

**PANNAL & BURN BRIDGE  
NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
2021-2035**

**CONSULTATION STATEMENT**

**PREPARED ON BEHALF OF  
PANNAL & BURN BRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL**



Prepared By:  
Mike Dando BA (Hons) BPI  
23 Victoria Avenue  
Harrogate  
HG1 5RD

Tel: 01423 525456  
Email: [m.dando@directionsplanning.co.uk](mailto:m.dando@directionsplanning.co.uk)

October 17<sup>th</sup> 2022

## CONTENTS

Section 1 – Introduction	3
Section 2 – Consultation Aims	4
Section 3 – Background to Neighbourhood Plan Consultation	5
Section 4 – Neighbourhood Plan Consultees	6
Section 5 – Consultation Stages and Issues Raised	7
Section 6 – Conclusion – Reflection on Consultation Process and Outcomes	15
Appendix 1 - List of Neighbourhood Plan Consultees	
Appendix 2 – Pannal Area Community-led Plan	
Appendix 3A – Crimple Valley SLA Survey Results	
Appendix 3B – Crimple Valley SLA Survey Results Summary	
Appendix 4A – Landscape & Environment Focus Group Report	
Appendix 4B – Transport Focus Group Report	
Appendix 4C – Housing Focus Group Report	
Appendix 4D – Landscape & Environment Group Terms of Reference	
Appendix 4E – Transport Group Terms of Reference	
Appendix 4F – Housing Group Terms of Reference	
Appendix 4G – Housing Needs Survey	
Appendix 5A – Policy Intentions Document Consultation Letter	
Appendix 5B – Policy Intentions Document Consultation Questionnaire	
Appendix 5C – Policy Intentions Document Consultation Questionnaire Results	
Appendix 5D – Policy Intentions Document Consultation Results Grid	
Appendix 6A – Regulation 14 Consultation NDP Summary Document	
Appendix 6B – Regulation 14 Consultation Questionnaire	
Appendix 6C – Regulation 14 Consultation Questionnaire Results	
Appendix 6D – Regulation 14 Consultation Results Grid	
Appendix 7A – Post-Regulation 14 Targeted Consultation E-mail	
Appendix 7B – HBC Parks Consultation Response	
Appendix 7C – HBC Estates Consultation Response	

## **1. Introduction**

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to meet the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 in respect of the Pannal and Burn Bridge Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP).

The legal basis of the statement is provided by Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, which requires that a Consultation Statement should:

- Contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed NDP;
- Explain how they were consulted;
- Summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
- Describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed NDP.

This statement:-

- Sets out the aims of the consultation process;
- Summarises the approach to consultation;
- Details the consultees;
- Sets out the consultation stages, the issues and concerns raised at each stage and the way in which they have been addressed.

## **2. Consultation Aims**

Throughout the Neighbourhood Plan consultation process, the aims have been:-

- To involve the community so that the plan was informed by, and took account of, the views of local people living, working and carrying out business in the Neighbourhood Area;
- To involve a wide range of statutory and non-statutory bodies in the development of the plan at key stages;
- To consult with landowners whose interests were affected by plan policies and proposals;
- To ensure that consultation took place at critical points in the process where decisions needed to be taken;
- To consult regularly and closely with officers of Harrogate Borough Council (HBC) to ensure that the plan was developing in line with legal requirements.

### **3. Background to Neighbourhood Plan Consultation**

Pannal and Burn Bridge Parish Council first took the decision to embark on a Neighbourhood Plan project in 2016, establishing a steering group and associated focus groups shortly thereafter. These covered Landscape and Environment, Transport, Traffic and sustainability, Housing and Community Facilities.

An application to HBC for the designation of the Neighbourhood Area was made on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2017. The Neighbourhood Area was approved by the council on 10th August 2017.

Following initial work, there was a hiatus while the council engaged with the Harrogate District Local Plan process and awaited final adoption of the plan, which took place in March 2020.

Between 2015 and 2022, extensive community engagement was undertaken, involving questionnaires, focus groups and occasional community drop-ins, together with consultation with HBC and a range of statutory and non-statutory bodies. The key engagement stages were:-

- 2015-2018 – utilization of an earlier Community-led Plan survey, incorporating a Young People’s Questionnaire (2015), a Save Crimple Valley Survey (2018) and detailed work by focus groups;
- July 2021 – Policy Intentions Document Consultation;
- April-June 2022 – Regulation 14 consultation on a Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan;
- August 2022 – post Regulation 14 targeted re-consultations with HBC and selected statutory bodies.

#### **4. Neighbourhood Plan Consultees**

Over the six years of the Neighbourhood Plan preparation process, a wide range of people and bodies have been consulted at the various preparation stages. These may be summarized as follows:-

- All residents in the Neighbourhood Area;
- All businesses and landowners in the Neighbourhood Area;
- All community and voluntary groups in the Neighbourhood Area;
- Statutory consultees;
- A range of non-statutory consultees, e.g. North Yorkshire Clinical Commissioning Group, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, Northern Rail.

A full list of statutory and non-statutory consultees can be found at Appendix 1.

## **5. Consultation Stages and Issues Raised**

### **2015-2018**

Before the decision was taken by the parish council to produce a Neighbourhood Plan, it had worked on and produced a Community-led Plan. The Pannal Area Questionnaire survey which underpinned the plan was carried out in February 2015 and was considered to still be a reliable barometer of local community concerns and wishes.

The survey involved each of the parish's 914 households, covering a population of 2,235 (2011 Census), receiving a questionnaire. The total returned was 464 (389 paper version, 75 online). Of these, 335 (72%) represented whole households with 129 (28%) from individuals. Overall, the total number of individuals represented in the survey was 1077, out of a population of 2,235, equating to a very healthy 48% response rate.

Alongside the community questionnaire, young people (7 – 17 years) were invited to complete a separate online questionnaire. In support of this, the head teacher of Pannal Primary School set aside time in class for pupils to complete the questionnaire. Overall 58 responses were received from young people living within the area. Of the respondents, 22% lived in Burn Bridge; 65% in Pannal; and 12% in Walton Park – a distribution similar to that of the household questionnaire responses. The age distribution was 58% aged 7-9 years and 42% in the 10-13 age range.

The plan, including the survey questions and results, is included as Appendix 2.

In 2018, the local Save Crimple Valley Group carried out a survey of local residents and users to determine views on the conservation of and development within the Crimple Valley Special Landscape Area, which makes up a significant proportion of the parish/ Neighbourhood Area. This in response to policies and proposals in the draft Harrogate District Local Plan. The survey was completed by 180 people. The full results and results summary are included as Appendices 3A and 3B respectively.

Following the 2016 parish council decision to proceed with a NDP and the establishment of focus groups of local people and parish councillors, those groups carried out detailed work on their assigned topics, resulting in a series of focus group reports from three of the four groups, the Community Facilities Group being the exception. The Housing group's Housing Needs Survey of May/June 2018 was particularly valuable, eliciting a response from 257 households – 27% of the parish.

These reports, together with terms of reference for three of the four groups, are included as Appendices 4A-4F.

Based on these reports, the parish council commissioned consultants to produce a scoping report on possible NDP contents, which was finalized in December 2018.

## **Policy Intentions Document Consultation**

In July 2021, a 'Policy Intentions Document' was circulated to all addresses in the Neighbourhood Area, including households and local businesses, with a request to feedback via an online or hard-copy questionnaire. HBC and other statutory and non-statutory bodies were also consulted. An online supporting drop-in event was also held as the ongoing pandemic precluded the holding of any face-to-face community drop-ins. This was however very poorly attended.

Over a hundred completed questionnaires and other representations were received (a roughly 10% response rate), indicating clear majority support for the proposed vision, aims and policy intentions, with approval ratings generally between 80% and 90%+.

Copies of the consultation letter and questionnaire, questionnaire survey results and composite consultation results grid are included as Appendices 5A to 5D.

The responses to the 'Policy Intentions Document' consultation were used during the second half of 2021 and early 2022 to develop a Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan for Pannal and Burn Bridge.

## **Statutory Regulation 14 Consultation on Pre-Submission Draft Plan**

The Pre-Submission Draft Pannal and Burn Bridge Neighbourhood Development Plan was the subject of a statutory six week Regulation 14 consultation from April to June 2022. The consultation was carried out in accordance with regulations and involved all those identified in the list at Appendix 1.

Documentation comprised the full draft plan, a plan summary and questionnaire available on Survey Monkey and as a hard copy. These were also available online, and on the HBC website, along with all previous documents from the NP process. A copy of the full plan was made available at locations around the area.

This attracted 38 separate detailed representations from a range of statutory consultees, organisations and individuals, via Survey Monkey, e-mail and written submissions. Although a small sample, relative to the Policy Intentions Document consultation response, the across the board, large majority support for the plan's policies mirrored that of the previous consultation.

The plan summary and questionnaire, questionnaire results and detailed composite consultation results grid can be found at Appendices 6A to 6D.

All representations were carefully considered and agreed actions in response reflected in the final submission plan.



## **Post Regulation 14 Targeted Consultations**

In its response to the Regulation 14 consultation, HBC recommended specific consultation with its Parks and Estates departments and with North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) Highways and Network Rail regarding particular proposed policies and non-planning community actions.

The parish council had already consulted both NYCC and Network Rail as required at Regulation 14 stage and received no response from either. It had also consulted HBC 'Planning' with the not unreasonable expectation that it in turn would consult internally with those departments whose interests were affected by plan policies/actions.

Nonetheless, it carried out further targeted re-consultations as recommended, receiving responses from HBC Parks and Estates by the deadline date set.

A sample consultation e-mail and the responses received are included as Appendices 7A-7C.

## **Summary of Main Issues Raised at Each Stage and How They Were Addressed**

### 2015-2018

The 2015 Pannal Area Questionnaire survey indicated the following as particular matters of concern or interest:-

- Keeping of rural character
- Maintaining of separation from Harrogate
- Importance of the Green Belt for wildlife
- The area's peacefulness
- Provision of allotments
- Over-development as a threat to village identity
- Enthusiasm for cycling
- More and safer cycle routes
- Parking problems/hazards around the primary school, Methodist Church and on pavements
- Inadequate parking at the 'station end' of Pannal
- 'Rat-running' through the villages
- Traffic congestion
- Speeding on various routes through Pannal and Burn Bridge
- Value of community facilities on the doorstep, including post office, local shops, doctor and dentist surgeries, garage and pub
- Lack of a pub in either Pannal or Walton Park
- Need for local café/restaurant facility

- No need for new housing development in the parish
- Starter and retirement homes as priorities (NB for the minority who saw some need for new housing)

The accompanying young people questionnaire also showed high levels of enthusiasm for cycling and a strong desire for more safe cycle routes, but little else of relevance to the NDP.

The detailed data can be found at Appendix 2 (P6-19).

The 2018 Crimble Valley Survey indicated that the valley is something the community is anxious to protect from development, with residents and users making the need to preserve its special landscape and Green Belt status clear. The detailed data is to found at Appendices 3A and 3B.

The reports of three of the focus groups (ref Appendices 4A to 4C) provided an additional firm basis for the 2018 scoping report which in turn fed into the Policy Intentions Document. In particular, the Housing Focus Group's Housing Needs Survey indicated the following:-

- A large majority of residents would support relatively small scale development, designed to specifically meet identified local needs
- A strong general awareness that some need does exist
- Specific perceived needs in respect of downsizers and people with special needs; 'up-sizers' and 'upgraders'; young adults and young couples

The full Housing Needs Survey can be found at Appendix 4G.

These concerns and areas of interest specifically informed and underpinned the following NDP policies within the Policy Intentions Document:-

- Green and Blue Infrastructure
- Local Green Space
- Provision of New Open Space
- Pannal Conservation Area – Development and Design
- Non-Designated Heritage Assets
- Village Character Areas
- Improved Walking, Horse Riding and Cycling Provision
- Car Parking – various
- Highway Improvements
- Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities
- Provision of New Community Facilities
- Housing Mix

- Small Scale and Infill Housing Development
- Housing on Non-Allocated Sites

### Policy Intentions Document Consultation

80% to over 90% of consultation respondents agreed with the policy intentions in respect of all topics and policy areas.

The main detailed consultation comments received relating to planning issues were as follows:

- Need for explicit statement on climate change;
- Local road network fails to adequately support vehicle, cyclist and pedestrian users in Burn Bridge, including on Hill Foot and Hill Top Lane, Yew Tree Lane and Brackenthwaite Lane;
- Walkers need improved access to Public Rights of Way and cycle networks, e.g. via new paths – various suggestions made;
- Need to recognize full extent of Crimple Valley in the plan;
- Give greater protection against development to Woodcock Hill; land between west Harrogate (Rossett Green) and Pannal;
- Suggestions re possible Local Green Space sites;
- Need for a multi-sports pitch;
- Need for small children’s play area;
- Use of ‘open’ rather than ‘green’ in relation to new recreational space provision;
- Policy provision to allow for ‘correction’ of over-provision of one type of open space by conversion of land to an alternative, currently under provided for type;
- Include reference to SINCs (Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation);
- Consider footpath (i.e. pavement) additions/improvements where narrow/non-existent on narrow roads/lanes;
- Use of ‘local listing’ rather than ‘non-designated heritage asset’ terminology in policy;
- Concern re possible proliferation of different types of area design policies;
- Controlled pedestrian/cycle crossing of Leeds Road needed as part of South of Almsford Bridge employment development;
- Need for segregated vehicle/cycle/pedestrian routes;
- Reference footbridge over River Crimple to link Park and Stride with Pannal Community Park and clarify purpose of Park and Stride provision;
- Include electric charging points for cars;
- Electric vehicle charging as part of Park and Stride not workable;
- Clarify Follifoot Lane/A61 junction improvement;
- Enhance Highway Improvements policy by reference to improved safety for all - people in vehicles, on 2 wheels and on foot;

- Frame Highway Improvements policy in context of the Regulations which state that any development contributions need to be necessary, directly related to the development and related in scale and kind;
- Add cycle parking/storage provision to Pannal Primary School educational facilities policy;
- Strengthen policy on housing development on non-allocated sites by reference to landscape and environmental impacts;
- Need to word Protection of Existing Employment Sites policy with Permitted Development rights in mind;
- South of Almsford Bridge development should provide jobs for local people, include 'green sides' to Leeds Road and take account of light/noise pollution.

The Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan addressed the majority of the above through policies GNE1, GNE3, GNE5, BE1-3, BE5, TTT1, TTT4-6, CFS3, H2, ED1 and ED2.

In particular:

- Policy GNE3 – all suggested Local Green Space sites were assessed against NPPF criteria and those considered eligible included under the policy. Assessments of those sites not considered eligible are to be found in the plan's evidence base;
- Policies BE1-3 and BE5 – this suite of built environment policies was considered to avoid the feared proliferation of different types of area design policies, by having separate policies for heritage areas (BE1-3) and single policy covering character areas outside the heritage areas;
- Policy ED2 – the policy includes provision re 'green sides' to Leeds Road and light pollution but not re local employment and noise pollution as there was considered to be no local evidence/justification for such provision.

The issues not addressed and the reasons for not doing so are as follows:

- Climate change – considered to be comprehensively covered by national planning policy and practice guidance and adopted Local Plan policies, with little or no scope for the NDP to add anything;
- Corrective open space over-provision approach – policy provision to address this not considered feasible or particularly desirable;
- Local Listing vs Non-Designated Heritage Asset – decision made to continue use of non-Designated Heritage Asset terminology as this is consistent with NPPF and with precedents set in already made NDPs.

All the many other issues raised and the response to them are detailed in the composite results grid at Appendix 5D.

## Statutory Regulation 14 Consultation

The main consultation comments related to the following:-

- Consider potential of 'Demand Responsive Transport' initiatives to address local public transport needs;
- Clarify location of the different areas of Green and Blue Infrastructure on Policies Map;
- Re Policy GNE2 – need for policy questioned relative to Local Plan Policy NE4; remove 'seriously' from 1<sup>st</sup> sentence to bring in line with NE4;
- Clarify different status of SINCs on Policies Map;
- Re Policy GNE3 – number Local Green Space sites in line with Policies Map;
- Re Policy GNE6 – suggested minor wording deletions in policy and preamble;
- Re Policy GNE7 – clarify preamble wording re Local Plan policy encouragement of tree planting;
- Re Policy BE2 – number Local Heritage Areas in line with Policies Map; minor amendment to policy wording suggested;
- Re Policy BE5 (Leeds Road Corridor section) – requested amendments to policy wording to better conform with Local Plan policy;
- Re Policy TTT1 – suggested additions to specified route improvements;
- Re Policy TTT5 – make reference to HBC low emissions strategy rather than West Yorkshire Strategy; reference to provision standards does not future proof policy;
- Re Policy TTT4 – clarify that footbridge over River Crimple is part of Park and Stride policy/proposal; add design criteria to ensure provision is environmentally sensitive;
- Re Policy TTT2 – suggested policy addition re cycle parking;
- Re Policy TTT6 – amend/update preamble text to reference west of Harrogate highway improvement measures;
- Re Policy CFS3 – amend preamble text to reference additional Local Plan policy;
- Question need for Policy H1 and role/status of Design Codes 'Annex';
- Re Policy H2 – address cumulative effects of development in policy provision; reference Air Quality SPD in preamble text;
- Re Policy H3 – reference additional Local Plan policy in preamble text;
- Re Policy ED1 – number employment sites in line with Policies Map;
- Re Policy ED2 – amend policy wording to make it more positive re landscaping;

Changes were made in accordance with the vast majority of the above comments to address the concerns/suggestions made.

In relation to Policy GNE2 – this was considered relative to Local Plan Policy NE4, the conclusion being that GNE2 adds valuable local detail regarding the special features and character of the Crimple Valley which are not present in the generic Special Landscape

Areas Local Plan policy.

In relation to Policy TTT5 – additional reference was made to HBC’s Low Emissions Strategy in preamble text. Due however to the absence of standards within the strategy, policy reference to standards informed by the earlier West Yorkshire strategy were retained. Wording was however added to future proof the policy against future amendments/improvements to standards.

In relation to Policy H1 – the majority of the policy wording was deleted in order to simplify/rationalize policy coverage relative to the NDP’s other design-related policies. The status/role of the Design Codes document was clarified.

Demand Responsive Transport potential was addressed by a new non-planning community action.

All other issues raised and the response to them are detailed in the composite results grid at Appendix 6D.

#### Post Regulation 14 Targeted Consultations

HBC Estates stated that it did not support the designation of Almsford Wood as a Local Green Space (LGS) under Policy GNE3, arguing that it is not in close proximity to/easy walking distance of the Pannal and Burn Bridge community and therefore cannot have demonstrable value to that community. It also points out an inconsistency in the plan between the LGS assessment and text elsewhere in the plan, regarding an underpass beneath the A61, and considers the site to be adequately covered/protected by Local Plan policies.

The parish council response is that the assessment makes it clear that the site particularly serves the closely situated Harrogate communities of Fulwith/Daleside and Stone Rings, that Pannal/Walton Park are 1km distant and that the site also serves a wider community of visitors/walkers given its location on a well-used part of the Public Rights of Way Network. There is nothing in the LGS criteria to say that LGS within a Neighbourhood Area cannot have community value to proximate communities just outside the area. It is maintained that the site does meet LGS criteria and that GNE3 adds to and strengthens Local Plan policies covering the site. The underpass inconsistency in the assessment was duly corrected but no other change made to the plan.

HBC Estates also objected to Policy GNE6 (Land at Almsford Bridge), considering the policy/designation confusing and not deliverable/achievable/evidenced or justified. It also references the underpass, referred above. The parish council response is that policies of this nature, i.e. worded as ‘presents an opportunity for’ and linked to a

defined area of land are commonplace in 'made' NPs – they represent policy aspirations for particular pieces of land. The policy looks to extend the open space resource of Almsford Wood, south into the fields abutting the South of Almsford Bridge employment site, to create an improved natural area of recreational benefit. Ownership is due to change with the disappearance of HBC and arrival of north Yorkshire Council. The reference to the underpass has been deleted from the plan. No other change was made to the plan.

## **6. Conclusion – Reflection on Consultation Process and Outcomes**

### **The Process**

In general terms, it is the parish council's view that the overall consultation process, over a period of some seven years, has provided ample and appropriate opportunity for local community and wider stakeholder engagement, involving two non-statutory consultation stages (early engagement surveys and Policy Intentions Document consultation) plus engagement via focus groups, leading up to the final statutory Regulation 14 consultation and targeted post regulation consultation. This has been supplemented throughout by the opportunity to attend regular and frequent NP Steering Group meetings and full parish council meetings where the NP has been a regular agenda item, albeit severely curtailed during the period of the pandemic.

What has been noticeable over the plan preparation period – in pure numerical terms - is a gradual dropping away of public interest, from the relatively high initial levels, including at Policy Intentions Document stage, down to quite modest numbers at Regulation 14 stage.

Inevitably, 'plan fatigue' is likely to account for a degree of 'dropping-off' over the years – similarly, latterly, the impact of the pandemic. The plan has been a long time in development, with the process both elongated and complicated, in the public's mind, by the parallel preparation of the Local Plan. It is notoriously difficult to generate and maintain community engagement in what can quite often seem to be quite remote and abstract matters.

The absence, for the most part, of controversial planning issues of particular concern to the local community is also likely to be a factor – these were largely dealt with through the Local Plan. However, where local issues did exist, e.g. in relation to transport/traffic, this clearly generated significant comment and concern at all stages. What seems to be clear from both Policy Intentions Document and Regulation 14 stage consultations is the general high level support for all NP policies and other provisions. What is also noticeable is the healthy response from statutory consultees and other stakeholders at the Policy Intentions Document stage.

What could perhaps have been done better over the preparation process was the specific targeting of older, younger and disabled interests within the community, in order to better establish their specific needs, although younger people were targeted in the 2015 survey. That said, it is fair to say that younger people's interests are clearly identified under 'community actions' in the 'Community Facilities and Services' section of the Neighbourhood Plan (i.e. Section 5) and in Policies GNE5 and CFS1. Both the older population and disabled interests were felt to be already well-catered for.



## **The Outcomes**

As a result of the consultation process, the parish council is satisfied that Neighbourhood Plan policies:-

- reflect key community concerns as expressed at initial issues, focus group and informal consultation stages;
- respond positively/reasonably to objections and comments received at the Regulation 14 consultation stage and thereafter, where considered to be appropriate and feasible.

Additionally, Neighbourhood Plan 'community actions' take on board many of the community's non-planning concerns, as expressed via consultations and as filtered by the parish council in the light of up-to-date circumstances and knowledge.