

ASPECT OF PID COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
Vision	<p>How is Pannal going to get involved in a cycle network</p> <p>Mostly</p> <p>Very important for the Parish to be separate from the built up area of Harrogate.</p> <p>Nothing wrong with a vision, but all this is a pipedream and overambitious</p> <p>1) We are supportive of the vision that is outlined although we would like to see some wording around "the promotion of retail/leisure/commercial uses that add to the vibrancy of the village" for example... independent coffee shops, butchers, bakers, artisan food makers etc... Not more Costa Coffees! 2) The statement about the</p>	<p>NOTED – National Cycle Route 67 passes just to the east of the parish, on Pannal Road before it meets the A658. It is not an unreasonable vision to have a new cycle path/paths within the parish to link into this national network, nor to create more local cycle-friendly paths.</p> <p>NOTED – without knowing where there are areas of disagreement, it is impossible to know how it might be made more agreeable.</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>DISAGREE – the preamble makes it clear that the vision is “aspirational” and a “challenging ambition” and that there is no guarantee it will be delivered. That is not to say that it is not achievable. Plans must be based on a vision and there is little point in aiming low.</p> <p>1) NOTED – this is encapsulated in the references to “enhanced facilities and activities” and “growth of the area’s community facilities and services”. 2) AGREE</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>parish "not being overburdened by unwanted commuter traffic" is CRUCIAL. This is a real concern of ours.</p> <p>Not convinced entirely.</p> <p>A good statement of the future of the village.</p> <p>Overall yes, but the next steps are very important for: 1. Who/how will the "documented character" document be produced and consulted and the timescale? 2. Who/how will the "neighbourhood Plan Map" be produced and consulted? These are very important documents to produce and will need a plan for consultation with villages for community views, eg. provision of more / improved footpaths and cyclepaths</p> <p>In general it is pleasingly ambitious yet always aware of the nature of the two places. More might be made of the long history of Pannal and its differences with Burn Bridge.</p> <p>The green space between the villages and the built up area of Harrogate is of prime importance and any development which diminishes this should be resisted</p> <p>FANTASIC JOB DONE BY ALL</p> <p>Not convinced of the need for more frequent trains</p> <p>With particular support for the vision regarding unwanted commuter traffic</p>	<p>NOTED – without knowing which aspects do not convince, it is impossible to know how it might be made more convincing.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the character area work is being carried out by consultants to a brief set by the PC. It will be completed in the autumn and its results embodied in the draft Neighbourhood Plan, to be consulted on early 2022 latest. The map, again produced by consultants, will be part of the draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED – a section on the history of the parish will form part of the draft plan, i.e. the next stage of work.</p> <p>AGREE – it is intended that the plan seeks to achieve jut this.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - considered that this chimes with sustainable transport agenda, i.e. making it easier/more comfortable to use public transport.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>1) I would like to see an explicit statement on climate change which is the most important issue of our time. This needs to be tackled bottom-up as well as top-down, so the parish needs to have a vision as to how it will make a contribution. 2) While I broadly agree, I have a slightly different take on paragraph 3. Traffic levels generally, not just commuter traffic, are on the increase. 3) The road network at present has to support traffic, cyclists and pedestrians - and fails to do this adequately on for example HillFoot and HillTop Lane, Yew Tree Lane and Brackenthwaite Lane. 4) The vision talks about enhancing the cycle network and Public Rights of Way - but walkers need improved access to these Rights of Way, possibly best achieved by new paths alongside these lanes.</p> <p>We agree with parts of the vision - not the whole package</p> <p>A lot of hard work and effort has gone into producing a well thought out plan for the benefit of Pannal residents</p> <p>It is reassuring to see something being done by people who have an interest in either maintaining the community or improving it.</p> <p>All sound sensible proposals for moving forward</p> <p>the document is very wordy and difficult to understand in plain layman's terms</p>	<p>1) NOTED – acknowledged this is an important issue that needs full consideration.</p> <p>2) NOTED – acknowledged that not just commuter traffic which is the problem.</p> <p>3) NOTED – acknowledged that there are problems on most of the narrow through routes in the parish.</p> <p>4) NOTED – it is the intention to put forward proposed improvements to the network as part of the next stagedraft plan.</p> <p>NOTED – without knowing which parts are not agreed with, it is impossible to know which parts to amend or how.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the document is the forerunner to a fully-blown Neighbourhood Plan which will ultimately form part of the statutory development plan for the parish, alongside the Harrogate Local Plan. Unfortunately, as such, i.e. as a</p>	<p>1) ACTION – planning policy and community action options for the plan to address climate change issues to be considered and included in plan as appropriate/feasible.</p> <p>2) ACTION – amend wording to read 'unwanted commuter and other 'rat-running' traffic'.</p> <p>3) ACTION – consider traffic management schemes on through routes where feasible and appropriate.</p> <p>4) ACTION – include proposed improvements to network in draft plan.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

		statutory planning document, it has to include technical language, not always easily accessible to the lay person.	
	Keeping Pannal /Burn Bridge/Walton Park as a separate village from Harrogate and protection of the Crimple Valley from inappropriate development are top of my list.	NOTED – the primacy of this view in the vision reflects its importance in the plan.	NO ACTION
	Yes. It has obviously been very well considered and we support it in full.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Green space and wildlife is priority	NOTED – the primacy of these issues in the vision and in the ordering of the plan’s sections reflects this view.	NO ACTION
	Excellent vision for the future	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Yes	NOTED	NO ACTION
	nCESSARY TO OBTAIN OUR FAIR SHARE OF DEVELOPERS LIABILITY PAYMENTS	NOTED – it is assumed that this refers to Community Infrastructure Levy – the PC automatically receives a set percentage at present. This will increase on the adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan.	NO ACTION
	Aspirational	NOTED – as stated in the preamble.	NO ACTION
	I would like to see the needs of Burn Bridge included, particularly in regards to traffic volumes/ management which will result from developments already underway as well as future plans	NOTED – these are implicitly covered in the final sentence of para 3 of vision. Acknowledged that there are problems on roads through Burn Bridge which attempts should be made to address. PC already doing utmost to address speeding.	ACTION - consider traffic management schemes on Burn Bridge through routes where feasible and appropriate.

	<p>Well thought out</p> <p>Seems well thought out</p> <p>Well balanced approach to a range of strategic issues facing the locality</p> <p>In the main but some issues need attention more urgently</p> <p>1) Concepts are directionally correct. However, they are too focused on Pannal village and not the broader Pannal and Burn Bridge community, especially the new Jubilee Park community that due to the timing of the prior survey has had limited voice in these proposals and from the document will benefit the least from the proposed paths forward. 2) Additionally, the vision fails to address the need to create spaces in the community for teenagers to hang out 3) and to create part time work opportunities for both younger and older members of our community.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – without knowing which issues are deemed to need more urgent attention, it is impossible to know whether/where to amend the vision or how.</p> <p>1) NOTED – the Jubilee Park community will hopefully have made its voice heard as part of the parish-wide consultation on this document. It is not however made clear what that community requires that is not covered in the document.</p> <p>2) NOTED – it is considered that such spaces (indoor and outdoor) already exist and that the issue is the provision (or lack of) activities within such spaces, in which the teenagers themselves should be playing a pro-active role.</p> <p>3) NOTED – it is not within the gift of a Neighbourhood Plan to create part-time or any other work opportunities. What the plan is intending, through its policies on community facility and employment site protection, is to create the conditions for continued employment of various types within the parish, some of which will inevitably be</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – add new community re facilitating teenager engagement in parish youth activities. 3) NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>Better quality rail links, but with whom or what?</p> <p>The Village should be protected from becoming a part of a larger Harrogate. The entrance routes to Harrogate though the Village should be cherished.</p>	<p>part-time and suitable for all ages. The newly allocated employment site at 'South of Almsford Bridge' will provide further local employment opportunities of all types.</p> <p>NOTED – 'better quality' relates to the standard of rolling stock and other service features rather than to destinations.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Aim 1	In #1 emphasise more the connectivity (network can be ambiguous) so 'connected into accessible green/blue corridors' through and around the parish e.g.	NOTED – connection is implicit in the definition of network.	NO ACTION
Aim 3	<p>I would only say that the third aim could be augmented. "All new development is in keeping with historical, architectural and landscape quality". This is a bit black or white. Some new development actually looks better by being obviously modern rather than a pastiche. There maybe provision for this under the relevant Policy but the key is we want very high quality sympathetic design.</p> <p>Slight worry about the 3rd aim re new development being in keeping with existing architectural quality as the reality is that current development is of very mixed architectural quality - perhaps the aim should be to increase the quality or at least match the best of existing buildings?</p>	<p>NOTED – the key word here is 'quality' rather than say 'style' – development can indeed be modern and in keeping with existing historical etc. quality. Policy will make it clear that innovative new development has a place.</p> <p>NOTED – the design policies which will appear in the draft plan will be nuanced in terms of relating new development to the existing character of the area of the parish in which it is proposed. As such, it may well be that development in an area of poor existing character is expected to be innovative/an</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

		improvement in order to raise standards.	
Aim 4	<p>Happy with the aims and objectives, with the one caveat that the "developing of better routes for cyclists and public right of way users" doesn't adversely impact on the improvements of transport infrastructure and services. i.e that the needs of cyclists are not given preference over those of car users.</p> <p>I would extend the 4th bullet to match the comment above for the vision statement.</p> <p>A vision of "a local rural road network no longer overburdened by unwanted commuter traffic" does not seem to equate with the aim to achieve the vision "by improving transport infrastructure and services, alleviating congestion"</p> <p>Re improvement of transport infrastructure, while I agree with the overall aim, I would like the 36 bus service to be mentioned specifically and supported as a vital connection between Pannal and Leeds, Harrogate and Ripon.</p>	<p>NOTED – in practice, it is unlikely that any proposals that may appear in the draft plan for cycle route creation/ improvement will have an adverse impact on other users.</p> <p>NOTED – any change to the vision with a direct implication for an aim will also result in an amended aim where deemed necessary.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the aim of ‘alleviating congestion’ equates perfectly with the vision of reduced commuter traffic. The aim of improving infrastructure/ services covers, for e.g., improved rail services (which could reduce commuter traffic) or to footpath creation/ improvement.</p> <p>NOTED – this is too specific a point to include in a general plan-wide aim. It is considered that the 36 service is of good quality with no indication of any threat to its continuation. As such no action is needed.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Aim 6	I don't agree that the Plan should seek to encourage the building of new homes irrespective of type (ref aims 6 and 7). The recently adopted Local Plan has defined the development limits and whilst developers might still seek	NOTED – in the case of Aim 6, the intent is to ensure that any homes that are built, primarily as a result of Local Plan allocations, meet local needs rather	NO ACTION

	<p>to build outside of these limits, the Plan should not in any way encourage this.</p> <p>Generally I support the 9 aims but have doubts about the reference in point 6 on housing to meet the needs of local people. What does local mean in this context? Does it mean Harrogate people, or Pannal people or Yorkshire people?</p> <p>c) Who would be the arbiter of 'homes of the right type'?</p> <p>There is a lot of emphasis on new housing developments which seems that you are resigned to the fact these will happen - more needs to be done to stop these awful developments. The developers always seem to get their own way and we need to put a stop to them destroying local communities, devaluing local properties and putting</p>	<p>than just being built in order to maximise developer profits.</p> <p>NOTED – local in the context of this Neighbourhood Plan, for Pannal & Burn Bridge Parish only, means the community of the parish.</p> <p>NOTED – the 'Housing' section of the document specifically cites the 2018 Housing Needs Survey carried out in the parish, which identified a threefold local housing need, and indicates the likelihood of a policy specifying a housing type mix that meets that identified need. The arbiters of what the policy states in the final submitted plan will be the community itself, via future consultations (NB consultation on this document overwhelming supported the proposed policy intention on housing mix). The arbiter of what the policy states in the final plan will be an independent examiner. The community itself is the ultimate arbiter as to whether the overall plan is adopted.</p> <p>NOTED – in the case of Aim 6, the emphasis is on trying to ensure that any houses built, primarily as a result of Local Plan allocations (which are a 'done deal'), meet local housing needs as well as developer's profit-led aspirations.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	up shoddy buildings without adding anything to the community!		
Aim 7	<p>I don't agree that the Plan should seek to encourage the building of new homes irrespective of type (ref aims 6 and 7). The recently adopted Local Plan has defined the development limits and whilst developers might still seek to build outside of these limits, the Plan should not in any way encourage this.</p> <p>No 7 - I'd question the need of more housing - there's been a lot already.</p> <p>Any new housing in the area should be kept to a minimum as infrastructure already stretched.</p> <p>#7 'positively influencing' very vague - not sure what it means - I think we should be bolder and say influence any new housing the reflect the essential principles of the village design and layout. sympathetic to heritage, adding to natural green space connectivity, adding cycling and walking access etc. thereby emphasising the exact terms that any new housing proposals will be judged by overall</p>	<p>NOTED – in the case of Aim 7, the intent is twofold (as reflected in Policy Intentions 2 & 3 in the Housing section of the document). Firstly to positively influence any future infill/windfall housing – either on vacant plots or as a result of re-development of currently built-on sites over the next 14 years. Proposals for such housing are inevitable and cannot be prevented by the Neighbourhood Plan. Secondly, in order to make it more difficult for speculative housing development proposals (which again the plan cannot prevent happening) to gain approval by HBC. In this latter regard, Aim 7 could perhaps be amended to make its intent clearer.</p> <p>NOTED – some future infill/windfall housing development is more or less inevitable over the 14 year plan period. No other housing, apart from Local Plan allocations, is anticipated and will be resisted.</p> <p>NOTED – the draft plan's design and housing policies will make these things explicit – such matters are too specific for a generic aim.</p>	<p>ACTION – amend aim to better reflect both indicated policy intentions.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>But rather than positively influencing building of more new housing, could we stop building more and more so our roads and school aren't massively overburdened and our green spaces lost? The huge development behind the station feels like more than enough new housing....</p> <p>There is a lot of emphasis on new housing developments which seems that you are resigned to the fact these will happen - more needs to be done to stop these awful developments. The developers always seem to get their own way and we need to put a stop to them destroying local communities, devaluing local properties and putting up shoddy buildings without adding anything to the community!</p> <p>I think that the current extension to the village housing meets the needs of the village for the next period. It will be difficult to develop further material housing without losing the separation of the village and preserving Pannal as a village community as opposed to a dormitory suburb of Leeds and Harrogate. Think infill residential only and redevelopment of existing development footprints is sufficient.</p>	<p>NOTED – some future infill/windfall housing development is more or less inevitable over the 14 year plan period. No other housing, apart from Local Plan allocations, is anticipated and will be resisted.</p> <p>NOTED – some future infill/windfall housing development is more or less inevitable over the 14 year plan period. The intent is to positively influence how/where this is delivered. No other housing, apart from Local Plan allocations, is anticipated and will be resisted. The quality of any housing built will be addressed via draft plan design policies.</p> <p>NOTED – the plan anticipates only infill/windfall development over the 14 year plan period and seeks to positively influence its delivery. It will resist any other housing proposals.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Aim 8	Overall good but what is appropriate employment.	NOTED – employment only in the types of uses/sectors already present at the locations set out in policy intention ED1 in the Economic Development section of the document – these will be specified in draft plan policy.	NO ACTION

	<p>I think that they seem broadly fine, though I am not sure how realistic "local employment opportunities" will be given the size of the area and the lack of local businesses following the replacement of the old Dunlopillo site area with housing.</p> <p>Mostly agree, but concerned about local employment issues in light of Costa, Crimple Hall and any future developments.</p>	<p>NOTED – such opportunities will reside in existing local employment sites, as set out in policy intention ED1, and in existing commercial community facilities/services as set out in CFS1.</p> <p>NOTED – the intention is to control the types of employment uses allowed on existing sites, as set out in ED1, while also protecting those sites for employment uses. The plan cannot influence the types of uses already allocated by the Local Plan on the South of Almsford Bridge site.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Aim 9	No 9 is a bit wishywashy	NOTED – the draft plan’s design policies which flow from this necessarily general aim will make layout and design requirements clear.	NO ACTION
Aims - General	<p>They are clearly stated and in the best interest of the village</p> <p>Agree with all.</p> <p>There is no mention of a bus service. The lack of buses through the village is a severe limitation on the connectivity of Pannal which contributes to the increase in car use.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>what are your 9 aims? it's just not clear in this document.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – bus services/public transport generally is implicit in the term ‘transport infrastructure and services’. The service through the village was withdrawn due to lack of community use.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – they are set out on P4-5 of the document under the heading ‘How the</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – amend heading as indicated.</p>

		plan aims to achieve vision'. In the interests of total clarity, the draft plan heading will be amended to 'Plan Aims'.	
	They seem sensible and deliverable	NOTED	NO ACTION
	All the aims are relevant to our community. I agree with all of them.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Fully agree	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Agree with the aims in general. The aspirations for housing development are good but how far developers will be made to follow these is a crucial issue.	NOTED – once the aspirations are carried through into planning policies in the plan and the plan is finally 'adopted', developers must take account of the policies in exactly the same way they must take account of Harrogate Local Plan policies.	NO ACTION
	I agree with all the stated aims, especially the first three that should underpin all the other 6 aims	NOTED – the primacy of these issues in the vision and the ordering of document sections reflects the importance placed on the natural and built environment in the plan/parish.	NO ACTION
	Hopefully achievable	NOTED – the plan's policies will be designed to achieve the plan aims.	NO ACTION
	I agree with the 9 aims and just hope they can be achieved	Once adopted, the plan/policies will carry the same weight as Harrogate Local Plan policies – their effectiveness will hinge on how rigorously they are applied by HBC officers/members (and their successors in the new unitary authority).	
	Agree	NOTED	NO ACTION

	All	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Agree	NOTED	NO ACTION
	ok all	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I agree with these aims, I would be concerned to ensure that they are not kept separate from one another and will link in. I.e when there is new development that infrastructure is also a part of that.	NOTED – the final adopted plan policies which will flow from the aims will be applied ‘in the round’ to any planning proposals that come forward in the parish.	NO ACTION
	I agree with all 9 aims	NOTED	NO ACTION
	should we explicitly aim to keep the village separated from Harrogate?	NOTED – this aspiration is already clearly embodied and upfront in the vision.	NO ACTION
	excellent	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Comprehensive.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	We would support all 9 aims with particular attention to controlling the amount of new development	NOTED	NO ACTION
	All seem OK = because they are pretty general, there is not much to disagree with.	NOTED – their generic nature sets the context for what will be detailed and specific policies.	NO ACTION
	And I would like to see a climate change / carbon reduction aim.	NOTED – acknowledged this is an important issue that needs full consideration.	ACTION – planning policy and community action options for the plan to address climate change issues to be considered and included in plan as appropriate/feasible.

	<p>1) We are all for the creation of jobs and businesses but the Crimple Valley between Pannal and Harrogate is not suitable for housing and industrial units of any type. The view towards the NYM and the White Horse with the viaduct is an iconic scene travelling into Harrogate. 2) Securing the current greenbelt from development should be of paramount priority. 3) How would these aims survive changes in government? How would they be resilient enough?</p> <p>The aims are well balanced and help to improve the community. Points 1 and 3 are particularly welcome</p> <p>Good. No clear mention of 'green' / sustainable building i.e. LEED or UKGBC registered developments, why not aim to set the standard for new build in the area?</p>	<p>1) NOTED – the document/ Neighbourhood Plan does not propose any such development and is powerless to prevent any such already set out in the Harrogate Local Plan. The plan’s policies will seek to protect key views such as those highlighted.</p> <p>2) NOTED – Neighbourhood Plans have no Green Belt policy remit – only HBC (and successor authorities) through their local Plans have Green Belt policy powers.</p> <p>3) NOTED – Neighbourhood Plans are prepared in good faith within the context of Acts of Parliament, Regulations, National Planning Policy and guidance etc.. They like all else are subject to changes in all of the above as a result of changing Government views (e.g. national policy was amended in July 2021)/changes in Government. It is impossible to legislate for such changes. What can be said is that once a Neighbourhood Plan is adopted, it carries as much weight as any plan adopted by HBC.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – acknowledged this is an important issue that needs full consideration.</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – planning policy and community action options for the plan to address climate change issues to be considered and included in plan as appropriate/feasible.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>We broadly agree with the nine aims and feel that taken together they offer a good chance of protecting and maintaining a village environment.</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>All very good</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>think we are missing a principle of modernisation i.e. protecting character and heritage whilst at the same time moving with the times in respect to broadband access, green transport, remote working, local employment</p>	<p>NOTED – it is considered that local employment is specifically addressed via Aim 8 and in the policies section. The remaining issues are implicit in the vision’s references to “taking full advantage of new technological developments” and “moving with the times”. Green transport is also addressed via a community action in the Transport etc. section. Broadband access is already being addressed on the ground.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>They seem to be appropriate to the local area and ethos</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Agree with all</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Agree with these. I agree with them all.</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>I feel the aims listed are a positive step</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Agree with them all</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Very good but you will need the co-operation of both Harrogate and North Yorkshire councils and that won't be easy to get.</p>	<p>NOTED – Harrogate Council (or its unitary successor) will ultimately adopt the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) and be responsible for applying its policies alongside those of the adopted Harrogate Local Plan. They are also a statutory consultee in its preparation.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>They're all relevant but only if some of the officers and elected councillors at Harrogate Borough Council will work to achieve them. Their record is not good to date.</p>		

		The ultimate arbiter of its final policy content however is an independent examiner not the local authority. NYCC are a statutory consultee but have planning powers only in respect of minerals and waste matters which are expressly excluded as NP topics. They are however a key partner in Highways matters.	
	on the whole they seem okay	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I agree with all 9 aims	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I consider the Aims set out comprehensively describe a P&BB that I would want to be part of.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Whilst I agree with the broad aims can some reference be made to support the issues around climate change beyond the green spaces, transport and housing, ie, so that it is an aim in it's own right.	NOTED – acknowledged this is an important issue that needs full consideration.	ACTION – planning policy and community action options for the plan to address climate change issues to be considered and included in plan as appropriate/feasible.
	Support them all	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Agree	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Like the aims and no objection to any of them	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I agree with your aspirations	NOTED	NO ACTION
	A good framework, especially in relation to traffic	NOTED	NO ACTION
	How realistic are these aims e.g developments in keeping with existing historical, architectural and landscape	NOTED – the aims and the policy intentions which flow from them are commonplace and tried/tested in	NO ACTION

	<p>quality. There are several completed and current developments in the area that don't meet these objectives</p> <p>Agree with aims.</p> <p>The aims are for the village boundaries of Pannal and BurnBridge, not so much the wider Parish Boundary. Those of us who live on Rossett Green Lane and Church Lane and guard the green area between Harrogate and Burn Bridge /Pannal should have some recognition or that green space will get developed!</p> <p>What has been stated are reasonable requests that enables Pannal to be truly recognised as a village.</p> <p>Agree with them all.</p> <p>All laudable</p> <p>Impressive</p> <p>they are aspirational but I doubt achievable . New development sites...The housing development at Jubilee Park, is an example of not being in keeping with the area. additional housing is needed I absolutely agree but this development is just a crush of red brick houses out of keeping with the village. it could have been so much better - even the name bears no link to the community !</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Plans. Once the plan is adopted its policies in this respect must be applied to new development proposals. Clearly the plan's as yet unadopted aims/policies can have no bearing on historical developments and their perceived failings.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – the aims, indeed the entirety of the document and the NP which will grow out of it relate to all of Pannal & Burn Bridge Parish. This includes Church Lane in its entirety and all land/properties south of Rossett Green Lane. It is not clear why it is thought otherwise.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that though challenging the vision/aims are achievable over a 14 year period. Clearly the plan's as yet unadopted aims/policies can have no bearing on historical developments and their perceived failings.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>commendable</p> <p>Generally agree with them</p> <p>I like them a lot and think they represent a comprehensive identification of approach to the future challenges facing Pannal, Burn Bridge and the Crimple Beck valley.</p> <p>Agree with the aims</p> <p>Agree with the aims.</p> <p>I think they are well thought out.</p> <p>Reasonable & achievable</p> <p>Agree with these broadly.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
PI GNE1	<p>1) Green issues are likely to be linked to important factors such as climate change and extreme weather. 2) An area at the back of the church appears to be a messy dumping ground.</p> <p>You have stated that "policy" will protect the blue infrastructure network, which was mentioned twice, but no expansion as to how from persistent pollution as like Sunday</p>	<p>1) NOTED – acknowledged this is an important issue that needs full consideration.</p> <p>2) NOTED – land is HBC owned. PC periodically approaches HBC re its condition and can do so again.</p> <p>NOTED – in the absence of specific information, it is assumed comment relates to Clark Beck. The cause is unknown. Incidents are referred to HBC but invariably clear before action is taken. NP planning policy can only relate to protection against adverse effects of development not incidents such as this.</p>	<p>1) ACTION – planning policy and community action options for the plan to address climate change issues to be considered and included in plan as appropriate/feasible.</p> <p>2) ACTION – approach HBC re maintenance of land.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Critical to the nature of the Parish as a village. Fundamental to the physical and mental health of villagers that we can access natural and wild green spaces without using powered transport.</p> <p>1) I have lived in Pannal for over 20 years and don't even know the names of the Woods! They are in this document I assume (although the most important map wasn't printed!) How about putting up the names of the Woods so that we connect to our environment, simply but effective in feeling a sense of belonging. 2) The allotments have been talked about til the cows come home, surely this would be simple to sort. Too much hot air and not enough action in my opinion, sorry</p> <p>The importance of maintaining the green space separation of the Parish from Harrogate is stated in the intro but not specifically identified in GNE1</p> <p>We need as much open space as possible</p> <p>A 'green and blue infrastructure' really does need explaining.</p> <p>The 'wellness' effect of our 'greenspaces' cannot and should not be underestimated</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED – where relevant to the plan, the names of woods will be included. Erection of signs naming local woods is a good idea. There is no printable NP map at this early stage.</p> <p>2) NOTED – not as simple as might be supposed due to land ownership issues amongst others. The NP will help by putting in place a supportive policy context.</p> <p>NOTED – the green space 'gap' in question will form a key part of the infrastructure network referred to in GNE1. As such, it will be subject to policy protection. It must however be borne in mind that the NP cannot put in place any stronger protection that that provided by the Local Plan. NP policy will add another layer to existing Local Plan protection.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – para 2 (lines 2-4) of the document on P7 does explain the terminology. This will be expanded on in the draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) ACTION – incorporate names of woods in draft plan where appropriate and approach HBC (main woodland owner) re erection of signage with name and some information.</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>I think the importance of the green space between the village and Harrogate should be stressed more</p>	<p>NOTED – it is already addressed via GNE1 and GNE2 in the document. The resultant draft NP policies will add protection layers to those already provided by the Local Plan. The NP cannot provide stronger protection than that afforded by the Local Plan.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Would it be wise to differentiate between open spaces with public access and those without such access - these latter are still important.</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP’s policies will cover both across a range of policies.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Provided there is no rampant extension of "conservation" areas and tree preservation orders.</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP has no powers in respect of either conservation area designation or TPOs. It will however introduce local designations to better conserve areas/features of evidenced value.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>We are unsure of the need for allotments</p>	<p>NOTED – community consultation has indicated and continues to indicate significant support for provision.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>The environmental green spaces appear a secondary aim to enhancement (OK) extension (reads like extension is a done deal and this is to make it more palatable).</p>	<p>DISAGREE – this interpretation of the NP’s policy intentions is not recognised and is inaccurate.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>This is crucial to protect the distinctive historical and semi rural aspect of Pannal, maintain the SLA's and ensure the protection of local assets</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Strengthen to emphasise true connectivity between green spaces to create connections for people to be able to walk, ride, cycle through spaces, in safe pathways, and to other non-motorised pathways outside the parish.</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP policy provisions will be as strong and comprehensive as they can be within the national policy and</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Agree for the most part but Green Belt needs a review as its implementation almost 50 years ago was completely arbitrary with Special Landscape Areas excluded. Some of the land in the Green Belt is more suited to development than any on SLAs.</p> <p>Consider allocation of an area to be “rewilded” to allow nature to develop unhindered.</p> <p>Important that we stand alone and aren't absorbed by Harrogate</p> <p>1) The as yet undeveloped football pitches on the former Dunlopillo site are not needed with the vast number of football pitches recently and welcomed on Leeds Rd. They would also cause congestion and parking problems on the housing estate. better to provide tennis courts. 2) Allotments are I believe a legal requirement, one of the few that the Parish Council has to provide.</p> <p>The policy is fine but it doesn't say anything yet, really. It depends which open spaces are identified for protection. The danger with this policy is that any area not identified for protection will then be open season for developers.</p>	<p>Local Plan context that they must be prepared.</p> <p>NOTED – Green Belt review can only be undertaken by HBC (or its successor authority) as part of a Local Plan review. NPs have no Green Belt policy remit.</p> <p>NOTED – rewilding is not a planning policy matter for which land can be formally ‘allocated’. Land set-aside for this purpose is also dependent on land ownership. The HBC-owned ‘Crimple Seasonal Wetland’ includes rough agricultural land between beck and footpath which may be suitable. Suggestions as to possible areas would be useful.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>1) Such a revision to approved plans is not within the gift of the NP. 2) NOTED – PCs do have a duty to provide allotments. The PC is endeavouring to do so and the NP will help in this regard. Landownership is an obstacle.</p> <p>NOTED – it is not yet a policy, merely the statement of a policy intention. The policy will appear in the next stage draft plan. The map which will accompany the draft plan will identify all areas for</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re approaching HBC re rewilding idea as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>Would be a yes if I understood specific areas that were to be assigned for development. An overall map of the area showing different area classifications would be very helpful.</p> <p>I could have if I knew what 'blue' infrastructure was.</p> <p>Improve access for all, able and disabled, where possible. Help the local people to easily enjoy and relate to the local Green and Blue Infrastructure.</p>	<p>protection. Plans, whether NPs or Local Plans, cannot protect every piece of open land from development – only those where there is an evidenced case for protection.</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan will identify all areas for protection. In the meantime, the Harrogate Local Plan Proposals Map provides the most up-to-date picture of areas currently allocated for development/protection.</p> <p>NOTED – the term is explained in the document (P7/para 2/lines 2-4), i.e. watercourses and water bodies.</p> <p>NOTED – access to green/blue infrastructure is addressed via TTT1.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI GNE2	<p>The 3 lines in the document appear to be something of a 'wish list' with nothing very 'concrete'. It is rather a wish list</p> <p>It is not up to the Parish to dictate what changes should be made to this area.</p>	<p>NOTED – as explained in the document (P6/para 2), only 'policy intentions' are stated at this stage. Actual detailed policies will be included at the next draft plan stage.</p> <p>DISAGREE – as explained in the document (P3/para 1), a parish council is, since 2011, legally empowered to produce Neighbourhood Plans setting out planning policies/proposals for its area which, once adopted become part of the statutory Development Plan alongside the district council's Local Plan.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Would prefer no further development in the Crimple Valley</p> <p>See above</p> <p>Vital to preserve the SLA.</p> <p>Agreed but must have clear guidelines and not subjective criteria so avoiding room for argument</p> <p>1) where is this exactly? Do Pannal villagers know?? 2) What about more simply ideas, like adding more park benches or asking someone to cut the hedge up Church Lane so that the bench there can enjoy the views of the crag!!</p> <p>1) As I comment in point 2 above, the Plan should not seek to set criteria for development outside of the development limits set in the Local Plan as this could be seen to condone and encourage such development. Given the village is surrounded by the Upper Crimple Valley SLA and Green Belt, any such development would encroach further on these important landscapes and reduce the separation from the more urban Harrogate. 2) For any new infill or replacement building within the development limits, layout and design criteria could be helpful.</p>	<p>NOTED – adopted Local Plan policy, which the NP cannot conflict with or override, already allows for some development in the Crimple Valley. The NP cannot change this only seek to shape it.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – policy in the draft plan will do this as far as possible within a national and Local Plan policy context.</p> <p>1) NOTED – the extent of the Crimple Valley SLA is shown on the Harrogate Local Plan Proposals Map. It will also be shown on the NP Map which will accompany the next stage draft plan. 2) NOTED – the hedge issue is periodically addressed by the PC. Suggested locations for benches would be useful.</p> <p>1) DISAGREE – Local Plan Policy NE4 (Landscape Character) already allows for appropriate development within the SLA, but subject only to 2 generic criteria. The NP seeks to supplement this by adding more detailed local criteria relative to the specific character (s) of the Crimple Valley SLA. 2) NOTED – this intention is set out in the document’s Housing section and</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>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>Crimple Valley needs protection from whatever nibbles along its edges. There is important grazing land where the beck flows through Pannal, not just a pretty picture and perhaps someone's livelihood.</p> <p>crimple Valley view is very, very important</p> <p>The Intention should be strengthened to include resisting inappropriate development.</p> <p>danger is it will be too subjective</p> <p>The Crimple Valley SLA is important to the parish in that it provides a green buffer between the parish and Harrogate, thus ensuring the continuance of the parish's separate identity, a factor that is of great importance to its residents.</p> <p>However, the criteria is woolly and has not be defined in the document. What are the distinctive landscape features? What would fit?</p> <p>CV SLA has already been compromised with the approval of employment development on the A61 opposite Crimple Hall by HBC to the dismay of local residents. It is imperative that its natural beauty is maintained and</p>	<p>will be realised through draft plan policies.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP planning policies will do all it can to add to the protection of the valley from development.</p> <p>NOTED – the importance of views and vistas is specifically acknowledged in GNE2.</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan policy will do just this, in line with adopted Local Plan Policy NE4.</p> <p>NOTED – policy wording in the next stage draft plan will be made as unambiguous as possible.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan policy, flowing from this document's generic policy intention, will set out detailed criteria based on a detailed assessment of landscape character.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP will do its utmost to do this, but is constrained by both national and Local Plan policies.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – ensure 'resistance of inappropriate development' forms part of policy wording.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>protected from further development by HBC for all to enjoy.</p> <p>How can we protect the view and vista in the distance way out of our area i.e. the waste incinerator next to the A1?</p> <p>Yes, with addition that we need to identify here (or elsewhere if appropriate) A wide range of vistas/views that need protection.</p> <p>The Crimple valley should be protected at all costs.</p> <p>I think it important to recognise and acknowledge that the Crimple Valley is more than the area between St Robert's Church and Almsford Bank. It extends southward at least as far as Buttersyke.</p> <p>Important not to lose this special landscape area, bit by bit. Before you know it, it will be swallowed up and lost forever</p> <p>I would but cannot see how the village can effect this in face of the Borough Councils drive to sell off PN18 for cash</p> <p>The policy should be to protect and enhance all of the special landscape areas to make it as difficult as possible for developers.</p>	<p>NOTED – NP policies will do what they can through the influence they can exert over developments on land within the parish.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP will identify key views/ vistas and include policies designed to protect them.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP will do its utmost in this regard, subject to national and Local Plan policy contexts.</p> <p>NOTED - if/where the Crimple Valley extends beyond the designated SLA, this extension could be covered, if deemed appropriate, by the NP's green/blue infrastructure designation.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – while the NP/PC can do nothing about historical decisions made elsewhere, it can do its best to protect what remains for the future.</p> <p>NOTED – the intention behind GNE1 & GNE3 in the document is to endeavour to protect/enhance other areas of landscape value.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider the area specified as being outside the SLA for inclusion within green/blue infrastructure.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>this is imperative. We need to to maintain development but we need to build in keeping with the landscape and area. Costa Coffee drive through ? come on - design is so important.</p> <p>This would be important to preserve the appearance of the village and ensure developers keep to local rules</p> <p>Views and vistas ok but you need to allow for different tastes and characters to be experienced. Not just twee village design!</p> <p>Greenbelt and 3 Special Landscape Areas cover land within the Parish. Their wording and status should be upheld in any new plans. Watering down the language may let unwelcome development erode the village character, and that of Harrogate.</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP will endeavour to improve design standards across a range of design policies.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – policies will allow for innovative/modern design in keeping with local character.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP cannot water down what is already stated in adopted Local Plan policies. NP policy cannot in any way address Green Belt policy as Green Belt is not a NP matter. As a matter of fact, there is only 1 named SLA in the parish (ref Local Plan policy), which is then sub-divided into compartments in the HBC Landscape Assessment.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI GNE3	<p>Not sure what some of these areas are, eg Pannal Community Park</p> <p>I have no objection to change of use</p> <p>1) No further development to Pannal Green. 2) Demolish garage areas to accomodate future power points for electric cars. Garages are not fit for purpose these days, new cars are too large</p> <p>How can we include protection against development of the farming/grazing fields on Woodcock Hill? Could this be included as a green space to preserve or rather under</p>	<p>NOTED – all named areas will be clearly identified on a map accompanying he next stage draft NP.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED – LGS designation should prevent development. 2) NOTED – this is beyond the remit of NPs.</p> <p>NOTED – this area is already designated Special Landscape Area (SLA) in the adopted Local Plan – NP policy will</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include in identified green and blue infrastructure network.</p>

	<p>Policy Intention GNE6 (i.e. biodiversity/nature conservation). It is such a special place and green field oasis in middle of our beautiful Pannal.</p> <p>All these areas are most important to provide sporting facilities for young people especially.</p> <p>Think you've already identified them, how are you going to protect them?</p> <p>Not sure if this includes the path along the beck and the pond</p> <p>I would add that the Special Landscape Area which falls within the Parish boundary should also be identified and protected.</p> <p>It is more of a wishlist, rather than a policy.</p> <p>the plan also needs to consider, if appropriate, the field next to Spacey Houses Whin, off the Follyfoot Road, which has interesting plants, according to Harrogate and District Naturalists Society.</p>	<p>supplement this policy. Inclusion in the NP's green and blue infrastructure policy would add another layer of protection. The area would not however meet criteria for Local Green Space designation.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage plan will additionally clearly identify them on a map, showing boundaries for each. LGS designation effectively gives them Green Belt status – the strongest protection against development available.</p> <p>NOTED – on assumption this refers to 'corridor' between Burn Bridge and Pannal, it can be assessed as a candidate LGS site.</p> <p>NOTED – the SLA is too large an area to be eligible for LGS designation.</p> <p>NOTED – as explained in the document (P6/para 2) these are 'policy intentions' not policies – the detailed policies will appear in the next stage draft NP.</p> <p>NOTED – sites such as this can be assessed as candidate LGS sites.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider whether site suitable as LGS candidate and assess if so.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider whether site suitable as LGS candidate and assess if so.</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>Include footpath (ringway)between Pannal and Burn Bridge as a natural wildlife environment for non development</p> <p>The current heatwave has shown how valuable and well loved is the green wooded land encircling Pannal and Burn Bridge. The paths all around are very well trodden.</p> <p>The 'Crimple seasonal wetland' provides an excellent chance to create and protect an essential bio-diverse area which would be accessible to everyone. An opportunity for an outside classroom maybe?</p> <p>The list is not complete, e.g the football pitches at the rear of the Dunlopillo site and the wooded area on the left going up Follifoot road should be included</p> <p>add crimple valley SLA duck pond</p> <p>Please add Spring Lane land to this list</p> <p>However, the scope is too limited - include the Crimple Valley, Woodcock Hill and Daw Cross/Hilltop Lane.</p>	<p>NOTED – sites such as this can be assessed as candidate LGS sites.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – this may well be the case but is an issue for the school not the NP/PC.</p> <p>NOTED – it is acknowledged that the list may not be definitive – hence the use of ‘including’. The ‘Follifoot Rd site can be assessed as a candidate LGS. The football pitches are not yet created/used so too early to assess for LGS.</p> <p>NOTED – sites such as this can be assessed as candidate LGS sites.</p> <p>NOTED – unclear exactly which area of land is meant so impossible to respond meaningfully.</p> <p>NOTED – it is acknowledged that the list may not be definitive – hence the use of ‘including’. Crimple Valley is too large an area to be eligible for LGS designation. Woodcock Hill and Daw</p>	<p>ACTION – consider whether site suitable as LGS candidate and assess if so.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider whether Follifoot Rd site suitable as LGS candidate and assess if so.</p> <p>ACTION – consider whether site suitable as LGS candidate and assess if so.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider whether site suitable as LGS candidate and assess if so.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>Again, the protection of local green space is vital for maintaining and enhancing the lifestyle quality of local residents and visitors.</p> <p>Yes, but with addition of other areas - this is not exhaustive - the Environment sub-group have identified others and will add details. Others need nominated protection.</p> <p>Our local green spaces are all very precious.</p> <p>1) Spelling of 'Allen Wood'? Thought it was 'Allan Wood' 2) Can we include any part of the land behind the Church which is farmed but could also be accessible to the public as it is, informally, now.</p> <p>The "management" of Allen Wood is overdue. A significant reduction of trees in the early 90's never produced the glades and clearings that were planned.</p> <p>Crimple wetland should be promoted. The agricultural value of the adjoining areas must be very low.</p> <p>Agree essential to protect these areas</p> <p>Important to protect and retain all local green spaces</p>	<p>Cross/Hilltop Lane can be assessed as candidate LGS sites.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is acknowledged that the list may not be definitive – hence the use of 'including'. Further sites can be assessed as candidate LGS sites.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED – Allen Wood is considered by NP steering group to be correct spelling. 2) NOTED – as agricultural land, this would not meet LGS eligibility criteria. Also already within SLA so has some protection/status.</p> <p>NOTED – HBC owned. Management could be improved.</p> <p>NOTED – meaning of comment unclear. As such, difficult to respond meaningfully. Decisions re agricultural land are down to the farmer responsible.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – Environment 'sub-group' to provide details of further candidate sites for assessment.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re encouraging management.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>1) Again - any area not listed here will be open season for developers. 2) This policy seems to be very focussed on the village itself rather than the wider parish. Please remember that the parish includes parts of Rossett Green Lane and Yew Tree Lane and we are the buffer between Harrogate and Pannal parish. The green space in the very narrow wedge between Rossett Green Lane/Yew Tree Lane and Burn Bridge should be specifically protected.</p> <p>The land at the top of Drury Lane between the by-pass and the Golf Club could be considered,</p> <p>All concentrated on Pannal but no mention of Burn Bridge areas</p> <p>Any strengthening of protection would be welcome.</p> <p>HBC – make sure you have robust evidence and justification for the areas you choose with reference to the Local Green Space designation criteria in the NPPF.</p> <p>Scrub land near All Saints Court/Stone Rings Beck, Almsford Bank Wood and wet meadows west of the footpath off Follifoot Road are all belonging to HBC should also be valued. Spacey Houses Whin Wood (part) is also valuable and has public access. Setting of path from Mill Lane to Burn Bridge Road beside beck to be cherished.</p>	<p>1) NOTED – all sites put forward which meet the eligibility criteria following assessment will be put forward for designation.</p> <p>2) NOTED – the green space wedge specified is likely to be too large for LGS designation, but can be considered for inclusion within green/blue infrastructure. It is already SLA. All candidate sites in this area that are put forward for LGS designation will be assessed against the eligibility criteria.</p> <p>NOTED – sites such as this (Black Wood?) can be assessed as candidate LGS sites.</p> <p>NOTED - any candidate sites in Burn Bridge area that are put forward for LGS designation will be assessed against the eligibility criteria.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – all candidate LGS sites are being/will be assessed using a pro-forma embodying the NPPF eligibility criteria.</p> <p>NOTED - sites such as these can be assessed as candidate LGS sites.</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION</p> <p>2) ACTION – consider specified green wedge for inclusion in blue/green infrastructure.</p> <p>ACTION – consider whether site suitable as LGS candidate and assess if so.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider whether site suitable as LGS candidate and assess if so.</p>
--	---	--	--

<p>PI GNE4</p>	<p>Generalised 2 line 'wish list'</p> <p>This is too vague. It needs more focus.</p> <p>don't understand the question here at all, ie how?</p> <p>see comment above. Tree planting should be in appropriate areas.</p> <p>Not too much 'enhancement' please.</p> <p>open spaces are vital .</p> <p>Provided there is no rampant extension of "conservation" areas and tree preservation orders.</p> <p>Yes, with more specificity on enhancements - we should be specific on the need for tree planting with native species in more of the green area network and connecting routes.</p> <p>1) More details needed. 2) Would love to see an entirely new playground on the village field, for example.</p>	<p>NOTED – as explained in the document (P6/para 2), only 'policy intentions' are stated at this stage. Actual detailed policies will be included at the next draft plan stage.</p> <p>NOTED – the detailed policy in the next stage draft plan will hopefully make this clear.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy intention makes no mention of tree planting. If there were to be any tree planting on any site, by way of enhancement, it would only be done if/as appropriate.</p> <p>NOTED – any enhancement would be relative to the needs, existing character /functions of any given site.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the meaning of this comment in relation to this particular policy intention is not clear.</p> <p>NOTED – any enhancement would be relative to the needs, existing character /functions of any given site.</p> <p>1) NOTED – the detailed policy in the next stage draft plan will provide more detail. Any enhancement would be relative to the needs, existing character /functions of any given site.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – add community action as indicated.</p>
----------------	--	---	---

	<p>See comment on GNE3</p> <p>In total agreement</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>We are a rural village and should remain so but this will be difficult in view of the vast increase in house developments on Otley Road, Whinney Lane, the old Police training Centre etc. etc.</p> <p>Same comments as above - those areas not deemed worthy of enhancement will be concreted over!</p> <p>HBC – how are you going to differentiate between allocated Local Green Spaces and other green spaces. Make sure that there is no confusion – maybe change terminology of non-allocated sites.</p> <p>Also the confirmation of exiting popular path routes over HBC land as PROW, to support for the long term existing and extra nature conservation on areas of poor farmland.</p>	<p>2) NOTED – ‘village field’ taken to be Crimple Meadows – provision for small children here is supported.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the NP cannot answer for or address historical decisions.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP will do its utmost to protect green areas of evidenced local value. It is simply not possible for it to protect every piece of undeveloped land.</p> <p>NOTED – consideration will be given to how possible confusion could be avoided, with particular reference to how such confusion as been voided in other ‘made’ NPs.</p> <p>NOTED – PROW designation /confirmation matters are non-planning. This could however be looked at as part of the work to identify PROW network expansion and improvement.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – avoid possible confusion as highlighted through careful policy wording.</p> <p>ACTION – investigate as part of PROW network work as indicated.</p>
PI GNE5	<p>Bit like as above - where are the allotments, tennis courts and bowling green going to go?</p>	<p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan policy may identify a specific site/sites if such can be identified. If not the policy</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Not specific</p> <p>Yes, we need tennis courts, bowling green etc.</p> <p>These facilities are lacking in the area without having to use powered transport to reach them.</p> <p>More areas are needed for the needs of items listed in GNE5.</p> <p>Tennis courts and a bowling green would require significant investment to build and maintain. I need convincing that there isn't sufficient provision already elsewhere in Harrogate. I expect a bowling green would appeal primarily to our older residents - will the demand still be there for a bowling green in 20 years? Aren't some bowling greens struggling to maintain their membership and meet their costs? Building a bowling green and tennis courts would require building on a significant amount of green space - the protection of which is one of the other priorities</p> <p>The parish council already support this but nothing has happened to date, so why not? particularly allotment provision?</p> <p>I am personally very keen on the idea of allotments. I can see how tennis courts and a bowling green could enhance health and social interaction of several age groups in our community and therefore also think these are a good idea.</p> <p>If this involves taking out existing natural green areas, we would prefer that these were retained as they are currently. <i>(NB remaining text missing)</i></p>	<p>will appear as an aspiration, perhaps with criteria as to suitable location types.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – a policy aspiration for such facilities does not constitute a commitment to any expenditure on the part of the PC. Parish facilities would be more sustainable, removing the need for travel – probably by car. A bowling green is a form of green space. Neither bowling green nor tennis courts take up ‘significant’ amounts of space. Draft plan policy may well identify a suitable site/sites or set out locational criteria.</p> <p>NOTED – landownership obstacles.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - draft plan policy may well identify a suitable site/sites or set out locational criteria.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>Allotments would be a valuable addition to the village</p> <p>Allotments are required in this area as we are encouraged to grow our own vegetables</p> <p>Have doubts re necessity of provision of tennis courts/bowling green. There is probably sufficient provision in the Harrogate area already.</p> <p>It should be ensured this is not focused on Pannal village but it spread evenly throughout the parish in Walton area and Burnbridge.</p> <p>As previously mentioned, unsure of need for allotments</p> <p>Difficult to see where the land for some of these would be found, and they are quite high maintenance facilities.</p> <p>But where would you place these? Would these have a negative impact on the diversity of wildlife and plantlife in the area?</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – community consultation, including on this document, show strong support for provision. Parish facilities would be more sustainable, removing the need for travel – probably by car.</p> <p>NOTED - draft plan policy may well identify a suitable site/sites or set out locational criteria. Specific suggestions re Burn Bridge/Walton are welcomed.</p> <p>NOTED – community consultation, including on this document, shows strong support for provision.</p> <p>NOTED - draft plan policy may well identify a suitable site/sites or set out locational criteria. Any commitment to provide would need to be underpinned by a clear future business/management plan.</p> <p>NOTED - draft plan policy may well identify a suitable site/sites or set out locational criteria, e.g. in order to avoid adverse impacts on wildlife.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>Particularly important In a post covid world as this adds real value to local residents' quality of life at little cost to the council.</p> <p>1) This will be hard to provide, even if a green space, 'NIMBY's' will object... noise, light pollution, additional car parking will all be used against such a development even though the village is crying out for such things as tennis or bowls. 2) There are areas which could be used for such things i.e. at the northern end of Rosedale.</p> <p>I'm not sure how you create new green space without adapting what is already there... I think unspoiled green space is best for the environment.</p> <p>Are tennis courts and a bowling green going to be financially viable.? They take a lot of upkeep and would need to be well supported and paid for by the users.</p> <p>Tennis courts and a bowling green would serve only a very limited section of the parish. A multi-sport pitch involving basketball, netball, tennis, walking football, children's football, etc. all on astroturf would be a better proposition and be open to far more participants.</p> <p>I think there will be a need for additional playground facilities and particularly for the 1-5 year olds</p> <p>Allotments, tennis courts & bowling green are fantastic ideas. The village would really benefit from these new facilities.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED - draft plan policy may well identify a suitable site/sites or set out locational criteria, seeking to address such potential objections. 2) NOTED – the site is privately owned but owner’s intentions are not known.</p> <p>NOTED - draft plan policy may well identify a suitable site/sites or set out locational criteria, with an aim of not impacting adversely on valuable existing green space.</p> <p>NOTED - any commitment to provide would need to be underpinned by a clear future business/management plan.</p> <p>NOTED – community consultation, including on this document, shows strong support for provision. Not all provision will be used by all. That said, there is considered to be merit in the suggestion.</p> <p>NOTED – this is considered a suitable suggestion for Crimple Meadows.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – approach owner re future intentions.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add multi-sports pitch to policy.</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re play area for small children as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>Biodiversity and nature is integral to this area</p> <p>Especially allotments</p> <p>Depends where these amenities go, but in general support provision of such activities for the village</p> <p>Provided they meet evidenced needs</p> <p>Tennis courts not more football pitches for use by teams from all over harrogfate and Knaresborough.</p> <p>Suggest outside green space to sit, meet and chat</p> <p>This needs to be progressed as soon as possible</p> <p>Additional social facilities would make Pannal a better place to live and improve physical and mental fitness</p> <p>This will positively improve amenities in the area.</p> <p>Surely the provision of green space is determined by availability unless we transform brown space to green. I do not consider tennis courts to be green space - more likely to be hard courts.</p>	<p>NOTED - draft plan policy may well identify a suitable site/sites or set out locational criteria, e.g. in order to avoid adverse impacts on wildlife.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - draft plan policy may well identify a suitable site/sites or set out locational criteria.</p> <p>NOTED - community consultation, including on this document, shows strong support for provision.</p> <p>NOTED – there is no policy intention in respect of football pitches.</p> <p>NOTED – such spaces already exist – village green, Crimple Meadows, new space at Dunlopillo site. Specific suggestions to fill any perceived gaps welcomed.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – consideration will be given to using the term ‘open space’ rather than ‘green space’. New green space can be created from existing brown space.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider use of ‘open space’ wording rather than ‘green space’ in draft plan policy.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>What about things for the tweens? The play area is constantly full of black tracksuit wearing 13/14 year olds clogging up the children's areas</p> <p>Imbalanced on the needs of younger members of the community vs older members. Need places for younger / teenagers to safely hang out and be entertained.</p> <p>No allotments Bowling green and tennis courts could be sited in Crimple meadows</p> <p>HBC – I would make a change in the terminology here and maybe refer to them as open space rather than green space to avoid confusion with the allocated Local Green Space. Also open space would more accurately reflect areas such as tennis courts, bowling greens, which would more likely be classed as outdoor sport rather than green space.</p> <p>If locally, overprovision of certain facilities exists an alterative greenspace provision is made of that same land.</p>	<p>NOTED – it is considered that such spaces (indoor and outdoor) already exist and that the issue is the provision (or lack of) activities within such spaces, in which the teenagers themselves should be playing a pro-active role.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that such spaces (indoor and outdoor) already exist and that the issue is the provision (or lack of) activities within such spaces, in which the teenagers themselves should be playing a pro-active role.</p> <p>NOTED - draft plan policy may well identify a suitable site/sites or set out locational criteria to rule out unsuitable locations.</p> <p>NOTED – consideration will be given to using the term 'open space' rather than 'green space'.</p> <p>NOTED – this could be considered as part of policy.</p>	<p>ACTION – add new community re facilitating teenager engagement in parish youth activities.</p> <p>ACTION – add new community re facilitating teenager engagement in parish youth activities.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider use of 'open space' wording rather than 'green space' in draft plan policy.</p> <p>ACTION – consider additional policy clause to reflect comment.</p>
PI GNE6	<p>One sentence 'aspiration' - no details</p> <p>Vague</p> <p>Essential!</p>	<p>NOTED – the decision as to whether to include a policy on Biodiversity/Nature Conservation in the next stage draft plan is dependent on further consideration of existing HBC policies on these matters.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	See comment above for GNE3	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Joined up woodland contributes greatly to sustainable biodiversity.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Bio-diversity and nature conservation are much overlooked.	NOTED – initial consideration suggests that HBC Local Plan policies are very comprehensive.	NO ACTION
	isn't HBC policy enough?	NOTED – initial consideration suggests that HBC Local Plan policies are very comprehensive. The decision as to whether to include a policy on Biodiversity/Nature Conservation in the next stage draft plan is dependent on further consideration of HBC policies.	NO ACTION
	Biodiversity needs great care.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Why say Policy may be developed rather than will be developed?	NOTED – the decision as to whether to include a policy on Biodiversity/Nature Conservation in the next stage draft plan is dependent on further consideration of existing HBC policies on these matters.	NO ACTION
	On the proviso that it greatly strengthens HBC policy.		
	dont know what this means ?		
	Provided there is no rampant extension of "conservation" areas and tree preservation orders.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Not enough detail given to comment.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	We have no idea what HBC's policy is.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I'm surprised by the HBC allowing all the developments being on green belt.	NOTED – comment not relevant to the NP	NO ACTION

	<p>Biodiversity is very important and this local area has the potential to contribute much more</p> <p>Biodiversity and nature conservation is essential for the future, and is often overlooked by HBC.</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>Nature conservation yes, biodiversity no</p> <p>1) There needs to be more clarity on what are the gaps and what needs to be done. 2) The Parish is riddled with ivy and removing some of this might help with greater diversity of plants</p> <p>Not really enough information in this to agree or disagree</p> <p>Highlight existing Sites of Interest for Nature Conservation, encourage the designation of Local Nature Reserves, and Geological Sites. Encourage and support the production of information to promote and develop public interest in various aspects of their local environment.</p>	<p>NOTED – if a NP policy can add locally to existing HBC policy, then a policy will be included in the next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED – initial consideration suggests that HBC Local Plan policies on nature conservation are very comprehensive.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – the comment is nonsensical – the two go hand in hand.</p> <p>1) NOTED – the decision as to whether to include a policy on Biodiversity/Nature Conservation in the next stage draft plan is dependent on further consideration of existing HBC policies on these matters. 2) NOTED – this is far too detailed and at same time general a point to respond to meaningfully. Some information on ‘ivy hotspots’ would have been helpful.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – SINC’s should be highlighted on NP Map and where relevant to other NP policies. The other matters are non-planning in nature – designation of specific LNR/Geological sites already covered by community actions – no other candidates are known. HBC is to be approached re erection of</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>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – SINC’s to be included in NP as indicated. HBC to be approached re woodland signage.</p>
--	--	--	---

		information signage at its wood in the parish.	
PI GNE7	<p>As previous comment in GNE6</p> <p>what does this mean exactly. Villagers would need to know existing HBC policy to know how to answer this and I am sure the majority do not know what it is, I certainly don't!</p> <p>Vague</p> <p>It's crucial that we retain trees, hedgerows and woodlands especially as there are so many people uprooting these to accommodate cars in their driveways and creating house extensions.</p> <p>very much so - it is sad to see a lot of hedges getting removed for walls/fences for peoples gardens.</p> <p>Essential!</p> <p>Replace "may" by "will"</p> <p>Not enough detail yet.</p> <p>On the proviso that it greatly strengthens HBC policy - to make it better at protecting the environment (same for q8)</p> <p>Not enough detail given.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the decision as to whether to include a policy on Trees/Hedgerows/Woodlands in the next stage draft plan is dependent on further consideration of existing HBC policies on these matters.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the decision as to whether to include a policy on Trees/Hedgerows/Woodlands in the next stage draft plan is dependent on further consideration of existing HBC policies on these matters.</p> <p>NOTED – the decision as to whether to include a policy on Trees/Hedgerows/Woodlands in the next stage draft plan is dependent on further consideration of existing HBC policies on these matters.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>The preservation of local hedgerow and habitat is vitally important across all parts of the parish and development proposals such as Spring lane which severely disrupt and diminish this are not welcome in the local community</p> <p>Hedgerows.... so many people allow their hedges to overgrow the pavements. WHY???!!!</p> <p>We don't know what HBC's policy is.</p> <p>More trees planted both for wildlife and for supporting biodiversity.</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>The entire district has a shortage of mature trees, development should see the planting of more mature, and of course more expensive, trees as part of housing developers liability.</p> <p>as above</p> <p>Are there any opportunities to develop more woodland in the Parish?</p> <p>As with GNE6 no detail And just a "may be"</p> <p>This area is declining in birdlife, and perhaps the hedges are too thin to provide for nesting.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – PC periodically approaches owners re hedgerow management.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED– new tree planting is addressed under community actions and may yet be addressed via NP policy.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – new tree planting is addressed under community actions and may yet be addressed via NP policy.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – no specific schemes at moment but receptive to idea.</p> <p>NOTED – the decision as to whether to include a policy on Trees/Hedgerows/ Woodlands in the next stage draft plan is dependent on further consideration of existing HBC policies on these matters.</p> <p>NOTED – beyond the remit of the NP to address.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>1) Develop public awareness for the local trees and hedgerows and the wildlife it contains. 2) Identify locations where new provision would be most useful. Find land so that Northern Forest can create woodlands in the Parish.</p>	<p>1) NOTED 2) NOTED – could conceivably form part of planning policy, but may be better in community actions. More consideration needed.</p>	<p>1) ACTION - HBC to be approached re woodland signage in the parish. 2) ACTION – consider suggestion as either planning policy and/or community action issue.</p>
<p>Green & Natural Environment – Non-Planning Community Actions</p>	<p>1) Where would the tree planting take place? 2) I don't understand the Till Aquifer.</p> <p>Where is Till Aquifer?</p> <p>The Parish Council should have a record of 'Flora and Fauna' for the Parish. Essential in protecting our 'green spaces' from development.</p> <p>It is vital to protect hedgerows for our local wildlife, but this has to be tempered with transport, i.e. walking into the village the very thin pathway is often made smaller by the hedgerows. This means that people are often walking in the middle of the road to get around one another.</p> <p>Consider community purchase of important green space (as per Longlands Common)?</p> <p>The hedgerow protection status for Spring Lane would be very welcome by the local community.</p>	<p>1) NOTED – suitable sites not yet identified. 2) NOTED – part of the 'Harrogate Till' aquifer, i.e. permeable rock containing groundwater, underlies the parish. What happens above it has implications for it and vice versa – hence the action to monitor and record.</p> <p>NOTED – hence the action to record and list species. Existing records are held by the North & East Yorkshire Ecological Data Centre.</p> <p>NOTED – the issue here would appear to be hedgerow management. Equally, footpaths can be made wider at expense of road narrowing/traffic calming – issue to be considered for inclusion in next stage draft plan under 'Traffic etc.' section. PC periodically addresses hedgerow management with owners.</p> <p>NOTED – e.g. is outside parish. Specific suggestions welcomed.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider potential footpath improvements as part of highway improvement proposals in policy and/or as community action.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>the Village green is often a mess / unkempt.</p> <p>As another Action point, Introduce more resident responsibility for adequate maintenance of hedges, trees and pavement edges in order to ensure safety etc of all users.</p> <p>1) Encourage the take up of Solar panels (good looking all black inset solar panels) and home batteries to meet Carbon targets not really mentioned in this document yet crucial in decarbonisation and climate change. 2) Also encourage wild flower fields in the area.</p> <p>I like the idea of a Country Park status for the area north east of St Roberts church</p> <p>1) Country Park status most important for Crimple Valley. 2) Village Green status has been applied to Pannal Green by PVS. 3) First Conservation Area and Buildings by Anne Smith. Anne Smith also had Spacey Houses Farm protected by Historic England.</p> <p>The duck pond at Mill Lane is an eyesore at times and whilst it is not the responsibility of the parish council an official letter to those who are responsible may provoke a response. I'm sure some residents would also contribute to funding it's dredging.</p>	<p>NOTED – HBC responsibility. Not often mown and trees not well managed. PC periodically approaches HBC re these issues.</p> <p>NOTED – PC periodically approaches owners re hedgerow management.</p> <p>1) NOTED – acknowledged this is an important issue that needs full consideration. 2) NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED 2) NOTED – while this may be the use, it has no statutory authority and the village green is not officially listed. 3) NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the duck pond is owned privately/jointly by neighbouring residents and is their responsibility. Little/no management currently takes place. With its wildlife/historic interest, it is a candidate LGS site.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) ACTION – planning policy and community action options for the plan to address climate change issues to be considered and included in plan as appropriate/feasible. 2) ACTION – add community action re encouraging wildlife-friendly management and mowing regimes.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider whether site suitable as LGS candidate and assess if so.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>poor drainage and flooding (particularly on side streets where the NYC does not come to clear drains).</p> <p>I am surprised that in a document that has aspirations for the next 15 years there is no mention of Zero Carbon initiatives - perhaps it would be useful to get some input and ideas from local charity Zero Carbon, Harrogate. See also article on p39 (<i>NB Harrogate Advertiser 1st July</i>) on discouraging car journeys.</p> <p>Thanks to you for both 'important hedgerows' and 'eligible' hedgerows.</p> <p>Spring Lane hedge must be protected.</p> <p>The Spring Lane hedge should be a priority</p> <p>identify suitable TPO opportunities</p> <p>Provided there is no rampant extension of "conservation" areas and tree preservation orders.</p> <p>In addition there needs to be an action to identify areas for tree planting, prior to seeking (<i>NB remaining text cut off – possibly 'funding'</i>)</p> <p>We should ask residents to identify hedgerows for protection and enhancement - for biodiversity and maintaining visual amenity.</p>	<p>NOTED – ongoing issue for NYCC – not a NP/PC issue.</p> <p>NOTED – acknowledged this is an important issue that needs full consideration.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – this would be an onerous task for the PC/NP steering group. Specific suggestions for trees outside the conservation area would be welcomed.</p> <p>NOTED – any proposed actions re trees/TPOs (NB conservation areas not relevant in this section), will be fully justified/evidenced.</p> <p>NOTED – specific suggestions as to areas welcomed.</p> <p>NOTED – seems like a feasible idea.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – planning policy and community action options for the plan to address climate change issues to be considered and included in plan as appropriate/feasible.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – ask residents via newsletter.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>Focus first should be on improving the condition of existing trees, hedgerows and woodland before expanding.</p> <p>Would like to see expansion of field hedgerows to provide better support for wildlife particularly birds.</p>	<p>NOTED – community actions re pursuit of county park and LNR status for significant wild areas in the parish signals an existing focus.</p> <p>NOTED – may be possible within context of future country park/LNR status for areas of parish, if successful (ref community actions). Otherwise, down to individual farmer decisions.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Green & Natural Environment - General	<p>Yorkshire Wildlife Trust - Yorkshire Wildlife Trust would recommend inclusion of details of the 'Building with Nature' initiative within the Neighbourhood Plan. Building with Nature is a framework that enables developers to integrate high-quality multifunctional green infrastructure to create places in which people and nature can flourish.</p> <p>-Building with Nature sets out standards to provide a benchmark to be used in addition to the Biodiversity Net Gain metric, in order to provide a qualitative assessment of a proposed development site. The Building with Nature (BwN) key themes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core – Distinguishing green infrastructure from a more conventional approach to provision of open and green space. • Wildlife – to protect and enhance wildlife, creating networks where nature can thrive, and supporting the creation of development which more effectively delivers a net gain for wildlife. • Water – a commitment to improving water quality, on site and in the wider area: reducing the risk of flooding and managing water naturally for maximum benefit. • Wellbeing – to deliver health and wellbeing benefits through the green features on site, 	<p>NOTED – while clearly a laudable initiative, it is not considered appropriate to promote to developers a set of voluntary, non-statutory standards in NP policy.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>making sure they can be easily accessed by people close to where they live.</p> <p>-Building with Nature is a voluntary approach developed by practitioners, policy-makers and academic experts, and tested with the people who will use and benefit from the framework. Schemes can be assessed at pre-application, reserved matters and post-construction/in-use stages. Further information can be accessed via the website: https://www.buildingwithnature.org.uk.</p>		
PI BE1	<p>Bit of a 'catch all'</p> <p>For the benefit of wildlife I would support mixed hedgerows and object to their destruction and replacement with walls.</p> <p>Vital to maintain the character of the area,</p> <p>But must have clear criteria</p> <p>isnt this already covered by planning permission, why would parish council need to get involved?</p> <p>Is all of this not already covered by the current planning guidelines?</p>	<p>NOTED – acknowledged that the stated policy intention perhaps reads as such. The next stage draft plan policy will set out clear, detailed criteria to guide new development in/adjacent to the conservation area.</p> <p>NOTED – this can be considered in policy drafting, relative to the evidenced characteristics of the conservation area.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – it is currently covered in the non-statutory Pannal Conservation Area Appraisal, against which planning applications are assessed. The embodiment of Appraisal advice in what will be statutory NP planning policy will give the advice significant extra weight.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider comment as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Yes, although our comment above about very high quality sympathetic design still stands. This could be a modern style.</p> <p>I agree subject to my comments above relating to potential future development in the SLA and outside of the Local Plan development limits.</p> <p>Criteria need to be specific. This is still vague.</p> <p>Because the criteria have not been detailed.</p> <p>Strongly agree</p> <p>It would be important to know who is doing the documenting. Residents should know how much older Pannal is than Harrogate. Pannal is recorded having its own market by 1304. Not until 1770 was Harrogate a 'well established spa'.</p> <p>views and vistas are essential to Pannal</p> <p>We support a degree of flexibility in design, traditional and modern design can be successfully <i>(NB rest of wording missing)</i></p>	<p>NOTED – the NP policy will not preclude innovative modern design solutions.</p> <p>NOTED – the conservation area sits almost entirely within development limits, overlapping the SLA in one small area. It should be noted that existing HBC Local Plan policy does not preclude development within the SLA and the NP cannot override this.</p> <p>NOTED – as explained in the document (P6/para 2), only 'policy intentions' are stated at this stage. Actual detailed policies will be included at the next draft plan stage.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the starting point for documented character must be the existing Pannal Conservation Area Appraisal produced by HBC. This will be supplemented by a new study currently being undertaken on the PC's behalf by independent consultants.</p> <p>NOTED – these will be fully documented and evidenced as justification for NP planning policies.</p> <p>NOTED – policy wording by its nature allows for some flexibility. Policy will not preclude innovative modern design solutions.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>No new level of mandatory approval to be introduced! Who will decide the criteria, inc design, to be applied?</p>	<p>NOTED – the policy criteria in the final NP will be developed by the PC, based on the Pannal Conservation Area Appraisal, supplemented by a new PC-commissioned consultancy study, in the context of existing HBC policy and subject to further rounds of community consultation. HBC (and its successor authority) will be responsible for applying the policy once adopted, following a community referendum. BE1 attracted very strong community support in the consultation on this document.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>This should not be so constrictive as to not allow for technological developments to be used in development i.e. ground source heat pumps which may require construction of a plant room.</p>	<p>AGREE – policy needs to allow for climate change related initiatives, subject to design considerations where necessary.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Totally agree with need for sensitive planning and design to sensitively fit in with village, and not something along the style of barracks!!</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Important to protect the nature and character of the neighbourhood</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>The plan should not be restricted to the conservation area. More controls are needed on the residents' planning applications which are seeing a proliferation of giant extensions not in keeping with the rest of the village.</p>	<p>NOTED – other plan policies, as set out in policy intentions BE2-7 in the document will address design considerations throughout the parish.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>The views and vistas should be given more weight in this policy. There is too much reference to historical architecture which I can understand but our architecture</p>	<p>NOTED – views/vistas will be given due weight in the next stage draft plan policies. Acknowledged climate change</p>	<p>ACTION – planning policy and community action options for the plan to address climate change issues to be</p>

	<p>needs to develop to be more efficient and use less carbon and this inevitably means that the "look" of dwellings will/must change. I would prefer to see a policy that supports low carbon footprints for new dwellings which is consistent with preservation of views and vistas.</p> <p>This supplements GNE2</p> <p>Burn bridge in particular has multiple different designs of houses throughout the ages - we need to be able to put our stamp on these houses and keep them Individual and with character - not just boring white blobs of housing</p> <p>I hope the design of future developments will not be anything like Jubilee Park. This whole area is an eyesore and a perfect example of how ignorant HBC Planning department are. It is a complete mish mash, no overall forward thinking, planning, development, design and above all it is not in keeping with a village. If this has been allowed I have no faith whatsoever that any of Heritage, Development and Design policy intention will or would be adhered to but I do agree with it.</p> <p>HBC – use the Conservation Appraisal document as the starting point for these criteria.</p>	<p>is an important issue that needs full consideration.</p> <p>NOTED – only in so far as the SLA and conservation area overlap in one small area and the SLA forms the setting of some of the conservation area. In practice many plan policies will work in concert in respect of any given site/area/development proposal.</p> <p>NOTED – plan policy will also address design and new development outside the conservation area.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP will put in place a suite of design/development policies covering the whole parish, relative to the evidenced characteristics of the different ‘character areas’ which make up the parish. Once adopted, the policies must be implemented, alongside Local Plan policies, by HBC or its successor authority.</p> <p>NOTED – this will be the logical starting point.</p>	<p>considered and included in plan as appropriate/feasible.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI BE2	<p>Not sure what would be involved here</p> <p>what is a local heritage area?</p>	<p>NOTED – the idea of Local Heritage Areas is explained in the document (P9/para 1/lines 2-6).</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>It is to be hoped the Parish Council Planning Committee will have more influence following the implimentation of the announced reorganisation of the Council/County Council</p> <p>This would be too restrictive for those already in residence</p> <p>Subject to seeing what the defined areas are and what restrictions will be imposed.</p> <p>What is the purpose of this Policy?</p> <p>Sorry - don't understand. Where are these areas 'exactly'?</p> <p>The older dwellings in the Burn Bridge - Malthouse Lane should become a Local Heritage area with appropriate constraints on future development</p> <p>I live on Malthouse Lane,and would like to have more information about what "heritage status " would mean for our location.</p> <p>All three of the candidate areas listed, All Saints, Burn Bridge – Malthouse Lane and Hill Foot/Hill Top Lane should be designed as Local Heritage Areas. Each has its own particular character and is as worthy of designation and protection as the Pannal Conservation Area</p> <p>I have some reservations.</p>	<p>NOTED – this is not a NP matter. As far as it is understood, PC powers will remain unchanged in relation to higher authority planning powers and responsibilities.</p> <p>NOTED – the level of ‘restriction’ would be less than for conservation areas. The design criteria for any defined LHAs will be set out in the next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan policies/map will make this clear.</p> <p>NOTED – the idea of Local Heritage Areas is explained in the document (P9/para 1/lines 2-6).</p> <p>NOTED – this is the intention of BE2-5 in the document.</p> <p>NOTED - The design criteria for new development in defined LHAs will be set out in the next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED – this is the intention of BE2-5 in the document.</p> <p>NOTED – with no information as to those reservations, it is not possible to address any concerns.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>Maybe the list could be extended.</p> <p>Not sure that I fully understand the Local Heritage Areas- for example Malthouse Lane is a mixture of historic buildings and 1960s/1970s housing of no architectural merit</p> <p>I don't really see a distinctive character to these areas.</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>But not sure where 'All saints' is supposed to be</p> <p>As above. Too much emphasis on heritage for me.</p> <p>I hope the design of future developments will not be anything like Jubilee Park. This whole area is an eyesore and a perfect example of how ignorant HBC Planning department are. It is a complete mish mash, no overall forward thinking, planning, development, design and above all it is not in keeping with a village. If this has been allowed I have no faith whatsoever that any of Heritage, Development and Design policy intention will or would be adhered to but I do agree with it.</p>	<p>NOTED – with no information as to potential extensions, it is not possible to respond in any meaningful way.</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan will define proposed LHAs, including a boundary. The areas defined will be based on a thorough character analysis and should only include areas of demonstrable heritage value. All documentation will be available to view/for comment at the next community consultation stage.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the map accompanying the next stage draft plan will define areas with boundary lines.</p> <p>NOTED – the document reflects the importance placed on heritage in community consultations to date (and endorsed in the consultation on this document).</p> <p>NOTED – the NP will put in place a suite of design/development policies covering the whole parish, relative to the evidenced characteristics of the different 'character areas' which make up the parish. Once adopted, the policies must be implemented, alongside Local Plan policies, by HBC or its successor authority.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	Development of local heritage area status would be very welcome as would a set of design and design codes for the area.	NOTED	NO ACTION
PI BE3-BE5	As BE2 same as above isn't it? As above answer is yes (faulty box). Where housing already has a uniform design, any change of use/new development should be obliged to follow similar design. see comment above 1) Provided acceptable innovation/design is not prohibited which would otherwise add interest and sympathetic, tasteful character. 2) No new level of mandatory approval to be introduced. Who will decide the criteria, inc design, to be applied?	NOTED NOTED – no, BE2 addresses the identification/definition of LHAs, while BE3-5 address the detailed design criteria for each. NOTED NOTED – design criteria for each area will be set relative to the documented characteristics of each area. Mimicking is not necessarily the best/only design solution. NOTED 1) NOTED - policy will not preclude innovative modern design solutions. 2) NOTED – the policy criteria in the final NP will be developed by the PC, based on a new PC-commissioned consultancy study, supplemented by local survey work, in the context of existing HBC policy and subject to further rounds of community consultation. HBC (and its successor authority will be responsible for applying the policy once adopted, following a community referendum.	NO ACTION NO ACTION NO ACTION NO ACTION NO ACTION 1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION

	Again the criteria have not been laid out!	BE3-5 attracted very strong community support in the consultation on this document.	
		NOTED – as explained in the document (P6/para 2), only ‘policy intentions’ are stated at this stage. Actual detailed policies will be included at the next draft plan stage.	NO ACTION
	broadly agree but it is a bit jargonistic for me. I am not clear what you are trying to say.	NOTED – detailed design/development criteria for each defined area will be set, relative to the documented characteristics of each area, in policies in the next stage draft plan.	NO ACTION
	One would need to know the documented characteristics to be able to comment.	NOTED – these will be available to view/for comment, alongside the draft plan at the next consultation stage.	NO ACTION
	See above	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Totally agree	NOTED	NO ACTION
	See comments on BE1	NOTED	NO ACTION
	as above	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Whilst respecting heritage areas, fresh eyes should always be used if environmental modernisation plans are submitted	AGREE - policy needs to allow for climate change related initiatives, subject to design considerations where necessary.	NO ACTION
	Comments again as point <i>(NB text missing)</i>	NOTED	NO ACTION

	The extremely high cost for building to design standard set is likely to create financial hardship for some and make property too expensive for others. There needs to be a balance in preserving local beauty while creating a diverse place to live and work.	NOTED – while having some sympathy with this view, the national planning policy imperative on design – strengthened as recently as July 2021 in the revised NPPF – places a high premium on locally distinctive design standards which the NP is bound to reflect.	NO ACTION
PI BE6	<p>These are important buildings in our parish.</p> <p>these buildings are not owned by parish council and any enhancements would be sort under normal guidelines why the need for this protection, surely this would happen anyway</p> <p>Wesley Cottage should not be considered a non-designated heritage asset. Spring Lane Farmhouse and adjoining stone barn should.</p> <p>must retain character of the area</p> <p>should make clear that the list is not complete and may be added to.</p> <p>maybe add some of the older farmhouses</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the concept of identifying and lending some protection to ‘non-designated heritage assets’ or ‘local listing’ by local authorities as it is often referred to is commonplace. No such local list exists for Pannal Parish or indeed Harrogate Borough as a whole. The highlighting of what is likely to be a small number of locally important buildings/structures will make their protection and sympathetic enhancement easier to achieve.</p> <p>NOTED – the final list of ‘assets’ to be included in the policy will be based on assessments carried out relative to Historic England published guidelines.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the use of the word ‘included’ in BE6 makes this clear.</p> <p>NOTED – which? Specific suggestions welcomed</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>All three identified should be designated as stated.</p> <p>No new level of mandatory approval to be introduced! No new level of mandatory approval to be introduced! Who will decide the criteria, inc design, to be applied?</p> <p>And expand on those mentioned.</p> <p>This should be put forward as an urgent matter as these historic building should be afforded protection status</p> <p>But needs to be more extensive - name buildings that are otherwise contained within Heritage Area Assessments - because individual properties have specific value and need protection.</p>	<p>NOTED – the final list of ‘assets’ to be included in the policy will be based on assessments carried out relative to Historic England published guidelines.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy content and list of identified ‘assets’ in the final NP will be produced by the PC, based on a new PC-commissioned consultancy study, supplemented by local survey work, in the context of existing national/HBC policy and Historic England guidance, and subject to further rounds of community consultation. HBC (and its successor authority will be responsible for applying the policy once adopted, following a community referendum. BE6 attracted very strong community support in the consultation on this document.</p> <p>NOTED – any candidate ‘assets’ put forward will be rigorously assessed against historic England criteria.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP is being progressed as quickly as possible.</p> <p>NOTED - any candidate ‘assets’ put forward will be rigorously assessed against historic England criteria. Assuming ‘heritage assessments’ to mean ‘conservation area assessments’, any properties mentioned therein are already part of a ‘designated’ heritage</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

		asset (i.e. the conservation area), so by definition cannot be considered as 'non-designated' heritage assets.	
	We understand the Methodist Church may not survive anyway due to lack of support which would put the whole complex at risk of development.	NOTED – the intention of the policy is to protect the church as a heritage asset irrespective of its future use/any proposed development.	NO ACTION
	No comment	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Also the Parish Church if that is not already identified as a Heritage building?	NOTED – as stated in the document (P9/para 2/line 2), the parish church is a gradell* Listed Building.	NO ACTION
	I do not attach much importance to this	NOTED – the policy intention attracted very strong community support in the consultation on this document.	NO ACTION
	Wensley Cottage - No	NOTED – the final list of 'assets' to be included in the policy will be based on assessments carried out relative to Historic England published guidelines.	NO ACTION
	No opinion	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I hope the design of future developments will not be anything like Jubilee Park. This whole area is an eyesore and a perfect example of how ignorant HBC Planning department are. It is a complete mish mash, no overall forward thinking, planning, development, design and above all it is not in keeping with a village. If this has been allowed I have no faith whatsoever that any of Heritage, Development and Design policy intention will or would be adhered to but I do agree with it	NOTED – the NP will put in place a suite of design/development policies covering the whole parish, relative to the evidenced characteristics of the different 'character areas'/'heritage assets' which make up the parish. Once adopted, the policies must be implemented, alongside Local Plan policies, by HBC or its successor authority.	NO ACTION

	<p>HBC – I would title this policy as Local Listing rather than non-designated. In reality anything that is not listed and not identified anywhere could be a non-designated heritage asset. By having a local listing policy where you identify the important buildings, it still gives you the chance to have non-designated heritage asset status for any asset that you may have missed. It also reflects the local nature of the asset and process for designating. Check the Conservation Appraisal where it lists the important buildings.</p>	<p>NOTED – consideration will be given to this comment. That said, it is known that a number of recently ‘made’ NPs include non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) policies of the type envisaged and titled as such and that neither the local authorities nor examiners concerned have raised this as an issue. Experience suggests that examiners are unlikely to allow the identification of NDHA within a conservation area, given that the conservation area itself is already a designated heritage asset, i.e. there is a clear conflict here.</p>	<p>ACTION – consider the suggestion made in titling/framing the draft plan policy.</p>
PI BE7	<p>Walton Park is a housing estate. At the same side of the A61 there is also Long Acre plus several older desirable properties on/leading from mainly 2 cul-de-sacs</p> <p>how?</p> <p>See comments above on future new development within SLA and outside of Local Plan development limits.</p> <p>The requirements seem very demoralising given, for instance, Walton Park.</p>	<p>NOTED – policy content will reflect the character areas into which each fall, taking account of notable individual characteristics.</p> <p>NOTED – policy will set criteria for different defined/documented character areas, against which all planning applications for development will be assessed.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is somewhat premature to make comment on requirements for Walton Park or anywhere else in the parish, as such requirements have not yet been set out. The next stage draft</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>No new level of mandatory approval to be introduced! No new level of mandatory approval to be introduced! Who would decide the criteria, inc design, to be applied?</p> <p>1) It has been hard to disagree with any of the BE intentions. However I felt it was weighted too much to the heritage aspects and BE7 for me is quite important. I hope that buildings can be constructed in the next 15 years of which we can be proud and which can have a value as people look back 50 years from now. 2) Also I think that we should have an intention to require new buildings to be constructed using sustainable technology (to address the climate change vision/aim)</p> <p>Potentially yes, if the design criteria had been defined and presented.</p> <p>We can't see what is so special about Walton Park that it deserves special mention. It's a housing development</p>	<p>plan policies will make requirements clear.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy criteria in the final NP will be produced by the PC, based on a new PC-commissioned consultancy study, in the context of existing national/HBC policy and subject to further rounds of community consultation. HBC (and its successor authority will be responsible for applying the policy once adopted, following a community referendum. BE7 attracted very strong community support in the consultation on this document.</p> <p>1) NOTED 2) NOTED - acknowledged this is an important issue that needs full consideration.</p> <p>NOTED – the criteria will be set out in the next stage draft plan policies and underpinned by a full assessment of local character across the parish, available to residents.</p> <p>NOTED – every part of the parish has its own character, irrespective of whether</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – planning policy and community action options for the plan to address climate change issues to be considered and included in plan as appropriate/feasible.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>much the same as Crimple Meadows or the former Dunlopillo site.</p> <p>See BE1 again</p> <p>Landscape - yes absolutely. Would prefer the emphasis on low carbon rather than repetition of historical style if it can blend in better with the landscape (for example single storey dwellings with green roofs etc.)</p> <p>The more control of development design the better the area will be protected</p> <p>The vision wants to take "full advantage of technological developments" All the policies in this section need to be aspirations subject to newer technologies eg it would concern me if the policies barred the installation of solar panels or other zero carbon power sources.</p> <p>As before - still need to be able To Add character and modernise existing buildings</p> <p>I hope the design of future developments will not be anything like Jubilee Park. This whole area is an eyesore and a perfect example of how ignorant HBC Planning department are. It is a complete mish mash, no overall forward thinking, planning, development, design and above all it is not in keeping with a village. If this has been allowed I have no faith whatsoever that any of Heritage, Development and Design policy intention will or would be adhered to but I do agree with it.</p>	<p>that character is special or not. Design criteria in the policies will reflect this.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – acknowledged this is an important issue that needs full consideration.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE - policy needs to allow for climate change related initiatives, subject to design considerations where necessary.</p> <p>NOTED – policy wording by its nature allows for some flexibility. Policy will not preclude innovative modern design solutions.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP will put in place a suite of design/development policies covering the whole parish, relative to the evidenced characteristics of the different ‘character areas’/‘heritage assets’ which make up the parish. Once adopted, the policies must be implemented, alongside Local Plan policies, by HBC or its successor authority.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – planning policy and community action options for the plan to address climate change issues to be considered and included in plan as appropriate/feasible.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>See point 12.</p> <p>HBC – I think it is a good idea to identify different areas where there will be different design criteria etc. however I do not feel it is necessary to have it split between all the different policies and split by heritage and non-heritage areas. It would be better if there was one character area policy that identified all the different areas and provided design/development criteria for each area. There are a variety of elements that make up the character of the area not just heritage so by splitting them in this way you may miss important elements e.g landscape, trees, highway treatments etc. Will be necessary to undertake comprehensive character assessments of each of these areas to enable the distinctive features to be identified and the criteria to be produced. The NPPF has recently been updated and enhanced particularly with design guidance and policies https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2 Also see the National Design Guide at https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-design-guide and the newly published National Design Code guidance at https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-model-design-code.</p> <p>The distinctive architecture of Walton Park (where I live) has been eroded in recent years with the building of extensions in material other than stone.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the PC has commissioned AECOM consultants, via Locality’s Technical Support scheme to carry out comprehensive character assessments. The PC is also fully aware of the recently updated NPPF and new design guidance. Consideration will be given to the best way to achieve appropriate/ effective policy coverage, drawing on the experience of other known ‘made’ NPs. The council’s views will be taken account of in this.</p> <p>NOTED – BE7 is designed to address this sort of issue.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider HBC view re policy approach.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<p>Built Environment – General</p>	<p>Historic England – we do not wish to comment in detail on the Neighbourhood Plan..... The Pannal and Burnside (<i>sic</i>) Plan Area contains 3 grade II* and 7 grade II Listed Buildings, as well as the Pannal Conservation Area. It will also contain several local non-designated heritage assets.</p>	<p>NOTED – the statement that there are 10 Listed Buildings in the parish conflicts with the document’s view that there are 12. References to the Heritage at Risk register, the NYAAS and</p>	<p>ACTION – check number of Listed Buildings/structures (NB there are 12) and Heritage at Risk register. Approach the organisations suggested re</p>

	<p>We also note that the Neighbourhood Plan (PID) incorporates Heritage and Heritage Asset policies. These policies should be worded in a way which will help to protect these sites and their settings, to address any Heritage at Risk and ensure that any change is managed appropriately..... We consider that the planning and conservation staff at the Harrogate Council are best placed to assist you in the development of your Neighbourhood Plan and, in particular how the strategy might address the area's heritage assets. Consequently, we do not consider that there is a need for Historic England to be involved in the further development of your plan. If you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the staffs at the North Yorkshire Archaeological Advisory Service who look after the North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record/Sites and Monuments Record. They should be able to provide details of not only any designated heritage assets but also locally important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may also be available on-line via the Heritage Gateway (www.heritagegateway.org.uk). It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as.....local historic groups in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Regarding heritage, I like what Linton village has done to put plaques on older properties referencing previous owners</p>	<p>NYHER/SMR are useful and can be followed up. Use will also be made of the books by local historian Anne Smith.</p> <p>NOTED – this is a nice idea which could perhaps be actioned by a group in the local community as in Hebden Bridge.</p>	<p>potential NDHA and information useful to LHA assessments.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI TTT1	<p>1) Cycling , no roads are wide enough for separate cycle lanes, nor are the footpaths to share with the foot traffic. Where are the extra footpaths required? 2) I think we have a good system of footpaths / bridleways they just need clearing from time to time.</p>	<p>1) NOTED – the possible identification of routes will be part of the process of drafting the next stage draft plan policy. If none are identified, the policy be left as generally welcoming of routes,</p>	<p>1) ACTION – develop policy wording in line with response. 2) ACTION – consider maintenance issues as part of overall network review.</p>

	<p>1) The Parish is poorly served by paths which can be used all the year round. 2) There are no concessions or designated cycle paths in the Parish. 3) Even the poor state of the road surfaces makes cycling unsafe.</p> <p>These networks are vital in view of future increases in traffic.</p> <p>There is no mention of a bus service for Pannal . A return of such a service would reduce car use and decrease the isolation suffered by those unable to drive or get to the train or the bus service on the Leeds Road</p> <p>1) Protect what cycling routes? There aren't any. 2) Road are diabolical, tackle that first</p>	<p>should any be proposed, perhaps subject to caveats reflecting the types of concerns raised.</p> <p>2) NOTED – maintenance issues can be looked at as part of the plan’s overall review of the PROW/cycle way network.</p> <p>1) NOTED – maintenance issues can be looked at as part of the plan’s overall review of the PROW/cycle way network.</p> <p>2) NOTED – policy will look to address this.</p> <p>3) NOTED – PC already lobbying on this. Individual resident/community lobbying may also help.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – previous bus service was withdrawn due to lack of community use.</p> <p>1) NOTED – ‘protect’ is used generically in TTT1 in relation to the network – it is acknowledged there are currently no designated cycle routes.</p> <p>2) NOTED – PC already lobbying on this. Individual resident/community lobbying may also help.</p>	<p>1) ACTION – consider maintenance issues as part of overall network review.</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p> <p>3) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>Strongly agree. As new residents to Burn Bridge we love seeing people and horses walking round the village. This should be encouraged.</p> <p>A bit wishy washy...</p> <p>As well as cycle paths, cycle crossings and pedestrian crossings need to be addressed on the A61 particularly.</p> <p>Emphatically Yes!</p> <p>But see previous comment about the rights of cyclists</p> <p>Definitely! Improvements for walking and cycling are extremely important. Too many cars are parked on pavements, including our road (Pannal Avenue) which has become a car park over recent year. We also need improved walking and cycling routes from Pannal into harrogate - the pavement along the A61 past the garden centre is frightening to walk along with the fast, close traffic and yet only half the pavement is available due to overgrowth. We were also sad that a walking / cycle route were never explored across the fields behind the church</p> <p>1) No mention anywhere that A61 cuts off Spacey Houses and how this might be overcome especially with new employment site coming on stream 2) footpaths cycleways can be provided within field boundaries especially where they are HBC owned</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan policy will provide greater clarity.</p> <p>NOTED – given that crossing already exists at Pannal Bank, a new crossing at Crimple Hall, delivered via the PN18 commercial development, might be feasible.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the suggestions will be considered as part of policy development.</p> <p>1) NOTED – given that crossing already exists at Pannal Bank, a new crossing at Crimple Hall, delivered via the PN18 commercial development, might be feasible. 2) NOTED – will be borne in mind in policy development and consideration of possible routes.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include new crossing as requirement/aspiration of PN18 development – ref PI ED2. Also investigate rumoured existing underpass at this broad location.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider the suggested routes as indicated.</p> <p>1) ACTION – include new crossing as requirement/aspiration of PN18 development – ref PI ED2. Also investigate rumoured existing underpass at this broad location. 2) NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>This must be pragmatic and fully allow access for people's daily transport needs, mainly by car</p> <p>Mustn't adversely affect traffic flows in the area. There are already problems for traffic flow.</p> <p>Horse riding and vehicles do not go well together. The roads are narrow enough without putting more horses on them!</p> <p>See earlier comments on paths alongside roads.</p> <p>Expansion of bridleways through the valley to further link up with the wider network (e.g., the bridleway under the viaduct that comes to a dead end). these are important 'nature' routes that people in the parish have enjoyed and kept grounded using recently.</p> <p>Walking on footpaths and bridleways is well signposted. Horse-riding is well catered for. There is no provision for safe cycling in to Harrogate, can this PLEASE change? Plenty of sport and recreation cycling available, but how are we to expect people to cycle to high school, work or shopping in Harrogate.</p> <p>Very strongly - should also be bolder and specific e.g. add to and connect safe cycling routes that can allow users to connect to a wider network of safe cycling routes and travel from the village to important amenity areas locally and more widely to the extent that there is a multiplefold increase in cycling journey and significant reduction in short motorised journeys.</p>	<p>NOTED – the needs of all highway users will be considered, but the climate crisis places a new imperative on encouraging non-vehicular travel means.</p> <p>NOTED – TTT1 makes no mention of encouraging more horses onto the roads.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – suggestion may have potential as new route to be identified in policy and/or community action.</p> <p>NOTED – policy aims to address this as far as the parish is concerned.</p> <p>NOTED – as explained in the document (P6/para 2), only ‘policy intentions’ are stated at this stage. Actual detailed policies will be included at the next draft plan stage.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider suggested route idea in policy development/for community action.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>I would like there to be no parking facilities on Buttersyke Way, Pannal for the new football ground area. It needs it's own parking facility.</p> <p>Any cycling route must be segregated from vehicles and pedestrians. Cyclists are vulnerable to vehicular traffic and pedestrians/pets/disabled/older people are vulnerable to cyclists.</p> <p>Could do with some intentions about walking and cycling routes as well as the car-based policies</p> <p>Connect crimple viaduct footpath to the show ground via the disused rail track</p> <p>Very strongly support</p> <p>Focus should be on addressing rat runs, there is no consideration of the problems in Burn Bridge. These should take president over horse riding and cycling.</p> <p>How about a policy to make horse riders clean up their horses' mess from the roads?</p> <p>1) Consider hard cutting back of hedges to give more space and safety to pedestrians - e.g. station rd. 2) FOLLIFOOT RD is in dire need of a path set back from the road as well as a cycle path.</p> <p>1) Is horse riding really going to help? 2) Also if all you do is Make the roads even more narrow the cycle idea is also</p>	<p>NOTED – PC aware of situation and agree. But developer responsibility and not to be provide despite PC efforts.</p> <p>NOTED – this safeguard could be built into the draft plan policy.</p> <p>NOTED – this is encompassed under TTT1. New routes will be considered as part of development of next stage draft plan policy.</p> <p>NOTED – outside the parish.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is not a question of one issue having precedence over another, certainly in NP policy terms. HGV use to be addressed. Speeding already being addressed to PC's utmost.</p> <p>NOTED – this is not a planning policy issue and unrealistic as a PC/NP action point.</p> <p>1) NOTED – already periodically addressed by the PC. 2) NOTED – suggestion may have merit.</p> <p>1) NOTED – bridleways form only a very small part of the Public Rights of Way</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider suggested safeguard in policy development.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re HGV use.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – consider as part of policy development.</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>a terrible idea - look what happened in London recently and Leeds - even worse traffic and no one using the cycle lanes</p> <p>1) I do not think cyclists need any more provision. 2) If you have cyclists, horses and walkers all on the same path that is dangerous. 3) Just improve the path between the duck pond and the cricket pitch. 4) It would have been useful to include a current Neighbourhood plan map in this survey.</p> <p>Does not cover the newly developed area of Jubilee park. This area has the same needs and should be given the same priority for investment.</p> <p>1) Yes but clarity is needed on what 'improved walking provision' will achieve. 2) If it is hoped more children will walk to school, why provide more car parking for parents? 3) Interesting to note that horse riding provision is mentioned but nowhere in this section is the provision of</p>	<p>(PROW) network. Bridleway improvements (if indeed any result from the intended policy) are likely to be limited in nature.</p> <p>2) NOTED – there is no suggestion that any new cycling routes would be on roads and certainly not on roads too narrow to accommodate them. Policy will look to take account of the needs of all road users.</p> <p>1) DISAGREE – there are currently no dedicated cycle paths within the parish 2) NOTED – there is no suggestion anywhere that this would be the case. Policy will take account of the needs of all users. 3) NOTED – ongoing problem and NYCC responsibility – PC keeps trying to get it addressed. 4) NOTED – premature at policy intentions stage to prepare/present a map when no firm proposals have been worked up.</p> <p>DISAGREE – not clear how this policy intention does not cover Jubilee Park, particularly when it makes no mention or exclusion of any specific geographical area – it applies parish-wide.</p> <p>1) NOTED – encouragement of more walking generally is a good thing per se as part of a multi-pronged approach to trying to reduce vehicular travel.</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) NO ACTION 4) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) ACTION – add community action re approach indicated.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>a regular, cheap bus service given any thought. Perhaps children will canter to school?</p> <p>The Parish lacks safe beautiful paths that can be used all year round.</p> <p>1) Better provisions for cycling to school / church etc.. 2) Cycle track along old railway line to Sainsbury's / Fodder? Possibly extended to Morrisons? 3) I don't see any mention of footbridge to Pannal Sports / Crimple Hall?</p>	<p>2) NOTED – the proposed 'Park and Stride' provision is aimed at taking parked traffic off Main Street and will involve some walking (NB hence the 'stride' element). Many children from outside the parish attend the school and cannot walk to school.</p> <p>3) NOTED - bridleways form only a very small part of the Public Rights of Way (PROW) network. Bridleway improvements (if indeed any result from the intended policy) are likely to be limited in nature. Previous general bus service was withdrawn due to lack of community use. Re a primary school bus, while considered unlikely to be workable, due to widely spread catchment, PTA could be approached with the idea, including by parents and residents.</p> <p>NOTED – paths maintenance issues can be looked at as part of the plan's overall review of the PROW/cycle way network.</p> <p>1) NOTED – on assumption this is alluding to a cycle lane on the road, there is no room. 'Cycle Box/Refuge' at top of Pannal Bank/traffic lights could be investigated.</p> <p>2) NOTED – suggested routes outside parish/plan area.</p> <p>3) NOTED – part of Park 'N' Stride project – can be made clear in policy explanation in next stage draft plan.</p>	<p>ACTION – consider maintenance issues as part of overall network review.</p> <p>1) ACTION – investigate cycle refuge idea.</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p> <p>3) ACTION – explain policy as indicated.</p>
--	--	--	--

	HBC – just make sure that any routes that are identified are deliverable i.e. not across private land where the landowner will not allow access.	NOTED – this will be the case.	NO ACTION
PI TTT2	<p>Parking is important - but land is scarce / valuable</p> <p>To include electric charging points for cars</p> <p>All new parking facilities need to include electric vehicle charging points.</p> <p>The free car park outside the former office block on station road is not full by 8am but it was pre covid, could be full soon if people come back by car to join their trains at Pannal station.</p> <p>Development of future parking for Pannal station may not be required due to 'covid' and the total change to working practises</p> <p>School traffic affects Pannal is a very negative way. School need to be part of the village. Invite villagers into school, etc etc. AT the moment I suspect a very large percentage of parents don't live in the village and Pannal is just a car park at school drop off and pick up. There is generally a lack of respect as cars are parked everywhere, and it has</p>	<p>NOTED – the intention is that this policy only applies in the specified areas where on-street parking is an existing problem.</p> <p>AGREE – all new parking provision should include electric vehicle charging infrastructure, ideally to a specified standard for each type of accompanying development (if any). Next step draft plan will include a stand-alone policy on electric vehicle charging infrastructure, rather than repeated mentions in a number of policies.</p> <p>NOTED – unsure what point is being made here so difficult to respond meaningfully.</p> <p>NOTED – may well be case but remains to be seen. Neither TTT2 (nor TTT3) address more future parking for Pannal Station.</p> <p>NOTED – TTT2 and TTT4, together with proposed community actions are looking to address these issues. Can also look at scope for time-limited parking restrictions on Main St and elsewhere.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include separate charging infrastructure policy as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re time limited parking restrictions on Main Street.</p>

	<p>got worse over the years. Simple answer, parking isn't allowed nearby the school between 8.45-9am and 2.30-3pm. They will have to park further away and walk or cycle. Sadly nothing ever seems to happen</p> <p>There is no mention of the serious effect on primary school age children walking to school along Main St, of the inhalation of exhaust fumes emitted by morning traffic using the village as a rat run.</p> <p>This is crucial as residential areas are becoming too parked up to the detriment of local inhabitants</p> <p>Problem with parking during school hours of coming and going. This will increase with increased building</p> <p>Unfortunately extended parking facilities will only attract more cars. Solving one problem may create a bigger one.</p> <p>1) See earlier comments re buses. 2) The more car parking that is offered, the more cars will clog up Pannal Main Street.</p>	<p>NOTED – HBC approached re air quality monitoring pre-pandemic, since which ‘all gone quiet’. PC to chase up. Aim to address rat running via ongoing speeding actions, and looking at HGV restrictions and selected traffic management on some through routes.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – TTT2 aims to address this with any new building in the vicinity of the school.</p> <p>DISAGREE – extra off-street parking for any new developments in the vicinity of station or school will only be for the use of those developments and will take cars associated with those developments that might otherwise be parked on-street, off the street.</p> <p>1) NOTED 2) DISAGREE – it is illogical to assert that by providing more off-street parking for any new development near station/school (or a ‘Park and stride’ car park) will increase cars clogging up Main St.</p>	<p>ACTION – add community action re pursuing air quality monitoring. And re HGV restrictions and selected traffic management measures on through routes.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	HBC – would need to provide evidence and justification for the area identified.	NOTED – it is the intention to provide evidence in support of any areas included in the policy.	NO ACTION
PI TTT3	<p>To include electric charging points for cars</p> <p>All parking facilities need to include electric vehicle charging points.</p> <p>The car park has been under used. Could it be put to better use by local businesses for customer / patient parking?</p> <p>This must be retained.</p> <p>does this include the parking on both sides of the railway?</p> <p>This is very important, in my opinion, if we are to encourage greater use of public transport now and in the future</p> <p>Needs to do something about this (as comments previously made).</p> <p>If 'work at home' is to continue, the Pannal Station car parks will remain under used. It isn't that far from the station to the school?</p>	<p>AGREE – all new parking provision should include electric vehicle charging infrastructure, ideally to a specified standard for each type of accompanying development (if any). Next step draft plan will include a stand-alone policy on electric vehicle charging infrastructure, rather than repeated mentions in a number of policies.</p> <p>NOTED – likely down to Covid and also charging policy.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – no, north side only. South side is private/HBC car park.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – although unclear what 'this' is.</p> <p>NOTED – remains to be seen. Too far from school to serve parents dropping-off.</p>	<p>ACTION – include separate charging infrastructure policy as indicated.</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re approaching Northern Rail re charging policy.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>This could be extended if the existing 1960's ugly office block could be demolished</p> <p>more of it.</p> <p>Policy refers to Pannal Station Car Park. This is just the area near Pannal Motors and the CoOp. It should also include Pannal Car Park in front of the old Dunlopillo Office Block</p> <p>Expand it if possible.</p> <p>Not relevant to me. The station is in walking distance.</p> <p>Or increase parking at the station</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>But how soon after WFH (<i>NB work from home</i>) will this be needed. What provision has been made for off street parking is included in the housing development of Dunlopillo?</p> <p>Any reduction in parking space at the station will affect use of the train service, which should be encouraged</p> <p>I agree that parking should be available but think that the better environmental choice would be to provide more secure cycle storage and discourage people from driving relatively short distances to the station.</p> <p>I don't understand in what capacity so will just agree</p>	<p>NOTED – there is no aspiration/ intention to seek increased capacity.</p> <p>NOTED – there is no aspiration/ intention to seek increased capacity.</p> <p>NOTED – this is not official station car park. It is privately owned and leased to HBC. There is enough capacity in official car park.</p> <p>NOTED – there is no aspiration/ intention to seek increased capacity.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – there is no aspiration/ intention to seek increased capacity.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – no evidence that will not be needed once Covid passes. None despite PC protestations.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – cycle storage can be added to existing community action re improvement of facilities.</p> <p>NOTED – capacity in this sense means amount of parking.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add to community action as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>Consideration to better access from Leeds road to Pannal station and parking to avoid larger traffic volumes at peak times using church lane rat run.</p> <p>Higher parking capacity at the station would encourage people to "park & train".</p> <p>But to resist creation of park and ride for Harrogate, which will dramatically increase traffic in the village, pollution and destroy the village character.</p> <p>Station and school car parking issues are top priority and extra capacity can't come soon enough for the benefit of all.</p> <p>HBC – would need to think carefully about how this could be achieved if it relates to private land.</p>	<p>NOTED – there is no feasible route.</p> <p>DISAGREE – there is no aspiration/ intention to seek increased capacity – car park is currently underused due to charging.</p> <p>NOTED – there is no intention to create a 'park and ride for Harrogate', although nothing of course to prevent people using car park and catching train to Harrogate.</p> <p>NOTED – there is no aspiration/ intention to seek increased capacity – car park is currently underused due to charging.</p> <p>NOTED – there are known 'made' NP precedents for protection policies relating to private car parks.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI TTT4	<p>Land at back of church is limited and there may be competing demands on it</p> <p>Will people be prepared to walk a few yards more?</p> <p>Ground is on flood plain</p>	<p>NOTED – none are known of and site is considered big enough.</p> <p>NOTED – it is a short distance and could be combined with Main St parking restrictions.</p> <p>NOTED – this would not preclude car parking use.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Important to reduce congestion.</p> <p>who owns this lands and why hasn't this happened already</p> <p>This provision would be beneficial only if it was free thereby reducing lengthy parking on the streets of Pannal. However, free parking could also encourage people to leave cars for lengthy periods of days and weeks as happens now on Crimple Meadows.</p> <p>Park and Stride is a great idea. Parking on main street and other areas is problematic in term time around school start/end, especially as this coincides with other commuter traffic which is getting heavier especially with various new housing developments in the vicinity eg: near Harlow Hill / Harlow Carr area.</p> <p>Hopefully this will stop random parking (often inconsiderate) throughout the village at school opening and closing times</p> <p>Getting through the village at school starting and finishing times is a nightmare, but really we need to do something to get less (<i>more?</i>) cars off the roads !</p> <p>Whose land lies to the rear of the Church? Please inform the vicar EARLY as to any plans here and the diocese should know.</p> <p>Anything that prevents the fiasco of school morning and afternoon parking has to be pursued.</p> <p>a bigger car park attracts more traffic. radical solution to exclude cars ??</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – HBC. Discussions are protracted.</p> <p>NOTED – it would be free. Restrictions could control other usage, perhaps on a time/payment basis.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – this is the aim.</p> <p>NOTED – hence TTT1 and various community actions re walking to school, rail use, highway restrictions.</p> <p>NOTED – HBC. Vicar/diocese consulted on this document.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – not necessarily. Could be combined with Main St restrictions.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>A footpath/bridge is required that links the proposed Park & Stride to Pannal Primary School. This will alleviate the traffic congestion on Pannal Main Street at school drop off and pick up times, as parents can drop their children at the P & S facility and the children can use the footpath/bridge to access the school.</p> <p>Electric charging points provision to be "self financed" if to be provided. How will duration of time at each point be regulated. Someone parks, plugs in, and comes back later in the day!!</p> <p>An important area for improved car parking facility is the Village Hall. For daytime events, a major limiting factor is car parking. The hall provides an important focus for village life and adequate car parking is needed if it is to fulfil its potential. (I was a bit surprised it was not mentioned in the BE section.)</p> <p>Will this be liable to flooding? could be good if it linked into the Pannal Sports playing fields.... they could also use as car parking. Why not develop Sandy Bank Woods? Encourage those who live in the Village to walk their children to school, don't automatically pander to their needs.... the car park will only be filled.</p> <p>Depends on the size and scope of this parking area and whether it will create an in effect an unplanned overflow for the station</p>	<p>Blanket car exclusion not within PD/NP gift. A non-starter with NYCC.</p> <p>NOTED – bridge will be included as part of Park ‘n’ Stride scheme if needed.</p> <p>NOTED – on reflection, because primarily a drop-off/pick-up point, not a car park (except for weekend sports), charging will not be a feature. High installation cost could also fall on PC. Likely facility will be barrier controlled.</p> <p>NOTED – apart from Dunlopillo, acknowledged that very limited parking options. PC are/have been trying to come up with a solution.</p> <p>NOTED – occasional flooding does not preclude proposed use. Will primarily cater for parents/children coming from outside the village/parish. Already a community action re encouraging increased walking to school. Will additionally cater at weekends for playing field users.</p> <p>NOTED - primarily a drop-off/pick-up point, not a car park (except for</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – delete charging element in NP policy.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – make playing fields link clear in policy preamble in next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

		weekend sports). Likely facility will be barrier controlled.	
	What exactly is this for? School drops off or local walking? And will it take the place of green space?	NOTED – school drop-off/pick-up. Policy title/wording needs to make this clear. Some green space will be lost – this is considered acceptable given the huge village problem it aims to solve.	ACTION – make purpose of Park and Stride clear in both policy title and wording.
	I understand that this aim, although laudable, has already run into trouble	NOTED – discussions with the landowner – HBC – are protracted.	NO ACTION
	Can't come soon enough. Really needed and great use of the land.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	With the opposition from HBC, as reported in a recent newsletter, how likely is this?	NOTED – can't say at time of writing.	NO ACTION
	See my response to TT2.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	But this would inevitably take up what is currently grassland?	NOTED - Some green space will be lost – this is considered acceptable given the huge village problem it aims to solve.	NO ACTION
	No comment	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Consider access across crimple beck to crimple Hall- so villagers can visit crimple hall without having to walk along A61	NOTED – weekend use by playing field users forms part of concept.	ACTION – make playing fields link clear in policy preamble in next stage draft plan.
	Especially re electric charging points	NOTED - on reflection, because primarily a drop-off/pick-up point, not a car park (except for weekend sports), charging will not be a feature. High installation cost could also fall on PC.	ACTION – delete charging element in NP policy.

	<p>Much needed expansion of off-road car parking a great idea.</p> <p>See also my point in TTT2 but the installation of electric charging points will become an essential part of any scheme. I think the priority, however, is to discourage car usage rather than create a swathe of parking facilities.</p> <p>See reply to ttt2</p> <p>If this area behind the church is given to a park and stride it will cause more congestion on the road queuing in and out. I believe if this area is developed we will lose all the green open space loved by all of us.</p> <p>See earlier comments. Chances are that the proposed car park will be clogged up by station commuters who won't want to pay to park at the stations. Hence parking issue will not be solved & traffic congestion will be even worse. We should be discouraging cars. Double yellow lines all down Main Street & give us some buses!</p> <p>The land at the back of the church is presently a bit of a wild dumping ground and is limited and may not be able to provide all the suggested needs.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is not considered that one 'Park and Stride' car park to solve a serious village problem, plus a policy of more private parking spaces in areas with serious existing on-street parking problems constitutes a swathe of parking facilities. On reflection, because primarily a drop-off/pick-up point, not a car park (except for weekend sports), charging will not be a feature. High installation cost could also fall on PC.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – there is no evidence to support this assertion. Only a small area of green space would be lost. Consultation on this document showed strong community support for this proposal.</p> <p>NOTED – not car park. Barrier controlled drop-off/pick-up point. Plan to look at time limited parking restrictions on Main St. Idea of school bus also to be explored.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that the land is adequate for the proposed use.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – delete charging element in NP policy.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add community actions re exploring parking restrictions and school bus.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>This survey is inadequate. How should we react to proposals for provision of on street electric vehicle charging points.? How do we react to any proposed Park & ride facilities off the <i>(NB text missing)</i></p> <p>Not sure about the park and ride etc</p> <p>Making more parking for pannal school by losing green space isn't a good idea. Parking has been better since school has staggered pick up drop off times. Every other school has similar issues with parking and removing green space to make a car park isn't really in line with your environment policies!</p> <p>Pannal school parking needs drastic improvement with consideration more for children's safety than residents annoyance at on street parking.</p> <p>School doesn't need car parking, it needs a drop-off facility which is off the high street.</p> <p>Station and school car parking issues are top priority and extra capacity can't come soon enough for the benefit of all.</p> <p>Encourage Pannal parents to walk their children or cycle. More parking just encourages more traffic in the immediate vicinity of the school.</p> <p>Off street parking is needed for the school and the Community Sports centre (where there is only enough for visiting teams). A suitable site should be identified with paths which connect it to both venues.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – there are no proposals for on-street electric vehicle charging points or for a park and ride facility – ‘Park and Stride’!</p> <p>NOTED – the proposal is not for a park and ride, but for a ‘Park and Stride’.</p> <p>NOTED - only a small area of green space would be lost. Given 18 months of Covid, too song to tell if staggered times have really helped.</p> <p>NOTED – proposal is designed to bring about improvement.</p> <p>NOTED – the ‘Park and Stride’ is essentially that drop-off facility – not a car park.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is not more parking, rather a drop-off area, primarily to cater with parents/children coming from outside the village/parish.</p> <p>NOTED – part of Park ‘n’ Stride concept.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – make playing fields link clear in policy preamble in next stage draft plan.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>But only if this is free! If it is to help ease congestion people shouldn't have to pay for the privilege. Also I don't understand where it will be. Needs to be less than 2 mins walk from school with children!</p> <p>Given a small village these areas could be combined and/or physical limitations mean that Pannal school parking provision does not need to be adjacent to the school I.e. a short (0.5 Mile) walk away.</p> <p>more parking required for the school traffic</p> <p>School-related parking on Main Street is a real shambles at school-run times - needs radical action!</p> <p>HBC – should call the policy 'Park and Stride'. Need to be confident that this site is deliverable as it is in HBC ownership.</p> <p>I would like the bridge over beck to Pannal Community Park to be undertaken to complement the new car parking, or to be achieved previously.</p>	<p>NOTED – rear of church (map to accompany next stage draft plan will make location clear). It will be free.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – 'Park and stride' drop-off not parking.</p> <p>NOTED – hence the TTT4 proposal.</p> <p>AGREE – existing title is misleading. As this will be an aspiration not an allocation, ownership is not seen as a problem. Ownership is also likely to change with the disappearance of HBC and its replacement by a unitary authority. Discussions with HBC are ongoing.</p> <p>NOTED – if bridge needed, will form part of 'Park 'n' Stride scheme.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – amend title as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI TTT5	<p>Traffic congestion is a real problem - made worse by massive house building projects in Harrogate - eg Dunlopillo site - can't see what scheme would alleviate this.</p> <p>So important with such heavy traffic through the parish.</p>	<p>NOTED – A61/Pannal Bank turning improvements are considered to be beneficial.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>The actions for traffic calming measures including digital speed signs should also be applied to the entry and exit points at Walton Park.</p> <p>Extreme traffic calming measures on Church Walks and in the vicinity of Pannal School are needed to discourage through traffic.</p> <p>Residents should definitely be consulted.</p> <p>turning lanes wont fit</p> <p>Traffic calming measures should be introduced on Church Lane between Sandy Bank Cottages and Pannal Main Street. Cars regularly exceed the 30mph speed limit on this road despite the bends and blind corners, making it dangerous for both the many pedestrians and for residents exiting their driveways.</p> <p>We need a western by-pass to take the commuter traffic out of the village. Traffic "calming" just adds to pollution and carbon footprint.</p> <p>"alleviate traffic congestion on the west side of Harrogate"? You mean through Pannal and Burn Bridge?</p>	<p>NOTED – this can be looked at.</p> <p>NOTED – Church Walks location not recognised by PC. Time limited parking restrictions on Main Street to be looked at.</p> <p>NOTED – there will be further NP consultations and doubtless consultation on any detailed highway schemes should they come forward.</p> <p>NOTED – clarity of proposed scheme lacking. In fact relates to junction improvement with Follifoot La/Drury Lane focus.</p> <p>NOTED – PC already addressing speeding to utmost. Restriction of HGV use to be explored.</p> <p>NOTED – a ‘Western By-Pass’ solution would fall outside the parish/NP boundary and is an unrealistic aspiration. Calming would aim to discourage traffic from using calmed routes.</p> <p>NOTED – a ‘Western By-Pass’ solution would fall outside the parish/ NP</p>	<p>ACTION – add community action as indicated.</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re parking restrictions.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – frame policy in next stage draft plan to make nature of proposed scheme clear.</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re HGV use.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>Not a big fan of the West of Harrogate bypass as that may well attract even more traffic and noise to some currently peaceful countryside around P & BB</p> <p>Strongly agree, the increasing rat running/speeding through the parish that the west harrogate developments have and will bring are the biggest single problem/challenge we face. In my opinion!</p> <p>The aims are laudable but "traffic calming" can equal driver frustration which defeats the objective. In my view, improving traffic flow is a better objective.</p> <p>This would be an excuse to say the community supports a western bypass which has been muted on many occasions and never goes away.</p> <p>1) Turning lanes may benefit traffic flow. 2) So called traffic calming measures, such as "road humps" complemented by already potholed road surfaces just add to braking and accelerating of vehicles adding to pollution noise and damage to vehicles.</p> <p>Very strongly support</p> <p>Further traffic management required at junction with Leeds Road to prevent accidents.</p> <p>This policy could be enhanced by reference to improved safety for all - people in vehicles, on 2 wheels and on foot.</p> <p>See earlier comments</p>	<p>boundary and is an unrealistic aspiration, not to be supported via the NP.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – equally, traffic calming can equal driver discouragement, taking the flows out of/reducing the flows in problem areas.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the comment makes a link that is not there.</p> <p>1) NOTED 2) NOTED – calming does not just equal humps, e.g. chicanes, road narrowing /prioritising which can discourage traffic from problem areas.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – hence TTT5 proposal.</p> <p>NOTED – all highways improvements can be predicated on acceptability in terms of highway safety, congestion and air quality. This can be built into the policy.</p> <p>NOTED</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>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – word policy to include indicated safeguards.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>I am wary of traffic calming measures. Slowing and acceleration of traffic causes noise problems for nearby residents and increased pollution. Road humps can set up vibration which damages buildings. Emergency vehicles may also be adversely affected. Closure of roads except for access might be preferable if possible.</p> <p>Should not have objected to the bypass decades ago. Short term nimbyism</p> <p>I think there are sufficient traffic calming measures at the moment and the congestion on the Main Street at school times provides accident free traffic calming.</p> <p>Can we make sure that the calming is before you get to the village - let's deter people from using our villages for rat runs before they get here and definitely slow them all down on burn bridge road no matter what time of the day</p> <p>1) Again I don't understand how a turning lane could be incorporated at Pannal Bank. 2) I agree to traffic calming. I feel we haven't been given enough information to comment effectively on this section.</p> <p>Does not cover the newly developed area of Jubilee park. This area has the same needs and should be given the same priority for investment.</p>	<p>NOTED – calming does not just equal humps, e.g. chicanes, road narrowing /prioritising which can discourage traffic from problem areas.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – Main St congestion is a big problem to many and not an acceptable calming measure.</p> <p>NOTED – areas to be subject to calming still to be decided based on evidence.</p> <p>1) clarity of proposed scheme lacking. In fact relates to junction improvement with Follifoot La/Drury Lane focus. 2) NOTED – as stated in the document (P6/para 2) only broad intentions are set out here. Detailed policies will appear for comment in the next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED – information on the traffic etc. needs of Jubilee Park would be helpful/necessary if the NP is to address them.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) ACTION – frame policy in next stage draft plan to make nature of proposed scheme clear. 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>HBC – all development should be expected to mitigate for its own impacts, however the Regulations state that any contributions need to be necessary, directly related to the development and related in scale and kind. Whether a development is required to provide contributions or bring about improvements should not be used as a reason for supporting development. Planning decisions should be based on a number of elements including sustainability, policy, impact etc and not on merely whether they bring about highway improvements. If highway improvements are required and not provided it could be a reason for refusal but if not required it cannot count against the proposal.</p> <p>The west Harrogate developments are of great concern to village traffic.</p>	<p>NOTED – this will be borne fully in mind in the framing/wording of the next stage draft plan policy.</p> <p>NOTED – policy can only relate to developments/consequent highway improvements within the Neighbourhood Area. PC monitors these developments on an ongoing basis.</p>	<p>ACTION – frame/word policy taking full account of comments made.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<p>Traffic, Transport, Travel – Non-Planning Community Actions</p>	<p>1) How about a school bus service for Pannal Primary, staffed appropriately, so that parents could reliably use it even for younger children, and therefore cut down car journeys in and out of the village. 2) And on a related topic, I was wondering why there was no mention of local bus services services (apart from ‘commuter’ buses such as the Number 36) in the Transport Section of the PID.</p> <p>Re-routing the harrogate bus (36) or alternative to give greater access to the new Dunlopillo site residents</p>	<p>1) NOTED – while considered unlikely to be workable, due to widely spread catchment, PTA could be approached with the idea, including by parents and residents.</p> <p>2) NOTED – other local service were withdrawn/cut because not used. The existing community action re evolving technology solutions is considered a better option to look at addressing local transportation needs.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the path to A61 alongside the care home provides easy access to the 36 route.</p>	<p>1) ACTION – add community action re the approach indicated.</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>There is an existing problem in addition to future developments near the station as many station users park in pannal avenue which blocks access for residents. This is because there is a charge for the station car park</p> <p>Also improvements to Pannal station - waiting area, ticketing and disabled access / access for all</p> <p>Just not sure we need more or larger trains.</p> <p>Car park is under utilised since charging was introduced leading to more parking on the streets of Pannal.</p> <p>Station car parking to be free, otherwise people will park in residential areas.</p> <p>Vital to be free instead of blocking local streets.</p> <p>Free car parking at Pannal railway station to prevent use of inadequate roads off Main Street</p>	<p>NOTED – the Pannal Avenue problem could be addressed via time limited parking restrictions. The parking charge levied by owners Northern Rail appears anomalous as other car parks on the line levy no charge.</p> <p>NOTED – better disabled access already covered, but other ideas have merit.</p> <p>NOTED – considered that this chimes with sustainable transport agenda, i.e. making it easier/more comfortable to use public transport.</p> <p>NOTED – apparently anomalous (in context of line as a whole) levying of charge by Northern Rail to be queried with view to change.</p> <p>NOTED – apparently anomalous (in context of line as a whole) levying of charge by Northern Rail to be queried with view to change.</p> <p>NOTED – apparently anomalous (in context of line as a whole) levying of charge by Northern Rail to be queried with view to change.</p> <p>NOTED – apparently anomalous (in context of line as a whole) levying of</p>	<p>ACTION – add community actions to address parking restrictions and car park charging.</p> <p>ACTION – add improved i.e. sheltered waiting areas and ticketing (NB subject to checking that no ticket machine on 'to Harrogate' platform) to existing community action.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re challenging charging policy.</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re challenging charging policy.</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re challenging charging policy.</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re challenging charging policy.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>The parking should be free to keep cars from using nearby streets where some motorists park on the footpaths.</p> <p>This should be free to park as it is the only station on this line which demands a fee. Hornbeam Park is a much larger car park and is free.</p> <p>parking should be free</p> <p>Should be free parking</p> <p>1) To be free of charge 2) and available for overnight parking (not camping!). 3) Well lit also.</p> <p>And enhance, at the same time as creating and enforcing restrictions in surrounding streets so that rail users must use car parking.</p>	<p>charge by Northern Rail to be queried with view to change.</p> <p>NOTED – apparently anomalous (in context of line as a whole) levying of charge by Northern Rail to be queried with view to change.</p> <p>NOTED – apparently anomalous (in context of line as a whole) levying of charge by Northern Rail to be queried with view to change.</p> <p>NOTED – apparently anomalous (in context of line as a whole) levying of charge by Northern Rail to be queried with view to change.</p> <p>1) NOTED – apparently anomalous (in context of line as a whole) levying of charge by Northern Rail to be queried with view to change. 2) DISAGREE – there is no evidence of the need for this. Risk of blocking spaces intended for early morning rail users. 3) NOTED – the idea has merit.</p> <p>NOTED – existing/to be expanded community action re facility improvements will address enhancement. Problems in surrounding streets could be addressed via time limited parking restrictions.</p>	<p>ACTION – add community action re challenging charging policy.</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re challenging charging policy.</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re challenging charging policy.</p> <p>1) ACTION – add community action re challenging charging policy. 2) NO ACTION 3) ACTION – add to existing community action on facility improvement.</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re time limited parking restrictions in streets around station which experience problems.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>Can we propose a highway improvement scheme for lower speed limits and/or enhanced and improved road markings and adequate signals and/or truck/lorry ban on Spring Lane, especially on bend at Old School House as lots of people walk/jog on the road and many boy and girl scouts walk to the scout building.</p> <p>1) Concern about cars parked on pavements, 2) and about speed of vehicles. 3) no footpath on upper Spring Lane and several others.</p> <p>It is vital to protect hedgerows for our local wildlife, but this has to be tempered with transport, i.e. walking into the village the very thin pathway is often made smaller by the hedgerows. This means that people are often walking in the middle of the road to get around one another.</p> <p>Some more horse riders warning signs on Church Lane by Sandy Bank, and on the bends on Rudding Lane, would be great.</p> <p>The biggest problem and likely to become more of a rate payers anger unless drastic steps including 1) residents only access to Church Lane and Burn Bridge Road 2) and legal enforcement by NYP of the current weight limits on vehicles using these roads as part of heavy vehicles avoiding Leeds Rd between the town centre and Spacey Houses.</p>	<p>AGREE – a scheme involving extension of 20mph zone west to roundabout; enforcement re HGVs/HGV access only; and chicanes/directional priority measures has merit.</p> <p>1) NOTED – parking on footpaths allowing 1m clearance is allowed. Otherwise an issue to be addressed individually via a photo to PCSO. 2) NOTED – action already being taken to try to address this. 3) NOTED – creation of footpath here simply not feasible.</p> <p>NOTED – PC already trying to address issue of overhanging hedges with landowners.</p> <p>DISAGREE – more signs unlikely to have any effect as existing signs are ignored. Rudding Lane is outside parish.</p> <p>1) NOTED – this is simply not feasible. 2) NOTED – enforcement and access only measures to be addressed/re-addressed.</p>	<p>ACTION – add community action re lobbying for scheme described.</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – add community action re measures specified.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>1) There is a conflict between cyclists and vehicles on the two routes out of the parish - Church Lane and Burn Bridge road - which is a danger. 2) Large vehicles and buses should be banned from using the route through Burn Bridge to the A61. The narrow road means danger.</p> <p>1) Yew tree LANE (!) and 2) Burn bridge road are not the By pass and far too much heavy traffic uses them. the narrow right angled bridge over the railway is very dangerous.</p> <p>The use of Burn Bridge as a "rat run" (exacerbated by the extensive development to the West of Harrogate) is a real concern of ours. We have young girls and live near to Burn Bridge Road. We would like to see the use of this road as a cut through strongly discouraged.</p> <p>Traffic volume, particularly heavy vehicles, and speeding cars along Burn Bridge Road need to be a priority</p> <p>Yes, but should be much more specific on schemes/ proposals that will alleviate through traffic in village/west of Burn Bridge i.e. west side congestion. We need concrete proposals in here.</p> <p>Burn bridge road is a rat run and getting worse.</p> <p>No more speed humps. Traffic restrictions to be based on reduced speed limits on Burn Bridge road and directional? blocks to traffic as by the bridge over the beck.</p>	<p>1) NOTED – no scope to either ban cyclists or install cycle lane. HGV use to be re-addressed. 2) NOTED – school buses perform valuable function. Other large vehicle use to be re-addressed.</p> <p>NOTED – HGV use to be re-addressed.</p> <p>NOTED – HGV use to be re-addressed.</p> <p>NOTED – HGV use to be re-addressed. Speeding already being addressed to utmost.</p> <p>NOTED – HGV use to be re-addressed.</p> <p>NOTED – HGV use to be re-addressed.</p> <p>NOTED – no scope for reduced speed limits. Directional/priority measures can be looked at. Ditto HGV use/enforcement.</p>	<p>1) ACTION – add community action re HGV use. 2) ACTION – add community action re HGV use.</p> <p>ACTION - add community action re HGV use.</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re measures described.</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>Please, please, please make sure that Burn Bridge needs are addressed. Railway bridge on Burn Bridge road hasn't been designed for volume or heavy traffic using this road.</p> <p>Can we make sure that the calming is before you get to the village - let's deter people from using our villages for rat runs before they get here and definitely slow them all down on burn bridge road no matter what time of the day</p> <p>At peak periods 8-9am, 4-6pm more green light time required to leave the village.</p> <p>1) The A61 its now to fast, speed limits should be set here as the number of residents has increased and children walk along this road. 2) The pathway needs amending as it is insufficient in places.</p> <p>Lobbying for A61 peak time traffic flow optimisation , increased train frequency and capacity and improved access to the station, if possible, would be my preferred areas for action.</p> <p>The biggest concern for us is the walk from Walton area to the school. In particular the crossing over the railway bridge. A traffic light should be in place for pedestrians. It is very hard to walk to school with a pram, especially as cars stop on the bridge at the crossing were the pavement is low. It is almost impossible to see red/green lights on both sides and you have to run across the road hoping cars don't drive very fast to get through the lights. Now there are a number of children from the Walton and new</p>	<p>NOTED - Directional/priority measures can be looked at. Ditto HGV use/enforcement.</p> <p>NOTED - Directional/priority measures can be looked at. Ditto HGV use/enforcement.</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>1) NOTED – scope to reduce speed limit to 30mph for stretch through village can be explored, i.e. Crimple Hall to Thirkill Drive roundabout. 2) NOTED – as it is not specified where there are pathway problems, it is not possible to respond in any meaningful way.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – introduction of extended yellow box between the 2 sets of traffic lights, combined with monitoring cameras seen as possible solution. With possible addition of pedestrian lights.</p>	<p>ACTION – add community action re measures described.</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re measures described.</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re the suggested change.</p> <p>1) ACTION – add community action re 30mph exploration. 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re suggested solution.</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>development cross here I think this should be top priority to ensure the children's safety.</p> <p>1) The actions at the end of TT&T are comprehensive and also add to saving lives and improving the health of children in the community. 2) The Council should enable funding to ensure safe access across the busy through-route of the village during school access times. The blind spot of the zebra crossing is worrying and will inevitably lead to accidents with the increase in traffic numbers throughout the village.</p> <p>Speed limits need to be urgently reviewed.</p> <p>Resurfacing of Main Street and Station Road critical and needs addressing immediately. Parts are in a dangerous state for cyclists and motorists.</p> <p>including road maintenance (currently roads are lethal for bikes) and bike parking?</p> <p>No influence on road maintenance.</p> <p>1) One real issue (which I know does not go here but you have no additional space) is that the roads are terrible 2) and there is little if any control of parking (I get blocked in my own driveway)</p>	<p>1) NOTED 2) NOTED – exhaustive past lobbying on this issue has so far had no effect. Efforts will continue but with little hope of success.</p> <p>NOTED – PC already doing utmost on speeding. Spring Lane and A61 worth exploring. Other roads no.</p> <p>NOTED – PC already lobbying on this. Individual resident/community lobbying may also help.</p> <p>NOTED – PC already lobbying on this. Individual resident/community lobbying may also help.</p> <p>NOTED – PC already lobbying on this. Individual resident/community lobbying may also help.</p> <p>1) NOTED – PC already lobbying on this. Individual resident/community lobbying may also help. 2) NOTED – individual approach to PCSO with photographic evidence may help</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add community actions re exploring scope for reductions where indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>Policy should include the adoption of residents' parking schemes</p> <p>but it is about enforcement</p> <p>Parking on both sides of entrance road to Crimple Meadows opposite the church to be restricted to one side only. This will reduce the hazards, particularly at school drop off and pick up times.</p> <p>The Harrogate Advertiser (1st July) highlights the Harrogate District Walk to School initiative (p24). Rather than just having this a half-termly event Pannal School should encourage this to be a much more frequent activity.</p> <p>school parking must be taken away from Main Street. All children should walk!</p> <p>1) Footpath needed to Spring Lane, it is dangerous for those who walk along it especially when vehicles are parked on it. Could a permissive footpath be provided in the farmers field? 2) Stop school buses using Yew Tree Lane.... so many near misses. 3) Streetlights along Yew Tree Lane, between the Methodist Church and Rossett Green Lane. This is VERY dark and dangerous in the winter. 4) The path could do with being wider too. 5) Relocate the zebra-crossing on Main Street so it isn't hidden around the corner. 6) Potholes!! 7) Compulsory purchase of a house(s) on Main Street to provide additional access to the primary school!! 8) Connect the Pannal Sports fields to the village so children do not have to walk adjacent to Leeds Road to get there.</p>	<p>AGREE</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>NOTED – time limited parking restrictions to be explored.</p> <p>NOTED – ‘encourage increased walking to school’ is already a community action.</p> <p>NOTED – children from outside the parish cannot reasonably be expected to walk. Park and Stride designed to address issue. Time limited parking to be explored.</p> <p>1) NOTED – not feasible. 2) NOTED – not desirable – other HGV use could be restricted – to be explored. 3) AGREE 4) NOTED – not feasible – no space. 5) NOTED – long lobbying history – efforts continue but little hope. 6) NOTED – already addressed on regular basis. 7) NOTED – not within NP/PC gift. 8) NOTED – part of Park and Stride strategy, which includes weekend parking for sports field users.</p>	<p>ACTION – add community action re exploring with NYCC.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add community action as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re time limited parking restrictions.</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – add community action as indicated. 3) ACTION – add community action re street lights. 4) NO ACTION 5) NO ACTION 6) NO ACTION 7) NO ACTION 8) NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>1) Emphasise need to ban HGV through traffic 2) and reduce speed limits to 20mph and introduce appropriate traffic calming measures.</p> <p>Agree with all of these especially the school and main street parking. However we do need to discourage car usage, although this may be difficult because it is no longer a village school as it is likely to have a wider catchment area.</p> <p>1) Traffic calming, we would suggest that the only way to control speeding would be the use of speed cameras and fines. While we appreciate the dedication of speed watch teams, they are a temporary deterrent, Because the route is a rat run, the mindset of most is speed. 2) Train station facilities: certainly encourage increased use of trains, I don't think frequency is a problem. Station facilities could be improved: the 'shelter' on Platform 1 is not adequate against bad weather or indeed Good weater! It does not provide shade or shelter. A ticket machine on Platform 1 would be very welcome too.</p>	<p>Discussions with HBC as landowner ongoing.</p> <p>1) NOTED – already sufficient emphasis. 2) NOTED – extended 20mph scope on Spring Lane only. Calming to be looked at on route by route basis.</p> <p>NOTED – TTT1 plus various existing community actions seek to address this as far as is possible within a NP.</p> <p>1) NOTED – PC already doing utmost in this regard. 2) NOTED – suggested improvements have merit.</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – add community actions as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – add to existing community action re facility improvement as suggested.</p>
Traffic, Transport, Travel – General	<p>One of the main local problems is increased traffic congestion. This is going to get worse following all the recent house building in Harrogate. There is unlikely to be government money for new roads and tinkering with park & stride, extra parking and cycle lanes is unlikely to be the answer.</p>	<p>NOTED – these are strategic/larger than Pannal problems/issues. There is only so much that can be done through NP which by its nature can only address issues within the parish boundary. Discouraging road traffic and encouraging more sustainable travel modes is the best approach it can take.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>1) When the Bellway project was approved, the proposed road from the development was intended to be pedestrian only, cars were to go via the newly built roundabout on the A61 and enter the village that way. This 'open' road has now become a rat run with big vehicles using it daily as a short cut. The traffic lights outside Crimple Hall has exacerbated this over recent months as locals circumnavigate 2 sets of lights and add extra volume in through the village. 2) The cars travel rather fast up to the village hall junction and pull straight out, not mindful of pedestrians with babies who have ventured out of the hall after attending mother and baby groups. This is an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>Traffic through Pannal village needs to be discouraged, e.g. by toll barriers with number plate recognition to allow free access to residents.</p> <p>Any new housing development west of Harrogate should be carefully monitored. Developers do not and are not interested in road infrastructure. They are only interested in making money out of houses. They are not interested in traffic problems</p> <p>The rat run and congestion through the village is steadily worsening and would benefit from some urgent consideration to develop a comprehensive infrastructure plan in the light of the extensive housing development to the west of Harrogate</p> <p>Although motor traffic from outside the area is a problem, residents need their own vehicular access to be protected</p>	<p>1) DISAGREE – incorrect re what was intended. Supposed to be better traffic calming and PC fighting to get it implemented, but contingent on completion of industrial development and Dunlopillo building use. 2) AGREE – road is currently unadopted so no signage etc.. PC lobbying but won't be addressed till development completion.</p> <p>NOTED – the e.g. solution is a complete non-starter. Discouragement by other means, e.g. various traffic calming measures, will be considered for inclusion in the next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED – PC already addressing this.</p> <p>NOTED –discouragement by various traffic calming means will be considered for inclusion in the next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED – any measures taken will ensure that access for locals is maintained.</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider variety of traffic calming measures on a route by route basis.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider variety of traffic calming measures on a route by route basis.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>rather than impeded. Not everyone is able to cycle or walk.</p> <p>1) This whole section is one of the most important yet contains less than half a page of explanation. It is vague without clear fact or intention making it very difficult to vote on. 2) Again no proposed or current Neighbourhood Plan Map, how can we vote when you haven't identified the actual areas in definition. 3) You state there is inadequate parking at the 'station end' of Pannal. Get HBC to give back half the station car park as it is NEVER full. I'm sorry but this section of the survey is so important and yet we have been given vague, woolly statements. I don't have enough information to make a decision.</p> <p>Area of traffic concern is from the new development on the dunlopillo site into the village. We were led to believe</p>	<p>1) NOTED – as stated in the document (P6/para 2), the document contains only broad policy intentions. The next stage draft plan will set out fully fledged policies with expanded justifications/ evidence. That said, it should be noted that 'Traffic etc.' issues, while clearly of key concern to the community, cannot be significantly addressed via planning policies, being largely Highways matters, subject to separate regulation and responsibility. As such, the NPs planning policies will have only limited reach, with the onus on non-planning community actions – not a statutory part of NPs – to address many traffic etc concerns.</p> <p>2) NOTED – a NP Proposals Map, illustrating planning policies with site/area specific implications, will accompany the next stage draft plan. Such a map is not appropriate at broad policy intentions stage.</p> <p>3) NOTED – unclear which 'station car park' the comment relates to. The official station car park is owned by Northern Rail not HBC. The unofficial Dunlopillo car park is owned privately by Wharfedale Properties and leased to HBC. Pre-Covid it was always full.</p> <p>NOTED – never intended as pedestrian only route. Supposed to be better</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>this would be a pedestrian only route but there is a lot of traffic, some quite heavy, which appears to use this as a shortcut from the A61, avoiding the traffic lights.</p> <p>a road should be built from Otley Road to Buttersyke bar.</p>	<p>traffic calming and PC fighting to get it implemented, but contingent on completion of industrial development and Dunlopillo building use.</p> <p>NOTED – what is suggested is essentially the ‘western bypass’ idea which was considered and dismissed many years ago.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
PI CFS1	<p>Totally agree</p> <p>The hairdressers are not mentioned</p> <p>Essential.</p> <p>how can parish council resist the loss when most of these are private businesses and they could simply go out of business. It cannot protect them or enhance them?</p> <p>Public conveniences is a very good idea</p> <p>Too vague</p> <p>Emphatically</p> <p>The village needs all these facilities</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – they were considered for inclusion, but it was decided that although having community value as a by-product of their primary commercial function, they did not qualify as essential community facilities.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy aims to protect not the business itself but the community facility use of a particular building /site.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – as stated in the document (P6/para 2), the document sets out only broad policy intentions. Fully detailed policies with justifications/evidence will be set out in the next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>St. Robert's Church and the surrounding graveyard cannot be picked up and moved somewhere else.</p> <p>However more facilities are needed and spread throughout the community not just focused on Pannal</p> <p>1) The title of the policy includes "Enhancement" but the greyed title only include "resist loss" i.e.excludes enhancement. There should be much more emphasis on enhancement. 2) The list is not complete . Omissions include Elizabeth Black Hairdresser, the revamped Crimble Hall and since Pannal Motor Centre is included so should the BMW and Mercedes facilities, the new Costs coffee shop and the BP M& S shop. 3) I have no issue with any on the list but the community has to support each of these, else there is little point in preserving them.</p> <p>All needed and more where possible. Help should be provided wherever possible to attract new ventures to the village.</p> <p>All very valued</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>The devil is in the detail here - the question it begs is "how"</p> <p>No clue how you will put this in place but good ideas</p>	<p>NOTED – the policy aims to protect the community facility use of the church/ chapter house.</p> <p>NOTED – provision of new community facilities is addressed by TTT2.</p> <p>1) NOTED – this omission from the intention will be addressed in next stage draft plan policy. 2) NOTED – the hairdresser was considered for inclusion, but it was decided that although having community value as a by-product of its primary commercial function, it did not qualify as an essential community facility. The other businesses listed are addressed as employment sites under ED1. 3) NOTED – undoubtedly true, but there is little or nothing the NP or PC can do make people use them.</p> <p>NOTED – CFS2 aims to put in place a supportive planning policy environment for new community facilities.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – via the implementation of the final adopted planning policy, by HBC or its successor planning authority, in relation to any planning applications that threaten the listed facilities.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>The village can not afford to lose any of these</p> <p>Pannal, Burn Bridge and Walton Park are frequently mentioned but Walton Place Long Acre Drury Close/Lane and Walton Ave are on the fringes but neglected</p> <p>As most of these are private businesses it is not clear what intervention is worthwhile</p> <p>Community facilities such as the Post Office/Village store and the Co-op have provided an essential lifeline during the pandemic. They should be protected at all costs.</p> <p>Very important to support making Pannal a great place to live and work.</p> <p>I was surprised that there was little reference to the village hall which is an important village asset.</p> <p>HBC – need to make sure this policy does not just replicate the policy in the Local Plan. There are also facilities on this list that could be classed as open space/sport rather than community, or also business (Pannal Motor Centre). Not sure how appropriate it would be to try and protect the loss of a private business. Need to be careful as well with regards to permitted development which may allow the loss of some facilities. Would need to think carefully about the policy wording for this policy as there are lots of changes of use that are actually permitted now due to the change to the use class orders and Permitted Development. Commercial, business and service</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – this policy can only protect existing community facilities. None exist in the specified locations.</p> <p>NOTED – private businesses can provide valuable community facilities from the premises they occupy. CFS1 aims to keep those premises in community facility use even if occupying businesses fail/leave.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the village hall is listed as Pannal Memorial Hall</p> <p>NOTED – the PC is mindful of not duplicating Local Plan policy and of permitted development implications for certain uses. Policy can/will of course only apply to those developments requiring planning permission. Many already ‘made’ NPs with community facility protection policies include commercial/private businesses providing such facilities – this does not preclude their inclusion. Equally, the likes of sports clubs which also offer</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	land/buildings (Use Class E) is now permitted to change to residential for example (subject to meeting some conditions and Prior Approval).	their built facilities for hire, for parties/functions etc. separate from their sports use, can be included in lists of community facilities – again there are many ‘made’ NPs where this is the case.	
PI CFS2	<p>Why no mention of the village hall</p> <p>New development by A61 will provide extra cafe / restaurant capacity</p> <p>A pub would be very welcome news</p> <p>Public house, cafe/restaurant? How? Where?</p> <p>not sure what this means, help out existing pub, build a new one?? Toilets, where?</p> <p>It would be really good to have a local cafe and/or restaurant and shops in the village, this would <i>(NB rest of text missing)</i></p> <p>The current pub is possibly not financially safe so not sure another one might do more harm than good.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – the village hall is listed (as Pannal Memorial Hall) under CFS1 because it is an existing facility.</p> <p>NOTED – while this may well be the case, facilities are needed at the heart of the communities.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the policy will put in place a supportive planning context for assessing any proposals for these uses that may (or may not) come forward in the parish over the plan period. No particular locations are favoured. Such new uses were very well supported by the community in consultation on this document.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is down to ‘the market’ to determine whether individual pub businesses arrive/thrive. Support would be for pubs in either Pannal or Walton Park not Burn Bridge.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>If there was sufficient demand for a pub in Pannal, then the previous pub wouldn't have shut down. Drinking habits have changed in the last 20 years. The Black Swan isn't overly busy. I'd rather see the Black Swan succeed than campaign for a second pub that is going to struggle. If people Pannal want to go to the pub, I can't imagine many are put off by the extra 600m they need to walk to get to the Black Swan.</p>	<p>NOTED – the policy will put in place a supportive planning context for assessing any proposals for a new pub that may (or may not) come forward in in Pannal or Walton Park over the plan period. It is down to ‘the market’ to determine whether individual pub businesses arrive/thrive. Walton Park in particular lacks facilities.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Don't think we need a new pub</p>	<p>NOTED – it is down to ‘the market’ to determine whether individual pub businesses arrive/thrive. The idea was very well supported by the community in consultation on this document.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Although as we commented above other independent retail/leisure/commercial uses that add to the amenity within the Parish should be strongly encouraged.</p>	<p>NOTED – CFS2 does not preclude other such uses.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>A public house in Pannal and/or Walton Park is neither a realistic commercial proposition nor is it needed. The former pubs at Spacey Houses (now BMW forecourt) and Pannal station (now the Coop) closed through lack of support. The area has neither the local trade to support another pub nor does it have the destination characteristics and surrounding infrastructure to attract visitors from further afield.</p>	<p>NOTED – it is down to ‘the market’ to determine whether individual pub businesses arrive/thrive. The idea was very well supported by the community in consultation on this document.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>An ideal location would be in the vicinity of the current PO, Co-op and rail station - instead of the ugly, out-of-keeping semi-ruined building. The developers had promised residents that this building would be demolished as part of the new housing development plan but somehow wriggled out of it (pleading loss of profit!) This</p>	<p>NOTED – it is considered too restrictive to limit provision to a specified location within the village. Better to leave it open thereby increasing the chance of an opportunity coming forward,</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>location would be ideal to knit the new housing to the village and provide community meeting spots, like a cafe/restaurant and pub, maybe some green space and a water feature.</p> <p>The return of a pub in Pannal would be welcomed as would the creation of a cafe/restaurant</p> <p>Definitely need a pub since the demise of the Harwood</p> <p>Not sure we need additional pubs and not sure we could support a cafe/restaurant. Need to think about location of public conveniences as such facilities can quickly become run down/damaged.</p> <p>Provided any new build respects the surroundings it is placed in.</p> <p>pub for pannal.</p> <p>Very much agree with this</p> <p>is there really a need for a pub? what was the real level of support for this?</p> <p>Would prefer that 'instead of' or 'as well as' proposing a new pub this policy promoted the use of the existing pub in Burn Bridge and the social facilities at the Memorial Hall. I personally do not believe that in this day and age</p>	<p>although does need to be at the heart of the community served.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is down to ‘the market’ to determine whether individual pub/café etc. businesses arrive/thrive. The idea was very well supported by the community in consultation on this document. As stated, conveniences ideally in association with recreation facilities.</p> <p>NOTED – this would be addressed via other NP policies.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – over 78% (82) of the 105 people who expressed an opinion in the consultation on this document. Following on from earlier survey support for the idea.</p> <p>NOTED – planning policy cannot promote the use of facilities. ‘The market’ will decide whether another pub arrives/it and existing pubs thrive.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>there is sufficient business for more than one pub in the parish.</p> <p>Yes to cafe and public conveniences (if properly serviced) but not clear that another pub is needed ...in fact if there is a need, another pub will surely appear!</p> <p>However the residents will need to use a public house and/or cafe/restaurants.</p> <p>There is adequate provision of these services with the new development at Crimple Hall</p> <p>I think the Cricket Club and their pop-up bar is fantastic. Showing the pub what to do and how to do it!! The club house should be extended and the bar be open more often so the profits can be ploughed back in to a community facility. Same also for Pannal Sports.</p> <p>Not convinced that there is a need for a public house in Pannal. Black Swan is located well and needs to be run well and used by residents. Another pub could not probably be sustained in current modern environment. Very supportive of public conveniences and cafe/restaurant - should be such facilities in heart of new housing area and around the station.</p>	<p>NOTED – people clearly support the idea. ‘The market’ will determine if one appears or not. Plan policy will in place a supportive planning context for the aspiration.</p> <p>NOTED – there is clear support for both.</p> <p>NOTED – the consultation response to this document shows very strong support for the policy intention.</p> <p>NOTED – these are not considered to be either NP or PC matters.</p> <p>NOTED – there is clear support for the idea. Market will decide. Public conveniences associated with recreational facilities preferred. It is considered too restrictive to limit provision to a specified location within the village. Better to leave it open thereby increasing the chance of an opportunity coming forward, although does need to be at the heart of the community served.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	Pub in Pannal village or Spacey Houses would be great to have; hard to imagine where one could be located in Walton Park.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	A public house within Pannal would be a great addition to the village	NOTED	NO ACTION
	A cafe in the village would be wonderful. I personally feel The Black Swan is close enough to Pannal to not need another one.	NOTED – ‘the market’ will decide re pub.	NO ACTION
	Being as so few people in the parish actually support the existing pub, which is just a short walk away from anywhere in Pannal/Burn Bridge. It will be hard to get another one that would be financially viable.	NOTED – ‘the market’ will decide re a new pub.	NO ACTION
	None of the facilities identified are of interest to me.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	The Black Swan is struggling, so it is questionable whether the village could support another pub	NOTED – ‘the market’ will decide re a new pub.	NO ACTION
	No need for a further public house. The current one is not well used.	NOTED – ‘the market’ will decide re a new pub. The idea is well supported by the community.	NO ACTION
	Not sure about the need for a pub on Walton Park or whether a cafe would be viable in the village. Public toilets could be a bonus for walkers passing through the area.	NOTED – ‘the market’ will decide re new pub/café.	NO ACTION
	We look like having cafe and restaurant facilities at the garden centre site. Also the drive in Costa.	NOTED – while this may well be the case, facilities are needed at the heart of the communities.	NO ACTION
	No comment	NOTED	NO ACTION

	<p>1) But no need for a public house in Pannal or Walton Park, we have already seen the closure of Platform One in Pannal and the Spacey Houses pub on the A61 through lack of use. best to try and keep the Black Swan going. 2) Public loos are a sensible suggestion but who will pay for the service and cleaning of them and how much will it cost. Could we have the types of unisex toilets available in some continental countries where admittance is prepaid for with automatic cleaning after each use??</p> <p>Unsure about the public conveniences</p> <p>Do we need another pub as such. Cafe/resturant/wine bar would be better maybe?</p> <p>Cafes to serve different tastes. Independents would suit the village perfectly</p> <p>Public conveniences should not be locked up or only available at certain times</p> <p>Public House -- dubious we did not support The Harwood Cafe/Restaurant -- dubious Toilets -- Support</p> <p>Again, these should be address separately as it relates to private businesses.</p> <p>All will improve the quality of life for residents and encourage visitors</p>	<p>1) NOTED - 'the market' will decide re new pub. The idea is well supported. Little the NP/PC can do re Black Swan. 2) NOTED – the detail is beyond the scope of planning policy. Much would depend on who proposes/develops them (if anyone).</p> <p>NOTED – the idea is well supported.</p> <p>NOTED – the idea is well supported.</p> <p>NOTED – the planning system/planning policy makes no fine distinctions – a café is a café.</p> <p>NOTED – operational details are beyond the scope of planning policy. Much would depend on who proposes/develops them (if anyone).</p> <p>NOTED – the idea is well supported by the community.</p> <p>NOTED – private businesses are legitimate providers of community facilities and acknowledged as such in adopted NPs elsewhere.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>With the Costa Coffee and redeveloped Crimple Hall, I do not think there is a need for further Public House/Cafe/Restaurants. I have doubts about the maintenance, cleanliness, safety of public conveniences.</p> <p>What about children's areas</p> <p>Fully agree these ar missing requirements to achieve the vision. Areas around Pannal railway and new Jubilee park housing area should be prioritized for investment.</p> <p>Unnecessary</p> <p>Except I do not seek a pub etc. on my home 1970's housing estate of Walton Park.</p> <p>Will locals support another pub. This is a commercial decision unless it is a community facility.</p>	<p>NOTED – all aspirations are well supported by the community. While acknowledging Costa/Crimple Hall, facilities are needed at the heart of the communities.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that there are sufficient built facilities available to house children's activities. But also considered that a multi-use games area, younger children play provision and more 'teenager-led' activities would be beneficial.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered too restrictive to limit provision to a specified location within the village. Better to leave it open thereby increasing the chance of an opportunity coming forward, although does need to be at the heart of the community served.</p> <p>NOTED – the aspirations are well supported by the community.</p> <p>NOTED – the idea is well supported by the community.</p> <p>NOTED – 'the market' will decide. All the NP will do is put in place a supportive planning context, should a proposal come forward.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include provision as indicated in next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI CFS3	<p>Because of house building there will be pressure to increase the size of the school - but is this realistic.</p>	<p>NOTED – the school is already identified for expansion in the adopted Harrogate Local Plan.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>If this means enlarging the school, more pupils = more traffic, this must be addressed by better parking facilities elsewhere. Pannal Green and the church car park cannot take any more school traffic.</p> <p>Again, necessary with increased housing.</p> <p>again what does this mean? it would set out constraints and requirements that would be needed to be satisfied for the development of educational facilities on this site? The school is already here, surely this would come under the education budget provision?</p> <p>It is not clear what 'educational facilities' are needed. What is 'buffer planting'? Charging points? Noise coming and going? A very narrow approach road. Both school and church must be treated with respect. Losing trees and hedgerows does not sound good either.</p> <p>Difficult I know, but children learn from their parents. Respecting the village and its residents, plus a little bit of exercise to start the day shouldn't be too difficult??</p> <p>Electric charging points provision to be "self financed" if to be provided. How will duration of time at each point be</p>	<p>NOTED – the school is already identified for expansion in the adopted Harrogate Local Plan. TTT4 addresses the school traffic issue.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - the school is already identified for expansion in the adopted Harrogate Local Plan. The Local Plan sets out some planning requirements to govern the way it is built. The NP policy will set out additional requirements, as set out in CFS3.</p> <p>NOTED - the school is already identified for expansion in the adopted Harrogate Local Plan. The Local Plan sets out some planning requirements to govern the way it is built. The NP policy will set out additional requirements, as set out in CFS3. These include tree/hedgerow retention to prevent loss, new tree/hedgerow planting to 'buffer' the boundary with adjacent countryside and charging points for electric cars etc..</p> <p>NOTED – unclear how this relates to CFS3. TTT4 and various community actions address walking to school.</p> <p>NOTED – 'education' will provide parking and therefore charging points.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>regulated. Someone parks, plugs in, and comes back later in the day!!</p> <p>However with strong support for additio to this to add a lot of cycle parking, storage with cover and secure storage at the site so that a large proportion of children could use cycling to school. We should be VERY ambitious in this regard to reduce traffic in the village.</p> <p>But I am struggling to see the need for electronic car charging points for people dropping their kids at school...</p> <p>Not so sure about the access to the footpath for all and sundry to the school. there is adequate provision already.</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>Already overstretched before the vast increase in homes planned by HBC which will further swamp the school even after its planned expansion unless further restraints are put on its catchment area.</p> <p>Getting in touch with community groups such as Treesresponsibility, who recently planted 800 tress on a farm on Brackenthwaite lane</p> <p>I presume you have a wish list of aspirations for educational facilities.</p>	<p>It will be in school grounds and thus in school control.</p> <p>NOTED – this is a reasonable suggested addition to stated requirements/ aspirations.</p> <p>NOTED – parking in this case is not for parent drop-off/pick-up, it relates to any parking provided as part of the school expansion for staff/visitor usage.</p> <p>NOTED – footpath access as suggested would link the school to the proposed ‘Park ‘n’ Stride’ and remove the need to walk to school along Main St.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the setting of the catchment area is outside the scope of the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – unfortunately no longer an option as Treesresponsibility will apparently soon cease to exist.</p> <p>NOTED – the actual facilities to be provided through the expansion will be planned by the education authority and doubtless subject to separate consultation with school/community.</p>	<p>ACTION – add cycle parking/storage provision to list of requirements/aspirations.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>Don't make it so difficult and all about trees to improve the pretty dowdy facilities for our children. Doubt the footpath Will do much</p> <p>Important but perhaps of lower priority than other actions.</p> <p>In part - see earlier comments re car park. Essentially Pannal School is in the wrong place - resite onto A61 & provide school bus for village children.</p> <p>I would welcome further access to Pannal Primary school via Sandy Bank Woods.</p> <p>HBC – would this policy relate to any new development on the site as would need to be careful that it didn't make it difficult for new facilities to be provided and also that any requirements could be justified and met the Regulations of being necessary, related etc.. Would advise talking to NYCC Education about this policy.</p>	<p>NOTED – rather than 'difficult', CFS3 is about making this new development the best it can possibly be for school users/community/environment. The proposed footpath will link the proposed 'Park 'n' Stride (ref TTT4) to the school without the need for children to walk along the busy Main St. In the consultation on this document, almost 90% of people supported CFS3.</p> <p>NOTED – no one policy intention is of any greater or lesser priority than any other. All will be applied equally, as appropriate, to planning application proposals.</p> <p>NOTED – such a proposal is a complete on-starter in the current Harrogate-wide planning context.</p> <p>NOTED – considered that a further access to the school, and through a woodland at that, would raise security/safety concerns</p> <p>NOTED – the intention is that it relates purely to the PN20 development and adds requirements/aspirations to those set out in the Local Plan. Agreed that pre-Reg 14 consultation with NYCC Education on a proposed policy is a good idea.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – NYCC Education to be consulted on proposed policy prior to Reg 14 consultation.</p>
--	--	---	---

Community Facilities & Services - General	<p>1) A community run pub?? 2) Get the Black Swan to be a focal point of the community.</p> <p>1) Fails to address the need for the area to have best in class access to internet services. 2) Does not address the land around Pannal station and finding ways to convert to value adding community facilities including pubs, cafe, shops and restaurants. 3) Appears to miss the need to create spaces / activity areas for teenagers to safely be entertained and spend time with friends.</p>	<p>1) NOTED – not considered to be a NP/PC matter. No evidence of community interest in such an idea. 2) NOTED – beyond the scope of the NP</p> <p>1) NOTED – this is in the process of being addressed for the vast majority of properties in the parish. 2) NOTED – it is considered too restrictive to limit provision of new community facilities to a specified location within the village. Better to leave it open thereby increasing the chance of an opportunity coming forward, although does need to be at the heart of the community served. The future of the land in question (assuming it to be Dunlopillo site) is not within NP/PC remit. 3) NOTED – it is considered that there are sufficient built facilities available to house children’s activities. But also considered that a multi-use games area, younger children play provision and more ‘teenager-led’ activities would be beneficial.</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) ACTION – include provision as indicated in next stage draft plan.</p>
PI H1	Who decides what the local needs are?	NOTED – the ‘Housing’ section of the document specifically cites the 2018 Housing Needs Survey carried out in the parish, which identified a threefold local housing need, and indicates the likelihood of a policy specifying a housing type mix that meets that identified need. The arbiters of what the policy states in the final submitted	NO ACTION

		plan will be the community itself, via future consultations (NB consultation on this document overwhelming supported the proposed policy intention on housing mix). The arbiter of what the policy states in the final plan will be an independent examiner. The community itself is the ultimate arbiter as to whether the overall plan is adopted.	
	Include building bungalows	NOTED – as stated in the document (P14/para 1), a preference for bungalows will be included.	NO ACTION
	No future housing for the village	NOTED – some future infill/windfall housing development is moreorless inevitable over the 14 year plan period. No other housing, apart from Local Plan allocations, is anticipated and will be resisted.	NO ACTION
	NO MORE HOUSING AT ALL		
	The priority on housing is to limit numbers built to ensure the rural aspect is maintained		
	But must ensure much better provision of affordable housing	NOTED – affordable housing is already adequately covered by adopted Local Plan policy, to which NP policy can add nothing.	NO ACTION
	doesn't HBC already do this?	NOTED – HBC policy reflects 'local need' based on a strategic assessment not a parish assessment – NP policy will reflect local parish need.	NO ACTION
	The recently adopted Local Plan has set the development limits for Pannal/Burn Bridge. The Plan should not seek to address any sort of perceived housing needs outside of	NOTED – some future infill/windfall housing development is moreorless inevitable over the 14 year plan period. Plan policy seeks to guide/shape this.	NO ACTION

	<p>these limits. Any as yet unallocated space within the development limits is likely to be very small scale.</p> <p>Ideally would like to see bungalows being built for the older population but builders prefer town houses etc as they can get more built in the same area.</p> <p>Please include a wish that housing developments are not boring samey samey design</p> <p>Does "Local" just mean Pannal /Burn Bridge ?</p> <p>We agree that it is based on need of the prospective home owners and not on the need of a land owner to develop. However, please note that demand for housing on the south side of Harrogate will always be greater as people want to work in Leeds - making Harrogate more of a dormitory town</p> <p>Houses built to satisfy local housing requirements are not necessarily filled with local people. With a policy that states it will fulfil local demand will end up with an estate the size of West & South Yorkshire. Demand for housing here is high because it is a nice place to live, for no other reason. Priority No 1 should be to keep it that way.</p> <p>I don't want to see more new houses built...</p>	<p>No other housing, apart from Local Plan allocations, is anticipated and will be resisted – plan policy seeks to achieve this. H1 looks to ensure that whatever housing is built caters for parish level local need.</p> <p>NOTED – as stated in the document (P14/para 1), a preference for bungalows will be included.</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan’s design/development policies will seek to achieve his aim.</p> <p>NOTED – yes, the parish/ Neighbourhood Area.</p> <p>NOTED – no doubt developers will make this very point themselves in seeking to secure a mix that suits’ their needs’.</p> <p>NOTED – not necessarily, but providing houses that local people say are needed/they need at least gives them the chance to fill them. Policy only applies to housing that will be built anyway, i.e Local Plan allocations and infill/windfalls. Other NP policies will address maintaining village character.</p> <p>NOTED – some future infill/windfall housing development is moreorless</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>Traffic is already bad on most roads around this area. Building new houses will detract from the heritage of the area.</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>Bungalows not mansions.</p> <p>The issue is that housing built is not really addressed by capacity in other services (roads, schools, etc.) beforehand.</p> <p>Stop new houses</p> <p>I am actually astounded that the evidence from the survey stated larger properties were needed. I feel we have a wealth of this type in Pannal, Burn Bridge and Walton Park but will accept the evidence</p>	<p>inevitable over the 14 year plan period. No other housing, apart from Local Plan allocations, is anticipated and will be resisted.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – as stated in the document (P14/para 1), a preference for bungalows will be included.</p> <p>NOTED – this is a HBC/NYCC rather than a PC/NP issue. School expansion is part of the adopted Local Plan proposals.</p> <p>NOTED – some future infill/windfall housing development is moreorless inevitable over the 14 year plan period. No other housing, apart from Local Plan allocations, is anticipated and will be resisted.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI H2	<p>No future housing for the village</p> <p>Stop new housing</p> <p>Must ensure adequate affordable housing</p>	<p>NOTED – some future infill/windfall housing development is moreorless inevitable over the 14 year plan period. No other housing, apart from Local Plan allocations, is anticipated and will be resisted.</p> <p>NOTED – affordable housing is already adequately covered by adopted Local</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>yes, with the proviso that such small sites could also be useful for providing the additional local community facilities specified earlier.</p> <p>Emphatically support the policy of small infill sites that knit into the current mix of housing. No more large, stand-alone developments are needed.</p> <p>No more development in private gardens</p> <p>Any new development should also have environmental considerations at its heart. Sustainable and longevity being key focus</p> <p>10 units 0.4 ha too large for these communities</p>	<p>Plan policy, to which NP policy can add nothing.</p> <p>NOTED – NP will not specify suitable small scale housing sites – just set suitability criteria. Similarly, the NP will not specify sites for new community facilities, it being considered better to leave the door open for opportunities wherever they may come forward, as long as they are within the heart of the communities to be served.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – criteria to be set should rule out inappropriate development of private gardens. That said, some private gardens may be of significant size and taken together with redevelopment of the properties they serve could in theory constitute infill/windfall sites.</p> <p>NOTED – such considerations are largely covered by national and local plan policy plus Building Regulations. There is very limited scope for NPs to be prescriptive in this regard.</p> <p>NOTED – these are the standard thresholds for small as opposed to large (Local Plan level) developments.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>Environmental needs also need to be added - such as 'green corridors'.</p> <p>10 houses? Care needs to be taken to dissuade developers from splitting larger plots into smaller developments - is 10 the right number?</p> <p>Allow for sufficient car parking.</p> <p>Specific criteria should include net additions to green space and connected network of green and blue spaces; enhancement to wildlife biodiversity</p> <p>Prefer no infill . Green spaces and open vistas are better.</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>Not many sites available around the village for even developments of 10 houses or less.</p> <p>This is an invitation to developers to to build 10 units or less on sites which are not specifically protected or enhanced. We all lost the apeal against 13 houses on Rossett Green Lane - but this is the kind of development that you are inviting by this policy.</p>	<p>NOTED – green corridors are addressed under GNE1.</p> <p>NOTED – these are the standard thresholds for small as opposed to large (Local Plan level) developments.</p> <p>NOTED – parking standards are set by NYCC/HBC. That said, NP TTT2 seeks above standard provision for any housing development in areas where of existing, well-evidenced existing on-street parking problems.</p> <p>NOTED – these considerations already adequately covered by adopted Local Plan policies. It is not the function of NPs to duplicate such policies.</p> <p>NOTED – some future infill/windfall housing development is moreorless inevitable over the 14 year plan period. Policy will aim to control where that happens.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – but over the 14 year period of the plan, redevelopment is also a possibility.</p> <p>NOTED – some future infill/windfall housing development is moreorless inevitable over the 14 year plan period. Policy will aim to control where that happens. Such a policy may have</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>Depends on what the criteria or tests are. Until these can be reviewed to ensure appropriateness against the vision then it is difficult to endorse this point.</p> <p>So long as it does not lead on to spoiling the appearance of the village.</p>	<p>prevented the scheme referred to. Better to anticipate a potential situation and seek to control it rather than be silent and then have no policy to address it when it occurs.</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan will provide the detailed policy.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy together with other design/development policies in the plan will seek to conserve the villages’ appearance.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI H3	<p>Who decides?</p> <p>No future housing for the village</p> <p>NO MORE HOUSING OF ANY SIZE</p> <p>I am against further housing development within the Pannal/Burnbridge area</p>	<p>NOTED - the arbiters of what the policy states in the final submitted plan will be the community itself, via future consultations (NB consultation on this document overwhelming supported the proposed policy intention). The arbiter of what the policy states in the final plan will be an independent examiner. The community itself is the ultimate arbiter as to whether the overall plan is adopted. HBC or its successor will be responsible for implementing the policy in relation to planning application proposals.</p> <p>NOTED – some future infill/windfall housing development is more or less inevitable over the 14 year plan period. No other housing, apart from Local Plan allocations, is anticipated and will be resisted – hence H3.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>How can we include protection against development of the farming/grazing fields on Woodcock Hill; both directly as being explicitly mentioned under the green and natural environment policy but also indirectly by broadening the criteria/ tests as per policy intention H3 (p.14) rather than just "pollution issues" to extend to "environmental and preservation issues".</p> <p>Important to limit expansion of building.</p> <p>For the reasons I've given above, it is not appropriate to set out any such criteria or tests for hypothetical scale development (10 or more units) which could only take place outside of the Local Plan development limits. In rejecting an Appeal to develop 48 sites on Spring Lane Farm (within the SLA but outside the LP development limits) the Government appointed Inspector placed by far the most weight on the adverse landscape impact.</p> <p>After the completion of the Dunlopillo site there are very few, or no 'brown field' sites in the villages. any future development would inevitably involve 'Greenfield sites'.</p> <p>subject to comment above</p> <p>Include environmental aspects - such as 'green corridors'.</p> <p>Think our policy should be that there is no further need for such large scale housing developments in this parish, so setting out criteria for them implicitly accepts that there could be need or justification. The parish has provided</p>	<p>NOTED – NP policy on green/blue infrastructure and SLA will add layers of protection. Consideration can also be given to criteria/tests under H3. Consideration to other possible policy mechanisms can also be given.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the proposed criteria/tests will add to/complement existing local Plan tests – a 'belt 'n' braces' approach. Landscape impact can form part of tests. This policy plus others in the NP can only strengthen the protection of sites such as Spring Lane Farm.</p> <p>NOTED – hence H3. HBC Local Plan SLA policy does not preclude development.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – green corridors will be addressed through GNE1. Other 'environmental' tests could form part of policy.</p> <p>NOTED – national planning policy's presumption in favour of sustainable development does not permit local (including NP) planning policy to impose such blanket bans on development.</p>	<p>ACTION – consider how best to provide layers of protection in respect of the site specified.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – build landscape impact tests into policy.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – build environmental tests into policy.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>significant new housing via the dunlopillo area and plans there should be completed to meet housing needs.</p> <p>No Building on green belt should be allowed.</p> <p>Please save Crimple Valley. Like the non planning Trust</p> <p>Traffic issues need to be fully considered</p> <p>As above - this is an invitation. Would it not be better to have a policy to identify land where development would be acceptable provided lots of criteria were met? This would be a better containment strategy than the reactive ones that are proposed and more in line with number 7 bullet in "how the plan aims to achive the vision" on page 5. "Positively influencing....." to me means identifying possibly suitable land for devlopment.</p>	<p>Developers are at liberty to make speculative planning applications on any land. The proposed criteria/tests will add to/complement existing Local Plan tests – a ‘belt ‘n’ braces’ approach – making it more difficult for a housing case to be made.</p> <p>NOTED – the rules surrounding building on Green Belt are set by national planning policy. The NP has no remit to address Green Belt issues.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP, through its planning policies, will do its utmost to protect the valley.</p> <p>NOTED – as stated in H3, criteria/tests will include coverage of highways/ traffic issues.</p> <p>NOTED – the allocation of further land for housing within the NP would be a gilt-edged invitation (not to mention a difficult and technical exercise involving a lot of work). It would also be very controversial in the parish. The proposed approach, involving criteria/ tests, will add to/complement existing Local Plan tests – a ‘belt ‘n’ braces’ approach – making it more difficult for a housing case to be made. This approach is very well supported in the consultation on this document.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>For larger developments there should be Zero Carbon considerations using ground source heating and/or solar power</p> <p>Stop new housing</p> <p>Depends on what the criteria or tests are. Until these can be reviewed to ensure appropriateness against the vision then it is difficult to endorse this point.</p> <p>Attempt to have influence over any sites close to the village that will impact on the village.</p>	<p>NOTED – acknowledged this is an important issue that needs full consideration.</p> <p>NOTED – some future infill/windfall housing development is more or less inevitable over the 14 year plan period. No other housing, apart from Local Plan allocations, is anticipated and will be resisted – hence H3.</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan will provide the detailed policy.</p> <p>NOTED – hence H3 and H2.</p>	<p>ACTION – planning policy and community action options for the plan to address climate change issues to be considered and included in plan as appropriate/feasible.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Housing – Non-Planning Community Actions	<p>The action to establish a Community Land Trust could do with being expanded to explain what it is and why it comes as part of Housing, why not also Community Facilities ?</p> <p>Community Land Trust is an excellent idea.</p> <p>What would be the benefit of a Community Land Trust?</p>	<p>AGREE</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – explanation of benefits should be provided.</p>	<p>ACTION – explanatory worded to be added to next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include explanation of benefits in next stage draft plan.</p>
PI ED1	<p>Don't see the need for Costa coffee on that site - there are other coffee suppliers in the area.</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP/policy can do nothing about Costa or any other business occupying any of the sites. The aim is keep the sites to existing use types and any other commercial uses that are appropriate.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Question mark still over former office block and land behind</p> <p>We agree with protecting current businesses. Regarding the Dulopillo site we would not like to see large business development there.</p> <p>how would parish council do this?</p> <p>As long as the safeguarding bears in mind the size and shape of what they are being used for in the future.</p> <p>no buildings at all at bottom of Almsford Bank</p>	<p>NOTED – the future of the building/land is out of the hands of the PC/ community. PC has made local views known. Building will either be retained and converted to flats or demolished and a larger block of flats erected.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP does not propose large businesses on the site. Development will be in line with Local Plan allocation and existing planning permission, in line with which new business units will be provided.</p> <p>NOTED – it is not the PC per se that does the safeguarding, but rather the planning policy which the PC proposes to put in place via its NP, which will become part of the Development Plan for the area. The policies will then be implemented by HBC and its successor planning authority.</p> <p>NOTED – the point re design is well made – this will be addressed via design/development policies in the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – on the assumption that this refers to the ‘South of Almsford Bridge’ site, this is already allocated for development in the adopted Local Plan. The NP can do nothing to stop the building.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>It is not clear why these sites are considered Employment sites rather than local facilities. It should include the Dunlopillo site</p> <p>care homes are employment sites as are the commercial facilities in the village listed CFS1.</p> <p>1) Ideally any development should aid local employers. 2) need a policy that aims to integrate this very large development into the village</p> <p>On the east side of the A61, the Mercedes Garage, BP and ATS are an eyesore. These act as a nucleus for further expansion of similar units and ruin the aspect the valley and viaduct provide.</p> <p>How many people who live in P & BB work in these places?</p>	<p>NOTED – the distinction within the NP is between genuine ‘community’ facilities, which can be clearly evidenced as such (ref CFS section of document) and commercial/business uses which, while providing a service to the community, provide only a pure and simple commercial service. Consideration will be given to retitling the policy, as ‘employment sites’ is perhaps misleading and inaccurate in planning terms. In planning terms, car homes are a residential use. The Dunlopillo site is already a protected ‘employment site’ in the Local Plan – it is not the function of NPs to duplicate.</p> <p>1) NOTED – unclear as to what is meant here, i.e. in what way it should help local employers. As such, it is difficult to respond in a more meaningful way. 2) NOTED – which large development? How? Lack of clarity makes it difficult to respond in a more meaningful way.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP cannot do anything about existing developments. The plan’s design/development policies will aim to secure improved future developments.</p> <p>NOTED – not known. Local employment sites at least offer the potential for local jobs.</p>	<p>ACTION – consider renaming policy as discussed.</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>But the eyesore of the Dunlopillo building needs to be demolished</p> <p>Although was very disappointed to see that a big chain like Costa was allowed to build in place of where our much more useful dry cleaners and petrol station were.</p> <p>Yes, the village needs a community hub/centre such as a cafe</p> <p>1) How about the new food store destined for later this year? 2) What about the commercial businesses on the former Dunlopillo site?</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>No development of PN18</p> <p>Why would we have a policy to safeguard these? What if they become economically unviable? There is nothing any Parish Council can do if a business loses money and needs to close. This is unrealistic.</p>	<p>NOTED – the future of the building/land is out of the hands of the PC/ community. PC has made local views known. Building will either be retained and converted to flats or demolished and a larger block of flats erected.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP can do nothing about historic developments.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED – a food store is exclusively a retail use and as such the site on which it will be located is not appropriate to include in the policy. 2) The Dunlopillo site is already a protected ‘employment site’ in the Local Plan – it is not the function of NPs to duplicate.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – this is a Local Plan allocation and out of the NP’s hands as far as the principle of development is concerned.</p> <p>DISAGREE this is about safeguarding those use types (and others considered appropriate) to retain local employment, rather than the individual businesses.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</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>The Dunlopillo site is an eyesore that would be better demolished and rebuilt</p> <p>We could happily lose the the Mercedes, BMW and ATS sites.</p> <p>This relates to private businesses and is not really within the purview of the council</p> <p>The litter of coffee cups around the village from Costa is a pain. I don't know what could be done about it though.</p> <p>Add the care home to the list</p> <p>Doubt many locals are actually employed by these companies?</p> <p>Too limited. How are we going to make Pannal an attractive investment location for businesses. We need local jobs for the local community esp part-time jobs for younger and older members of the community.</p>	<p>NOTED – the future of the building/land is out of the hands of the PC/ community. PC has made local views known. Building will either be retained and converted to flats or demolished and a larger block of flats erected.</p> <p>NOTED – the principle of these sort of uses is already established. The NP seeks to safeguard them while also controlling any future change, and to retain local employment.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the planning system rightly exists to exercise control of the use of land, which is what ED1 seeks to do. This relates to the use types not the businesses themselves.</p> <p>NOTED – neither does the PC, beyond existing litter campaigning.</p> <p>NOTED – in planning terms, care homes are a residential use.</p> <p>NOTED – not known. Local employment sites at least offer the potential for local jobs.</p> <p>NOTED – ED1 safeguards jobs already in the parish. The ‘South of Almsford Bridge’ development will provide more. This is considered more than enough for a village the size of Pannal.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>HBC – would need to think carefully about the policy wording for this policy as there are lots of changes of use that are actually permitted now due to the change to the use classes order and Permitted Development. Commercial, business and service land/buildings (Use Class E) is now permitted to change to residential for example (subject to meeting some conditions and Prior Approval).</p>	<p>NOTED – policy will be worded with this in mind.</p>	<p>ACTION – word policy taking account of comment made.</p>
PI ED2	<p>I'm opposed to any further development on the farmland in the vicinity of ATS, BP and Crimple Hall. There is already enough development.</p> <p>I would not agree with any employment sites south of Almsford Bridge</p> <p>We would not like to see any further business development south of Almsford Bridge or anywhere else along the A61 leading into Harrogate</p> <p>This is a lapwing nesting site which are on the endangered list</p> <p>Electric car charging points essential and urgent</p> <p>Account needs to be taken of climate impact - increased risk of flooding with increase in hard standing surface areas. Repercussions for the village and adjoining businesses, and railway line.</p>	<p>NOTED – the site is already allocated for development in the Local Plan. The NP can do nothing to change this.</p> <p>NOTED – the site is already allocated for development in the Local Plan. The NP can do nothing to change this.</p> <p>NOTED – the site is already allocated for development in the Local Plan. The NP can do nothing to change this.</p> <p>NOTED – the Local Plan policy allocating the site for development requires the submission of a preliminary ecological appraisal when any planning application is submitted. This would be expected to pick up on this issue.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the Local Plan policy allocating the site for development requires the submission of a site specific flood risk assessment when any planning application is submitted. This would be expected to pick up on this issue.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>BUT, any further development for this area should be limited. Proposals to date have been inappropriate, such as a mail-order distribution centre and would not provide employment for local people. On the contrary, such developments would only bring yet more daily commuters and commuter traffic to the area.</p> <p>There certainly needs to be building height restrictions so as to not lose sight of the wonderful viaduct</p> <p>Bear in mind that this will be an important entry to Harrogate. It would be good to keep green sides to the road rather than an even larger jumble of heterogeneous buildings, some great, some small. Transport assessment sounds good.</p> <p>I find it strange that neither of the care homes are worthy of a mention in the plan? They must be the villages largest employers? Should we be looking at making them more inclusive in village life?</p>	<p>NOTED – the Local Plan policy allocating the site for development already sets out the acceptable use types, which the NP cannot change. The policy requires the submission of a transport assessment and travel plan when any planning application is submitted – these should address traffic/commuter issues to some degree. As stated in ED2, the NP policy will seek to add to the traffic assessment requirements. Consideration could be given to the feasibility of a local employment policy clause.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the Local Plan policy allocating the site for development already sets out a requirement to “retain boundary trees along the western site boundary where possible”. NP policy could add to this with requirement for additional landscaping along this roadside boundary.</p> <p>NOTED – care homes are a residential use in planning terms not an employment use. Unclear how the plan could usefully mention them or include them more in village life – there are for e.g. already links with the school.</p>	<p>ACTION – consider feasibility of policy clause as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add requirement for roadside landscaping as indicated, but of a type/height that will not obscure key viaduct views from the road.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>Within working hours this should also include light pollution. The light pollution emitted from the BMW garage at night is not acceptable and should be looked at regardless of this survey.</p> <p>dont agree need to restrict working hours</p> <p>1) Electric charging points provision to be "self financed" if to be provided. How will duration of time at each point be regulated. Someone parks, plugs in, and comes back later in the day!! 2) No working hours restrictions should apply except for noise considerations.</p> <p>This is not a suitable site for this type of development.</p> <p>There should be no development here. We have heard stories of kingfishers being seen regularly at this site...</p> <p>Obviously no one wants PN18, but it's in the Harrogate plan, so we have to live with it. I trust the Neighbourhood plan will be as restrictive as possible in order to act as a dissuasion to anyone thinking of building there.</p> <p>There is a lot of replace upon electronic vehicle charging points within the document, could these be solar or wind</p>	<p>NOTED – the light pollution issue can be looked at as a possible part of the draft plan policy.</p> <p>NOTED- the aim is to prevent the possibility of 24/7 working for noise/light pollution reasons –</p> <p>1) NOTED – charging points are provided at developer's expense and controlled by site operator(s), e.g. as with points on supermarket or local authority car parks. 2) The aim is to prevent the possibility of 24/7 working for noise/light pollution reasons –</p> <p>NOTED – the site is already allocated for development in the Local Plan. The NP can do nothing to change this.</p> <p>NOTED – the Local Plan policy allocating the site for development requires the submission of a preliminary ecological appraisal when any planning application is submitted. This would be expected to pick up on this issue.</p> <p>NOTED – the restrictions need to be reasonable and cannot exceed or conflict with those already required through the Local Plan policy.</p> <p>NOTED – the requirement for charging points is now commonplace – use of</p>	<p>ACTION – consider feasibility of a light pollution policy clause.</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>powered. I don't want the village to be known as a charging area!</p> <p>Support would be dependent on criteria. A lot of work is required here to make sure that the development controls ensure no increase in traffic, and that there are associated additions to green space and walking/cycling routes to employment/facilities. Specific need to avoid height that destroys rural views of the Crimple Valley.</p> <p>but why restrict working hours unless the activity is excessively noisy?</p> <p>We all want to keep the view of the Crimple valley and viaduct from the A61 and are concerned about increased traffic accessing the A61 at that point.</p> <p>We should persist in attempts to reverse the development of this site which is entirely unsuitable for so many reasons including access/egress; filling the space between Pannal and Harrogate, and spoiling the Crimple Valley vista</p> <p>This is a sop to an inappropriate development in a special area. This development should be opposed.</p> <p>Concern about extensive developments at Almsford Bank</p> <p>No comment</p>	<p>points will be controlled by those operating the sites in question. The stipulation of power source lies beyond the scope of the planning system.</p> <p>NOTED – the Local Plan policy restrictions already in place coupled with additional NP policy requirements will together seek to achieve the best possible development of the site.</p> <p>NOTED - the aim is to prevent the possibility of 24/7 working for noise/light pollution reasons –</p> <p>NOTED – Local Plan and NP development requirements together will aim to address both concerns.</p> <p>NOTED – there is no readily available mechanism to reverse the development and certainly not via the NP.</p> <p>NOTED - the site is already allocated for development in the Local Plan. The NP can do nothing to change this. Better to seek to shape the development to achieve the best outcome possible than for the NP to say/nothing and rely solely on Local Plan policy.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>But be harsher with HBC when we gain some more element of control.</p> <p>ED2 would not be necessary if the development of Harrogate Rugby Club had been allowed. Worried about development in terms of spoiling Crimple Valley and traffic congestion.</p> <p>Add Zero Carbon power sources to the list</p> <p>I would add noise restrictions pre 9am and post 5pm. Noise carries and Pannal village community could be disturbed without this restriction.</p> <p>As presented, the clause appears too restrictive to attract the investment needed.</p> <p>HBC – would need to ensure that this development brief was supported by robust evidence. HBC is already undertaking work on master planning for this site so might be useful to liaise with the Housing Delivery & Strategic Sites Team on this. Alex Robinson is the officer to contact with regard to this site.</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP cannot exceed or conflict with the adopted Local Plan policy for this site, but will look to add to it.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP cannot reverse history. ED2 aims to do its best to deliver the best development possible in the circumstances, including re the valley and traffic.</p> <p>NOTED – this aspect of developments is already addressed through adopted Local Plan Climate Change policies, which the NP cannot exceed or usefully add to.</p> <p>NOTED – the noise pollution issue can be looked at as a possible part of the draft plan policy.</p> <p>NOTED – unclear which clause is being referred to or whether it's the entire policy. Irrespective, such requirements are not unreasonable – ref the 9 clauses already pertaining in the adopted Local Plan policy.</p> <p>NOTED – policy will be drafted with this in mind. Agree re liaison with HBC officer as suggested.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider feasibility of a noise pollution policy clause.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – liaise with suggested officer on draft policy pre-Reg 14 consultation.</p>
--	---	--	---

	Please also consider the value of linking in foot and cycle\disabled paths around the whole site and to provide a safe crossing of the A61, perhaps using an existing bridge\tunnel under the road. Screen development from rail users.	NOTED – majority of these issues already addressed via adopted Local Plan policy, with exception of A61 crossing. This can be looked at as a possible part of the draft plan policy.	ACTION – consider feasibility of a A61 crossing policy clause.
Economic Development - General	Economic Development fails to provide for a) part time opportunities for both younger and aging population and b) fails to identify opportunities to bring investment into the area to create jobs for local population.	NOTED – ED1 safeguards jobs already in the parish. The ‘South of Almsford Bridge’ development will provide more. This is considered more than enough for a village the size of Pannal. Consideration could be given to the feasibility of a local employment policy clause in ED2.	ACTION – consider feasibility of policy clause as indicated.
Non-Planning Community Actions - General	No comments.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	No.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	None	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Very detailed with some desirable outcomes for the village if achieved.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	No further comment	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Agree with all of these especially the school and main street parking. However we do need to discourage car usage, although this may be difficult because it is no longer a village school as it is likely to have a wider catchment area.	NOTED – the NP’s walking etc. policy intention (TTT1) plus various community actions seek to achieve this.	NO ACTION
	Nothing in particular	NOTED	NO ACTION

	After your careful, detailed examination of how best to order Pannal and Burn bridge, the decision on the day I finished this response to your ideas was disheartening to say the least.	NOTED – impossible to respond meaningfully to the generality of the comment. Any specific comments made in this regard above will have been dealt with individually.	NO ACTION
	agree all	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Agree with these intentions	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Agree with all the proposed actions	NOTED	NO ACTION
	none	NOTED	NO ACTION
	None	NOTED	NO ACTION
	No	NOTED	NO ACTION
	No comments.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	no	NOTED	NO ACTION
	No	NOTED	NO ACTION
	No	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I am broadly in agreement with them	NOTED	NO ACTION
	No	NOTED	NO ACTION
	no	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I think the Parish Council has done a brilliant job of outlining what is important to residents and what is potentially achievable within our planning system.	NOTED	NO ACTION

I support them all	NOTED	NO ACTION
All very worthwhile actions.	NOTED	NO ACTION
Think they are all very valuable and necessary.	NOTED	NO ACTION
No	NOTED	NO ACTION
No	NOTED	NO ACTION
no	NOTED	NO ACTION
None	NOTED	NO ACTION
Agree entirely	NOTED	NO ACTION
no thanks.	NOTED	NO ACTION
No. All good.	NOTED	NO ACTION
Agree	NOTED	NO ACTION
No	NOTED	NO ACTION
Don't understand the question	NOTED – it relates to the 'Non-Planning Community Actions' listed at the end of each themed section in Chapter 3 of the document, as stated in the question header.	NO ACTION
I've run out of time. It would have been useful to add this to the end of each chapter!	NOTED – can look at remedying this for the next Survey Monkey consultation.	ACTION – rejig questionnaire in respect of community actions as suggested. For next consultation
Included in the above. Thank you for the opportunity to contribute.	NOTED	NO ACTION

<p>General</p>	<p>I appreciate the amount of work put into create this document but I feel it is something of a 'wish list' summarised by 'we want to improve our local environment' - no one can really argue with this general aspiration but there are not many concrete proposals.</p> <p>The commercial uses of the Dunlopillo site should avoid uses which would be detrimental to the residential areas EG, noisy, untidy and excessive road use.</p> <p>1) Dunlopillo should be demolished. Low level buildings should be provided including a new post office for the current business to move into. 2) The Cherry trees that were destroyed by the developer should be reinstated along the road past the current post office into the Dunlopillo development.</p> <p>This is a general comment. I think there is an opportunity to form partnerships with local businesses and institutions, in order to obtain sponsorship for village improvements. Villages that are successful in 'Britain in Bloom' for example will have planters sponsored by local businesses, providing the businesses with useful advertising - but that is just an example.</p> <p>1) Demolish Dunlopillo! 2) The village isn't the prettiest, particularly around the Coop / garage area. No idea what</p>	<p>NOTED – as stated in the document (P6/para 2), the document sets out broad policy intentions. The detailed policies with expanded justification/evidence will be set out in the next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED – the uses for the site have already been set out in the adopted Local Plan (Policy EC1) which the NP cannot change.</p> <p>1) NOTED – the future of the building/land is out of the hands of the PC/ community. PC has made local views known. Building will either be retained and converted to flats or demolished and a larger block of flats erected. 2) NOTED – there is a planting plan to address this (a residential development reserved matter) once the building's future has been bottomed out.</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>1) NOTED – the future of the building/land is out of the hands of the PC/ community. PC has made local</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – link sponsorship to any community actions regarding village improvements.</p> <p>1) NO ACTION</p>
----------------	--	--	--

	<p>can be done. Perhaps once the house building is complete it will help.</p> <p>The Harrogate Local Plan, although approved, has several shortcomings which are supposed to be addressed in part by the West of Harrogate Parameters Plan. Should this not be adequate, why should any of the parish's needs be forced to comply with the policies of a dysfunctional borough council?</p> <p>I think the PID is a very serious and well-structured document. Well done.</p> <p>No more development in Crimple Valley between the Show ground and Pannal.</p> <p>The document is too complicated and should be much simpler. This way we would look to interest the community. This document does the total opposite I am afraid, even though I'm sure there are some good ideas in it, how on earth would they all be implemented? The document needs to address less and explain how it will endeavour to achieve any of it!</p>	<p>views known. Building will either be retained and converted to flats or demolished and a larger block of flats erected.</p> <p>2) AGREE – attractiveness of village in this location should be addressed. NP policies should result in more attractive development in general in the future.</p> <p>NOTED – NP legislation/regulations state that NP policy must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan. The NP will be tested on this by an independent examiner.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the NP cannot guarantee this but will put in place policies aimed at making it even more difficult to develop.</p> <p>NOTED – as stated in the document (P6/para 1), the NP, once 'made' (i.e. adopted) will be a statutory planning document with the same status as the Harrogate Local Plan. It is therefore essential that it is written in the form of legally enforceable planning policies and proposals. It's policies will be implemented by HBC and its successor authority in relation to future planning applications.</p>	<p>2) ACTION – add community action re village centre improvements once Dunlopillo saga is resolved.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>The school is already considered to be large within the Harrogate district and I think it is VERY important to keep this as a local village school, not open to all. This would also help with the traffic follow as most parents would be able to walk to school.</p> <p>prefer no new development sites</p> <p>I would like for the Dunlopillo building to be demolished entirely and replaced with something less overbearing</p> <p>As well as removing the dreadful eyesore, the former Dunlopillo offices.</p> <p>Natural England - Natural England does not have any specific comments on this policy intentions document for the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>The Coal Authority - Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on it.</p>	<p>NOTED – the expansion of the school is already agreed in the adopted Local Plan which the NP cannot change. Its catchment is set by NYCC Education and is beyond the NP’s scope.</p> <p>NOTED – the document does not propose to allocate any new development sites.</p> <p>NOTED – the future of the building/land is out of the hands of the PC/ community. PC has made local views known. Building will either be retained and converted to flats or demolished and a larger block of flats erected.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--