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – without knowing which part(s) not agreed with, not possible to consider any amendment.</p> <p>NOTED – unclear if/how HBC would like to see the vision amended in response.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) NO ACTION 4) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	south of Pannal as part of HTIP Project. Potential Changes to junctions and roads also part of mitigation measures for West Harrogate developments.		
Aim 7	HBC - Not support further large scale house-building... - this is very negative and neighbourhood plans should not be about preventing development but about managing development accordingly. Suggest that this aim is removed or reworded.	DISAGREE – opposition to large scale house-building is in general conformity with the adopted Local Plan policy approach to Pannal, i.e. Local Plan policy does not support it. The PC would also point out that this is an aim and not a policy. The NP’s policies – notably H1 and H2 – are about managing development in line with the aim.	NO ACTION
Policy GNE1: Green & Blue Infrastructure	<p>1) Over development of housing is definitely our biggest threat and I am doubtful about the amount of power we have in relation to planning committee decisions, especially when that is moving further away to North Yorkshire. 2) I do think that mention needs to be made of protecting the conservation area along the path next to the Crimple between Pannal and Burn Bridge. The footpath is an important access route and does get very muddy in winter so would benefit with some better surface to make it more accessible.</p> <p>we really want to protect what we've got here in Pannal & Burn Bridge.</p> <p>No development to be permitted in crimple valley special landscape area please.</p> <p>HBC – 1) The areas identified need a specific reference and whilst reference is made to them being on the Policies Map, it is really unclear where any of these areas are and</p>	<p>1) NOTED – the NP’s policies do as much as they possibly can in this regard.</p> <p>2) NOTED – this is an ongoing saga which the PC has in hand.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP aims to do just that.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP does as much as it possibly can in this regard within the context of adopted Local Plan policy.</p> <p>1) NOTED – as there is no difference re how the policy will be applied in the 3 named areas, there is no perceived</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) ACTION – show different GBI areas on Policies Map as requested.</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p>

	<p>specifically where the policy will apply. 2) Also there is no detail about how the policy will actually work and what criteria will be used to assess whether development will 'sever it or harm its operation.....'.</p> <p>HBC - The appendix has extracts (corridor descriptions) from some work undertaken by Natural England in 2010 but which hasn't really been progressed since then. The boundaries were drawn around a table from a workshop of interested parties working at a regional scale. This is partially recognised on p.12 and therefore the neighbourhood plan should not give the detail of the boundaries too much weight, and it may be better to draw own boundaries within the context of the regionally important corridors, based on detailed local knowledge and aspirations, as have been done with 'the Walton Fringe'.</p>	<p>need to differentiate between them on the Policies Map. The extent/ boundaries of Green and Blue Infrastructure areas are shown perfectly clearly on the Policies Map. This self-same approach has already been viewed favourably by various examiners of other NPs in Yorkshire without any comment, e.g. Haworth, Otley – ditto by the LPAs concerned. That said, it would be possible to differentiate between the 3 areas on the Policies Map.</p> <p>2) NOTED – further detail/criteria not considered necessary. This self-same policy approach has already been viewed favourably by various examiners of other NPs in Yorkshire without any comment, e.g. Otley, Haworth – ditto by the LPAs concerned.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP uses the 2010 work boundaries as a necessarily broad starting point and interprets them at a local level relative to local geography – in effect drawing own boundaries as suggested. Experience from other NPs indicates that this approach, based on the 2010 work, has found favour with examiners/other LPAs alike, with the resultant areas/boundaries approved in made NPs, e.g. Haworth.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	------------------

<p>Policy GNE2: Crimple Valley Special Landscape Area</p>	<p>Providing we can have some influence here</p> <p>Critical to separate the villages from Harrogate town</p> <p>WE need to ensure that the replacement for the dunopillow building is the least obtrusive possible and that no further monstrosities are allowed.</p> <p>The policies together appear to have the intent of restricting building of any further housing at all within the area. Whilst a lovely idea, this is not realistic when set against the national need for housing.</p> <p>HBC – 1) The policy does not recognise HDLP allocation PN18 employment site and is too restrictive and could stifle important employment development. 2) The word ‘seriously’ should be removed from the first sentence as this is not in conformity with Local Plan Policy NE4 which states ‘would harm or be detrimental to’ Question the need for this policy as the SLA is covered by Policy Local Plan Policy NE4?</p>	<p>NOTED – the policy once adopted will have to be applied alongside adopted Local Plan policies by HBC/it’s successor authority.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – as the application for this is already in the planning system, it is not a NP matter. The PC has however been heavily involved in it.</p> <p>NOTED – this is not the case – see Housing policies H1 and H2. The overall policy approach to housing is in conformity with adopted Local Plan policy as it must be.</p> <p>1) DISAGREE – PN18 is specifically addressed in NP Policy ED2. The PC would argue that GNE2 recognises PN18 to the same extent as Local Plan Policy NE4 does (NE4 does not appear to specifically recognise PN18 either) – it is the Local Plan which allocates an employment site within an SLA. As the majority of the policy’s bullet points are not relevant to the PN18 site, it is unclear how exactly the policy will restrict or stifle development – some specifics would have been helpful here. 2) NOTED – the policy adds local detail to the more generic NE4. It is not a duplication. This self-same policy approach has already been viewed</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – delete ‘seriously’ from line 2 of the policy.</p>
---	---	--	---

		<p>favourably by various examiners of other NPs in Yorkshire without any comment, e.g. Otley, Aberford, Horsforth – ditto by the LPA concerned. It is acknowledged that the use of ‘seriously’ is not in line with NE4.</p>	
<p>Policy GNE3 & GNE4 - Supporting Text</p>	<p>HBC - SINC – Spacey Houses Whin potential SINC is shown as SINC (3) on the Policy Map. It has been assessed as qualifying by the North Yorks SINC Panel but has not yet been designated in the Local Plan (hopefully to be put forward in the Local Plan Review).</p>	<p>NOTED – the status of the Spacey Houses Whin SINC should be acknowledged in the NP text (P15, para 4) and on the Policies Map.</p>	<p>ACTION – amend text and Policies Map as indicated.</p>
<p>Policy GNE3: Local Green Space Protection</p>	<p>Include green space protection for the area around the Ringway Pannal - Burn Bridge and beyond. Protection of the area around the fields behind the church (is this included in protecting Crimple valley?)</p> <p>It omits the open green space associated with the development of the Dunlopillo site</p> <p>Why 10? Surely there could be more or fewer depending upon criteria for inclusion</p>	<p>NOTED – the areas highlighted in the comment are too large/extensive to be eligible for Local Green Space designation, which is subject to very specific qualifying criteria as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>NOTED – this green space is not yet in use. As such, it does not meet the Local Green Space criteria of being demonstrably special to/of value to the local community.</p> <p>NOTED – 10 just happens to be the number of sites which were assessed which met the eligibility criteria. All candidate sites put forward by the steering group and by the community via the previous round of consultation were assessed. Assessments of ineligible sites are to be found on the NP pages of the PC website.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>The policies together appear to have the intent of restricting building of any further housing at all within the area. Whilst a lovely idea, this is not realistic when set against the national need for housing.</p> <p>This is really important.</p> <p>There are potential Open Space areas associated with the old Dunlopillo site - the proposed soccer ground and the land at top of Thirkell drive on both sides.</p> <p>HBC – 1) Not every LGS has to qualify on every potential criterion. There is no need to make the case as to why, for example, Pannal Cricket Club Ground should qualify on the basis of wildlife richness. It would be better to simply argue the case on those other grounds which really justify it, rather than trying to include that particular justification for some of the proposed LGS where it is not really relevant. 2) The sites need numbering in the policy to reflect the number on the Policies Map.</p>	<p>NOTED – this is not the case – see Housing policies H1 and H2. The overall policy approach to housing is in conformity with adopted Local Plan policy as it must be.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – these green spaces are not yet in use/existence. As such, they do not meet the Local Green Space criteria of being demonstrably special to/of value to the local community.</p> <p>1) NOTED – the PC is well aware of the qualifying criteria. The assessments are considered to be fair and balanced with no irrelevant/spurious justifications. The approach draws on experience from several other NP LGS assessments based on which sites have been successfully designated within ‘made’ NPs. There is no reason put forward relative to basic conditions as to why any assessments should be amended or sites not designated. 2) AGREE – policy list would benefit from site numbering in line with Policies Map.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – number sites in policy list in line with Policies Map.</p>
Policy GNE4: Green Space Enhancement	<p>As per previous comments</p> <p>The policies together appear to have the intent of restricting building of any further housing at all within the</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – this is not the case – see Housing policies H1 and H2. The overall policy approach to housing is in</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>area. Whilst a lovely idea, this is not realistic when set against the national need for housing.</p> <p>HBC - Does this need to be a separate policy, could it not form part of Policy GNE3?</p>	<p>conformity with adopted Local Plan policy as it must be.</p> <p>NOTED – experience indicates that either combined (e.g. Haworth NP) or separate (e.g. Otley, Aberford NPs) policies are equally acceptable to examiners. As LGS NPPF provision and guidance focus on designation/ protection and do not reference enhancement, the inclination on balance is for separate policies.</p>	NO ACTION
Policy GNE5: Provision of New Open Space	<p>I would suggest Padel tennis courts rather than the traditional tennis courts. Padel tennis is a popular and fast growing sport nationally because it is easier to play.</p> <p>Padel tennis courts instead of traditional tennis courts.</p> <p>However don't we now have a small children's play area and equipment on the village Sports field?</p> <p>Bowling Green for only a few people?</p> <p>Don't think a bowling green would be practical or even used</p> <p>Particular need for allotments and play areas for small children</p> <p>I think allotments would be the greatest priority.</p>	<p>NOTED – this is very much a minority view and may well be more expensive to install due to need for enclosed courts, although dual tennis/padel tennis courts are a feasible option.</p> <p>DISAGREE – No, this is not the case. There is a NP community action re installing one at Crimple Meadows.</p> <p>NOTED – taken together, the categories of new open space that the policy would support cater for all age groups and a range of interests/active recreation.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – policy is reactive to whatever opportunities present themselves on an equal basis. This may well be</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	HBC - Does this policy need expanding to make reference to the type of issues which would need to be considered when dealing with a proposal for new open space, or reference back to the local plan and other policies in the neighbourhood plan?	determined by the nature of individual proposed developments/sites. NOTED – a simple aspirational policy is preferred. Such a policy approach has already been viewed favourably by various examiners of other NPs in Yorkshire without any comment, e.g. Otley, Haworth – ditto by the LPAs concerned. It is taken as read that all relevant policies will be applied’ in the round’ without the need for cross-referencing.	NO ACTION
Policy GNE6: Land at Almsford Bridge – Supporting Text	HBC – (Re para 2 P16) 1) ‘the newly allocated South of Almsford Bridge employment site (Local Plan PN18)’ – remove the word ‘newly’ as not necessary and doesn’t make any difference to its allocation status. 2) ‘This policy builds on discussions at the District Local Plan Inquiry in which the potential for rewilding and biodiversity measures immediately north of PN18 were considered’ – this is not appropriate to add here and should be deleted as there is no evidence of the discussion and there is no recommendation from the Inspector about the use of this land.	1) AGREE – word ‘newly’ is not necessary. 2) AGREE – accepted that unevidenced wording is not appropriate.	1) ACTION – delete ‘newly’ as indicated. 2) ACTION – delete wording as indicated.
Policy GNE6: Land at Almsford Bridge	Definitely - protection needed for this area against housing development But it should be included in GNE5 Anything to stop development here	NOTED DISAGREE – as a specific named site it is distinct from the generic nature of GNE5. NOTED	NO ACTION NO ACTION NO ACTION

	<p>An excellent opportunity to improve the environment and open up more rights of way and hence access to open space from the parish. Potential to link cycling to off road routes.</p> <p>HBC – 1) This policy is confusing as it does not actually allocate the land for the purpose of open space. The policy states that it ‘presents an opportunity’ so uncertainty about what weight could actually be attached to the policy. As the policy does not actually allocate the site, it is not appropriate to list criteria that need to be taken into account. Uncertainty about delivery as it is HBC owned land.</p> <p>2) The land to the north of PN18 could be developed for biodiversity, landscape and sensitively designed public access – and there may be an opportunity to achieve this in association with the need to mitigate for the employment site, including ‘no net loss of biodiversity’ (or +10% after Nov. 2023). However, this is HBC owned land and there has been no discussion between Pannal PC and the estates team yet.</p> <p>3) Bullet 1 – the cost of the underpass is surely probative to this proposal. 4) There is the opportunity to improve pedestrian and cycle links across the A61 through the PN18 development.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED – experience indicates that this self-same policy approach has been found to be acceptable by examiners in other ‘made’ NPs, e.g. Haworth Policy GE4. This includes the listing of criteria. Will HBC still own the land post March 2023?</p> <p>2) NOTED - Will HBC still own the land post March 2023? As HBC has been consulted on the Pre-Submission NP, there was an opportunity for internal consultation with Estates. The PC would be happy to discuss further.</p> <p>3) NOTED – the underpass references in policy and preamble relate to an existing underpass, which on re-consideration is unlikely to present a feasible usable option.</p> <p>4) NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – discuss with HBC Estates. 3) ACTION – delete underpass references in policy and preamble. 4) NO ACTION</p>
<p>Policy GNE7: Development & Trees – Supporting Text</p>	<p>HBC – (re Para 1 P17) ‘to address any perceived gaps in adopted HBC Local Plan policies’ should be removed as there is no evidence for this.</p> <p>HBC – (re Para 2 P17) ‘the encouragement of new tree planting is lacking and that replacement/compensatory planting in the event of tree loss to development could be more specifically addressed’ – this is incorrect as Policy</p>	<p>DISAGREE – this is simply a statement of consultation fact, i.e. that the community supported a policy to address any perceived gaps – it does not state that there are any gaps.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the wording states that encouragement of new planting is ‘lacking’ not entirely absent, i.e. that</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – clarify wording re encouragement of tree planting in Local Plan policy NE7.</p>

	Local Plan Policy NE7 does encourage additional tree planting.	more could be said on the subject. This could perhaps be made clearer.	
Policy GNE7: Development & Trees	<p>1) Yes but how do we ensure this is enforced. 2) I complained bitterly when the trees on the edge of the Dunlopillo site were chopped down (they were a haven for wildlife) and I was assured that Bellways had an agreement for planting on the site - I am still waiting to see this happen. Can anyone reassure me?</p> <p>Tree planting should be more widely encouraged rather than linked with new developments.</p> <p>Definitely need more greening to counter the the recent development that has taken place and to keep pressure on developers to plant & replace trees.</p> <p>HBC - How would the financial contributions be collected and replacement tree planting managed?</p>	<p>1) NOTED – the implementation of the policy, once ‘adopted’ will be the responsibility of HBC/it’s successor authority as the local planning authorities (LPA), as with any other planning policies. The PC has a role in consistently reminding the LPA that NP policies need to be applied.</p> <p>2) NOTED – it is understood that the planting will take place on completion of the development.</p> <p>NOTED – planning policies can only encourage tree planting related to new development. Tree planting is specifically encouraged in various of the NP’s ‘Non-Planning Community Actions’.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – that is for the LPA to decide. How does HBC collect other financial contributions made in lieu of actual provision and provide for the management of other open space/landscaping provided as part of development? Experience indicates that this self-same policy approach has been found to be acceptable by examiners in other ‘made’ NPs, e.g. Otley Policy GE8.</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

		This policy is in turn based on adopted Leeds City Council Natural Resources and Waste Local Plan Policy LAND2.	
Green & Natural Environment – Non-Planning Community Actions	<p>Support Country Park status for SLA north east of St Robert's church.</p> <p>P48 prohibit mountain biking in Allen Wood or Sandy Bank wood.</p> <p>HBC - Local Geological Site – There is an aspiration to make the rock exposure at Sandy Bank Quarry into a LGS (p.48 – <i>NB Project Delivery Plan</i>). This could be done through the Local Plan Review – I believe that the North Yorks. Geological Partnership has documented and set out the case for about half a dozen proposed RIGs in Harrogate District, including Sandy Bank Quarry.</p> <p>HBC - Local Nature Reserves – Sandy Bank Wood & Allen Wood (POS?) – these are declared by the lead local authority, usually on land over which they have control or via agreement with the Parish Council if they control it. Natural England must approve a management plan for them. In practice these would be managed by HBC Parks, so it may be worth seeking their views on this aspiration.</p> <p>HBC - ‘Country Park’ status - SLA NE of parish church (p.49) – this is not a designation, but Natural England say “Country parks are areas for people to visit and enjoy recreation in a countryside environment”. NE produce guidance for what they call accredited county parks, with a minimum size (10ha) public access with a minimum level of facilities. Not sure this is appropriate in this instance. HBC Parks have a couple of site which they call ‘country</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – HBC have been made aware of this issue. That said, the use is not considered to be excessive/noticeably harmful to the woods.</p> <p>NOTED – this information can be usefully incorporated into the text supporting this aspiration (P18).</p> <p>NOTED – the PC is aware of the declaration process, a fact reflected in the identification of potential lead/partner organisations in the Project Delivery Plan (P48). The PC would be happy to discuss with HBC Parks.</p> <p>NOTED – country park status is not included in NP planning policy. No justification is provided for why such status is not appropriate in this case – people visit, enjoy, there is good public access and it is over 10ha.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add text to NP as indicated.</p> <p>ACTION – discuss aspiration with HBC Parks.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	parks', but these are not accredited by NE the label has no particular status in planning.		
Policy BE1: Pannal Conservation Area – Development & Design	<p>I am not sure that this adds ro what is already included in the definition of the Conservation Area</p> <p>In principle yes. In reality, again suspect this is stated as a vision in order to control any development at all.</p>	DISAGREE – what the policy adds/does is to give statutory teeth to design principles enshrined in the non-statutory conservation area character appraisal, i.e. it gives them more teeth.	NO ACTION
Policy BE2: Local Heritage Areas	<p>Some of the proposed areas seem very small</p> <p>Pannal Methodist Church - local heritage???</p> <p>Not sure I quite understand the reasons for each of the proposed areas</p> <p>Malthouse Lane area identified has many architectural and historic features and should be protected - would also benefit form signposting and historical interpretation information linked to Ringway path.</p> <p>Too restrictive - if all these aims are put into policy, no householders will be able to undertake any improvement unless the Parish Council decide to approve.</p>	<p>NOTED – size is irrelevant. The definition of these areas is based on guidance/criteria used by Historic England for the designation of conservation areas (for which there is no minimum size requirement). If an area is deemed to meet the relevant criteria then no reason why it cannot be identified no matter how big/small.</p> <p>NOTED – yes – see assessment Appendix 4 of NP.</p> <p>NOTED - see assessments in Appendix 4 of NP.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP has put in place a Local Heritage Area policy to give the area some protection and a community action to lobby for conservation area status. Agree that signposting/ interpretation would be beneficial.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the policies (BE2 and BE3) are couched in terms of 'encouragement' and 'should do', not 'will do' or 'must do'. It is considered</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action re signposting/interpretation in Malthouse Lane area.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>HBC – 1) The Local Heritage Areas need numbering as per the policies map. 2) Could a better phrase be used instead of ‘better reveal’ 3) Not sure that Local Heritage Areas is the right terminology.</p>	<p>important to conserve the area’s heritage – once it’s gone, it’s gone. The PC does not approve or refuse proposals for development – that power rests with HBC/its successor local planning authority which will implement the NP’s policies once made, i.e. ‘adopted’, not the PC.</p> <p>1) AGREE – policy list would benefit from site numbering in line with Policies Map. 2) NOTED – alternative wording can be considered. 3) DISAGREE – Local Heritage Area is widely accepted terminology in NPs.</p>	<p>1) ACTION – number areas in policy list in line with Policies Map. 2) ACTION – consider alternative wording as suggested. 3) NO ACTION</p>
<p>Policy BE3: Local Heritage Areas – Development & Design</p>	<p>I disagree with the proposal that any new highways should not have pavements. On the contrary the plan should encourage the provision of pavements on roads where they are missing</p> <p>See above</p> <p>Hill Top/Foot Lane need pavements for the safety of pedestrians.</p> <p>HBC:- 1. Not sure this needs to be a separate policy, could it not form part of Policy BE2.</p>	<p>NOTED – the policy makes it clear that this applies only in the Hill Foot/Hill Top Lane LHA where pavements would be contrary to the country lane/rural character of the area, i.e. where pavements not currently a feature.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – this would be contrary to the country lane/rural character of the area, i.e. where pavements not currently a feature. Level of development does not warrant it.</p> <p>1) NOTED - experience indicates that this self-same 2 policy approach has been found to be acceptable by</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) NO ACTION</p>

	<p>2.Pannal PC should be congratulated on the amount of work put into the assessments for these areas however this policy is quite confusing with the general requirements and then the specific requirements for each area. 3) Also think it will be very difficult and restrictive to expect development in all the areas to have to comply with all the general requirements when the areas are different with their own characters. Will also be very difficult for development Management officers to interpret as part of planning application consideration. There are also a number of the requirements that are ambiguous and not specific enough such as 'Retain surviving historic buildings'. These would need identifying individually as the statement is open to lots of different interpretation.</p> <p>4.Recommendation – delete the general requirements but create specific, individual requirements for each Heritage Area and list those features within each area that you want to protect and retail. These could then be added to the list of non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>5.Query area 4 – Pannal Methodist Church – area seems to overlap with a Village Character Area – how would the design requirements for the 2 areas be assessed at application stage.</p>	<p>examiners in other 'made' NPs, e.g. Otley, Haworth, Horsforth. The PC sees no reason to vary from this approach.</p> <p>2) NOTED - experience indicates that this self-same general/specific policy approach has been found to be acceptable by examiners in other 'made' NPs, e.g. Haworth, where the same requirements apply to a number of different LHAs. The PC sees no reason to vary from this approach.</p> <p>3) NOTED – as stated in 2) above, the general requirements apply across LHAs. As the policies are couched in terms of what development 'should' do, rather than 'will' or 'must' do, there is considered to be flexibility as to what is expected. Regarding management officer interpretation, including re 'surviving historic buildings', this wording has proved acceptable to examiners in other 'made' NPs, e.g. Haworth, Horsforth.</p> <p>4) DISAGREE – this would result in needless duplication within policies for each LHA. Also, it would run counter to the PC/NP's approach re NDHA in private ownership as set out on P25 para 3 and in Appendix 5.</p> <p>5) NOTED – area/policy overlap is not considered to be a problem. It is common in Local Plans and NPs for areas/sites to be covered by different policies and for management officers to have to apply those policies, e.g. various designations/policies overlaying</p>	<p>4) NO ACTION 5) NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--------------------------------------

		sites in Pannal in the Harrogate District Local Plan.	
Policy BE4: Protection & Enhancement of Non-Designated Heritage Assets	<p>The number of sites is too limited. For example It should include the Black Swan.</p> <p>HBC - Are there more non-designated heritage assets than set out here given you have identified 4 fairly extensive heritage areas. See point above in Policy BE3 about identifying individual features within each area.</p>	<p>NOTED – the small number of sites reflects both the PC/NP approach towards assets in private ownership (ref Appendix 5 for explanation) and the number of other individual assets encompassed within the NP’s LHA provisions, which are considered to be an equally effective means of protecting their importance. Additional assets, not listed here, have also been identified already by HBC (ref P25, para 3).</p>	NO ACTION
Policy BE5: Village Character Areas – Development & Design	<p>Too restrictive. This is just adding another layer of approval. There are already required approvals through normal planning procedures.</p> <p>HBC - The document refers to ‘Design Codes Annex’ to the plan, is this a separate document or is this as set out in Policy BE5 which sets out character areas.</p> <p>HBC – (ref Leeds Road Corridor) 1) 10m set back – not appropriate policy. Good quality design and landscaping scheme does not hide development. Such NP policy would stifle PN18 site development.</p>	<p>NOTED - As the policy is couched in terms of what development ‘should’ do, rather than ‘will’ or ‘must’ do, there is considered to be flexibility as to what is expected, so it is not too restrictive. The policy will not add another layer of approval – it will, once ‘adopted’ become part of the normal planning procedures.</p> <p>NOTED – this is a separate document.</p> <p>1) NOTED – as clearly stated, set back is to reduce noise not hide the development as commented. It is however accepted that such a set back could ‘stifle’ the development. As such,</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) ACTION – except PN18/NP ED2 site from 10m set back provision. 2) ACTION – delete 4th clause re material palette.</p>

	<p>2) Reflect local character – Leeds Road corridor has a varied material palette from existing Crimple Garden Centre, car showrooms and drive through. This wording is not appropriate for the Leeds Road corridor.</p> <p>3) Seek opportunities for tree planting – agree with seeking opportunities to plant more trees however this is not be to screen/hide development. Good quality landscaping schemes enhance the street scape whilst allowing views into the development sites. 4) Tree planting close to the railway line will need to be checked with Network Rail as it can cause safety and maintenance issues.</p>	<p>the site can be specifically excepted from this policy provision.</p> <p>2) AGREE – accepted that this is not appropriate relative to existing palette.</p> <p>3) NOTED – accepted that purpose of visual screening is not appropriate and that wording could better reflect ED2 wording re new planting.</p> <p>4) NOTED – Network Rail were consulted on the Pre-Submission NP and made no comment. The PC is happy to follow this up with a specific re-consultation on the matter raised.</p>	<p>3) ACTION – amend 5th bullet as indicated in order to provide consistency.</p> <p>4) ACTION – re-consult Network Rail as indicated.</p>
Built Environment – General	Historic England - We do not wish to comment in detail upon the Neighbourhood Plan, other than to welcome the comprehensive and well thought out -Heritage, Development and Design.	NOTED	NO ACTION
Policy TTT1: Improved Walking, Horse Riding & Cycling Provision	<p>Seems too limited in application</p> <p>Only 2 specified locations - where are they and why not more?</p>	<p>NOTED – as no information as provided as to how/in what way it is limited, it is not possible to respond or considering amending the NP in any meaningful way.</p> <p>NOTED – as stated their location is shown on the Policies Map, available on the PC website and at deposit locations in the area. There are 2 because only 2 have been put forward by the steering group/PC and the community during the previous consultation. It is noted that the comment itself suggests no other locations.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>1) The section of the Harrogate Ringway path east of St Robert's Church to Almsford Bank is only a permissive footpath and as such the landowner/tenant farmer could withdraw that permission and does not have a legal requirement to maintain it. By common usage the route of the permissive path is in question. This section is badly in need of signage and general maintenance and protection as an access route. Consideration should also be given to it being a designated bridle way. 2) There is poor safe access between Pannal and Burn Bridge for cyclists. 3) We want to encourage less use of cars for journeys to school, but our footpaths are too narrow, in places exacerbated by vegetation. 4) The proposed path connecting Westminster Crescent to Crimple Meadows across the recreation area should include access for bicycles but not horses. 5) The plan does not address safe access for cycling from the village (centre and neighbourhoods) to either the proposed Follifoot lace cycle route or to safe roads in southern Harrogate. 6) Neither does the plan provide for walking access over land behind ST.Roberts Church to the Pannal Community Park or retail developments on Leeds Road - leaving the only walking access to these facilities via the very busy Leeds Road. Both are missed opportunities and should be addressed.</p>	<p>1) AGREE – improved footpath/footpath laying along permissive route and signage could be added to TTT1 and community actions. Lobbying for definitive PROW status, including bridleway could also be added to community actions. Opportunity also for cycle way along same route instead of proposed A61 route linked to Bellway development.</p> <p>2) NOTED – no direct route along Crimple valley is feasible. Reasonable alternative road route along Westminster Drive/Rosedale.</p> <p>3) NOTED – the issue is one of cutting back the vegetation. The PC identify hedges etc for cut back on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>4) NOTED – the policy does not propose it as a bridleway, only a footpath.</p> <p>5) NOTED – existing NP policy/actions re A61/Follifoot Lane junction improvement and Pannal Bank cycle refuge will improve route from village up Pannal Bank to Follifoot Lane route. Difficult to see what else can be done. See 1) above re additional policy provision/action on new cycle route to southern Harrogate.</p> <p>6) NOTED – footpath link from Park and Stride towards Community Park already exists. Branch off this and across R. Crimple to park needs to be added to TTT1 (and TTT4) and community actions.</p>	<p>1) ACTION – add to policy and community actions as indicated.</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p> <p>3) NO ACTION</p> <p>4) NO ACTION</p> <p>5) ACTION – cycle route as at 1) above.</p> <p>6) ACTION – amend policies and community actions as indicated.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>Hugely support this. Anything to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists as this will encourage more people to be active.</p> <p>Need to ensure this happens, for example, I understand that as part of redeveloping the Dunlopillow site a cycle path was agreed but not actioned.</p> <p>HBC – 1) Does the group support a cycle route alongside the A61? The Bellway Homes site contributed to provision of the route through a S106. 2) Para 2 – how are you planning to assess whether it increases pedestrian footfall etc? 3) Any contribution to the improvement of the public rights of way network would have to be done through off-site S106 contributions and to meet the CIL Regulations would have to be necessary and related the specific development. There would therefore need to be a specific assessment of this link to enable contributions to be made.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – NP/PC cannot ensure these things happen but policy strengthens prospects and gives PC a sound basis for arguing for them. Subsequent discussions re the proposed A61 cycle path concluded it to be a bad idea. NP will instead include proposal for off-road route between church and community park/A61, along Ringway route.</p> <p>1) NOTED – it is understood that discussion has rendered this undesirable. The NP/PC will instead support an off-road route along line of Ringway from church to community park/A61 using same contribution. 2) NOTED – this aspect of the policy approach has not been perceived as an issue/problem by examiners of other NPs (or the LPAs concerned) in which the self-same approach has been viewed favourably and now appears in a number of made NPs, e.g. Haworth, Horsforth, Otley. 3) NOTED – it is unclear from the comment whether the ‘specific assessment’ would need to be done as part of the NP or at the time of any development proposal – the latter is assumed as proposed details would not be available until that stage. As</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include ‘Ringway’ cycle route in TTT1.</p> <p>1) ACTION - include ‘Ringway’ cycle route in TTT1. 2) NO ACTION 3) NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

		<p>immediately above, this policy approach, i.e. specifying improvements that would be supported, has not been perceived as an issue/problem by examiners of other NPs (or the LPAs concerned) in which the self-same approach has been viewed favourably and now appears in made NPs, e.g. Haworth, Otley.</p>	
<p>Policies TTT2-TTT5 – Supporting Text</p>	<p>HBC – (Re Para 1 P30) With regard to electric charging points – Village hall speaking to HBC about this however it is not feasible for HBC to put these in car parks we lease. Previous discussion with the Parish Council to take over this lease but would not necessarily make it any better for them to put in charging points.</p> <p>HBC – 1) (Re Para 2 P30) Appreciate the concerns regarding car parking but need to consider that providing more car parking will not discourage car use, in fact it could have the opposite effect. 2) Electric vehicle Charging – HBC published an Ultra Low Emission Vehicle Strategy since 2019. Our strategy is more up to date than WYCA and our specification would be more than adequate for Pannal.</p> <p>HBC – (Re Para 3 P30) Has any thought been given to alternatives to car use rather than encouraging further cars into Pannal and greater dependence on private cars? Could any new developments include car club provision?</p>	<p>NOTED – the reference to electric vehicle charging points relates to it being raised as a general issue in consultation, not to any particular sites/locations.</p> <p>1) NOTED – the only additional car parking proposed in the NP is in Policy TTT3 (off-road parking in excess of adopted standards for new developments in areas with existing on-street parking problems, i.e. to alleviate a village problem) and in Policy TTT4 (weekend/evening use of Park and Stride facility by Pannal Community Park visitors). 2) NOTED – this needs to be looked at the plan text amended accordingly.</p> <p>NOTED – it is not accepted that the NP’s policies will encourage further cars into Pannal. That said, it is considered worth investigating the potential of car clubs/car sharing and a ‘demand responsive transport’ approach to</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – look at HBC strategy and amend NP text accordingly.</p> <p>ACTION – consider potential of ‘Demand Responsive Transport’ initiatives to address local public transport needs.</p>

	HBC - Pedestrian Bridge Link – who would fund this?	village needs with a view to inclusion of suitable initiatives within the final NP. NOTED – to be developed as part of/in conjunction with Park and Stride provision, i.e. by Park and Stride developer, e.g. PC. Bridge and path link to existing PROW should also be part of TTT4.	ACTION – amend TTT4 as indicated.
Policy TTT2: Pannal Station Car Park Capacity	<p>Another problem here too! Since the rail provider have started charging for parking the residents of Pannal Avenue (and I am sure other streets too) get all the station parkers causing havoc in our narrow lane and causing problems for some of my elderly and less mobile neighbours in gaining access to their drives and gates. This situation has become far worse in recent years and causes a lot of problems, especially when someone parks their car in a difficult position and then disappears for a few days by train, which frequently happens.</p> <p>All the references to Pannal Station Car Park should make it very clear that the Harrogate Council manged site at the front of the old Dunlopillo office block is included</p> <p>Probably too big already - surely is almost empty most of the time so why keep all for parking</p> <p>I rarely see anyone use this facility.</p> <p>Highway improvement schemes always make things much worse</p> <p>Would like to see some universal electric charging points to encourage and support electric vehicles.</p>	<p>NOTED – there are community actions re the car parking charge and Pannal avenue parking restrictions aimed at addressing just this problem.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy refers to the NP Policies Map which clearly shows this area as forming part of the station car park.</p> <p>DISAGREE – any spaces are due to parking charges with effect of moving cars to surrounding streets. There are community actions to address this.</p> <p>NOTED – unclear what this means.</p> <p>AGREE – a new community action could be added to this effect.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action as indicated.</p>

	HBC – what about improved provision for cycle parking or provision of car share or car club spaces etc.?	NOTED – add support for cycle parking provision to policy and a complementary community action. Investigate the potential of car clubs/car sharing and a ‘demand responsive transport’ approach to village needs with a view to inclusion of suitable initiatives within the final NP.	ACTION – amend TTT2 and add new community action as indicated. Consider potential of ‘Demand Responsive Transport’ initiatives to address local public transport needs.
Policy TTT3: Car Parking Standards for New Development in the Vicinity of Pannal Station and Pannal Primary School	A good idea but will it ever happen? Will there be adequate parking places for residents at the new apartment block on the Dunlopillo site? I doubt it having looked at the plans.	NOTED – if the policy is finally adopted, it would be required to happen for all new developments in the specified area. The NP clearly cannot influence parking on a site for which a planning application has already been made/approved.	NO ACTION
	see commenst on TTT3. There are two car parks at Pannal Station	NOTED – both are clearly shown on the NP Policies Map to which Policy TTT2 refers.	NO ACTION
	More parking is needed but unsure where this could go.	NOTED – the extra parking would come only as part of any new development in the specified area, e.g. parking spaces provided as part of the re-development of any existing built area.	NO ACTION
	Encourage drivers not to park on pavements around the school and Crimble Meadows.	NOTED – there are already community actions in the NP designed to address both issues.	NO ACTION
	HBC – 1) Over-provision of car parking can encourage car use and ownership. Arguably developments in short walk of good transport infrastructure (rail line) and near local facilities (school) can have reduced or no car ownership	1) NOTED – it is considered that such a policy is warranted in the small area specified as part of a package of NP policies/actions designed to avoid	1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION

	<p>rather than over provision. There is no justification or evidence provided for the over-provision of car parking. This policy is not supported by HBC and is contrary to the Local Plan so should be removed. 2) It is also contrary to actions in the Non-planning Community Actions Pg34 which looks to encourage increased walking to school.</p>	<p>further exacerbating the already severe existing on-street parking problems experienced by local residents in this area. NPPF para 108 allows for such an approach if there is clear and compelling justification. The PC is in the process of compiling evidence in support of the approach as stated in the policy supporting text. It is not made clear how the policy is contrary to the Local Plan, i.e. which policy/policies specifically?</p> <p>2) DISAGREE – the parking that would be provided as a result of TTT3 would be off-road and to serve whatever development generated the parking need. It has nothing to do with walking to school/parental parking.</p>	
<p>Policy TTT4: Pannal Park and Stride</p>	<p>School drop off is definitely a big problem when main street becomes completely blocked. I just wonder if a Park and stride would be used unless there was some parking restrictions implemented in main street to stop the quick drop off.</p> <p>In addition there should be yellow lining (accompanied by residents guaranteed access space) on one side of Pannal Main Street to ensure access through the village at all times. Currently there are regular complete jams along Main Street due to irresponsible parking at school drop off/pick up points and the road can be completely grid locked.</p> <p>In the last year of its life Harrogate BC has the opportunity to allocate as a legacy land it owns behind St Roberts Church to the Park & Stride scheme and for Allotments</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP’s community actions already include parking restrictions designed to prevent just this happening.</p> <p>NOTED - the NP’s community actions already include Main Street parking restrictions.</p> <p>NOTED – the PC has been liaising with HBC re this land and will continue to do so.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>However, consideration needs to be given to the environment around the church not being disturbed too much.</p> <p>Would like to see any land identified remains wildlife/weather friendly and not tarmacked over</p> <p>1) Whilst a park and stride facility feels a good idea, locating it in the field behind St Robert's Church is not a good development for the village. This will take away important green space that acts as a buffer to the church, its cemetery, and local housing behind Pannal Green and on the Clark Beck Close Development. Encouraging car users to park here for the school drop off, and attracting more vehicles to the village from other areas for dog walking, walking, and other recreational activities. This will also spoil the aesthetic appeal of the fields, and the quiet / unspoilt character of the church environs. 2) A better solution could be the use of the new car park situated in the Pannal Community facility just off the A61, which are only used at weekends. Erecting a bridge over the River Crimple will have the double benefit of enabling parents to take their children to Pannal Primary, and residents from Pannal to walk to the sports fields from the village - rather than driving there.</p> <p>Harrogate BC should be urged to allocate as a legacy land behind St Robert's church for the Park & Stride scheme and for Allotments.</p>	<p>NOTED – development of the Park and Stride would be subject to NP policies covering village character, green infrastructure and the conservation area which would require a sympathetic scheme.</p> <p>NOTED – suitably sustainable surfacing materials could be used in the scheme, but being mindful also of site's flood plain location. Park and Stride should also be added to community actions.</p> <p>1) NOTED – this is a minority view as the scheme is very well supported by the wider community. The scheme will be sensitively designed and subject to other NP policies covering village character, green infrastructure and the conservation area. Use of the area would be limited to school times and some evening/weekend use for access to the community park. TTT4 should include requirements covering design, surfacing etc. relative to other NP policies.</p> <p>2) NOTED – experience suggests that this would be considered too long a distance for parents/children to walk and would not be used.</p> <p>NOTED – the PC has been liaising with HBC re this land and will continue to do so.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – amend policy to reflect surfacing requirement and add scheme to community actions.</p> <p>1) ACTION – amend policy as indicated. 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>HBC – 1) This policy is confusing as it does not appear to allocate land for Park and Stride but just provides support for it so unsure how much weight or purpose the policy has.</p> <p>2) This land is owned by HBC and therefore discussions would need to be had with the Council’s Estates team.</p> <p>3) Have NYCC Highways been consulted as they are currently commissioning WSP to carry out the HTIP.</p>	<p>1) NOTED – this type of policy is common in made NPs and has found favour with both examiners and other LPAs, e.g. Haworth, Otley, Horsforth and Aberford NPs.</p> <p>2) NOTED – the PC has been liaising with HBC re this land and will continue to do so.</p> <p>3) NOTED – NYCC were consulted as a statutory Reg 14 consultee – the consultation was directed at NYCC Planning with the expectation that it would consult internally – experience indicates that this has been the case with other NP consultations. NYCC made no comments on the NP. The PC would be happy to re-consult on this specific issue.</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p> <p>3) ACTION – discuss with NYCC Highways as suggested. Approach HBC Planning for a suitable contact.</p>
Policy TTT5: Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure	<p>But it should be extended to apply to any new building including any single dwelling</p> <p>Like the principle, but cost for young families hoping to extend their homes likely to be prohibitive. If implemented, how about a village grant scheme to cover the cost</p> <p>Universal EV charging points (not just for Teslas).</p>	<p>NOTED – it already does.</p> <p>NOTED – many home extensions do not require planning permission so policy would not apply to them. Even where permission required, an extension is not a development which would normally require associated parking, so again policy would not apply.</p> <p>NOTED – this is too technical for inclusion in planning policy and would in any case be covered by policies final clause, i.e. in line with most up-to-date minimum industry standards.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	HBC - Rather than putting the actual electric charging infrastructure standard in the policy, would it be better to make reference to the source of the standard to ensure the policy is futureproofed if standards change within the life of the plan.	NOTED – this is considered to be a reasonable suggestion.	ACTION – consider amendment of policy in line with comment.
Policy TTT6: Highway Improvement Schemes – supporting text	HBC – (Re Para 2 P31) Follifoot Road junction identified for improvements as part of the West Harrogate mitigation measures. HBC – (Re Para 2 P32) will need to be consulted on the appendix when available. HBC – (Re Para 3 P32) Parameters Plan published Feb 2022. This paragraph needs deleting or updating accordingly.	NOTED – this is helpful information which could be added to the supporting text. NOTED NOTED	ACTION – amend supporting text as indicated. ACTION – consult HBC once appendix is available. ACTION – update paragraph as indicated.
Policy TTT6: Highway Improvement Schemes	The pavement along the A6(1)....needs turning into a cycle lane. They spent all that money on resurfacing the road but pedestrians and cyclists got a poor deal. How could an extra lane be provided at the junction of A61 and follifoot road > Improvements are necessary irrespective of any local plan and they're needed now	NOTED – the Bellway Homes site development included contributing to provision of a cycle route along the A61, through a S106. Subsequent discussions re this cycle path concluded it to be a bad idea. NP will instead include proposal for off-road route between church and community park/A61, along Ringway route. NOTED - Follifoot Road junction already identified by HBC for improvements as part of the West Harrogate mitigation measures, so it is clearly feasible. NOTED – NP cannot make the improvements happen per se never mind now. It can only put in place the	ACTION - include 'Ringway' cycle route in TTT1. NO ACTION NO ACTION

	<p>Surely it is A61/Burn Bridge Road that requires improvement, not Follifoot?!</p> <p>Although not applicable to this neighbourhood plan, effects of through traffic from elsewhere will seriously impact on roads within the parish</p> <p>There must also be improved design of traffic calming on Main Street as the current ramps deteriorate into underlying structure which is very dangerous to cyclists. General state of Main Street is also appalling and need improved priority for repairs and maintenance.</p> <p>It should not be stated that developments will be supported if they bring about specific improvements as this would not meet the CIL regulations. Highway improvements can come about as a result of development and the specific mitigation measures but this should be part of the balanced planning judgement and consideration of the impacts of the actual development not a reason for supporting them.</p> <p>HBC:-</p>	<p>planning policy context supportive of them. PC can then lobby for improvements on this basis. NB the Follifoot Road junction improvements already identified by HBC for improvements as part of the West Harrogate mitigation measures.</p> <p>NOTED – junction falls outside the Neighbourhood Area. As such cannot be addressed by NP policy.</p> <p>NOTED - as suggested, nothing the NP can do about problems generated outside the neighbourhood area, aside from what is stated in TTT6 and community actions on traffic management to discourage through traffic.</p> <p>AGREE – needs resurfacing. PC already lobbying for work to be done.</p> <p>NOTED – which is why the policy clearly states that support is subject to compliance with other policies in the NP or the Local Plan.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>1) Have NYCC been consulted on the list of highway improvements as development would only be required to contribute to them if they were considered necessary to mitigate the impact of the developments. Otherwise it would not meet the CIL regulations. Are the improvements actually required or just desirable?</p> <p>2) Improvements are proposed as part of West Harrogate mitigation measures. 'A scheme or schemes, within the Neighbourhood Area, to address traffic volumes and congestion in Pannal and Burn Bridge, emanating from new developments on the west side of Harrogate will also be supported' – not sure this is necessary to be in here as development in West Harrogate would not be able to proceed without the appropriate highway mitigation which would form part of the S106 of the planning application/s. Support would not be needed from the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>3) What does the 'for any such development refer to' – is it related to the paragraph on West of Harrogate or development as a whole? Not sure this sentence is necessary as highway safety and air quality are adequately covered in Local Plan policies.</p>	<p>1) NOTED - NYCC were consulted as a statutory Reg 14 consultee – the consultation was directed at NYCC Planning with the expectation that it would consult internally – experience indicates that this has been the case with other NP consultations. NYCC made no comments on the NP. The PC would be happy to re-consult on the specific schemes listed. The PC accepts, and the policy specifically acknowledges that to be supported schemes must be either NP or Local Plan policy compliant, including regard to Local Plan TI4 (Delivery of New Infrastructure).</p> <p>2) NOTED – given that this is such a big issue with the Pannal community, as evidenced in consultations, the PC considers that the NP should adopt a 'belt and braces' approach rather than be silent on such a key issue. Such support is not considered to fall foul of basic conditions for the NP. NP text can reference West of Harrogate mitigation measures referred to.</p> <p>3) NOTED – it relates to development as a whole. It is arguably a matter of opinion as to whether the sentence is necessary. Other LPAs commenting on similar policies in other NPs have considered that it should be included.</p>	<p>1) ACTION – consult NYCC Highways as indicated.</p> <p>2) ACTION – include reference to West of Harrogate measures as indicated.</p> <p>3) NO ACTION</p>
Traffic, Transport, Travel – Non-	Just an additional comment which is not necessarily related to this - Northern Rail have withdrawn the first 2 trains into Leeds in the morning so the first train is now at	NOTED – PC/others already lobbying on this. NR have said they will reinstate before Christmas.	NO ACTION

<p>Planning Community Actions</p>	<p>07.04 from Pannal. They have also withdrawn the 10.38 return from Leeds. The loss of these well used services will be affecting Pannal residents/</p> <p>Traffic has increased markadly recently traff needs to be directed away from village not just widen roads</p> <p>1) As a regular walker in the village and area, I can confirm that the pavements are a hazard. In the autumn they are so dirty as they never get cleaned or swept and so are cluttered with rotting leaves. 2) Crossing the busy main street is also a hazard 3) and walking along the paths outside the village you take your life in your hands! This includes the A6(1) towards Harrogate past the Crimple Garden centre (or the other direction) - the pavement along the A6(1) is wide enough to be cleared of debris to make a much wider path and also needs turning into a cycle lane. They spent all that money on resurfacing the road but pedestrians and cyclists got a poor deal. 4) and walking along the paths outside the village you take your life in your hands! - Yew Tree Lane.</p>	<p>NOTED – unclear what the road-widening comment refers to as NP proposes no road widening. Various of the NP policies/community actions do aim to direct traffic away from the villages.</p> <p>1) NOTED – apparently down to cost-cutting. PC is already seeking to address.</p> <p>2) NOTED – community actions for Pannal Railway Bridge and Main St parking restrictions may help to address. With 20mph limit and speed bumps in place, hard to know what else can be done.</p> <p>3) NOTED – the Bellway Homes site development included contributing to provision of a cycle route along the A61, through a S106. Subsequent discussions re this cycle path concluded it to be a bad idea. NP will instead include proposal for off-road route between church and community park/A61, along Ringway route. ‘Debris’ is taken to mean vegetation - the issue is one of cutting back the vegetation. The PC identify hedges etc for cut back on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>4) NOTED – NP already includes a specific community action re restoring Yew Tree Lane pavement to full width.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) ACTION - include ‘Ringway’ cycle route in TTT1 4) NO ACTION</p>
-----------------------------------	---	---	--

	<p>1) But it should be extended, e.g. footpaths should be provided along all length of the A61 2) and Spring Lane</p> <p>Parking around Pannal School, in particular on Pannal Grren, needs addressing immediately.</p> <p>1) Enforce cycling prohibition on footpath between Burn Bridge and Pannal / introduce barrier to cyclists 2) Remove misleading signs relating to defunct operations (Leeds Road) – NYCC.</p> <p>Residents' parking permits should be encouraged.</p> <p>I do not support any road widening schemes as has happened in Spring lane which has ruined the. Character of the road</p> <p>I also noted in the planning documents for the monstrosity which is going to replace the former Dunlopillo office</p>	<p>1) NOTED – the section where footpath is taken to be missing is north of Burn Bridge Lane junction. NP will put forward alternative solutions, i.e. provision of pavement to fill gap or creation of footpath through new Dunlopillo open space to join existing PROW up to A61.</p> <p>2) DISAGREE – any provision of pavement footpaths along north side of Spring Lane could be seen as a green light to development of adjacent farmland as proposed in the past.</p> <p>NOTED – addressed already via NP community actions. PC lobbying is ongoing and has been for some time.</p> <p>1) NOTED – enforcement is a Police matter. Barrier in form of offset railings at ginnel between Malthouse Lane and Crimple Meadows is a good idea which NP can include.</p> <p>2) NOTED – not a NP matter. PC will address.</p> <p>NOTED – already include as a community action.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP does not propose any road widening schemes.</p> <p>NOTED – the Bellway Homes site development included contributing to</p>	<p>1) ACTION – amend NP (NB policies and/or community actions) to include solutions as most appropriate.</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) ACTION – include community action re installation of barrier as indicated.</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION - include 'Ringway' cycle route in TTT1.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>block that the developer was promoting the fact that it was only a 20 minute cycle ride into Harrogate from the proposed new development. Who in their right mind would take their life into their hands and cycle that route at present?? I also thought that Bellway were supposed to be committed to doing something to develop a cycle way into Harrogate. If we really want to promote cycling and walking we need to mean it - and not just talk about it!! I just remember how wonderful it was during the first lockdown with no cars !</p> <p>HBC – 1) 30 mph zone – Why is this proposed and who is the improvement for? It will reduce the flow of traffic in the area which will cause greater hold ups in traffic which would already be made worse by increasing peak time ‘green light’ time at junction of Pannal Bank/Follifoot Road and the A61.</p> <p>2) Pedestrian Refuge – if the bridleway could be linked to the showground as proposed by NYCC previously then there would be a good walking and cycling link between Pannal and Wetherby Road that would be off road that would be relatively flat and accessible.</p> <p>HBC – (Re footpath improvements) What about the path between St Roberts Church and the A61. Would make a better off-road route from A61 and provide much better cycling link especially if a crossing was located at the A61 end. This could link to the Hornbeam Park quiet route into Harrogate and link to the showground.</p>	<p>provision of a cycle route along the A61, through a S106. Subsequent discussions re this cycle path concluded it to be a bad idea. NP will instead include proposal for off-road route between church and community park/A61, along Ringway route.</p> <p>1) NOTED – the PC would point out that this is a community action not a policy and that the action is to ‘explore’ the idea. The aim is to slow traffic down, make road crossing safer, make narrow pavements safer. The PN18 development with the increase in vehicular/pedestrian/cyclist traffic it will bring is seen as all the more reason for this proposal.</p> <p>2) NOTED – it is not clear what implication this comment has for the NP – is a change or addition to a policy or action being sought? As a matter of fact the PC has already expressed its support for this.</p> <p>AGREE - NP policy TTT1 will be amended to include proposal for off-road route between church and community park/A61, along Ringway route.</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION - include ‘Ringway’ cycle route in TTT1.</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>HBC – 1) There should be consideration of demand responsive transport in this location.</p> <p>2) There is nothing in terms of Park and Ride. NYCC is due to commence the next stage of HTIP (<i>Housing Transformation Improvement Plan?</i>) soon, that has a focus on A61 corridor south of Harrogate and includes looking at Park and Site south of Pannal and bus priority along A61 as well as active mode provision.</p>	<p>1) NOTED – NPs are a response to issues raised by communities – as this has not come up as an issue, there is no compulsion on the PC/community/NP to include anything on this. That said, it is considered worth Investigating the potential of car clubs/car sharing and a ‘demand responsive transport’ approach to village needs with a view to inclusion of suitable initiatives within the final NP.</p> <p>2) NOTED – it is understood that the Park and Ride site being looked at lies outside the Neighbourhood Area. It is not clear exactly what implications the comments re A61 bus priority and ‘active mode provision’ are felt to have re proposed NP policies and community actions?</p>	<p>1) ACTION – Consider potential of ‘Demand Responsive Transport’ initiatives to address local public transport needs.</p> <p>2) ACTION – clarify HBC comments and NP implications.</p>
<p>Policy CFS1: Protection & Enhancement of Community Facilities</p>	<p>HBC – 1) The first part of the policy relating to protection is not needed as it simply replicates Local Plan Policy HP8. In fact, this policy is more prescriptive and does not give protection to other community uses which may come forward within the plan period.</p> <p>2) What exactly is meant by ‘improvement of the facilities’? and how is it envisaged that improvements will come about e.g through S106 contributions or support for planning applications that might come forward.</p>	<p>1) DISAGREE – it is not a simple replication of HP8, rather it adds value and certainty by specifying facilities to which the policy will apply. There is no reason why the wording could not be amended to also apply to other unnamed facilities of evidenced community value. Equally, these would presumably be covered anyway by HP8. This policy approach, i.e. the specifying of facilities, has not been perceived as an issue/problem by examiners of other NPs (or the LPAs concerned) in which the self-same approach has been viewed favourably and now appears in a number of made NPs, e.g. Haworth,</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p>

		<p>Horsforth, Otley, Aberford, within the context of similar Local Plan policies.</p> <p>2) NOTED – there is no perceived need to define ‘improvement’ - this policy approach, i.e. using the word ‘improvement’, has not been perceived as an issue/problem by examiners of other NPs (or the LPAs concerned) in which the self-same approach has been viewed favourably and now appears in a number of made NPs, e.g. Haworth, Horsforth, Otley, Aberford, within the context of similar Local Plan policies. The NPPF uses similar wording – developing, modernising – seemingly without any explanatory definitions. Improvement could come about via either planning application of S106.</p>	
Policy CFS2: Provision of New Community Facilities	<p>Pannal definitely needs a pub / restaurant since our local pub, The Harwood was taken away from us by Greene King Brewery and the Coop.</p> <p>Cafe yes. Pub No. The Harewood wasn't viable nor would any new pub be</p> <p>Do not differentiate between pub and cafe as the old concept of pubs is dead - we want all day venues that are serving food and drink from say 8.00am until 8.00pm</p> <p>Do we really need another pub and now we have a cafe at Crimple, do we really need another? I do, however, see a</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – that is a matter for market forces. The aspiration is widely supported by the community. The policy puts in place a supportive planning context should a proposal come forward.</p> <p>NOTED – in planning terms, the distinction remains.</p> <p>NOTED – both pub and café are a matter for market forces. The aspiration</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>value in having a community hub where people can drop in to socialise.</p> <p>Love the idea, but only if it is financially viable. Remember Spacey Houses pub deteriorated over many years and closed because it was not financially viable as footfall very low –</p> <p>1) Doubtful about a public house, the previous one failed, and the Black Swan is struggling. 2) Doubtful too about public conveniences, where is the evidence of need and is it a priority for use of public resources?</p> <p>1) Not sure a pub is required when the black swan is so close. 2) A cafe would be nice but again Crimple is only around the corner. 3) Pedestrian access to this from the village would be preferred.</p>	<p>is widely supported by the community. The policy puts in place a supportive planning context should a proposal come forward. The aim is to have both at the heart of the communities not on Leeds Road. There is no shortage of community venues in the village for people to socialise.</p> <p>AGREE – it is a matter for market forces. The policy puts in place a supportive planning context should a proposal come forward.</p> <p>1) NOTED - it is a matter for market forces. The policy puts in place a supportive planning context should a proposal come forward. 2) NOTED – priority public resource use is not an issue as this is a supportive policy in the event of a proposal coming forward, not a proposal to provide and spend public money on provision. As stated, a proposal associated with recreational provision is favoured to serve recreational uses, including Ringway users and potentially future cycleway users – ref new NP cycle route proposal put forward elsewhere in this document.</p> <p>1) NOTED – Black Swan is not close to everyone in the Neighbourhood Area. Provision is a matter for market forces. The aspiration is widely supported by the community. The policy puts in place</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) ACTION – amend NP as indicated.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>Would love to see a cafe in the village, could a regular cafe not be established in the village hall or church hall if location is the problem?</p>	<p>a supportive planning context should a proposal come forward. 2) NOTED - the aim is to have a cafe at the heart of the communities not on Leeds Road. 3) NOTED – footpath link from village towards Crimble/Community Park/Leeds Rd already exists. A branch off this and across R. Crimble to A61 could be added to TTT1 (and TTT4) and community actions.</p> <p>NOTED – a commercial proposal has recently made to provide a café as part of the new employment development on the Dunlopillo site, of which the PC is supportive. Both this and any proposal for such use in village halls would be supported under Policy CFS2.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
<p>Policy CFS3: Educational Facilities for Pannal Primary School – Development Requirements</p>	<p>All very sensible suggestions</p> <p>Couldn't find CFS3 but if it is the bullet point under CFS2 then my answer is yes.</p> <p>HBC - The text refers to the school allocation in the local plan but a reference to Local Plan Policy TI6: Provision of Educational Facilities would be helpful in the policy.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – this can easily be incorporated.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – amend plan in line with comment.</p>
<p>Policy H1: Small Scale & Infill Housing Development within the Development Limit</p>	<p>Some of these proposals seem outside the Parish Council's remit</p>	<p>NOTED – the PC has the power to produce a Neighbourhood Plan which is a document with planning policies at its core. The proposals in Policy H1 are all legitimate planning issues, considered to be in conformity with existing Local Plan policies.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Don't know if a prohibition of bin placement at the front of properties could be implemented retrospectively. Where possible, it certainly should be!</p> <p>existing planning laws already cover</p> <p>Too much new housing already not in keeping with the character of the village.</p> <p>HBC – 1) This policy relates to development within the development limit and is very specific on design, layout and requirements for new residential development. How does this relate to the proposed Design Code which is broken down into character areas? It is very confusing to have lots of design requirements over a number of areas and associated policies and will make it very difficult to assess planning applications. What evidence or justification is there for the design and layout requirements provided? The policy is far too restrictive for development that is within the development limit so supported in principle through local and national planning policy – Local Plan Policy GS3. Whilst we agree that consideration should be given to design and layout, this policy puts a ‘blanket’ of requirements across all housing within a very wide area and fails to take account of the character of the different areas in Pannal. Developments should be assessed on their own merit with regard to the individual site characteristics and it would be impossible for every application to meet all of the very detailed requirements of this policy. Depending on the individual application, meeting the requirement might also not be the best use of</p>	<p>NOTED – this is not a planning issue.</p> <p>NOTED – not, it is considered, at this level of detail.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP cannot do anything about past planning decisions – it aims to positively influence future decisions once adopted.</p> <p>1) NOTED – there is mileage in trying to simplify/rationalise the policy approach, with the Village Character Areas policy (BE5), based on the Design Codes report, being the lead. Role of Design codes annex should also be clarified. 2) NOTED – the inclusion of cycling, pedestrian, access criteria within TTT1 can be considered.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) ACTION – review H1 against BE5 and other development/design policies with a view to simplification/rationalisation. Clarify role of Design Codes annex. 2) ACTION – consider adding cycling etc criteria to TTT1 as suggested.</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>space, light, orientation, site layout etc which could result in less superior development. It also limits the opportunities for innovative design. Also reference is made to the design Code Annex to the plan but this is not attached – what is the purpose of this Annex and how does it relate to the list of design requirements in this policy.</p> <p>It is considered that this policy is not necessary as local design considerations are covered by the Local Plan Policy HP3 : Local Distinctiveness however an alternative could be to review the Village Character Areas Policy and add in design requirements for housing within each area. Policy H1 would then make reference to the fact that housing development within the development limit will be supported and applications with these areas should be in accordance with the criteria within the appropriate Village Character Area. 2) The requirements in relation to cycle, pedestrian facilities and access could be provided within Policy TTT1.</p>		
<p>Policy H2: Development Outside the Development Limit</p>	<p>I would have some reservations about this - depends on situation</p> <p>I thought that the 5 year supply of housing has now been met National Planning Policy guidelines may well change</p> <p>To date NYCC have not had objections to developments on traffic grounds because they never take into account cumulative effects of developments - just sites in isolation. Hence the paragraph on development and infrastructure capacity is fairly meaningless - although essential.</p>	<p>NOTED – without details as to the reservations held, there is no basis for considering policy amendment.</p> <p>NOTED – policy wording reflects that of Local Plan GS3 in respect of the 5 year housing supply. The NP has to be written in the context of the existing NPPF.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy worded referred to as “fairly meaningless” has met favour with other NP examiners and appears in already ‘made’ i.e. adopted NPs. Could however look at extending the para in</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider policy amendment as indicated.</p>

	<p>Unfortunately, that seems to be beyond the control of local people.</p> <p>existing planning laws already cover</p> <p>Concerned that this will be over ridden by the council/might of developers.</p> <p>HBC – 1) Aligns back to Local Plan Policy GS3 which gives a clear set of criteria A-D for consideration of developments outside the development limit including adverse impact on character and appearance of the surrounding countryside or heritage assets as well as on character, appearance and setting of the settlement. In the absence of a five year land supply there has to be a recognition that land outside the development might be needed and Policy GS3 adequately covers these circumstances. There does not appear to be any evidence to justify why the extra criteria are appropriate for inclusion in the Pannal and Burn Bridge Neighbourhood Plan. It is also not clear how the ‘intrinsic value’ or ‘valuable contribution’ referenced in para 2 can be adequately assessed as well as how the impact on local road network, local primary school places, or local medical service places can be measured and assessed.</p> <p>‘No development to exceed the capacity of infrastructure, as existing or provided as a condition of development’ – this sentence is quite confusing. If the development is judged to have an impact on the capacity of existing</p>	<p>question to embrace a consideration of cumulative effects.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that H2 amplifies rather duplicates what exists.</p> <p>NOTED – as the policy will become part of the Local Plan on adoption, it is the council (HBC/its successor) that will be implementing it not overriding it. To what extent developers are held to this or any other policy is ultimately down to officers/members/Government inspectors.</p> <p>1) NOTED - this policy approach, with self-same wording (or similar), has not been perceived as an issue/problem by examiners of other NPs (or the LPAs concerned). Rather, it has been viewed favourably and now appears in a number of made NPs, e.g. Haworth, Otley, Aberford within the context of similar Local Plan policies. The criteria reflect concerns of the local community, as voiced in consultations, and the PC.</p> <p>2) NOTED – the SPD could usefully be referenced in the text.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – reference SPD in text as suggested.</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>infrastructure, then these impacts will need to be mitigated either through onsite provision, off-site provision/improvements or financial contributions. This would then make the proposal acceptable in planning terms and could not be refused on infrastructure capacity grounds.</p> <p>2) The text could reference the council's Air Quality SPD which provides guidance for Policy NE1.</p>		
Policy H3: Housing Mix	<p>I completely agree that more bungalows needed</p> <p>There is already excessive provision for housing, far ahead of the provisions of the HBC local plan, hence no further housing should be considered in the parish apart from infill.</p> <p>existing planning laws already cover</p> <p>Would like to see smaller affordable properties for first time buyers and downsizers.</p> <p>HBC - Pannal and Burn Bridge Parish falls within the Harrogate and Surrounds sub-area within the 2018 HEDNA. The HEDNA Chapter 10 NEED FOR DIFFERENT SIZES OF HOMES key points identifies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three bedroom properties are the most common size of properties in all of the sub-areas. The percentage of 1 bedroom properties is highest in Harrogate and surrounds. Based on the economic led forecasts there is a clear need across the district for market delivery to be focussed on 2 and 3 bedrooms. This reflects the 	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – neither the adopted Local Plan nor the NP rules out/can rule out further future housing. H3 seeks to influence the type/mix of any such housing in the local interest should it come to pass.</p> <p>DISAGREE – NP policy puts a local accent on Local Plan policy reflecting local views.</p> <p>NOTED – H3 provides for this.</p> <p>NOTED – the text could also usefully reference Local Plan Policy HS2</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – reference HS2 in text.</p>

	<p>aging population, existing stock and the need to support down-sizing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarly affordable home ownership/Intermediate should also focus delivery on 2 and 3 although a greater percentage should be delivered as smaller homes compared to the market sector. • The focus of affordable housing delivery should be for 2 bedroom property. This reflects the closer links between need and occupation, as well as the high turnover of one-bedroom affordable homes. <p>The proposed policy and its evidence base is in-line with the findings of the district-wide HEDNA. It is noted that the policy refers back to Local Plan policies HS1 and HS4 but does not refer to HS2 Affordable Housing.</p>		
Housing – General	HBC - Agree with the general focus of the policies, particularly the prioritising of starter and retirement homes.	NOTED	NO ACTION
Policy ED1: Protection of Existing Employment Sites	<p>But what about the mercedes site and the BP site?</p> <p>What employment site is there at Almsford Bridge? Is this PN18 - which has no relation to Almsford Bridge. It could also be called South Harrogate as it is indeed south of Harrogate. Change the name please.</p> <p>if financially viable. It would be folly to just protect employment on a site if a business cannot make that work.</p> <p>HBC - The list of employment sites need an individual reference number.</p>	<p>NOTED – both fall within the Almsford Bridge site.</p> <p>NOTED – Almsford Bridge is the site with BP, Mercedes – see NP Policies Map.</p> <p>NOTED – the aim is to keep the sites in employment use not to keep individual businesses in business. It is considered important to sustain and support local business/employment.</p> <p>AGREE – sites in policy list should be numbered in line with Policies Map.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – number policy sites list as indicated.</p>

<p>Policy ED2: Employment Site South of Almsford Bridge – Development Requirements – supporting text.</p>	<p>HBC – (Para 2 P45) Use of the word “screening” and “restrictions” are too negative.</p> <p>HBC – (Para 3 P45) ‘It is however considered that there is no evidence and therefore no justification to support policy clauses in respect of local employment or noise’ – What does this mean?</p>	<p>NOTED – acknowledged that this wording should be amended to better reflect more positive policy wording.</p> <p>NOTED – it relates back to the previous paragraph which highlighted community comments re noise and local employment. The PC decided that despite concerns raised there was no justification for seeking to address these matters in the policy.</p>	<p>ACTION – amend wording as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<p>Policy ED2: Employment Site South of Almsford Bridge – Development Requirements</p>	<p>can a footpath be provided through the site into the Crimple Valley SLA</p> <p>No B8 or any heavyindustry or warehousing. Roads simply cannot cope</p> <p>No new developments please</p> <p>I don't agree with further development of this area, but agree that assessments need to take account of increasing traffic, A61 access, pollution, etc.</p> <p>HBC:- Bullet 1 - Good that the Neighbourhood Plan recognise this is a Gateway site Bullet 2 – Vary building heights – way it is worded makes it difficult to put any new buildings on the site and is in conflict with the Harrogate District Local Plan. Bullet 8 – PN18 is not adjacent to residential properties.</p>	<p>NOTED – this is considered to be a good idea.</p> <p>DISAGREE – Local Plan already allows B8 use which the NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – the development at South of Almsford Bridge is already an adopted Local Plan allocation which the NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – the development at South of Almsford Bridge is already an adopted Local Plan allocation which the NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>1) NOTED 2) DISAGREE – on the contrary the wording gives ample flexibility to put buildings on the site in such a way that key viaduct views are retained as required by Local Plan policy. There is</p>	<p>ACTION – add policy clause supporting a footpath as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) NO ACTION</p>

		no Local Plan conflict. As a matter of fact, the wording was okayed with HBC officers in a meeting pre Regulation 14. 3) NOTED – bullet 8 does not it is adjacent. Badly designed lighting can be intrusive and affect amenity at a distance from the generating site.	
Non-Planning Community Actions - General	<p>No</p> <p>1) I can't seem to find this as the only N Plan document I could find on the PC website only went up to 15 pages. 2) Also I just wanted to say that I recognise and appreciate the amount of work that has gone into developing this plan and that Pannal is a great place to live despite the traffic and parking problems!.</p> <p>I like the identification of where lobbying will be persued.</p> <p>No</p> <p>I am totally in support of the aspirations outlined in this section and applaud the Parish Council for the hard work and diligence they have shown in producing this Neighbourhood Plan. Let us hope that the new Unitary Authority and whatever version of a Town council we get in 2023 will pay heed to our local representatives in Pannal & Burn Bridge.</p> <p>No comments</p> <p>1) I do not support further housing/business developments on green field sites. 2) Thank you to everyone for putting this together for the village</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED – the full NP document was available on the website. 2) NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED – the NP does not propose any new housing/business development, but rather seeks to shape what is already allocated and what may</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Natural England - Natural England does not have any specific comments on the Pannal and Burn Bridge Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>The Coal Authority - Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on it.</p>	<p>be allowed in line with Local Plan policies. 2) NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Monitoring, Review, Implementation	HBC - It's not clear how the policies will be monitored and reviewed.	NOTED – there is no requirement on Qualifying Bodies to set this out within a NP. This will be a matter for the PC to decide for itself once the NP is finally made.	NO ACTION
Appendix 1: Green & Blue Infrastructure	HBC - The appendix has extracts (corridor descriptions) from some work undertaken by Natural England in 2010 but which hasn't really been progressed since then. The boundaries were drawn around a table from a workshop of interested parties working at a regional scale. This is partially recognised on p.12 and therefore the neighbourhood plan should not give the detail of the boundaries too much weight, and it may be better to draw own boundaries within the context of the regionally important corridors, based on detailed local knowledge and aspirations, as have been done with 'the Walton Fringe'.	NOTED – the NP uses the 2010 work boundaries as a necessarily broad starting point and interprets them at a local level relative to local geography – in effect drawing own boundaries as suggested. Experience from other NPs indicates that this approach, based on the 2010 work, has found favour with examiners/other LPAs alike, with the resultant areas/boundaries approved in made NPs, e.g. Haworth.	NO ACTION
Appendix 2: LGS Assessments	HBC - Not every LGS has to qualify on every potential criterion. There is no need to make the case as to why, for example, Pannal Cricket Club Ground should qualify on the basis of wildlife richness. It would be better to simply argue the case on those other grounds which really justify it, rather than trying to include that particular justification	1) NOTED – the PC is well aware of the qualifying criteria. The assessments are considered to be fair and balanced with no irrelevant/spurious justifications. The approach draws on experience from several other NP LGS assessments	1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – number sites in policy list in line with Policies Map.

	<p>for some of the proposed LGS where it is not really relevant. The sites need numbering in the policy to reflect the number on the Policies Map.</p> <p>HBC – (Re Pannal Community Park) Pedestrian Bridge Link – who would fund this?</p>	<p>based on which sites have been successfully designated within ‘made’ NPs. There is no reason put forward relative to basic conditions as to why any assessments should be amended or sites not designated.</p> <p>2) AGREE – policy list would benefit from site numbering in line with Policies Map.</p> <p>NOTED – to be developed as part of/in conjunction with Park and Stride provision, i.e. by Park and Stride developer, e.g. PC. Bridge and path link to existing PROW should also be part of TTT4.</p>	<p>ACTION – amend TTT4 as indicated.</p>
Policies Map	<p>HBC - there is a lot of information on the policies map with similar colours and shading which makes it difficult to read.</p> <p>HBC - SINC – Spacey Houses Whin potential SINC is shown as SINC (3) on the Policy Map. It has been assessed as qualifying by the North Yorks SINC Panel but has not yet been designated in the Local Plan (hopefully to be put forward in the Local Plan Review).</p>	<p>NOTED – no more or less than on other NP/Local Plan Policies/Proposals Maps – e.g. Harrogate District Local Plan, Harrogate Main Settlement Map. The zoom function renders electronic versions perfectly readable.</p> <p>NOTED – the status of the Spacey Houses Whin SINC should be acknowledged in the NP text (P15, para 4) and on the Policies Map.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – amend text and Policies Map as indicated.</p>
General	<p>HBC - The Parish Council should be congratulated on the work that they have put into the Neighbourhood Plan. In particular, there are some very detailed assessments that have been undertaken with regard to Local Green Space, Heritage Areas and Village Character Areas and it is evident that substantial public consultation and</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>engagement has been undertaken to inform the Plan’s development.</p> <p>HBC - Care is needed to ensure the Harrogate District Local Plan 2014-2035 is either referred to as the Local Plan or Harrogate District Local Plan rather than Harrogate Local Plan, which implies it only covers Harrogate rather than the whole district.</p> <p>HBC - Paragraph numbers would help navigation through the document.</p> <p>HBC - Strategic Property wish to ensure that any allocations in this plan allow the Strategic Priorities of Economic Growth, Carbon Reduction and Housing Growth to be delivered.</p> <p>HBC - Presentation could be clearer with policies and non-planning actions presented differently to the introduction and justification text. Highlighted policy text is difficult to read. Suggest putting policies in boxes so they stand out, with numbered justification paragraphs following to add detail rather than front loading the information.</p> <p>HBC - Need to be clearer what evidence has fed into policy development.</p>	<p>NOTED – the submission NP can be proofed to ensure consistency.</p> <p>NOTED – these can be incorporated into the submission NP.</p> <p>NOTED – having sought clarification on this comment from HBC, the following response was received – “this comment really just provides a back up to the other comments about PN18 in the fact that the Council needs to ensure that PN18 progresses as it is an important site to deliver the strategic priorities of economic growth etc.”</p> <p>NOTED – these are cosmetic matters of presentation and a matter of PC choice unless the examiner decrees otherwise. This style of presentation has proved perfectly acceptable to other LPAs/ examiners. That said, paragraph numbers can be incorporated into the submission NP and policies boxed as suggested.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that the NP is generally clear on this. Where specific examples of a lack of clarity have been</p>	<p>ACTION – proof submission NP to ensure consistent reference to the Local Plan.</p> <p>ACTION – incorporate paragraph numbering in final NP.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – incorporate paragraph numbering and box policies in final NP.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>HBC - Links to the Harrogate District Local Plan policies, NPPF etc. could be clearer.</p>	<p>highlighted in detailed comments above, the PC has indicated its intention to address the matter where felt to be necessary.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that the NP is generally very clear on this. Where specific examples of a lack of clarity have been highlighted in detailed comments above, the PC has indicated its intention to address the matter where felt to be necessary.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	------------------