

Comments

Harrogate District Local Plan: Publication Draft 2018 (26/01/18 to 09/03/18)

Comment by	Pannal and Burn Bridge Parish Council (Mr Andrew Macdonald - 1155764)
Comment ID	PD1191
Response Date	09/03/18 13:37
Consultation Point	Vision (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

3a. Consultation document

You can use this form to comment on the publication draft of the Local Plan or comment on one of its supporting documents.

To which document does your response relate? Harrogate District Local Plan: Publication Draft
Select one from the list below.

Policy reference

If your response relates to a policy, please use the drop down list to select the policy to which it relates e.g. DM1 Housing Allocations.

To which policy does your response relate? GS1: Providing New Homes and Jobs

Site reference

If your response relates to a site, please use the box below to enter the site reference to which it relates e.g. BL9

Please do not enter more than one site reference.

To which site does your response relate? Enter only the site reference e.g. BL9 All PN

Paragraph/figure number

Please use the box below to indicate the part of the document your response relates e.g. paragraph number, figure number etc.

To which paragraph number etc. does your response relate? 2.2

Development Limit

If your response relates to a development limit, please use the drop down list to select the settlement's development limit to which your response relates e.g. Harrogate

To which development limit does your response refer? Pannal

Policies Map

If your response relates to a policies map, please use the drop down list to select the policies map to which it relates. (Policies maps are located at chapter 11 of the plan.)

To which policies map does your response refer? Pannal

4. Soundness / Legal Compliance

Do you consider the Local Plan is: (please tick)

4(1) Legally compliant No

4(2) Sound No

5. Tests of soundness

What makes a Local Plan "sound"?

- . **Positively Prepared** - the plan should be prepared in a way that meets the needs for housing and other development, including infrastructure and business development.
- . **Justified** - the plan should be based on evidence, and be the most appropriate strategy for the district when considered against other reasonable alternatives.
- . **Effective** - the plan should be deliverable; the housing and other development should be capable of being carried out.
- . **Consistent with national policy** - the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

If you consider the Plan to be UNSOUND, please indicate the reasons why you think it is not (tick all that apply).

- . 1. Positively Prepared
- . 2. Justified
- . 3. Effective
- . 4. Consistent with national policy

6.Reasons for your response

Please give details of why you do, or do not, consider the Harrogate District Local Plan to be legally compliant or sound. Your reason(s) should concisely cover all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to justify your comments, as there will not normally be another opportunity to make further representations after publication stage. After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues she/he identifies for examination.

Please give reasons for you answer to 4(1), 4(2) and 5, where applicable. (You may also use this box if you wish to make representations on the Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment or Equality Analysis Report.)

We are particularly concerned about the Vision statements at paragraph 2.2 applied by the Council. We have gathered together our comments the respective paragraphs into one general comment noting below the relevant paragraphs to which we refer.

The vision comprises well-meaning phrases with which few can object. However the reality is that the narrative is flawed because it contains mutually exclusive aspirations.

2.3 If an area is 'sought after and desirable....a place where people want to live, work, do business, shop and spend their leisure time' it will have expensive house prices. Alternatively if you extend the built environment you may reduce the price of housing but only by making the District a less desirable place to live and work, which in turn will have consequences for the local economy.

2.4 There are no improvements to the Leeds-Harrogate-York rail line and that will continue to affect the ability of the district to be a key driver of the North Yorkshire economy. It was the rail line in the 19th century that helped the development of modern Harrogate and it is the lack of updating of the lines that will hamper future development because much needed workers cannot access the district quickly and comfortably.

2.5 The district's economy is no more resilient than before. Like all areas it undergoes structural change by operation of the market economy. It is subject to typical economic cycles and only out-performs other towns and districts due to the relatively high number of social grade ABs in the district (30% compared with 23% nationally). This gives the district a resilience in certain, but far from all, sectors.

2.6 Unsupported assertions about 'much needed new homes in sustainable locations across the district'. The plan is based on an untested presumption that building houses and allocating land for employment will attract economic growth beyond that achieved currently. See comments on para 2.3 above – we suggest that the scale of development proposed will reduce the desirability of the district as a place people want to live, work, shop and spend their leisure time. We refer to the assumptions in our comments in relation to PN 17, 18 and 19.

2.7 Another unsupported aspiration suggesting that somehow the development of new housing and employment will result in a significant investment in the road and rail infrastructure and a suggestion that it will also remove the hills and improve the weather so that people are prepared to walk and cycle in place of driving and using public transport. The reality is that the roads will be gridlocked, the environment will be harmed and people will want to avoid the town and its primary service villages. The Infrastructure Development Plan at paras 4.11, 4.12, 6.1 and 6.12 make it clear that no serious and costed consideration has been given to the transport infrastructure or the water/sewerage infrastructure. Our traffic consultants' report (attached to our submissions on PN17, 18 and 19 emphatically highlights this.

2.8 Nice words which sit totally at odds with the proposed development of Special Landscape Areas in the district

2.9 Another wonderful aspiration for which there is no action proposed in the plan.

2.10 More carefully chosen words that are not followed through by specific policies and the evidence of recent housing developments suggests that major housebuilders will continue to develop mundane, cheap to build generic housing that takes little account of local distinctiveness.

2.11 The Borough Council's track record on exploiting local opportunities for development and enhancing heritage assets is woefully inadequate giving little prospect for this worthy aspiration being fulfilled.

6a. Additional information

You can upload documents to support comments submitted to question 6. Answering 'Yes' will allow

Do you wish to upload and supporting documents?

No

Comment by

Pannal and Burn Bridge Parish Council (Mr Andrew Macdonald - 1155764)

Comment ID

PD1195

Response Date

09/03/18 13:40

Consultation Point

Site PN17 PN17: Land adjoining Spring Lane Farm, Pannal ([View](#))

Status

Submitted

Submission Type

Web

Version

0.1

Files

3a. Consultation document

You can use this form to comment on the publication draft of the Local Plan or comment on one of it's supporting documents.

To which document does your response relate? Harrogate District Local Plan: Publication Draft
Select one from the list below.

Policy reference

If your response relates to a policy, please use the drop down list to select the policy to which it relates e.g. DM1 Housing Allocations.

To which policy does your response relate? DM1: Housing Allocations

Site reference

If your response relates to a site, please use the box below to enter the site reference to which it relates e.g. BL9

Please do not enter more than one site reference.

To which site does your response relate? Enter only the site reference e.g. BL9 PN17

Paragraph/figure number

Please use the box below to indicate the part of the document your response relates e.g. paragraph number, figure number etc.

To which paragraph number etc. does your response relate? see box 6

Development Limit

If your response relates to a development limit, please use the drop down list to select the settlement's development limit to which your response relates e.g. Harrogate

To which development limit does your response refer? Pannal

Policies Map

If your response relates to a policies map, please use the drop down list to select the policies map to which it relates. (Policies maps are located at chapter 11 of the plan.)

To which policies map does your response refer? Pannal

4. Soundness / Legal Compliance

Do you consider the Local Plan is: (please tick)

4(1) Legally compliant No

4(2) Sound No

5. Tests of soundness

What makes a Local Plan "sound"?

- . **Positively Prepared** - the plan should be prepared in a way that meets the needs for housing and other development, including infrastructure and business development.
- . **Justified** - the plan should be based on evidence, and be the most appropriate strategy for the district when considered against other reasonable alternatives.
- . **Effective** - the plan should be deliverable; the housing and other development should be capable of being carried out.
- . **Consistent with national policy** - the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

If you consider the Plan to be UNSOUND, please indicate the reasons why you think it is not (tick all that apply).

- . 1. Positively Prepared
- . 2. Justified
- . 3. Effective
- . 4. Consistent with national policy

6.Reasons for your response

Please give details of why you do, or do not, consider the Harrogate District Local Plan to be legally compliant or sound. Your reason(s) should concisely cover all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to justify your comments, as there will not normally be another opportunity to make further representations after publication stage. After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues she/he identifies for examination.

Please give reasons for you answer to 4(1), 4(2) and 5, where applicable. (You may also use this box if you wish to make representations on the Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment or Equality Analysis Report.)

This response is on behalf of the residents of Pannal and Burn Bridge and is submitted by the Parish Council. It is a collective response and the names of the residents supporting this response will follow when requested.

We wish to emphasise that the responses to 2017 proposals – substantially unchanged in this version of the Local Plan – were significant in number (788 for PN17, 630 for PN18 and 746 for PN19). As far as the residents can see, no notice was taken of their views and therefore they do not consider that any proper “consultation” took place. It is a source of major disappointment and many of the residents have commented to the Parish Council that they could not see the point in commenting again. Furthermore, that little or no notice was taken of residents’ views in the previous consultation reinforces their lack of confidence and trust in the Council’s ability to plan sensibly and considerately for Harrogate’s future. For reference, the comments made by the Parish Council on behalf of residents in 2017 are attached as a separate comment on the portal under PN17 and can be viewed on the Parish Council’s website (planning page).

The allocation of PN17 for Housing.

In this submission the PC refers to the Arrowsmith Associates report where in Section 2 they provide a summary:

“2. Housing

2.1 In the case of the housing allocations our instruction does not cover challenging the planning authority’s calculations of district-wide requirements. Equally, lacking the resources to investigate all the potential sites in the district, we cannot demonstrate that those requirements could be met elsewhere in the district. We nevertheless recommend that the Parish Council make a holding objection to the planning authority’s calculation of housing requirements. Our reasoning is as follows.

- 1 The Council's decision to put forward additional sites in the 2017 Additional Sites consultation followed the publication of the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) prepared for the Council by G L Hearn. This report increased the annual housing requirement from 557 (in the 2016 draft plan) to 669.
- 1 The HEDNA produced two forecasts of housing requirements over the plan period. The first was based on demographic trends. It forecast an annual housing requirement of 410 dwellings. The HEDNA also produced an 'economic' forecast based on predicted job increases. This was for 669 dwellings per annum.
- 1 The HEDNA concluded that the housing requirement for the district should be 669 dwellings per annum because this level of provision would meet both the need based on job forecasts and that based on demographic forecasts.
- 1 The HEDNA did not address the policy issue of whether it is appropriate to provide housing to facilitate a jobs forecast.
- 1 The Government has recently published a consultation paper on 'Planning for the right homes in the right places'. An extract from this consultation, describing the proposed approach, is produced as appendix 1. The approach is simpler than that in the HEDNA. It has a demographic basis with an adjustment factor to take account of affordability. It does not include a second 'economic' forecast. Paragraph 28 in the consultation does however recognise that the approach makes no specific adjustment to take account of employment growth and that "where there is a policy in place to substantially increase economic growth, local planning authorities may wish to plan for a higher level of growth than our formula proposes". Paragraph 46 then says "we propose to amend planning guidance so that where a plan is based on an assessment of local housing need in excess of that which the standard method would provide, Planning Inspectors are advised to work on the assumption that the approach adopted is sound unless there are compelling reasons to indicate otherwise".
- 1 The Borough Council's proposed housing requirement can be seen as one designed to facilitate employment growth greater than that required for purely demographic reasons. We believe that this fundamental policy approach has not been adequately explained or justified. If the Parish Council wish to challenge the overall housing requirement figure it could be on this basis. The adverse impacts of allocations PN17, PN18 and PN19 would be part of the cost of adopting an employment based housing requirement.
- 1 Leeds City Council have already examined the way in which the calculation method outlined in the consultation paper would affect their housing requirement figures and have reduced the housing requirement figure in their currently emerging Sites Allocation Plan. They have however not adopted the entirely demographic based approach in the consultation paper on the grounds that it would constrain economic growth. If it chooses to object on this ground (and perhaps subsequently to give evidence at the Local Plan Examination) the Parish Council should be aware of the Government's intended advice to Inspectors as indicated in paragraph 46 of the consultation paper.
- 1 On 5 March 2018, in response to consultation on 'Planning for the right homes in the right places' the Government concluded that the approach proposed in the consultation paper was the most appropriate method of assessing local housing need. They will publish draft guidance on the proposed methodology.

2.2 We have not been instructed to appraise the HEDNA housing requirement calculation and we therefore recommend that our comments above be used with caution. We have no basis for arguing that the local plan housing requirement is wrong, merely that it is based on an approach which the Parish

Council might consider has not be adequately explained or justified. This will protect the Parish Council's opportunity to give evidence on the housing requirement at the forthcoming Local Plan Examination.

Save Spring Lane SLA Defence Group ("Spring Lane Group")

The PC now draws the Council's attention to the Spring Lane Group's submission to the portal received on 08/03/18 09:45 and the attached document submitted with it where it compares the four tests of soundness and finds them wanting. The Spring Lane Group's full report is attached to this response as document three.

The PC concurs with the Spring Lane Group's comments, and with the related comments that they and the PC submitted in 2017, and wishes to highlight and concur with these key areas made in their submission particularly emphasising where the plan for PN 17 fails the tests of soundness [PC's addition in bold]:

"Special Landscape Area (Adopted Policy C9 and Draft Policy NE4). PN17 lies within the Crimple Valley SLA and was added in to the Draft Local Plan at a late stage without proper justification as to why Policy C9 (giving long term protection) /NE4 should be overridden, in particular given the clear findings of the HBC Review of Local Landscape Designations - Updated 2016. **This fails Test 2.**"

"The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The Group does not consider that the Plan is consistent with the NPPF, in particular Paragraphs 109 (protection of valued landscapes) and 110. **This fails Test 4.**

(para.157 , 7th bullet is also relevant)"

"For several decades Harrogate Borough Council (HBC) has designated the Crimple Valley, in which lies PN17, as a Special Landscape Area meriting protection from development. In the Review of Harrogate's SLA's undertaken by HBC as recently as October 2016, The Crimple Valley SLA was summarized as: '4.22 This Special Landscape Area is extremely attractive and provides a very strong landscape structure and preserved consistency. The area as a whole comprises exceptional quality landscape as well as being important to the setting of the town.' In 4.23 some areas were recommended for removal from SLA designation. Spring Lane was unaffected."

And further...

"Special Landscape Area (Adopted Policy C9 and Draft Policy NE4) Paragraph 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that 'Local Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework.'

Within the adopted Local Plan, PN17 makes up part of the wider Crimple Valley Special Landscape Area (SLA), as identified within the adopted Local Plan proposals map (2001) and remains part of the wider Special Landscape Area designation within the Draft Local Plan (October 2016) under Policy NE4. The Group welcomes HBC's intention to maintain its long held position on the long term importance of the retaining the Special Landscape Area, but considers this has been undermined by the unjustified inclusion of PN17 as a Draft Housing Allocation.

The inclusion of PN17, which lies within the Special Landscape Area, is inconsistent with Policy C9 'Special Landscape Areas' of the Adopted Local Plan (February 2001), which states that "The Borough Council will give long term protection to the high quality landscape of the following special landscape areas..."

“HBC has demonstrated its intention to ensure that the Special Landscape Areas are afforded ‘long term protection’ through the 2004, 2008 , 2011 and 2016 reviews of the SLA designations. The 2008 review of the Crimple Valley SLA concluded that the part of the SLA comprising PN17 was defined as an area of very attractive landscape that provides land of ‘exceptionally high’ landscape quality and contributes ‘distinctively’ to the landscape setting of the town. The more recent review in 2011 made specific judgements about whether individual fields (such as the site of PN17) were suitable for designation, but again its findings were consistent with the 2008 review, and confirmed that the SLAs should remain as an important policy tool in protecting and enhancing the character of the District’s settlements. The history and methodology of the SLA Reviews is clearly set out in the 2016 document.”

The Spring Lane group report goes on to refer the decisions made by both the Borough Council and Planning Inspector in connection with an application across the valley from Spring Lane:

“Indeed, a similar view was shared by a Planning Inspector when considering an outline residential application at Land at Rossett Green Lane, Harrogate, HG2 9LH (Ref: APP/E2734/W/16/3164715) in April 2017. At paragraph 21 and 22 of the dismissed decision the Inspector states:

“Nevertheless, having regard to the submitted indicative layout plan, it seems to me that the development of the site for up to 22 dwellings as proposed would inevitably result in built form infilling the existing open pastoral gap at the edge of the settlement and extending southwards, beyond the existing building line of the dwellings to the south side of Rossett Green Lane, into the area of attractive open countryside which provides the rural setting to the southern edge of Harrogate and serves to separate Harrogate and Pannal. These are key objectives of the SLA.”

A reduced scheme for 14 houses on a smaller site is currently the subject of appeal. The Council has resolved (15th August) to resist the appeal.”

The PC also notes that this designation of the SLA also applies to PN18 and 19.

“Lack of Effectiveness in allocating PN17. The Group considers that HBC **has failed to test for effectiveness** in allocating this site for 72 houses as the number cannot and will not be delivered given the high number of constraints of the site.“

Sustainability Appraisal

The Spring Lane Group’s assessment of the Sustainability appraisal are well thought through and supported by the PC which highlights and supports these findings:

“The Group has reviewed the services and facilities in Pannal and confirms that with regard to PN17: there is no longer a regular bus service in Pannal as this was cancelled in April 2016 and the nearest bus stop is 1.2 miles away on Pannal Ash Road; there is no café or regular GP practice in Pannal; the village’s only Primary School is near capacity; and, the nearest secondary schools (Ashville and Rossett) are 1.3 miles away.

The Sustainability Appraisal confirms the Group’s findings and states that:

- 1 The Local Primary School is at or near capacity and may require extension.
- 2 There is some accessibility to local services, but poor accessibility to bus, rail, secondary school, shopping facilities and employment.
- 3 There is significant transport and/or accessibility/cumulative impact problems requiring substantial mitigation.
- 4 Increased public transport provision and extension of services cannot be predicted at this stage.

- 5 There is poor connectivity to cycle routes, and
- 6 Significant barriers to accessibility.

Despite PN17's location on the edge of the Burn Bridge settlement boundaries it is relatively inaccessible and does not provide access to the provisions associated with a Primary Service Village, this reinforces how unsuitable the site is for development."

The Spring Lane Group submission concludes as follows:

"The Core Planning Principles set out in the NPPF state that planning should 'be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings'. **The very late inclusion of PN17 by HBC, without notice or reference to the Parish Council, would seem to be a major breach of this core principle, as would HBC's apparent dismissal of over 500 individual objections (as well as the Group's and the Parish Council's objections) in the first round of consultation on PN17 in 2017.** Local people can justifiably feel that their voice is not being heard and that HBC is being cavalier in its approach to evidence and National Policy with regard to PN17.

Legal Compliance. The Group's principal concerns are with NPPF Tests 2 and 4.

It does however also raise the issue of compliance with Regulation 2(b) of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004: the requirement that the environmental report should identify, describe and evaluate reasonable alternatives, taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme. **Given that the Authority has not been prepared to review the Green Belt boundaries to the south-west of Pannal it is questioned whether this requirement has been satisfied.**"

Landscape Assessment. The assessment carried out by Smeeden Foreman is attached at document two. It is clear in its assessment of PN17 in paragraph 2.0 where it assesses that the overall significance of the visual effects is therefore assessed as being "major adverse" for all 5 viewpoints considered.

The PC wishes also to emphasise the following additional points:

The absence of an SEA study. The PC believes that there is a legal requirement to consider cumulative impacts in the Local Plan process. It is of concern that cumulative impacts were not considered at a Primary Service Village level (which Pannal is) despite the fact that this village plays an important part of the Growth Strategy and is a key through route for traffic in transit to and from the west of Harrogate and the A61.

Strategic Infrastructure. The Infrastructure Development Plan and Infrastructure Capacity Study highlight a number of shortcomings that threaten the ability of the Local Plan to be fulfilled (well documented in the Save Crimple Valley responses authored by local resident Denis Kaye). The PC refers here to BWB's report and the impact of not having an SIP in place.

Habitat and Wildlife. The PC's 2017 responses made clear that the plans for PN17 were contrary to the requirements of habitat and wildlife preservation. It should be noted that the RSPB identifies 13 of 41 species of bird in this area are red-listed (41%) and 11 (22%) amber listed.

The Planning Process and SEA. The PC understands that there has been a failure to apply the SEA Directive which if upheld would contravene legal compliance. We take this from the Hampsthwaite Action Group's submissions

"Paragraph 5.7 of the report states that work was undertaken to identify additional sites following receipt of the HEDNA report. The draft allocations are set out in Appendix 1 (section 3-4) to the report.

Paragraph 5.15 then states: "Consultation on the additional sites will run for a period of 6 weeks between 14th July and 25th August 2017." (the following day).

The decision to undertake the additional sites consultation was made by a single councillor with no opportunity for anyone outside the council or any other councillor to consider whether the evidence of housing need was sound and reasonable for the Local plan. The haste to get this report approved and for consultation on the additional sites to begin meant the decision had to be referred, in accordance with paragraph 16(b) of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules, to the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission. That report (also dated 13th July) stated "The urgency in this case is required by the need to start the consultation on 14th July as programmed in the report at paragraph 5.15."

The concluding paragraphs of the Arrowsmith reports are telling [PC's addition in bold]:

"6. Conclusion

6.1 Nothing that has occurred since August 2017 has changed the substance of our advice concerning the local harm that would be caused by allocations PN17, PN18 and PN19. We do however expect the Parish Council to reinforce their objection by incorporating many of the detailed arguments advanced by local residents.

6.2 The Transport and Landscape Assessments produced by BWB and Smeeden Foreman now constitute strong supporting evidence. We believe that our further consideration of the HEDNA report supports the argument that the need for additional employment land allocations does not outweigh the strong environmental, social and traffic objections to the proposals.

6.3 Whilst our brief has not extended to formally appraising the housing requirement calculations that underpin the Plan's housing allocations we have identified a policy issue that we believe has not been sufficiently explored and which the Parish Council might consider is the basis for an objection.

Arrowsmith Associates
March 2018"

All in all, the case for PN17 as a site for housing is extremely weak and highly flawed.

6a. Additional information

You can upload documents to support comments submitted to question 6. Answering 'Yes' will allow

Do you wish to upload and supporting documents? Yes

Supporting information: document one

If you wish to upload documents providing additional information to support your comments you can do so here.

1. Upload supporting document. Arrowsmith final report

Supporting information: document two

2. Upload supporting document. BWB transport assessment

Supporting information: document three

3. Upload supporting document

Save Spring Lane group response

7. Modifications

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Harrogate District Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at question 5 where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you could put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

(If you are suggesting that the plan is legally compliant or sound please write N/A)

Details of modification

We believe modifications should include:

- 1 Abandoning plans to build on any sites west of the railway line running through Pannal and the A61 as these will suffer from the same problems as at present – the two crossing points create choke points that would be very hard to overcome without major and very expensive engineering works. Anywhere near and utilising the section of the A61 between the Buttersyke roundabout and Harrogate will add further to the current congestion.
- 2 Specifically, sites should be chosen towards the A1 and A1 (M) where there is room and existing transport infrastructure to establish new “settlements or where infrastructure will be or is already in place. Such site include Flaxby North (the former golf course); the proposed but rejected new settlement between the old A1 and A1(M) north of Wetherby; the future likely availability of ex MoD sites such as Dishforth (plenty of space, and access to the main trunk roads) and the stock of ex MoD married quarters empty in places like Ripon.
- 3 Conducting a formal review of the questionable economic uplift figures. The HEDNA report is flawed as is the Jacobs traffic report. This is a fundamental point to examine and throws doubt on Harrogate’s Local Plan process.

Comment by	Pannal and Burn Bridge Parish Council (Mr Andrew Macdonald - 1155764)
Comment ID	PD1197
Response Date	09/03/18 13:44
Consultation Point	Map 10.61 Site PN19 (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

Files

3a. Consultation document

You can use this form to comment on the publication draft of the Local Plan or comment on one of it's supporting documents.

To which document does your response relate? Harrogate District Local Plan: Publication Draft
Select one from the list below.

Policy reference

If your response relates to a policy, please use the drop down list to select the policy to which it relates e.g. DM1 Housing Allocations.

To which policy does your response relate? DM1: Housing Allocations

Site reference

If your response relates to a site, please use the box below to enter the site reference to which it relates e.g. BL9

Please do not enter more than one site reference.

To which site does your response relate? Enter only the site reference e.g. BL9 PN 19

Paragraph/figure number

Please use the box below to indicate the part of the document your response relates e.g. paragraph number, figure number etc.

To which paragraph number etc. does your response relate? all

Development Limit

If your response relates to a development limit, please use the drop down list to select the settlement's development limit to which your response relates e.g. Harrogate

To which development limit does your response refer? Pannal

Policies Map

If your response relates to a policies map, please use the drop down list to select the policies map to which it relates. (Policies maps are located at chapter 11 of the plan.)

To which policies map does your response refer? Pannal

4. Soundness / Legal Compliance

Do you consider the Local Plan is: (please tick)

4(1) Legally compliant No

4(2) Sound No

5. Tests of soundness

What makes a Local Plan "sound"?

- . **Positively Prepared** - the plan should be prepared in a way that meets the needs for housing and other development, including infrastructure and business development.
- . **Justified** - the plan should be based on evidence, and be the most appropriate strategy for the district when considered against other reasonable alternatives.
- . **Effective** - the plan should be deliverable; the housing and other development should be capable of being carried out.
- . **Consistent with national policy** - the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

If you consider the Plan to be UNSOUND, please indicate the reasons why you think it is not (tick all that apply).

- . 1. Positively Prepared
- . 2. Justified
- . 3. Effective
- . 4. Consistent with national policy

6.Reasons for your response

Please give details of why you do, or do not, consider the Harrogate District Local Plan to be legally compliant or sound. Your reason(s) should concisely cover all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to justify your comments, as there will not normally be another opportunity to make further representations after publication stage. After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues she/he identifies for examination.

Please give reasons for you answer to 4(1), 4(2) and 5, where applicable. (You may also use this box if you wish to make representations on the Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment or Equality Analysis Report.)

This response is on behalf of the residents of Pannal and Burn Bridge and is submitted by the Parish Council. It is a collective response and the names of the residents supporting this response will follow when requested.

We wish to emphasise that the responses to 2017 proposals – substantially unchanged in this version of the Local Plan – were significant in number (788 for PN17, 630 for PN18 and 746 for PN19). As far as the residents can see, no notice was taken of their views and therefore they do not consider that any proper “consultation” took place. It is a source of major disappointment and many of the residents have commented to the Parish Council that they could not see the point in commenting again. Furthermore, that little or no notice was taken of residents’ views in the previous consultation reinforces their lack of confidence and trust in the Council’s ability to plan sensibly and considerately for Harrogate’s future. For reference, the comments made by the Parish Council on behalf of residents in 2017 are attached as a separate comment on the portal under PN17 and can be viewed on the Parish Council’s website (planning page).

Of fundamental importance is that PN19 is split by the Crimple Beck. The word "Beck" makes it sound like it's a small stream – often it is in the summer - though of more significance not only is it part of a recognised flood plain but it also splits the PN19 site in two, the eastern half (accessible only from the A61 Leeds Road) is between 3 and 5 metres higher than the land to the west which is only accessible through a narrow access point (suitable mainly for farm traffic) off the already very busy Pannal Main Street. No consideration seems to have been made about the difference in land levels and difficulties of access let alone the increases in congestion in Pannal or effects on the flood plain.

The allocation of PN19 for Housing.

In this submission the PC refers to the Arrowsmith Associates report where in Section 2 they provide a summary:

“2. Housing

2.1 In the case of the housing allocations our instruction does not cover challenging the planning authority’s calculations of district-wide requirements. Equally, lacking the resources to investigate all the potential sites in the district, we cannot demonstrate that those requirements could be met elsewhere in the district. We nevertheless recommend that the Parish Council make a holding objection to the planning authority’s calculation of housing requirements. Our reasoning is as follows.

- 1 The Council’s decision to put forward additional sites in the 2017 Additional Sites consultation followed the publication of the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) prepared for the Council by G L Hearn. This report increased the annual housing requirement from 557 (in the 2016 draft plan) to 669.
- 2 The HEDNA produced two forecasts of housing requirements over the plan period. The first was based on demographic trends. It forecast an annual housing requirement of 410 dwellings. The HEDNA also produced an ‘economic’ forecast based on predicted job increases. This was for 669 dwellings per annum.

- 3 The HEDNA concluded that the housing requirement for the district should be 669 dwellings per annum because this level of provision would meet both the need based on job forecasts and that based on demographic forecasts.
- 4 The HEDNA did not address the policy issue of whether it is appropriate to provide housing to facilitate a jobs forecast.
- 5 The Government has recently published a consultation paper on 'Planning for the right homes in the right places'. An extract from this consultation, describing the proposed approach, is produced as appendix 1. The approach is simpler than that in the HEDNA. It has a demographic basis with an adjustment factor to take account of affordability. It does not include a second 'economic' forecast. Paragraph 28 in the consultation does however recognise that the approach makes no specific adjustment to take account of employment growth and that "where there is a policy in place to substantially increase economic growth, local planning authorities may wish to plan for a higher level of growth than our formula proposes". Paragraph 46 then says "we propose to amend planning guidance so that where a plan is based on an assessment of local housing need in excess of that which the standard method would provide, Planning Inspectors are advised to work on the assumption that the approach adopted is sound unless there are compelling reasons to indicate otherwise".
- 6 The Borough Council's proposed housing requirement can be seen as one designed to facilitate employment growth greater than that required for purely demographic reasons. We believe that this fundamental policy approach has not been adequately explained or justified. If the Parish Council wish to challenge the overall housing requirement figure it could be on this basis. The adverse impacts of allocations PN17, PN18 and PN19 would be part of the cost of adopting an employment based housing requirement.
- 7 Leeds City Council have already examined the way in which the calculation method outlined in the consultation paper would affect their housing requirement figures and have reduced the housing requirement figure in their currently emerging Sites Allocation Plan. They have however not adopted the entirely demographic based approach in the consultation paper on the grounds that it would constrain economic growth. If it chooses to object on this ground (and perhaps subsequently to give evidence at the Local Plan Examination) the Parish Council should be aware of the Government's intended advice to Inspectors as indicated in paragraph 46 of the consultation paper.
- 8 On 5 March 2018, in response to consultation on 'Planning for the right homes in the right places' the Government concluded that the approach proposed in the consultation paper was the most appropriate method of assessing local housing need. They will publish draft guidance on the proposed methodology.

2.2 We have not been instructed to appraise the HEDNA housing requirement calculation and we therefore recommend that our comments above be used with caution. We have no basis for arguing that the local plan housing requirement is wrong, merely that it is based on an approach which the Parish Council might consider has not been adequately explained or justified. This will protect the Parish Council's opportunity to give evidence on the housing requirement at the forthcoming Local Plan Examination.

The concluding paragraphs of the Arrowsmith reports are telling [PC's addition in bold]:

"6. Conclusion

6.1 Nothing that has occurred since August 2017 has changes [sic] the substance of our advice **concerning the local harm that would be caused by allocations PN17, PN18 and PN19**. We do however expect the Parish Council to reinforce their objection by incorporating many of the detailed arguments advanced by local residents.

6.2 The Transport and Landscape Assessments produced by BWB and Smeeden Foreman now constitute strong supporting evidence. We believe that our further consideration of the HEDNA report supports the argument that the need for additional employment land allocations does not outweigh the strong environmental, social and traffic objections to the proposals.

6.3 Whilst our brief has not extended to formally appraising the housing requirement calculations that underpin the Plan's housing allocations we have identified sufficient concerns to support an argument that reliance of the HEDNA report and therefore the overall housing requirement **is unsafe**.

Arrowsmith Associates

March 2018”

The PC now refers to and reinforces some of its more pertinent comments made in 2017 on the lack of suitability for housing on PN19 which are still relevant today. Extracts below:

“Built & Natural Environment Site Assessments (New Sites 2017)

- 1 The Borough Council's own assessment shows that the site is unsuitable for development - (https://www.harrogate.gov.uk/downloads/file/2712/2017_built_and_natural_environment_site_assessments_new_sites). Specifically, in all categories (Landscape, Conservation and Design, Ecology and Land Drainage) the conclusions overwhelmingly showed a RED rating – see pages 292-298.”

“Landscape Site Assessment. The Summary conclusion (on page 293) states:

- 1 “The extent of the proposed site would have a significant impact on landscape character and the special qualities of the SLA which is a highly valued landscape. The southern part of the SLA is in PN14 [should read PN19] and the development of this are [should read “area”] while detrimental to landscape character offers greater opportunities for mitigation and would maintain a significant proportion of the green infrastructure of the Crimble Beck corridor.”
- 2 Despite the attempted amelioration through the wording of the second sentence, with these conclusions there should be no development on this site.

Conservation & Design Site Assessment.

- 1 Whilst providing a RED rating in the conclusion (page 295) the assessment goes on to deliver mixed messages about the viability of the site noting, for instance:
 - 1) “Site boundary unacceptable as proposed, a smaller site could accommodate housing without harmful impacts. Setting of Listed Church (GIILB) and Pannal conservation area would be significantly compromised by development on the site”

Then

“3) “Harm caused by the introduction of development into this attractive rural edge to Harrogate and important landscape area. Harm caused by the proposed scale of development on this edge of settlement site.”

Ecology Site Assessment

- 1 The Assessment provides only an ORANGE rating which the PC finds strange as the conclusion provides some very mixed messages: in the third sentence (p297) it states: “Large scale development would have an adverse impact on the landscape ecology to the south of Harrogate which would be intensified by the requirement to bridge the river. If the site is developed, high quality landscaping and buffering of the River Crimble through green infrastructure [sic] provision would be required to offset harm.”
- 2 In addition to the irreparable damage to the local ecology, the PC believes that the bridging cost would be considerable and along with land drainage (next section), the site would be commercially unviable for the developer.

Land Drainage Assessment

- 1 We refer the Council first of all to the Hydrographical report that has been produced [Appendix 3 of attached document two] and it is clear that the risks of development on this land have been massively underestimated. The extract from this report is unequivocal: “The cost and scale of effective flood resilience engineering has been very substantially underestimated. This general issue has been thoroughly documented in the recent HM Government Flood Resilience Review and in EA publications and project reports. Effective mitigation for the Crimble Valley and elsewhere would require expensive civil engineering projects (“Integrated Catchment Management”) over unacceptably large land areas. The smaller SUDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) schemes currently under consideration have very limited efficacy under flash storm conditions.”.

The Council's own assessment provides only an ORANGE rating which the PC finds very strange as the Summary of Issues (p298 of that report) paints a different picture.

In the conclusion it states: "Some adverse effects of additional surface water discharge on nearby watercourses but appropriate mitigation should enable development". For locals who live and walk there, this statement might well be referring to a completely different place as in their experience the ground is waterlogged for many months of the year."

Furthermore, The PC draws the Council's attention to the submission on the 2017 plan portal from one of the residents who is well versed in matters of land drainage (ID1106329), who states:

"1) Within active flood plain of River Crimple – significant portion within flood zone 3b. EA guidance indicates that residential properties should not be permitted within flood zone 3b.

2) Bridge would be required over the River Crimple creating a visual impact and destruction of riverbank habitat

3) EA document –'Flood Risk Assessments – Climate Change Allowances' indicates that there will be significant increase of flood zone 3.

4) EA surface water flood map indicates areas of high and medium risk

5) Current flood risk profile will be made worse by large areas of hardstanding

6) Disagree with HBC Site Assessment that SuDS could mitigate impacts of flooding

Sustainability Appraisal – Addendum July 2017. In the appraisal (<https://consult.harrogate.gov.uk/portal/pp/sa/sa17>) several key indicators are heavily flagged in RED none of which could remotely be used to favour or recommend development of this area."

The PC then draws attention in the supporting document two to the sections on:

"7 – Education and Training. Local primary school at or near capacity and likely to require expansion.". Comment: The school is already full and the existing housing plans for the Dunlopillo site will take up the remaining capacity when the out of town pupils move on.

Additional comments on "Biodiversity, Pollution, Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste, and Protect and enhance the historic environment." - all of which are RED. Arrowsmith's comments are that "Poor ratings here reflect real costs" and that "The site scores poorly which suggests the allocation is not justified."

Sustainability Appraisal Summary. Arrowsmith summarises with the view that **"on the Borough Council's own analyses, the three sites perform so poorly that it is likely that alternative locations will meet the calculated land requirements at less cost and with greater benefit."**

"General comments on additional housing & employment allocations.

Consistency.

- 1 The Council has shown consistency in supporting the refusal of housing developments in the SLA - specifically the refusals of the 22 and subsequently 14 houses at Rosset Green Lane, and then the two houses on Sandy Bank. None of these schemes are remotely significant when compared with the proposals for PN 19. In addition, the Planning Inspector has supported the refusal by the Council in his report on the 22 houses plan.
- 2 For the Council now to complete an about turn on this larger development demonstrates a serious flaw in its consistency of thought and can't be allowed to go unchallenged.

Summary Statement

The PC considers that there is no reason for PN19 to be included in the Draft Local Plan. All the evidence from both the Council's own assessments as well as the professional Consultancy engaged by the PC confirms that development on this part of the SLA would be detrimental and have an adverse impact on this as well as the Pannal Conservation Area. It would close the long established green space between Pannal and Harrogate."

It goes on to make reference to the Rossett Green Lane applications which seem to confirm the importance of the SLA to both the Council Planners and the Inspector.

The Council has demonstrated its intent to secure the status of the SLA through a range of reviews - 2004, 2008, 2011 and 2016. The 2008 review of the Crimple Valley SLA concluded that the part of the SLA comprising PN17, PN 18 and 19 was defined as an area of very attractive landscape that provide land of 'exceptionally high' landscape quality and contribute 'distinctively' to the landscape setting of the town. The more recent review in 2011 made specific judgements about whether individual fields (such as the site of PN17 and 19) were suitable for designation, but again its findings were consistent with the 2008 review, and confirmed that the SLAs should remain as an important policy tool in protecting and enhancing the character of the Districts settlements."

These assessments combined with the BWB traffic analysis supports rejection of the site for housing.

The PC wishes also to emphasise the following additional points:

Strategic Infrastructure. The Infrastructure Development Plan and Infrastructure Capacity Study highlight a number of shortcomings that threaten the ability of the Local Plan to be fulfilled (well documented in the Save Crimple Valley responses authored by local resident Denis Kaye). The PC refers here to BWB's report and the impact of not having an SIP in place.

Habitat and Wildlife. The PC's 2017 responses made clear that the plans for PN19 were contrary to the requirements of habitat and wildlife preservation. It should be noted that the RSPB identifies 13 of 41 species of bird in this area are red-listed (41%) and 11 (22%) amber listed.

The Planning Process and SEA. The PC understands that there has been a failure to apply the SEA Directive which if upheld would contravene legal compliance. We take this from the Hampsthwaite Action Group's submissions

"Paragraph 5.7 of the report states that work was undertaken to identify additional sites following receipt of the HEDNA report. The draft allocations are set out in Appendix 1 (section 3-4) to the report. Paragraph 5.15 then states: "Consultation on the additional sites will run for a period of 6 weeks between 14th July and 25th August 2017." (the following day).

The decision to undertake the additional sites consultation was made by a single councillor with no opportunity for anyone outside the council or any other councillor to consider whether the evidence of housing need was sound and reasonable for the Local plan. The haste to get this report approved and for consultation on the additional sites to begin meant the decision had to be referred, in accordance with paragraph 16(b) of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules, to the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission. That report (also dated 13th July) stated "The urgency in this case is required by the need to start the consultation on 14th July as programmed in the report at paragraph 5.15."

Landscape Assessment. The assessment carried out by Smeeden Foreman is attached at document two. It is clear in its assessment of PN19 in paragraph 4.0 where it assesses that the overall significance of the visual effects is therefore assessed as being "major adverse" for all viewpoints considered.

The concluding paragraphs of the Arrowsmith reports are telling [PC's addition in bold]:

“6. Conclusion

6.1 Nothing that has occurred since August 2017 has changed the substance of our advice concerning the local harm that would be caused by allocations PN17, PN18 and PN19. We do however expect the Parish Council to reinforce their objection by incorporating many of the detailed arguments advanced by local residents.

6.2 The Transport and Landscape Assessments produced by BWB and Smeeden Foreman now constitute strong supporting evidence. We believe that our further consideration of the HEDNA report supports the argument that the need for additional employment land allocations does not outweigh the strong environmental, social and traffic objections to the proposals.

6.3 Whilst our brief has not extended to formally appraising the housing requirement calculations that underpin the Plan’s housing allocations we have identified a policy issue that we believe has not been sufficiently explored and which the Parish Council might consider is the basis for an objection.

Arrowsmith Associates

March 2018”

All in all, the case for PN19 as a site for housing is extremely weak and highly flawed.

6a. Additional information

You can upload documents to support comments submitted to question 6. Answering 'Yes' will allow

Do you wish to upload and supporting documents? Yes

Supporting information: document one

If you wish to upload documents providing additional information to support your comments you can do so here.

1. Upload supporting document. Arrowsmith Associates Report

Supporting information: document two

2. Upload supporting document. Smeeden Foreman Landscape report

Supporting information: document three

3. Upload supporting document BWB transport assessment

7. Modifications

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Harrogate District Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at question 5 where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you could put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

(If you are suggesting that the plan is legally compliant or sound please write N/A)

Details of modification

We believe modifications should include:

- 1 Abandoning plans to build on any sites west of the railway line running through Pannal and the A61 as these will suffer from the same problems as at present – the two crossing points create choke points that would be very hard to overcome without major and very expensive engineering

works. Anywhere near and utilising the section of the A61 between the Buttersyke roundabout and Harrogate will add further to the current congestion.

- 2 Specifically, sites should be chosen towards the A1 and A1 (M) where there is room and existing transport infrastructure to establish new "settlements or where all the infrastructure will be or is already in place. Such site include Flaxby North (the former golf course); the proposed but rejected new settlement between the old A1 and A1(M) north of Wetherby; the future likely availability of ex MoD sites such as Dishforth (plenty of space, and access to the main trunk roads) and the stock of ex MoD married quarters empty in places like Ripon.
- 3 Conducting a formal review of the questionable economic uplift figures. The HEDNA report is flawed as is the Jacobs traffic report. This is a fundamental point to examine and throws doubt on Harrogate's Local Plan process.

Comment by	Pannal and Burn Bridge Parish Council (Mr Andrew Macdonald - 1155764)
Comment ID	PD1196
Response Date	09/03/18 13:43
Consultation Point	Map 10.87 Site PN18 (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

Files

3a. Consultation document

You can use this form to comment on the publication draft of the Local Plan or comment on one of it's supporting documents.

To which document does your response relate? Harrogate District Local Plan: Publication Draft
Select one from the list below.

Policy reference

If your response relates to a policy, please use the drop down list to select the policy to which it relates e.g. DM1 Housing Allocations.

To which policy does your response relate? DM2: Employment Allocations

Site reference

If your response relates to a site, please use the box below to enter the site reference to which it relates e.g. BL9

Please do not enter more than one site reference.

To which site does your response relate? Enter only the site reference e.g. BL9 PN18

Paragraph/figure number

Please use the box below to indicate the part of the document your response relates e.g. paragraph number, figure number etc.

To which paragraph number etc. does your response relate? all

Development Limit

If your response relates to a development limit, please use the drop down list to select the settlement's development limit to which your response relates e.g. Harrogate

To which development limit does your response refer? Pannal

Policies Map

If your response relates to a policies map, please use the drop down list to select the policies map to which it relates. (Policies maps are located at chapter 11 of the plan.)

To which policies map does your response refer? Pannal

4. Soundness / Legal Compliance

Do you consider the Local Plan is: (please tick)

4(1) Legally compliant No

4(2) Sound No

5. Tests of soundness

What makes a Local Plan "sound"?

- . **Positively Prepared** - the plan should be prepared in a way that meets the needs for housing and other development, including infrastructure and business development.
- . **Justified** - the plan should be based on evidence, and be the most appropriate strategy for the district when considered against other reasonable alternatives.
- . **Effective** - the plan should be deliverable; the housing and other development should be capable of being carried out.
- . **Consistent with national policy** - the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

If you consider the Plan to be UNSOUND, please indicate the reasons why you think it is not (tick all that apply).

- . 1. Positively Prepared
- . 2. Justified
- . 3. Effective
- . 4. Consistent with national policy

6.Reasons for your response

Please give details of why you do, or do not, consider the Harrogate District Local Plan to be legally compliant or sound. Your reason(s) should concisely cover all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to justify your comments, as there will not normally be another opportunity to make further representations after publication stage. After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues she/he identifies for examination.

Please give reasons for you answer to 4(1), 4(2) and 5, where applicable. (You may also use this box if you wish to make representations on the Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment or Equality Analysis Report.)

This response is on behalf of the residents of Pannal and Burn Bridge and is submitted by the Parish Council. It is a collective response and the names of the residents supporting this response will follow when requested.

We wish to emphasise that the responses to 2017 proposals – substantially unchanged in this version of the Local Plan – were significant in number (788 for PN17, 630 for PN18 and 746 for PN19). As far as the residents can see, no notice was taken of their views and therefore they do not consider that

any proper “consultation” took place. It is a source of major disappointment and many of the residents have commented to the Parish Council that they could not see the point in commenting again. Furthermore, that little or no notice was taken of residents’ views in the previous consultation reinforces their lack of confidence and trust in the Council’s ability to plan sensibly and considerately for Harrogate’s future. For reference, the comments made by the Parish Council on behalf of residents in 2017 (including comments on the SLA, flooding, biodiversity and habitat) are attached as a separate comment on the portal under PN17 and can be viewed on the Parish Council’s website (planning page).

The allocation of PN18 as “Employment Land”. In this submission the PC refers to the Arrowsmith Associates report where in Appendix 2 they provide an **“ASSESSMENT OF EMPLOYMENT LAND CALCULATION”**. The report, including the Council’s own sustainability appraisal of this site (appendix 3) is attached to this response in full as document one.

Key sections of the report are extracted below.

Abbreviated conclusions with which the PC concurs are as follows:

“Based on our analysis there are significant concerns about the HEDNA’s findings on employment land requirement. Whilst we recognise the policy justification for making a robust (i.e. a high end) estimate, the overall effect of combining several high-end assumptions can lead to exaggeration. Our reservations are increased by concerns about methods. Finally, the inconsistency between two tables questions the rigour with which the report has been edited and appraised.

The employment requirement in the October 2016 draft of the Local Plan was 20-25ha compared with actual allocations of 79ha. The minimum employment requirement in the Publication Draft of the Plan is 38ha compared with actual allocations of 108ha. These changes equate to an approximately two thirds increase in the minimum requirement and one third in the actual allocations.

The changes have occurred in just over a year. The only published justification we have found for the change is the evidence in the HEDNA. The relevance of the HEDNA is confirmed by paragraph 3.11 and 3.12 in the Publication Draft. **We find the evidence in the HEDNA unconvincing.**

The decision to add PN18 to the register of employment land allocations must be seen against this background. There is no justification in terms of a district wide balance between requirements and supply. We do not question the need to provide more than the minimum land requirement to provide for a choice of site and flexibility of supply. However, we do not consider that the HEDNA report is a sound basis for increasing the minimum requirement from that in the 2016 draft. If the original (and only just over a year old) figure was retained, the area of employment land allocated in the Publication Draft would be approximately five times the calculated requirement. Even if one were to accept the 38ha figure in the Publication Draft the amount of employment land allocated would still be almost three times that requirement. Whilst we accept that the need for choice and flexibility justifies some over-allocation we consider that this degree of over-allocation (whether by a factor of three or five) is excessive.

To the extent that the over-provision of employment land might generate additional jobs it will also increase inward migration, leading to the need to allocate even more land for housing, almost inevitably on greenfield sites.

Given the overall employment land supply position, it is difficult to see how any such argument about the commercial attractiveness of PN18 could overcome the very strong environmental and traffic objections to the proposal.”

Add to this the convincing arguments put forward by BWB on traffic (this report uploaded as “supporting document two”) and the case for using PN18 for an employment site is very, very weak.

The summary of the BWB report is extracted below.

“In summary, BWB reviewed the accessibility, highway safety and traffic implications of the proposed allocations of the three sites on the local highway network.

7.4 Although the sites are located within reasonable walking/ cycling distance to Pannal train station and existing public transport / bus services, the 2011 Census data suggests low use of such sustainable modes by current local residents. This raises questions over allocating the sites where future residents (sites PN17 & PN19) and employees (site PN18) are expected to travel sustainably to/from work.

7.5 Moreover, there are existing road safety concerns in the surrounding highway network, particularly along the A61 stretch in Pannal where accident clusters have been identified on key local junctions. This includes the A61 / A658 roundabout, A61 / Burn Bridge Lane junction, A61 / Follifoot Road / Pannal Bank junction and A61 / Hookstone Road / Leadhall Lane crossroads.

7.6 Therefore the proposed allocations of the three sites is likely to contribute further to the road safety issues, with increasing traffic, delays and queuing on the highway network.

7.7 In terms of traffic generation, owing to the residential and employment nature of the proposed allocation sites, the impact is likely to occur during weekday’s morning and evening peak hours. The identified hourly peaks of the local highway network were 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00 respectively.

7.8 Industry standard software, TRICS has been used to derive appropriate trip rates and calculate subsequent traffic generation of the three sites. As detailed within the report, the three sites are forecast to generate approximately 649 during the morning peak hour and 518 trips during the evening peak hour.

7.9 Following distribution and assignment of these trips, and taking into consideration the impact of committed developments in the area and local traffic growth, it was identified that the local highway network would not be able to accommodate such traffic, primarily due to the amount of traffic that would be added on the already congested A61 stretch in Pannal.

7.10 In conclusion, this Transport Assessment demonstrates that the three proposed allocations would cause severe traffic impact on the surrounding highway network and add to the existing road safety concerns Significant highway mitigation schemes would be required to accommodate the impact of the three sites, particularly on the A61 / A658 Roundabout, A61 / Burn Bridge Lane and A61 / Follifoot Road / Pannal Bank signalised junction.

7.11 Therefore the cumulative traffic impact of the proposed allocations should be taken into account. Any allocations [sic] should be based on an understanding of whether the likely impacts can be mitigated on the surrounding highway network and whether opportunities for sustainable travel have been identified. Such schemes should be cost effective, deliverable and sustainable for the future, otherwise would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.”

Landscape Assessment. The assessment carried out by Smeeden Foreman is attached at document two. It is clear in its assessment of PN18 in paragraph 3.0 where it assesses that the overall significance of the visual effects is therefore assessed as being “major adverse” for all viewpoints considered.

The PC wishes also to emphasise the following additional points:

The absence of an SEA study. The PC believes that there is a legal requirement to consider cumulative impacts in the Local Plan process. It is of concern that cumulative impacts were not considered at a Primary Service Village level (which Pannal is) despite the fact that this village plays an important part of the Growth Strategy and is a key through route for traffic in transit to and from the west of Harrogate and the A61.

Strategic Infrastructure. The Infrastructure Development Plan and Infrastructure Capacity Study highlight a number of shortcomings that threaten the ability of the Local Plan to be fulfilled (well documented in the Save Crimple Valley responses authored by local resident Denis Kaye). The PC refers here to BWB’s report and the impact of not having an SIP in place.

Habitat and Wildlife. The PC’s 2017 responses made clear that the plans for PN18 were contrary to the requirements of habitat and wildlife preservation. It should be noted that the RSPB identifies 13 of 41 species of bird in this area are red-listed (41%) and 11 (22%) amber listed.

The Planning Process and SEA. The PC understands that there has been a failure to apply the SEA Directive which if upheld would contravene legal compliance. We take this from the Hampsthwaite Action Group's submissions

"Paragraph 5.7 of the report states that work was undertaken to identify additional sites following receipt of the HEDNA report. The draft allocations are set out in Appendix 1 (section 3-4) to the report. Paragraph 5.15 then states: "Consultation on the additional sites will run for a period of 6 weeks between 14th July and 25th August 2017." (the following day).

The decision to undertake the additional sites consultation was made by a single councillor with no opportunity for anyone outside the council or any other councillor to consider whether the evidence of housing need was sound and reasonable for the Local plan. The haste to get this report approved and for consultation on the additional sites to begin meant the decision had to be referred, in accordance with paragraph 16(b) of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules, to the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission. That report (also dated 13th July) stated "The urgency in this case is required by the need to start the consultation on 14th July as programmed in the report at paragraph 5.15."

The concluding paragraphs of the Arrowsmith reports are telling [PC's addition in bold]:

"6. Conclusion

6.1 Nothing that has occurred since August 2017 has changed the substance of our advice concerning the local harm that would be caused by allocations PN17, PN18 and PN19. We do however expect the Parish Council to reinforce their objection by incorporating many of the detailed arguments advanced by local residents.

6.2 The Transport and Landscape Assessments produced by BWB and Smeeden Foreman now constitute strong supporting evidence. We believe that our further consideration of the HEDNA report supports the argument that the need for additional employment land allocations does not outweigh the strong environmental, social and traffic objections to the proposals.

6.3 Whilst our brief has not extended to formally appraising the housing requirement calculations that underpin the Plan's housing allocations we have identified a policy issue that we believe has not been sufficiently explored and which the Parish Council might consider is the basis for an objection.

Arrowsmith Associates

March 2018"

All in all, the case for PN18 as a site for employment (or housing) is extremely weak and highly flawed.

6a. Additional information

You can upload documents to support comments submitted to question 6. Answering 'Yes' will allow

Do you wish to upload and supporting documents? Yes

Supporting information: document one

If you wish to upload documents providing additional information to support your comments you can do so here.

1. Upload supporting document. Arrowsmith Associates report

Supporting information: document two

2. Upload supporting document. Smeeden Foreman landscape report

Supporting information: document three

3. Upload supporting document BWB Transport assessment

7. Modifications

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Harrogate District Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at question 5 where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you could put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

(If you are suggesting that the plan is legally compliant or sound please write N/A)

Details of modification

We believe modifications should include:

- 1 Abandoning plans to build on any sites west of the railway line running through Pannal and the A61 as these will suffer from the same problems as at present – the two crossing points create choke points that would be very hard to overcome without major and very expensive engineering works. Anywhere near and utilising the section of the A61 between the Buttersyke roundabout and Harrogate will add further to the current congestion.
- 2 Specifically, sites should be chosen towards the A1 and A1 (M) where there is room and existing transport infrastructure to establish new “settlements or where infrastructure will be or is already in place. Such site include Flaxby North (the former golf course); the proposed but rejected new settlement between the old A1 and A1(M) north of Wetherby; the future likely availability of ex MoD sites such as Dishforth (plenty of space, and access to the main trunk roads) and the stock of ex MoD married quarters empty in places like Ripon.
- 3 Conducting a formal review of the questionable economic uplift figures. The HEDNA report is flawed as is the Jacobs traffic report. This is a fundamental point to examine and throws doubt on Harrogate’s Local Plan

Comment by Pannal and Burn Bridge Parish Council (Mr Andrew Macdonald - 1155764)

Comment ID PD1193

Response Date 09/03/18 13:39

Consultation Point Map 10.60 Site PN17 ([View](#))

Status Submitted

Submission Type Web

Version 0.1

Files

3a. Consultation document

You can use this form to comment on the publication draft of the Local Plan or comment on one of it's supporting documents.

To which document does your response relate? Harrogate District Local Plan: Publication Draft
Select one from the list below.

Policy reference

If your response relates to a policy, please use the drop down list to select the policy to which it relates e.g. DM1 Housing Allocations.

To which policy does your response relate? DM1: Housing Allocations

Site reference

If your response relates to a site, please use the box below to enter the site reference to which it relates e.g. BL9

Please do not enter more than one site reference.

To which site does your response relate? Enter only the site reference e.g. BL9 All PN

Development Limit

If your response relates to a development limit, please use the drop down list to select the settlement's development limit to which your response relates e.g. Harrogate

To which development limit does your response refer? Pannal

Policies Map

If your response relates to a policies map, please use the drop down list to select the policies map to which it relates. (Policies maps are located at chapter 11 of the plan.)

To which policies map does your response refer? Pannal

4. Soundness / Legal Compliance

Do you consider the Local Plan is: (please tick)

4(2) Sound No

5. Tests of soundness

What makes a Local Plan "sound"?

- . **Positively Prepared** - the plan should be prepared in a way that meets the needs for housing and other development, including infrastructure and business development.
- . **Justified** - the plan should be based on evidence, and be the most appropriate strategy for the district when considered against other reasonable alternatives.
- . **Effective** - the plan should be deliverable; the housing and other development should be capable of being carried out.
- . **Consistent with national policy** - the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

If you consider the Plan to be UNSOUND, please indicate the reasons why you think it is not (tick all that apply).

- . 1. Positively Prepared
- . 2. Justified
- . 3. Effective
- . 4. Consistent with national policy

6.Reasons for your response

Please give details of why you do, or do not, consider the Harrogate District Local Plan to be legally compliant or sound. Your reason(s) should concisely cover all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to justify your comments, as there will not normally be another opportunity to make further representations after publication stage. After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues she/he identifies for examination.

Please give reasons for you answer to 4(1), 4(2) and 5, where applicable. (You may also use this box if you wish to make representations on the Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment or Equality Analysis Report.)

This response is on behalf of the residents of Pannal and Burn Bridge and is submitted by the Parish Council. It is a collective response and the names of the residents supporting this response will follow when requested.

We wish to emphasise that the responses to 2017 proposals – substantially unchanged in this version of the Local Plan – were significant in number (788 for PN17, 630 for PN18 and 746 for PN19). As far as the residents can see, no notice was taken of their views and therefore they do not consider that any proper “consultation” took place. It is a source of major disappointment and many of the residents have commented to the Parish Council that they could not see the point in commenting again. Furthermore, that little or no notice was taken of residents' views in the previous consultation reinforces their lack of confidence and trust in the Council's ability to plan sensibly and considerately for Harrogate's future. For reference, the comments made by the Parish Council on behalf of residents in 2017 are attached for the record at box 6a

6a. Additional information

You can upload documents to support comments submitted to question 6. Answering 'Yes' will allow

Do you wish to upload and supporting documents? Yes

Supporting information: document one

If you wish to upload documents providing additional information to support your comments you can do so here.

1. Upload supporting document. PN 17 - 2017 response

Supporting information: document two

2. Upload supporting document. PN18 - 2017 response

Supporting information: document three

3. Upload supporting document PN19 - 2017 response

7. Modifications

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Harrogate District Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at question 5 where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you could put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

(If you are suggesting that the plan is legally compliant or sound please write N/A)

Details of modification

The Arrowsmith Report - completed for the 2017 consultation and updated for 2018 (attached at document one) explains the objections we have to the plans

Modifications: document one

If you wish to upload documents providing additional information to support your comments you can do so here.

1. Upload supporting document.

Arrowsmith Report