

**CHURCH FENTON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN: PRE SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) FEEDBACK ASSESSMENT**

**STAKEHOLDERS**

Comment	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Modification to NDP
Vision		
Woodland Trust		
<p>Trees and woodland protection of ancient and old plus provisions for more proposals for development should contribute to their protection and enhancement</p> <p>NHP should recognise the fact that development should not lead to loss or degradation of trees and woodland in your parish. Increasing the amount of trees in Church Fenton will provide enhanced green infrastructure for your local communities, and also mitigate against the future loss of trees to disease (eg Ash dieback), with a new generation of trees both in woods and also outside woods in streets, hedgerows and amenity sites.</p>	<p>Noted for GI policies</p>	<p>Ensure Infrastructure reflects comments. Green policy these</p>
NYCC Stronger Communities		
<p>The process undertaken and resultant neighbourhood plan are great examples of the ambition of NYCC's Stronger Communities Programme for all communities in North Yorkshire to have greater collective control of their own well-being and so ultimately reduce inequalities. Key objectives: These support the Stronger Communities desired outcomes of reducing inequalities, improving social connectedness and improving well-being by striving to retain and improve the community places which enable people to meet and benefit from social interaction and having green space to enjoy and explore with the attendant health benefits. NYCC's Stronger Communities Programmes is keen to support communities to retain and develop community resources and activities through provision of information, access to professional guidance and advice for community groups and a limited amount of funding. For more information <a href="https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/stronger-communities">https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/stronger-communities</a></p>	<p>Support noted</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>AAH</p> <p>The vision appears deliberately restrictive and inward looking. It would be recommended that following "<i>the needs of its residents</i>" line the following words be inserted "<i>and surrounding villages</i>". This would ensure that a more open and inclusive vision is proposed. The following is suggested to finish "<i>The NPPF principles of sustainable development will govern how to achieve this growth in a planned manner.</i>" This would ensure the vision aligns back to planning policy.</p>	<p>Disagree – this is CF plan and consultation has taken place with neighbours.</p>	<p>None</p>

Comment	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Modification to NDP
NFU		
<p>In order for farming to continue to sustainably support this rural community, this plan must also allow for all farm enterprises to adapt in order to survive. This might include the need for modern agricultural buildings either to meet regulations or to change the use of existing buildings in order to respond to changing market demand:</p> <p>Strengthening our farming businesses to help them build profitability, adaptability and resilience; To create thriving localities which meet the needs of their communities, businesses and local environment; Realising the value of the region’s environmental assets;</p> <p>Policies which enable the next generation to take on the management of farms and to support this through the provision of affordable housing to allow succession;</p> <p>To allow farming enterprises to develop to meet the challenges of food security through modernising and becoming more efficient;</p> <p>Developing renewable energy which meets the needs of the farm and are appropriate to the location and renewable resources available</p> <p>Support sustainable development where possible.</p>	Noted	None
Bankes Jones Estate		
<p>We are currently pursuing development consistent with Policy H1: Type, Size and Scale, Policy H2: Design Principles and Policy H3: Location of New Housing Development and request that we remain informed with the Neighbourhood Plan process moving forward.</p>	Noted	Ensure they are on stakeholders list
<p>The aspirations for the environmental part of the neighbourhood plan are admirable especially the green corridor and River Wharfe corridor. We wonder if you are aware of the importance of the meadow fields either side of Rose Lane. The fields have never been ploughed and support a huge, diverse range of plants and animals. Some of the animals are rare. There is a family of white headed blackbirds that have survived many years. Red kites fly over and use the fields for soaring and feeding. Red crested newts lived in the middle of the field and probably still exist along the wetter boundaries.</p> <p>The Oak trees on Rose Lane are old and support such a lot of wildlife. We have seen birds of all kinds. Wrens, tree creepers, mistle thrushes, song thrushes, redstarts, fieldfares, sparrows, bluetits, great tits, long tail tits, bullfinches and hawfinches, goldfinches, goldcrests, magpies, rooks and crows. Rose lane has even seen yellow hammers and warblers flitting along the vegetation. In summer swallows, swifts and house martins fly over the meadows and along Rose Lane catching the many insects. It is a joy to see them return.</p> <p>Unfortunately in recent years cars have encroached onto the beautiful verges that once supported a host of celandines and bluebells to name just a few plants. Rose Lane still has a diverse range of plants that are full of insects and butterflies such as orange tipped, red admiral and peacock butterflies. Plants such as cow parsley, meadow sweet, buttercup and many more.</p> <p>The drainage ditches provide water for all this wildlife also including frogs, toads, newts, voles, beetles, damsel flies, dragonflies, bats. The hedgerow includes oak, ash, red hawthorn, buckthorn, hazel, elderberry, rowan, guelder rose, hornbeam.</p> <p>The birds flit along these hedgerows and in Spring are so busy building their nests. It is important that Rose Lane has protection as this landscape is so unique and enjoyed by those who live here and more importantly provides a habitat for wildlife that is all too often lost.</p>	Consideration for Rose Lane and the rationale for why we should include more reference to it.	Undertake an analysis – visual – of the area in question and if appropriate afford protection through policy.

Comment	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Modification to NDP
<p>The Oak trees on Rose Lane are more than 200 years old. They line Rose Lane and are so beautiful through all the changes each season.</p> <p>It is noticeable on your Neighbourhood plan that the Yorkshire Wharfe corridor covers the open land to the north of Common Lane and your plan mentions adjacent land affording protection too. This is vital to provide a wildlife corridor that is uninterrupted. The fields that have been unploughed for probably more than 100 years to either side of Rose Lane should also be included in this wildlife corridor. Not only is it important in its own right as it is so beautiful and has remained unploughed for so long but it also links the wildlife to the land beyond the main railway lines to Sheffield, York and Leeds.</p> <p>It is vital for the conservation of the rich biodiversity in this area bearing in mind it has remained untouched for so long. The fields over the years have been grazed by horses, sheep and cattle. It is a situation that cannot be lost not only in terms of preservation of surviving species including the plants such as meadowsweet, marsh marigold, lady's smock, buttercup, and many more meadow plants that I am unfamiliar with, but also for the wellbeing and health of the people who live here and enjoy this beautiful part of Church Fenton.</p> <p>The threat of HS2 destroying Common Lane and this part of Church Fenton is dreadful. We must all try as a parish council to save the countryside we have left and all enjoy daily. It is a joy to walk along Rose Lane each day and enjoy the unique Oak trees, hedgerows and pasture land either side of Rose Lane. It is uplifting to listen to the birds that flit from grass to trees and see the Oak trees and hedgerows develop through all the seasons. Come and see it when the Oak is growing new lime green leaves and the cow parsley frames the lane or in autumn when the leaves of the oak trees turn copper orange and the hedgerow is deep yellow.</p> <p>Rose Lane is beautiful and clings on through modern times supporting the wildlife that chose to live here with us. Help preserve what we have please.</p>		
<b>Objectives</b>		
<p>AAH</p> <p>Some of these objectives are unlikely to be met through the draft policies. In particular, the proposal to allow small scale development adjoining the settlement boundary for up to 10 dwellings would not benefit from the economies of scale and planning obligations / infrastructure improvements that planned for larger scale development proposals could bring. Whilst I would agree that quality of development should be sought urbanisation by definition does not necessarily mean a poor quality village setting and there appears to be an illogical jump in conclusion that large scale development is by definition harmful without any clear evidence.</p>	Disagree – urbanisation would mean the loss of the village/character.	None
<b>Policy HS1 &amp; HS2</b>		
<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>We have concerns regarding policies HSR1 and HSR2 and the extent to which these policies seek to replicate or modify controls that will be put in place at the time HS2 Phase 2b legislation comes in to effect. It could be interpreted that these policies provide an opportunity to revisit matters that are part of the parliamentary process or are matters which will be for the EMRs to address. This is not the case.</p> <p>That said, the policies could be re-drafted in a way that assists the local planning authority when it considers requests for approval made under the Schedule 17 Phase 2b equivalent, and, assuming the planning authority opts to be a 'qualifying authority' (a planning authority given a wider range of controls in the approval of detail of the construction works required for HS2 having signed a planning memorandum),</p>	Noted – taking advice from SDC planners and HS2 planners	Retain both policies and amend in the light of advice.

Comment	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Modification to NDP
<p>by focusing on matters which are relevant to the specified grounds for determining requests for approval (e.g. the preservation of the local environment or local amenity, road safety or traffic flows in the local area, or the preservation of the local historic and natural environment). Such policies could carry weight in circumstances where the planning authority considers and aims to demonstrate that plans and specifications submitted in support of a request for approval could reasonably be modified or the development for which approval is sought be carried out elsewhere within the development's permitted limits. Alternatively, HSR1 and HSR2 as drafted could be applied in the event that HS2 Ltd is required to seek planning permission outside the limits of Act powers (i.e. under the TCPA).</p>		
<p>With regards to policy HSR1 c), HS2 Ltd has a stakeholder engagement strategy which is applied consistently routewide to communities affected by the railway. The strategy explains how HS2 Ltd will engage with communities affected by the project. The Community Engagement Strategy can be located by clicking here. David Griffiths-Allen, the stakeholder engagement manager, would be happy to discuss this further.</p> <p>With regards to policy HSR2 b), the HS2 stakeholder engagement team is always happy to discuss additional regeneration opportunities suggested by stakeholders. As you know HS2 Ltd operates a Community Environment Fund, and, Business and Local Economy Fund. Both funds could provide additional regeneration opportunities or improvements within the local community.</p> <p>Furthermore, the below may provide some reassurance regarding design. While this relates to HS2 Phase One it is a policy that is likely to be replicated for other phases.</p>	Noted	None
<p>Also, there is more recent evidence regarding sustainability than that which is referred to in page 52 and 53 of the Neighbourhood Plan. Extracts are taken from the 2016 post-consultation Sustainability Report by Temple-RSK it is advisable for quotes to be taken from the October 2018 Phase 2B Working Draft Environmental Statement.</p>	Noted – bring into the Plan	Amend text as necessary
<p>It is also considered helpful to remind you that land subject to safeguarding directions continues to be reviewed as the designs of the project are refined following on from the Phase 2b Working Draft Environmental Statement consultation which took place during Autumn 2018.</p>	Noted	None
<b>Policy CH1 Non designated local heritage assets</b>		
<p>Heritage Services, NYCC  Archaeology: We support the recognition and conservation of heritage within the Objectives (3.2) of the plan. We also support the identification and inclusion of non-designated local heritage assets within the document (Policy CH1). We will make sure that these buildings are added to the Historic Environment Record maintained by NYCC. We note the intention to investigate the designation of a Conservation Area at Church Fenton. Historic England have prepared a number of guidance documents on this matter including:-  <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/conservation-area-appraisal-designation-management-advice-note-1/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/conservation-area-appraisal-designation-management-advice-note-1/</a> which provides a framework for assessment.</p>	Noted	None – refer onwards to PC regarding moving the discussions on a new CA onwards.
<p>Banks Jones Estate  Orchard Cottage has been designated under draft Policy CH1 as a non-designated heritage asset. Please be aware both the house and barns are currently subject to an application to extend and reuse the existing buildings (ref: 2019/0107/HPA and 2019/0108/FUL).  We trust you have all the information necessary to register our interest</p>	Noted that the area is subject to planning – check on status of the	Remove from policy

Comment	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Modification to NDP
	application & maintain aware	
<p>AAH</p> <p>The limited evidence in support of these individual assets is poor and should be more robust to ensure it satisfies the tests. However we would flag up that as a policy the test proposed here is markedly stricter than that required under paragraph 197 of the NPPF and should be amended to reflect the provisions of the NPPF.</p>	Noted	Check the justification matrix to ensure all proposed assets are justified. Consultation to be undertaken with landowners concerned.
<b>Policy AS1 Valuing community facilities</b>		
<p>Network Rail</p> <p>Whilst we are pleased that the value of the operational railway to the village is recognised the wording of the 2012 regulations is unequivocal and therefore the Church Fenton Neighbourhood Plan should not contain any policies that could adversely affect operational railway land and the Sunar Bangla restaurant and the railway station should be removed from the list of community facilities in Policy AS1</p>	Suggested we remove reference to the railway and the restaurant from the policy.	Remove from policy
<b>Policy AS2: New community facilities</b>		
<p>Woodland Trust</p> <p>AS2 should seek to retain and enhance recreational and local green spaces, resist the loss of open space, whilst also ensuring the provision of some more. Therefore, to what extent there is considered to be enough accessible space in your community also needs to be taken into account with new development proposals, such as housing. There are Natural England and Forestry Commission standards which can be used with developers on this:</p> <p>The Woodland Access Standard aspires:</p> <p>That no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size.</p> <p>That there should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20ha within 4km (8km round trip) of people's homes.</p>	Provision is sufficient with protective measures proposed here and under LGS.	None
<p>The Woodland Trust also believes that trees and woodlands can deliver a major contribution to resolving a range of water management issues, particularly those resulting from climate change, like flooding and the water quality implications caused by extreme weather events. This is important in the area covered by your Neighbourhood Plan because trees offer opportunities to make positive water use change, whilst also contributing to other objectives, such as biodiversity, timber &amp; green infrastructure - see the Woodland Trust publication Stemming the flow – the role of trees and woods in flood protection - <a href="https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/publications/2014/05/stemming-the-flow/">https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/publications/2014/05/stemming-the-flow/</a>.</p>	As CF now mainly resides in Flood Zone 2 – modifications required to the planting of trees and woodland?	No change
<p>Children and Young Peoples Service</p> <p>Church Fenton parish is served by Kirk Fenton Parochial C of E VA Primary School, Church Fenton, and Tadcaster Grammar School. We note the statement in Policy AS2 that 'the upgrade and growth of Kirk Fenton primary school, its buildings and grounds, will be supported where proposals provide for the ongoing sustainability of the facility and contribute to the improvement of the school's learning environment. However, the school playing fields will be protected from development except for that which is deemed essential for expansion of the school's capacity.'</p>	STARMAT should lead on investment in the school, not CIL.	None

Comment	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Modification to NDP
<p>The future need to expand the primary school should be taken into account when determining any other policies (Conservation and Heritage: Development in the historic core) that affect this area of the village.</p> <p>Any consideration of this site should consider the operational needs of the school at the time, and should the school and its playing fields need to relocate in future, the ongoing need for the existing school playing fields should be reconsidered.</p> <p>The local component of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) could be a potential funding source to help support the expansion of the education infrastructure.</p>		
<b>Policy F1 Development that does not add to flood risk</b>		
<p>Network Rail</p> <p>Whilst we support the principle of protecting Church Fenton from flood risk we would ask that the policy is consistent with the NPPF paragraph 163. We would ask that the policy refers to the need for a site-specific flood risk assessment where required under the NPPF footnote 50; sustainable drainage systems should be prioritised in accordance with point c) of paragraph 163 and the presumption against culverting / constricting watercourses should be removed as changes to watercourses may be acceptable as part of a comprehensive drainage strategy for the development of land.</p>	Noted	Policy amended
<p>York Consort - Drainage</p> <p>Where possible the risk of flooding should be reduced and that, as far as is practicable, surface water arising from any developed site should be managed in a sustainable manner to mimic the surface water flows arising from the site prior to the proposed development: This would be considered whether the surface water arrangements from the site are to connect to a public or private asset (watercourse or sewer) before out-falling into a watercourse or, to outfall directly into a watercourse within the Board's area. Any approved development should not adversely affect the surface water drainage of the area and amenity of adjacent properties.</p>	Noted	No change
<b>Policy EGS1 – Local Green Space</b>		
<p>NFU</p> <p>I would also like to raise your attention towards the proposed "local green space 7" of St Mary's Church environs, it was noted that the parcel of land towards the rear of the church is agricultural in nature. This parcel of land is currently under the ownership of the Bradley family, who have not agreed to this potential designation. They have achieved outlined planning permission for this area but fear this potential local green space designation will unfairly forfeit their application. We request that you consult with the Bradleys and if requested, remove this area from the designation.</p>	The parcel referred to is not subject to this policy.	Ensure policy and maps are clear.
<p>NYCC Ecology:</p> <p>In the Environment and Green Spaces section, it is stated that "There are few sites of ecological interest in the West Selby Plain due to the intensive farming" though it later says "Church Fenton is surrounded by open countryside and arable farmed fields with hedgerows and small pockets of deciduous woodland. These natural environments support an abundant and diverse range of nature and wildlife".</p> <p>The sub-section on biodiversity (4.4.2) appears to be based on information available from DEFRA's MAGIC website. It would be useful to add some local detail to this and we would like to see Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) mentioned. These are identified in the Selby district Local Plan and have been assessed as being of district or county-wide value for biodiversity. There is one SINC within the Neighbourhood Plan area, 'Pasture off Nanny Lane', which is designated for its species-rich grassland.</p>	Noted – review designations using MAGIC	No change unless review suggests otherwise.
<p>NYCC</p> <p>The statement that "From baseline survey data in the Selby District Species Action Plan 2004 there is no indication of any important species being present in the parish". In fact there are a number of important populations of Great Crested Newt in and around the village and Water</p>	Noted – include reference	Include reference.

Comment	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Modification to NDP
<p>Vole has been recorded on some local ditches in the recent past (e.g. at Sandwath). Other notable species include Brown Hare, Barn Owl and Grey Partridge on the airfield and Willow Tit and Marsh Tit at Old Park Plantation (bordering the Neighbourhood Plan boundary). Several species of bats occur in the vicinity. More detailed information could be obtained from North and East Yorkshire Ecological Data Centre.</p>		
<p>NYCC It is likely that herb-rich meadows, wet grasslands and other wetlands and ponds were more common in the area around Church Fenton in the past: the name 'Fenton' implies it was location in fenland (low-lying wet land prone to seasonal flooding). Fenton Trans and Ulleskelf Mires would have supported marsh and wet grassland, with fragments of such habitats still occurring. Jeffrey's 1772 Map of Yorkshire suggests that Fenton and Sherburn Commons had already been enclosed by the mid 18th century but Oxmoor to the north-west of Bishop Wood remained a large tract of common, accessible via Broad Lane and other drove routes.</p>	Noted	Update on the locality of the fen lands
<p>AAH There appears to be no specific evidence to demonstrate why the full extent of the St Mary's Church environs has been included as a local green space. When compared with the other useable public open spaces identified there is a clear difference with this Church 'environs' which is not evidenced as to why the full extent is included. Just because an area falls within the setting of a listed building is not sufficient justification for inclusion.</p>	Disagree – valued community asset	No change
Policy H1 Type size and scale		
<p>Policy H1 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan should ensure that it enables a scale of development that is consistent with the settlements Designated Service Village role in the Selby District Core Strategy, and the positive approach to plan making and sustainable development advocated in the NPPF.</p>	Agreed	No change
<p>AAH Policy H1 does not contribute to sustainable development. In particular, the proposal to allow small scale development adjoining the settlement boundary for up to 10 dwellings. This is considered arbitrary, inflexible and not based on any clear evidence. Furthermore it would not benefit from the economies of scale and planning obligations / infrastructure improvements that planned for larger scale development proposals could bring. The cumulative impact of numerous small scale developments could also be piecemeal, sporadic and un-planned. By seeking to deliberately stifle development this approach leaves the community at risk if Selby District Council fails to meet its five year housing targets. In such a scenario because this policy and the NP as a whole does not seek to allocate sites for housing the NP would be out of date. If the NP took a more proactive and positive approach to housing and sought to allocate sites then this positive approach would be rewarded by greater protection in a no five year situation as per paragraph 14 of the NPPF. A more positive NP therefore protects the community more than a restrictive NP. We would therefore recommend the NP working group engage and work with land owners and land promoters and developers to deliver a more proactive NP.</p>	Disagree – village has taken considerable development already in line with the emerging LP. No desire to stifle development, just to ensure it is sustainable.	No change

Comment	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Modification to NDP
<b>Policy H2 Design principles</b>		
<p>AAH</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>This Policy is poorly worded and conflicting. Criterion (a) appears restrictive and unnecessary. Whilst the majority of new houses are likely to be one or two storeys with gardens there maybe occasions where a need or a particular site delivers something else. Given the wording of (b) and (c) this would offer control anyway on the type and scale of housing delivered. Criterion (b) requiring development to reflect the best design elements as found in the historic core of the village may not be appropriate in all locations in Church Fenton and given the subsequent criteria doesn't appear necessary. Overall the policy is not clear and precise and lacks evidence.</p> </div>	Noted	Amend in line with SDC comments
<b>Policy H3 Location of new development</b>		
<p>Public Rights of Way  We are pleased to see that the Plan includes reference to the public rights of way network, recognising its value to the local residents and indeed uses the image of someone enjoying use of a path on their front cover of their Plan.  We note the wish to action the improvement of existing and support the establishment of new footpaths in relation to future development (H3). We might suggest that the plan might also like to add bridleways to the 'Actions' as the parish is currently poorly served by bridleways.    With reference to Gay Lane, it is unclear whether the aspiration is to create a circular walk including Gay Lane, or to produce a walk leaflet describing a walk including Gay Lane either/both would be a credit to the parish.</p>	Noted	Make this statement clearer in the Plan commentary.
<p>AAH  Policy H3 criterion (e) appears to be deliberately worded to stifle an extant planning consent. There appears no reference to the existing consent and how this policy may restrict development. The key views identified include views from private land which can not be considered by definition 'key'. There appears to be no evidence to justify these identified key views and its inclusion. Overall the policy appears deliberately restrictive.</p>	Not the case	No change
<b>Other comments</b>		
Creative Hub development supportive of our inclusion in the NHP: Pegasus/Makin	Check detail and possibly refer to renewal energy on this site?	In Ulleskelf – no change to our Plan.
Creating high quality places and increased housing provision and green infrastructure : NYCC	Does our NHP support this – we think so.	No change
Delivering a modern integrated transport network: NYCC	Not for the NDP	No change
Delivering a modern communication network	NYCC	Supporting High speed broadband

Comment	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Modification to NDP
<p>Woodland Trust Response. On 24th July 2018 the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government published the revised NPPF which states: development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists</p> <p>Also, the Woodland Trust would suggest that your Neighbourhood Plan is more specific about ancient tree protection. For example, the introduction and background to the consultation on the Kimbolton Neighbourhood Development Plan (2017), identified the importance of ancient woodland, and how it should be protected and enhanced. Also, we would like to see buffering distances set out. For example, for most types of development (i.e. residential), a planted buffer strip of 50m would be preferred to protect the core of the woodland.</p>	Noted	<p>Woodland Trust proposal : we would recommend that Policy EGS3 (Green Corridors) acknowledges this and should include the following sentence:</p> <p>Retention of hedges, trees and landscape features, and there should be no harm or loss of irreplaceable habitats such as ancient trees and hedges.</p>
<p>Woodland Trust</p> <p>The Woodland Access Standard aspires: That no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size. That there should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20ha within 4km (8km round trip) of people's homes.</p>	Is there anything we can do to incorporate this into the NHP? Would be interesting to identify potential areas e.g. around the HS2	No change – not relevant to HS2 policy.
<p>Knaggs and son</p> <p>Housing density and to some degree, size, has been directed by Government policy and is therefore outside Parish Council remit.</p> <p>You do not want large housing development but you want cheap houses. Four and five bedroom houses cannot conceivably be low cost accommodation. Low cost housing is designed to help those aspiring to enter the housing market. Small developments are very expensive to build thus making it impossible to offer low cost housing housing.</p> <p>You want agriculture to survive but it must make little change, noise, and to use no large heavy vehicles. Unfortunately, under the present circumstances small family farms will not last for much longer and will be merged into larger production units and this will increase the necessity for bigger machines and make village farms redundant.</p>	All noted - some interesting perspectives but mostly covered by the Plan.	No change, except to remove Manor Farm from policy.

Comment	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Modification to NDP
<p>You want to create new footpaths leading from housing developments that you don't want. The present footpath system, which were originally short cuts to the village church for the local community, is now the playground for dogs and their irresponsible owners. Why would any landowner want to co-operate in any additional footpaths?</p> <p>In the plan you quote the Environment agency on flooding and NVZ's. It is incorrect to say that most of Church Fenton is in an NVZ as the Environment Agency made horrendous mistakes which have, for the most part, been corrected. Manor Farm in not in an NVZ . Catastrophic flooding is only caused in this area if there is a major failure in the flood banks of the River Wharfe. Any run off from development, providing it enters appropriate drainage ditches, is inconsequential and has no significance on flooding in the area which is caused by ineffective river management and large development up stream.</p> <p>With regard to your interest in improving the environment, some of the most unsympathetic, ill-judged so called environmental improvements of late have been carried out by others, not in the farming community whose motives have appeared to be for profit rather than sympathetic environmental enhancement. The village allotments site is an area of embarrassment to any self- respecting countryman.</p> <p>If HS2 comes to pass the majority of land north of the village and encompassing Northfield Lane will be significantly reduced in height. In the event of catastrophic flooding this land will become a flood plain. This will result in flood water literally being a few hundred metres from Northfield Court and the Village School. Manor Farm will be effectively eliminated from viable production and will therefore cease to be a business.</p> <p>With regard to Manor Farm you have listed it as a non- designated local heritage asset. The moat to the north has been obliterated by the developer of the Laurels. The moat to the west was drained many years ago after our daughter nearly drowned. There are no historical buildings, barring those on the drive side. These will soon need significant attention. The rest of Manor Farm environs is made up of modern buildings and concrete yard. These will be surplus to requirements should HS2 proceed and change will be inevitable. The term "environs" is misleading and totally inappropriate.</p> <p>Regarding linear development and style in the village, natural hedges were not the only original feature but also red brick and rendered walls. The indigenous hedges are a relatively modern feature. There are also a mix of single, double and 3 storey developments including our own house that was built 150 years ago. Backfilling will become a necessity as the linear development already taken place has used up most of the available land.</p> <p>Concerning reference to energy efficiency, it is discriminatory that one side of the street can have solar panels but those on the north side cannot because they can be seen from the road. Whilst we would not, in our case, fit solar panels we feel that those who wish should have the right to do so.</p> <p>In respect to housing design, whilst it might not be to your, or our liking to have eco friendly designs which do not use bricks or stone as cladding, it is the future and it is totally in appropriate and hypocritical to condemn those who wish to be at the forefront of energy saving. You contradict yourself by saying that they should be out of sight which will mean backfilling.</p>		