

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
CF1 Retention of key facilities				
1.	Agree. But in a village that has already seen a decline in facilities.	No	No	Just a comment.
2.	Agree. Public Transport: Key to maintaining diverse village population (non-drivers) & links to surrounding villages and York - it would be good to see protection of village bus services. Transport links are vital to ensure healthy development	No	No	Could be included in a "Project" section of the Plan.
3.	Agree. Bus!! Needs to be earlier / later, it otherwise will go naturally.	No	No	Consider for a Project section.
4.	Agree. Policy should allow alternative to Parish Rooms to be developed where suitable.	Yes	-	Already addressed in the Plan.
5.	Agree. Plus <u>major</u> upgrading eg new parish hall, better post office facilities etc.	Yes	-	Already addressed in the Plan.
6.	(SDC) This policy does not conflict with any local or national policies.	Yes	No	Comment only.
7.	(NYCC) Policy CF1 seeks to retain key facilities including the primary school. Recognition of the school's value to the community is supported. However, there are concerns about how the policy might be applied should a facility cease to operate at some future time. If a facility closes or is no longer viable it would be inappropriate to insist on its retention and resist the reuse of the site for a beneficial alternative purpose. The policy should be amended to clarify that where proposed redevelopment is not the cause of a community facility being lost, there would be no need to retain the physical asset or provide an alternative replacement facility. A policy that obstructs reuse of redundant buildings would not ensure that a facility is replaced and could blight the site with negative consequences for the amenity of the community. Furthermore, this would not achieve sustainable development.	Yes	Not none	Discuss further with Rachel Wigginton at NYCC Rachel.wigginton@northyorks.gov.uk Policy to be amended: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not a LGS but playing fields protected other than for essential expansion. 2. Protected from closure except where not viable/no need.
CF2 Supporting the growth of Appleton Roebuck Primary School				
1.	Agree. Very important.	No	No	Comment only.
2.	Agree. Does this need to include improved safety measures around the school area?	No	No	Highways' responsibility.

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
3.	Agree. But each development proposal should demonstrate places exist at school ie. There is capacity to cope.	No	No	NYCC's responsibility.
4.	Agree. Need to sort out street parking!	No	No	Highways' responsibility.
5.	Agree. No more building on school field - the children need a playing field.	Yes	-	Already included in the Plan.
6.	Agree. The success of the school is the quality of the headteacher, staff and support of parents - not facilities.	No	No	Comment only.
7.	Agree. Increase parking spaces behind the school.	Yes	No	School Govs. / NYCC responsibility
DBE1 Local green spaces				
1.	Agree. Not sure about Daffy Field (who owns it) + Ridge & Furrow Field (again does it belong to the Parish).	No	No	Question only.
2.	Don't know. The community needs a car park to take parked cars from Main Street / & a children's playground. Use the church field.	No	No	The field does not belong to the church.
3.	Agree. Though it would be nice to see a children's playground on one of the greens.	Yes	N/A	Already covered in the Plan.
4.	Agree. Including medieval field behind Grayson Cottages.	No	N/A	Already included in the Plan.
5.	Agree. Plus the land down Daw Lane beyond the stables.	No	No	Already discounted because too far away from the main settlement.
6.	Agree. These areas should be maintained and looked after.	No	No	Comment only.
7.	Agree. Please note 'field' does not belong to All Saints' Church but is adjacent.	Yes	N/A	Information only.
8.	Agree. Key to have green areas and these need to be maintained and mowed and cuttings removed.	No	No	Comment only.
9.	(Yorkshire Wildlife Trust) Policy DBE 1 Local Green Spaces could this include a sentence to support management of these vital areas to improve them for wildlife? A variety of measures would be possible from plug planting wildflowers, sympathetic management of grassland, trees and hedgerows, bird and bat boxes, no use of pesticides etc.	No	No	Policy can't but should make reference to this as a project.

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
10	(NYCC) Policy DBE 1 identifies the school playing fields as local green space and seeks to protect them from development. The Council wishes to maintain flexibility over the development of its assets in order that it may facilitate local education provision. It would be helpful if Policy DBE1 could be qualified as ‘protect the school playing field from development <u>except for that which is deemed essential for expansion of the school’s capacity.</u> The plan should avoid locking the school site into a green space category as this could impede expansion of the school should this be necessary.	Yes	Yes	Remove as LGS and develop the point in policy CF2 regarding developing the playing fields.
DBE2 Respecting traditional building design and scale				
1.	Agree. However - late in the day as you have allowed large period homes to develop gardens.	No	No	Comment only.
2.	Agree. It does need to be adhered to, to prevent high density and clearly future unsuitability (?)	No	No	Comment only.
3.	Agree. Is the PC going to be able to be effective?	No	No	It’s not about Permitted development – just <u>new</u> development.
4.	Disagree. (Letter 34) In order to conform with NPPF, proper reference should be made to the paragraphs mentioned in the “conformity references” – 57-61 and 63-65 (note typo mistake in text of document). The fourth bullet of para 58 and para 60 both emphasise the need to promote appropriate innovation when it comes to design. Whilst it is proper to reinforce local distinctiveness it is also acceptable not to stifle “innovation, originality or initiative”. We want Appleton Roebuck to respond to change and to embrace innovative design, creating a vital and viable village for future generations. Policy DBE2 should be amended to add the NPPF bullet point 4 in para 58, or similar wording.	Yes	No	Points already covered in the policy – not stifling but reinforcing character. 63-65
5.	(SDC) You may wish to review the Village Design Statement (VDS) and feed that into this section, as the VDS is a material consideration but is not an	Yes	Yes	Review key points from VDS and character area appraisal.

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
	adopted policy. You will be able to add extra weight to design requirements in this way and better deliver your visions. Officers would also advise you delete the reference to solar panels, as this is in conflict with national permitted development rights (PD). The conservation area which part covers Appleton Roebuck also has stricter PD rules but again this is not something the Neighbourhood Plan can conflict with.			Agree delete reference to solar panels.
DBE3 Green infrastructure				
1.	Agree. Particularly trees but natural species.	No	No	Comment only.
2.	Agree. Hedges must be cut and not allowed to intrude pavement space.	No	No	Comment only.
3.	Agree. These again should be looked after.	No	No	Comment only.
4.	Agree. And see that developers stick to the rules and don't get away with breaking them.	No	No	Comment only.
5.	(Yorkshire Wildlife Trust) Policy DBE 3 Green Infrastructure is supported. It could also mention native species which support biodiversity being included in the landscaping.	Yes	Yes	Include wording on native species.
6.	(SDC) As discussed in the general comments, this policy needs an explanation section and further information to help inform those following or implementing the policy.	Yes	Yes	Expand for clarity.
DBE4 Streets and street scene (Policy to be removed)				
1.	Agree. This should also include the creation of a footpath to Ebor Park and beyond if land is identified for development.	No		Policy to be removed upon advice from Selby District Council.
2.	Agree. Suitable for disabled residents. (A footpath from Ebor Park to the village.)	No		
3.	Agree. Hedges shrubs & trees. Must not be allowed to intrude pavement space.	No		
4.	No response. Is the PC able to determine what happens on pavements? Nothing has been done up to date about clearing obstructive footpaths.	No		

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
5.	Agree. Particularly support reduction in unnecessary signage.	No		Perhaps develop an “aspirations” section. (CIL money?)
6.	Agree. Notices for people to keep pathways clear of bins days after bins collection etc.	No		
7.	Disagree. More street lights.	No		
8.	Agree. Especially access to Ebor Park.	No		
9.	(SDC) Officers advise this section is removed; SDC is a district council and does not have control over the implementation of this policy. SDC would be happy to provide the Parish Council contact details of North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) Highways Department if they wish to discuss this with them.	Yes	Yes	
DBE5 Drainage and flood prevention				
1.	Agree. Present situation has deteriorated in recent years to the point where surface water flooding of roads is becoming critical.	Yes	No	Comment only.
2.	Agree. Very important, there are problems with the drains.	Yes	No	Comment only.
3.	Agree. There are existing problems in sewage capacity foul smell and sluggish drainage from sewers. Overcome by extraction by tanker. Needs sorting soon.	Yes	No	Comment only.
4.	Agree. But does not go far enough - problems over the last 7 years with drainage in the village that we know well and have witnessed.	Yes	Yes	Strengthen policy eg permeable surfaces, green infrastructure. No dev in zones 2&3?
5.	Agree. But hope the PC can be effective.	Yes	No	Comment only.
6.	Agree. This needs to be dealt with as our village does at the moment have a problem with roads flooding and surface water.	Yes	No	Comment only.
7.	Agree. Could be difficult to achieve!! The systems appear to be already at capacity.	Yes	No	Comment only.
8.	Agree. No new development unless incorporating additional drainage provision.	Yes	No	Comment only.
9.	Agree. Essential in all respects.	Yes	No	Comment only.

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
10	Don't know. There is a problem with drains flooding at the bottom of our street. Before any significant number of houses are built these issues of flooding need to be fixed, so it's not added to the problem.	Yes	No	Yorkshire Water responsibility.
11	Agree. But should not cause drainage problems to adjacent properties.	Yes	No	Comment only.
DBES Drainage and flood prevention cont'd.				
12	Agree. How will this be enforced as Yorkshire Water have denied any problems with capacity for all applications to date? This is despite clear resident evidence and many recent excavations by Yorkshire Water that would suggest otherwise.	Yes	No	Comment / question only.
13	Agree. Especially on Main St. / West End Avenue	Yes	No	Comment only.
14	(SDC) This policy does not go any further than local or national policy, it is also the responsibility of Yorkshire Water as the statutory responsible body to assess and approve this work as part of the planning application stage. This policy will not add anything to the current SDC planning application assessment. The plan may wish to consider other water management solutions, such as permeable surfaces or water runoff and collection methods.	Yes	Yes	Strengthen policy
ELH1 Maintaining agricultural land				
1.	Agree. But does "exceptional circumstances" become a get out clause to allow local farmers to develop land?	No	No	Comment only.
2.	Agree. We need to keep as much of it as possible.	No	No	Comment only.
3.	Agree. Defining 'best and most versatile' is problematic though.	Yes	Yes	Link back to policy & land classification to explain best & most versatile.
4.	Agree. Provision of new community facilities of major importance probably on agricultural land.	No	No	Comment only.
5.	No response. Policy ELH1 suggests provision of new community facilities if agricultural land is used..... Why has this not been requested on the	No	No	Misunderstanding of the policy.

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
	Hillcrest Development in addition to money for the school. The school does not offer much for anyone over 12 years of age!			
6.	Agree. Development of a motorcross on agricultural land needs to be prevented.	Yes	No	Covered by the policy.
7.	Agree. (Letter 57) Use of the phrase “best and most versatile” does not seem to provide much protection, if any, in restricting development of agricultural land. The current hot topic of 28 houses on the entrance to the village being a case in point. The Agricultural Land Classification submitted with the application indicates that land is classified as Grade 1, 2, 3a, 3b, 4 or 5 with Grade 1 being the best and therefore possibly viewed as most versatile. This would suggest that any applicant simply has to get an “independent survey” (although paid for by the applicant) to grade the land as anything but Grade 1. As with the application for the 28 houses that land is apparently on the MAFF maps as Grade 2 but reassessed by the “independent survey” as Grade 3b which presumably Selby Planning consider as acceptable for development. Is it not possible to have a policy where proposals for development of agricultural land other than say Grade 4 Poor Quality or Grade 5 Very Poor Quality would not be considered other than by exceptional circumstances. This would not stop development of all agricultural land but at least restrict it to only the poorest quality rather than what appears to be the current case where anything other than the very best is acceptable for development.	yes	No	More clarity of best and most versatile. Get a better map (SDC)
8.	(Natural England) Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services (ecosystem services) for society, for example as a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, as a store for carbon and water, as a reservoir of biodiversity and as a buffer against pollution. It is therefore important that the soil resources are protected and used sustainably as reflected in para 112 of the National Planning Policy	Yes	No	Comment only.

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
	Framework. Natural England notes the figure on pg22 which illustrates Defra's 'Agricultural Land Classification – Provisional (England)' dataset and welcomes the protection of best and most versatile agricultural land provided by Policy ELH1.			
9.	(SDC) Officers have no comments on this policy.	-----	-----	-----
ELH2 Enhancing biodiversity				
1.	Agree. Not only maintained but also improved & enhanced.	Yes	Yes	Accept & enhance.
2.	Agree. But 'should be designed' be better as 'must be designed'?	No	No	Because of uncertainty over eg. state of trees.
3.	(Yorkshire Wildlife Trust) The Trust would like to see Policy ELH 2 improved. The policy as it stands will hopefully protect biodiversity but in order to enhance biodiversity a more proactive approach is needed. I will copy in the Ryedale biodiversity policy below as an example of a very thorough policy which aims to enhance biodiversity. Additions to ELH 2 could include encouraging native species in landscaping, providing enhancements in new building for wildlife such as bats and birds, and supporting the inclusion of species rich grassland in planting schemes to protect pollinators such as butterflies and bees. As well as specifically mentioning trees and woodland there could also be a mention of the very important floodplain grasslands which are found along the River Ouse and River Wharfe http://www.floodplainmeadows.org.uk/ .	Yes	Yes	General comments – look to strengthen policy
4.	(Natural England) Natural England considers that Neighbourhood plans and proposals may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment, use natural resources more sustainably and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature. We therefore welcome the protection and enhancement to the natural environment and access to the natural environment provided by policies ELH2 ELH3 and ELH5.	-	-	Supportive comments

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
5.	<p>(SDC) Officers strongly advise the wording of this policy is changed, as it stands the tree survey stipulation is currently required for all development. This will have to be read as the legal definition of development, meaning all development of any size or nature will require a tree survey. This will result for example in a householder garage application on brownfield land requiring a tree survey regardless of there being any trees in the proximately.</p> <p>Officers also believe the request for a biodiversity or habitat survey is also unreasonable for all development as above. Officers suggest this is refined to achieve the aim of the policy while not being overly restrictive.</p>	Yes	Yes	Refine the policy- alter to show where appropriateness/difference?
6.	<p>(NYCC) The policy on "enhancing biodiversity" (section 4.4.2, policy ELH2) is actually a protection policy as it talks about identifying (through survey) important features and habitats and designing proposals to ensure that these are retained. There is no mention of enhancement for biodiversity which means the policy is misleading. The policy should either be re titled to something like "protection of biodiversity" or it could expand the text to include information on enhancement and be re titled "protection and enhancement of biodiversity". Our preference would be for the second option as national policy advocates enhancement for biodiversity on all developments, where possible. The NPPF wording from para 118 might be useful in updating this section. It reads "...opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged;"</p>	Yes	Yes	Protecting biodiversity AND enhancing – expand or add to policy to do both things.

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
ELH3 Green corridors				
1.	Agree. Banks of The Fleet should be cut back to allow maximum water flow & minimise flooding.	No	No	Comment only.
2.	(Yorkshire Wildlife trust) The Trust is pleased to see the mapping and policy ELH3 for Green Corridors which are very important for wildlife.	Yes	No	Comment only.
3.	(SDC) Officers have no comments on this policy.	-----	-----	-----
ELH4 Renewable energy (Policy to be removed on advice)				
1.	Agree. But do not spoil with out of scale wind turbines.			Policy to be removed (SDC advice)
2.	Agree. No windfarms please!			
3.	Agree. <u>But</u> in all cases these systems should be for <u>new properties only</u> .			
4.	Don't know. I would need more information before making a judgement regarding type & scale.			
5.	Disagree. Don't want to open ourselves up to wind/solar farms.			
6.	Disagree. No wind farms.			
7.	Disagree. We do not need these blots on the landscape spoiling our village.			
8.	Agree. Make sure properties that are planned and agreed, which promise such energy, deliver.			
9.	Agree. But do not support use of wind turbines.			
10.	Disagree. Not strong enough.			
11.	(Yorkshire Wildlife trust) Policy ELH 4 could possibly include measures to ensure new developments reach the highest standards for energy efficiency which will reduce carbon emissions.			
12.	(SDC) Due to a change in national policy, officers would point out that policy ELH4 effectively makes Appleton Roebuck the only area in the district which can accommodate wind turbines. This policy sets out criteria for their installation which currently no other areas in the district have. This therefore identifies Appleton Roebuck as being the only settlement in the district which is not only allowing wind turbines, but actively encouraging their	Yes	Yes	

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
	installation. The aims of this policy and what it actually delivers may need to be considered.			
ELH5 Rights of way (policy to be removed)				
1.	Agree. Some footpaths are closed off at present. These should be re-opened.			Policy to be removed and assimilated into Policy H1
2.	Agree. Also better signposting of rights of way would be welcome.			
3.	Agree. Footpath Officer for North Yorks could help with this. (Steve Wood 0113 893121)			
4.	Agree. Local landowners should also help with the upkeep of rights of way.			
5.	Agree. Maintenance of some of these is an issue. ie overgrown and rutted by tractors.			
6.	Agree. Need to monitor some local farmers not encouraging use. Also problem with Smiths.			
7.	(SDC) Officers advise this section is removed; SDC is a district council and does not have control over the implementation of this policy. SDC would be happy to provide the contact details of NYCC Highways Department if they wish to discuss this with them.	Yes	Yes	
ELH6 Historic rural environment				
1.	Disagree. Zero tolerance?	No	No	Comment only.
2.	Agree. Eg. Brumber Mill?	Yes	Yes	Amend policy.
3.	Disagree. Your statement is confused. Agree modest scale developments with relatively little impact. The second part of your statement <u>should</u> be irrelevant.	Yes	Yes	Amend policy.
4.	Disagree. I do not wish to see developments outside of current development limits.	Yes	Yes	Amend policy.
5.	(SDC) Officers would advise the wording of this policy is reviewed as it could effectively encourage development outside of development limits.	Yes	Yes	Amend policy.

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
6.	(NYCC) Policy ELH6 Historic Rural Environment could apply to all countryside, and could be expanded to be more explicit in relation to the airfield. It could also be expanded to promote enhancement of landscape character and local distinctiveness including hedgerow and hedgerow tree restoration, wildlife buffers to arable fields and watercourses etc.	Yes	Yes	Amend remove “outside development limits” Enhancing landscape.
H1 Housing scale, location and density				
1.	Agree. (But) I think we should resist backfill (backland) but allow in-fill (ie building in back gardens) as this is an unobtrusive way of providing houses to keep families coming into the school.	Yes	No	Policy already covers this
2.	Agree. More care in access to Main Street required, narrowing for a site line (done before) not acceptable!	Yes	Yes	Slight re-wording of d)? Re-visit the policy.
3.	Agree. Much better.	No	No	Comment only.
4.	Agree. Attention <u>must</u> be paid to traffic & parking.	No	No	Comment only.
5.	Agree. Again, as long as developers stick to these proposals.	No	No	Comment only.
6.	Disagree. Sewers etc need upgrades before any more building.	No	No	Yorkshire Water responsibility.
7.	No response. Not sure what is meant by “unacceptable vehicle movements”.	Yes	Yes	Unacceptable? Re-visit the wording.
8.	Agree. Although how will new houses affect the school intake?	Yes	No	Question only / NYCC responsibility.
9.	Don't know. We are worried that expansion into what are currently, green spaces & fields may occur.	No	No	Comment only.
10	Agree. Car parking provision very important & impact on current drainage & sewage facilities.	No	No	Comment only.
11	Agree. But with the addition e) Road access to new housing developments from existing roads must be positioned so as not to compromise road safety. In addition, in the case of developments of more than 4 dwellings, such road access must be wide enough to allow vehicles to safely enter and exit the development at the same time.	Yes	Yes	Justified because of community request. But can only be enforced on developments of all new dwellings.

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
12	Disagree. Limiting to 10 units does not necessarily provide the right type of development.	Yes	No	10 units is a robust number reached after community consultation. It is also linked to SDC's definition of 'small scale'.
13	Don't know. Each application should be judged on its own merits. Stating or providing a maximum number of new homes for a development provides a target number for developers. If the development plan is robust, the parish may agree a larger development in one area and a smaller one elsewhere. The sufficiency of the plan's details is crucial so that development may be approved or supported <u>but</u> within limitations of the plan.	No	No	As stated above, 10 units is linked to Household survey and SDC definition of 'small scale' development.
14	Agree. Many properties have parking spaces which are not used and park on the road. Can the PC do anything about it?	No	No	Highways responsibility.
15	Agree. Small scale developments should be up to 6 houses to fulfil the necessity of low/negligible impact on infrastructure of the village - drains, traffic, parking, visual impact, refuse collection, delivery vehicles - would be compromised by anything bigger.	Yes	No	10 units linked to Household survey and SDC definition of 'small scale' development.
16	Disagree. Policy H1 does not preclude successive adjacent developments of less than 10 units which ultimately result in a larger overall development. Policy H1 also does not specifically prohibit development of garden space or 'backland' which I think it should in order to support the stated objective.	Yes	No	This cannot be addressed by the policy.
17	Disagree. 5 units would be max for small scale.	Yes	No	10 units linked to Household survey and SDC policy definition of 'small scale'.
18	Agree. Not to add to flooding or drainage problems.	Yes	No	Already covered in the policy.
19	Agree. (Letter 57) How can this be enforced? Again reference the application for 28 houses where the applicant has paid for yet another "independent survey" that surprisingly indicates there will be minimal increase in through traffic. However, this seems to be based on a load of general national statistical data that therefore cannot take into account the	No	No	Highways responsibility.

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
	<p>specifics of the development by which time it is too late and we the existing residents live with the consequences. Another survey I have viewed suggests that an average family occupied house can generate up to 7 vehicle movements per day. If you take this as factual but apply a conservative 5 movements per day x 28 houses you have a potential 140 vehicle movements per day from the site. Whilst a good percentage will be work related trips in and out that access the A64, most local residents would argue that by far the biggest percentage would be through the village to access the school, Copmanthorpe, Bishopthorpe and York. Therefore in order to enforce this policy who sets the criteria, decides what is a significant increase, Parish Council, Selby Planning, Highways or the applicant by means of an "independent survey"?</p>			
20	<p>Disagree. (Letter 34) Whilst small scale developments may be appropriate for the Village, the number of houses should not be restricted to less than 10 units. Each application should be considered on its merits. Reference to under 10 units should be removed from Policy H1.</p> <p>Policy H1 references para 55 of the NPPF, but is selective. In line with the findings of the Residential Survey of 2013 (page 59 of NDP), the following should be added to the Policy:</p> <p>e) New homes will be acceptable where they would re-use redundant or disused buildings leading to an enhancement to the immediate setting.</p>	No	No	Policy was removed because irrelevant. Opening up development in Greenbelt.
21	<p>(SDC) Officers would advise the explanation of this policy is expanded and that there is evidence and background documents to support the proposed numbers.</p>	Yes	Yes	Expand the explanation for clarity. Develop evidence base.
H2 Housing mix				
1.	Agree. Need more small + medium houses.	No	No	Comment only.

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
2.	Agree. More homes for the elderly.	No	No	Comment only.
3.	Disagree. We feel that the affordable housing complex existing in the village is sufficient for our needs. Very few elderly people applied hence the designated second bungalow was offered to younger people and if the village cannot offer sufficient people to fill those houses it is opened up to anyone in North Yorkshire who qualifies to whatever rules are in place at the time.	No	No	Policy is not about affordable housing but about size & types & mix of prices. Comment is out of context. Household survey demonstrated a need for elderly housing etc.
4.	Disagree. The mix should be price. I don't believe there is a call for elderly/disabled homes as these haven't been snapped up by these people with the new affordable housing.	No	No	Comment only.
5.	Disagree. (Letter 34) Policy H2 refers to Housing Mix. It is correct to make reference to the SHMA as noted above. However, we question the reference to the Housing Needs Survey, which was undertaken in 2007, almost a decade ago now. The SHMA is a more up to date document. It is not appropriate to single out provision for "young families and the elderly". Para 50 of the NPPF reinforces this. It is about providing a wide choice of high quality homes, not limited to certain groups.	Yes	Yes	Revisit the wording. In an 'Aspirations' section plan to update the survey to further inform H2 The most recent HNS/HMA Project = new HNS.
6.	(SDC) Officers have no comments on this policy	-----	-----	-----
H3 Car parking				
1.	Agree. But ... parking is a problem on Main Street. Recent developments have only provided one space when the household has two cars. One property was allowed to be built with no parking provided at all - the house adjacent to "White Lea".	Yes	No	Comment only.
2.	Agree. Definitely important.	Yes	No	Comment only.
3.	Agree. Present parking on Main St. should be discouraged & new facilities provided.	Yes	No	Comment only.
4.	Agree. <u>Very</u> important.	Yes	No	Comment only.

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
5.	Agree. Very important.	Yes	No	Comment only.
6.	Agree. I would insist on more spaces.	Yes	No	Comment only.
7.	Agree. Not effective in the village at the moment because there is no-one to enforce it.	Yes	No	Comment only.
8.	<u>But</u> why are the residents not using the spaces provided for them ie Grayson Cottages and Main St, are these people just bone idle to walk to spaces provided.	Yes	No	Comment only.
9.	Agree. How did Grayson Cottages get away with it? On street parking has & will continue to change the nature of our village.	Yes	No	Comment only.
10	Agree. If this removes on road parking.	Yes	No	Comment only.
11	(North Yorkshire Police) As an observation, I have noted the comments in Policy H3 of your document in respect of car parking. The use of in-curtilage off road parking spaces is fully supported by the North Yorkshire Police. What isn't supported, in 'designing out crime' terms, is the incorporation of rear parking courts or rear communal garage areas into development. These features are known generators of crime and anti-social behaviour. They can provide loitering space and potential access opportunities to the rear of properties, where it is known that the majority of property crime occurs. Vehicles parked in these areas can be susceptible to attack as surveillance from the street or adjoining properties is often limited. Building for Life 12 (Page 11) recommends, <i>“making sure people can see their car from their home or can park it somewhere they know it will be safe. Where possible avoid rear parking courts. However, there is a note to this which states, “If rear parking courts are used, they should be kept small so that residents know who else should be using it. Make sure at least one property is located at the entrance and within the parking courtyard to provide a sense of ownership and security. Avoid multiple access points. Allow sufficient budget for boundary walls, surface treatments, soft landscaping and lighting to avoid creating an air of neglect and isolation”.</i>	Yes	Yes	Advice – noted – consider in other policy?

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
	<p>The same document asks the question, “Are any parking courtyards small in size (generally no more than five properties should use a parking courtyard) and are they well overlooked by neighbouring properties</p> <p>Secured By Design advises that cars should be within view of routinely occupied rooms to provide adequate overlooking.</p> <p>National Planning Practice Guidance (ID 26-040-20140306) states: “In terms of parking, there are many different approaches that can support successful outcomes, such as on-street car parking, in-curtilage parking and basement parking. Natural surveillance of parked cars is an important consideration”.</p> <p>In addition to the above, consideration should also be made in respect of parking provision for visitors and other site users, as lack of this can lead to confrontation which can result in criminal behaviour.</p>			
12	(SDC) Officers have no comments on this policy	-----	-----	(permeable surfaces)
WB1 Re-use of redundant buildings				
1.	Agree. Essential but must conform to plan not just build anything that fits!! (Recent planning experience!!)	No	No	Planning Department matter.
2.	Agree. But with addition d) Significant increase in noise.	Yes	Yes	Revisit wording.
3.	Disagree. Redundant buildings sometimes require greater vision and development to achieve a sustainable future.	Yes	No	Comment only.
4.	Disagree. It should be up to the owners of these properties to decide their fate.	No	No	Comment only.
5.	Agree. What is the ‘section 4.3’ referred to? Should there be a statement regarding position on any application for extraction of minerals/oil/gas given likely expansion of this industry in wider region?	Yes No	Yes	Clarify/list

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
6.	Disagree. (Letter 34) Policy WB1: The re-use of redundant buildings is not just appropriate for new economic uses and this does not conform with NPPF, para 55 nor the findings of the Residential Survey of 2013. The latter confirmed overwhelming support (84%) for the conversion of unused agricultural buildings into residential dwellings. Government policy seeks to promote the reuse of redundant agricultural buildings for a range of uses from residential, employment, hotels and nurseries and this has been facilitated through amendments to Permitted Development Rights legislation. These uses are all considered to promote sustainable economic developments and help to boost the rural economy. Policies within the NDP should reflect this positively. Suggestions for amendments to Policy H1 have been made above. Section 4.6 should also refer to the need to create a robust rural economy.	No	No	We think it is appropriate because it supports work & business – it's not about housing.
7.	(SDC) Officers advise the implementation of this policy could conflict with PD rights.	Yes	No	No change
WB2 Farm diversification				
1.	Agree. But with the addition d) Does not result in significant increase in noise.	Yes	Yes	Needs to be included – noise & general disruption – smell, sights etc. Change the wording.
2.	Agree. Safeguarding against solar farms.	No	No	Comment only.
3.	Agree. Providing it continues a rural theme - not motocross!	No	No	Comment only.
4.	Agree. As long as it doesn't impact elsewhere.	No	No	Comment only.
5.	(SDC) Officers have no comments on this policy.	-----	-----	-----
WB3 Small business development				
1.	Agree. But any business development should also take into account light pollution from flood lights. For example: the night sky north of Colton Bridge is now floodlit by all the floodlights on the McCain Potato Plant, which seem to have increased recently, obliterating the night sky at Colton Bridge. Impact should be considered in positioning of lights (direction),	Yes	Yes	Re-word / strengthen the policy (noise, smell, light pollution etc.) – covered already?

ARAS NDP Pre - submission Consultation Responses 2016

Ref	Comments	Relevant to NDP planning matters?	Should it be accepted and considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
	masking vegetation (now useless(?) at McCains) & extensions to existing buildings. Worth including a "Dark Skies" clause? It is part of the joy of living away from town light pollution for us.			
2.	Agree. As long as we don't have heavy goods vehicles coming through the village.	No	No	Comment only.
3.	Agree. As with The Barn coffee shop.	Yes	No	Comment only.
4.	Don't know. It depends on the type of small business in question. If one chooses to live on a residential street it seems unfair that a house nearby is allowed to change the nature of the street if it impacts on noise, traffic and refuse. It may also impact on the market value of nearby homes and limit further purchasers as not everyone wants to live next door to a business or nearby one. There should be a requirement that the prospective small business owner collaborates with nearby residents to ensure community harmony.	Yes	No	Too onerous
5.	(Letter 34) Policy WB3 should actively promote home working.	No	No	PD
6.	(SDC) Officers have no comments on this policy.	-----	-----	-----