

Pannal and Burn Bridge Parish Council

Dear Liz,

Please see the requested response for the 7th December deadline from Pannal and Burn Bridge Parish Council.

The hearing sessions we wish to attend and be represented at are Matters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9 and 15. You have a list of our representatives already but to confirm, they are Howard West, Dave Oswin (Chairman and Deputy Chairman respectively), Richard Clark (Professional Advisor at Arrowsmith Associates) and Shazad Khan when we're working with HAPARA.

Please would you respond with confirmation that this email is satisfactory for the 7th December deadline and that at this stage, **you do not need hard copy**.

Inspector's Matters and Issues Questions Relevant Reports

Below is a list of the questions that the Parish Council wish to answer during the examination.

Representor number: The PC's representor number for comments is **Mr Andrew Macdonald (ID: 1155764)**, Pannal and Burn Bridge Parish Council. Please note that he will not be present at the Examination.

For reference and continuity, the links used in this document are sequentially numbered as "PBB" references and a summary of these PBB links is below:

"AA" refers to Arrowsmith Associates, professional advisors to the Parish Council.

1. Detailed HEDNA Appraisal October 18.
2. Smeeden Foreman Landscape Reports for PN 17, 18 and 19 compiled in March 18, in three parts – a, b and c
3. AA Sites Appraisal November 18
4. LUC SHELAA Landscape Appraisal October 18 covering document with 11 visuals
5. AA Planning Assessment March 18
6. BWB Transport assessment March 18
7. THaT Transport Assessment November 18
8. AA Assessment August 17
- 9 to 11. A61 Visual, Area Choke point visual and Crimple Valley picture.
12. BWB Cumulative traffic Study – Western Arc
13. HAPARA Supporting drawings of Western Arc allocations

Each question provides a reference to an Attachment showing specific comments to each of the questions and a hyperlink (if relevant) to source information that is on line.

- 1.4. Is the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) adequate in terms of its assessment of the likely effects of the plan's policies and allocations and its consideration of reasonable alternatives?**

Attachment: Matter 1

- 2.1 Is the objectively-assessed need for housing (OAN), including the figure for affordable housing, as established by the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) 2018, and reflected in the plan's housing requirement figure (policy GS1: Providing New Homes and Jobs) of 14,049 additional dwellings in the period 2014-2035, based on robust and up-to-date evidence?**

Pannal and Burn Bridge Parish Council

Attachment; Matter 2

Link: PBB1 - [Detailed HEDNA Appraisal October 18](#)

3.1, 3.2 and 3.3

Is the proposed distribution of housing consistent with policy GS2? Is it justified and soundly based having regard to the size of the settlements and their designation (noting in particular the quantum proposed for Boroughbridge, Darley, North Stainley, Killinghall and Pannal, which, having regard to commitments, appear at odds with their role and function)?

Attachment: Matter 3

Links: Smeeden Foreman Landscape reports

PBB2a - [Smeeden Foreman Landscape Reports for PN 17, 18 and 19 compiled in March 18 - part a](#)

PBB2b - [Smeeden Foreman Landscape Reports for PN 17, 18 and 19 compiled in March 18 - part b](#)

PBB2c - [Smeeden Foreman Landscape Reports for PN 17, 18 and 19 compiled in March 18 - part c](#)

3.4

Has the process for selecting sites proposed for housing allocations been robust and objective?

Attachment: Matter 3

Links:

PBB3 - [AA Sites Appraisal November 18](#)

PBB4 - [LUC SHELAA Landscape Appraisal October 18 covering document](#)

PBB4 Visuals:

[PBB4 Visuals\Figure 2 Boroughbridge Kirby Hill Dishforth.pdf](#)

[PBB4 Visuals\Figure 3 Cattal Green Hammerton Kirk Hammerton.pdf](#)

[PBB4 Visuals\Figure 4 Flaxby Pannal Huby.pdf](#)

[PBB4 Visuals\Figure 5 Middleton.pdf](#)

[PBB4 Visuals\Figure 6 Northeast Harrogate South Knaresborough.pdf](#)

[PBB4 Visuals\Figure 7 Northeast Knaresborough.pdf](#)

[PBB4 Visuals\Figure 8 Northwest Harrogate Killinghall Ripley.pdf](#)

[PBB4 Visuals\Figure 9 Ripon.pdf](#)

[PBB4 Visuals\Figure 10 Southeast Harrogate.pdf](#)

[PBB4 Visuals\Figure 11 Southwest Harrogate Beckwith.pdf](#)

[PBB4 Visuals\Figure 12 Tockwith Long Marston Wetherby.pdf](#)

4.1 Is the plan's proposal to deliver at least (noting the as yet unquantified numbers from mixed-use allocations) c.13% more dwellings than the 14,049 OAN figure justified? In particular, what is the rationale for double counting the 995 dwelling shortfall (to date, as per proposed modification) when establishing the housing requirement?

Attachment: Matter 4

4.3 Are assessments of dwelling numbers for allocated sites realistic and justified, given apparent constraints that would necessitate having undeveloped areas on some sites to address e.g. flood risk and impact upon heritage assets, affecting many of the sites? Has sufficient regard been had to the density of development surrounding the sites?

Pannal and Burn Bridge Parish Council

Attachment: Matter 4

Links:

Smeeden Foreman Landscape reports

PBB2a – [Smeeden Foreman Landscape Reports for PN 17, 18 and 19 compiled in March 18 - part a](#)

PBB2b - [Smeeden Foreman Landscape Reports for PN 17, 18 and 19 compiled in March 18 - part b](#)

PBB2c - [Smeeden Foreman Landscape Reports for PN 17, 18 and 19 compiled in March 18 - part c](#)

PBB4 - [LUC SHELAA Landscape Appraisal October 18 covering document](#) and accompanying visuals as shown in Matter 3.4

5.1 and 5.2

Is the plan's requirement (policy GS1: Providing New Homes and Jobs) for 38 ha of land for B1, B2 and B8 employment uses supported by robust evidence?

Is the proposed allocation of (at least) 73 ha justified having regard to the evidence? How much "flexibility of supply" is realistically required?

Attachment: Matter 5

Link: PBB5 - [AA Full Report March 2018.pdf](#)

5.3, 5 4 and 5 5

Is the proposed distribution of employment land across the district, as set out broadly in policy GS5, and specifically in policies DM2 and DM3, effective and soundly-based?

Has the process for selecting sites proposed for employment allocation been robust and objective?

Is policy GS5 effective or, with the exception of criteria C & D, only a list of aspirations? Why are only two strategic employment sites mentioned (e.g. Claro Barracks is referenced as a strategic employment site at paragraph 3.16)?

Attachment: Matter 5

Links: PBB4 - [LUC SHELAA Landscape Appraisal October 18 covering document](#) and accompanying visuals as shown in Matter 3.4 and 4.3

9.1 and 9.2

Are the following allocations (PN17, 18 & 19), as defined on the policies map, soundly-based?

Are the criteria set out in the relevant policies justified, effective, and consistent with other plan policies and with national planning policy (with particular regard to that in relation to the historic environment)?

Attached: Matter 9

Links:

Smeeden Foreman Landscape reports:

PBB2a – [Smeeden Foreman Landscape Reports for PN 17, 18 and 19 compiled in March 18 - part a](#)

Pannal and Burn Bridge Parish Council

- PBB2b - [Smeeden Foreman Landscape Reports for PN 17, 18 and 19 compiled in March 18 - part b](#)
- PBB2c - [Smeeden Foreman Landscape Reports for PN 17, 18 and 19 compiled in March 18 - part c](#)
- PBB5 - [AA Full Report March 2018.pdf](#)
- PBB6 – [PBB6 - BWB Transport Assessment March 18.pdf](#)
- PBB8 - [PBB8 - AA AUG 2017 REPORT.pdf](#)
- PBB9, 10 and 11 - [A61 Visual, Area Traffic Choke point visual and Crimple Valley picture](#)

9.3

Is there evidence that the development of the housing allocations is viable and achievable in the timescales indicated in Appendix 2 of the plan?

Attachment: Matter 9

15.1

Is there evidence to show that, taking account of proposed mitigation measures, the development proposed in the plan would not give rise to severe adverse transport impacts?

Attachments: Matter 15 and HAPARA Executive summary

Links:

- PBB13 - [Supporting drawings of Western Arc allocations](#)
- PBB7 - [PBB7 - THaT - Review of Transport Issues.pdf](#)
- PBB9 & 10 – [A61 Visual, Area Traffic Choke point visual and Crimple Valley picture](#)
- PBB12 - [PBB12 - Western Arc Transport Appraisal.pdf](#)

15.7 Policy TI6 – Provision of Educational Facilities

- (a) **Is it effective for the site requirements (PN20) to refer to supporting text (paragraph 10.2)?**
- (b) **Are the requirements set out in relation to PN20 justified and effective? Should it be made clear in TI6 that the sites are to be delivered in accordance with these requirements**
- (c) **Is the policy otherwise justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?**

Attachment: Matter 15

Best wishes,

Andrew Macdonald
Parish Clerk
Pannal and Burn Bridge Parish Council
parishclerk@pannalandburnbridge-pc.gov.uk
Tel: 07802 460789