

**SUGGESTED DELETIONS EDITS AND REDRAFTING AT REG 16 BURLEY IN WHARFEDALE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

<b>P12</b>	Detailed description of the Consultations predicated on earlier versions of the Core Strategy with a lower target for housing development should be in the Consultation Statement not the plan. In the main body of the plan it is misleading.			
<b>VISION</b>	There are no policies relating to infrastructure. We understand the reluctance to alter the wording of the vision and the aspirational nature of the vision, but the reference to growth being proportionate to infrastructure is misleading as there are no policies in the plan relating to infrastructure.			
<b>PROPOSALS MAP</b>	A proposals map has been submitted, but not referred to in the plan, and does not include all the spatial policy implications shown in the individual maps			
Was last revision really March?				
<b>3.13 GREENHOLME MILL</b>	Not a strategic site. This site is in the Green Belt and it is the scope of District to decide what is Strategic.	Reference is misleading.		
<b>PARAGRAPH 3.17</b>	This needs to be redrafted to reflect that Burley is local <u>growth</u> not service centre in the Core Strategy.			
<b>BW3 VIEWS</b>	There is a conflict between the first sentence, 'development should not adversely affect important view' and the second sentence, promoting mitigation through landscape appraisals and impact studies.	The description of view C is misleading	Whilst the intended outcome is laudable, as drafted, the policy lacks clarity and requires modification to improve its effectiveness.	
<b>PARAGRAPHS 4.24 TO 4.26</b>	These paragraphs should be deleted as there are no policies in the plan seeking to influence the scale or distribution of land allocations or sites for new housing development; and are prejudicial to the preparation of the Local Plan.			
<b>PARAGRAPH 4.24.</b> <i>The main issues raised by local people during the</i>	New development is not promoted in the plan and should be deleted from the plan with other consultation material and included in the Consultation Statement.			

<p><i>consultation were: the need for new homes to be spread over several sites, <b>not in one big estate-type development.</b></i></p>	
<p><b>PARAGRAPH 4.25.</b> <i>The vision for Burley is to ensure that the village continues to feel focused around a village centre and <b>avoids sprawl along the main commuter routes</b> to Menston, Otley or Ilkley. This means that new housing should be well integrated into the village, <b>avoiding a single large development</b> that is perceived as a separate place. This will ensure that residents in the new homes feel integrated with the existing community. Dispersing new housing development across a range of sites will help to ensure that these sites are of a size that avoids</i></p>	<p>New development is not promoted in the plan and should be deleted from the plan with other consultation material and included in the Consultation Statement.</p>

<i>dominating the local area.</i>			
<b>BW5 MIX and Type of Housing</b>	The policy seeks to use mix and type of housing as a design tool, in line with paragraphs 4.30 and 4.31. It does not seek to use housing need or demand to influence a development proposal, and accordingly the content of paragraphs 4.32 and 4.33 are irrelevant and should be deleted.	Is housing design the correct mechanism to achieve housing mix? It is confusing.	
<b>PARAGRAPH 4.32 AND 4.33</b>	These paragraphs are irrelevant to the policy and should be deleted.		
<b>BW7 BURLEY LOCAL CENTRE</b> And <b>BW8 DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE THE DEFINED LOCAL CENTRE</b>	<b>MAP 5</b> The Local Centre in Map 5 is not shown on Policies Map.		
<b>BW11 PROTECTING LOCAL GREENSPACES</b>	<p>To comply with NPPF, paragraph 77, the assessment should include all green spaces, particularly within the settlement boundary. The paragraph 77 criteria should be used to determine which sites may be suitable to include in the policy, mindful that the 'designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space.' All sites included in the assessment have been designated in the policy. Notable areas of green space have been excluded from the assessment.</p> <p>Most commentary in the assessment relates to a description of the site and its uses, and makes little reference to 'the community it serves', why it is 'demonstrably special', or whether it is 'local in character and is not an extensive tract of land'.</p> <p>Whilst some proposed designations have been included in the Conservation Area Appraisal 2007, as a 'positive contribution to character' or as a 'key open space,' this is in terms of the character of the conservation area does not necessarily mean that they are 'demonstrably special' and no such evaluation has been included in the assessment.</p>		
<b>MAP 6</b>	There are still mistakes with the map and policies map.	Full extent of site G not shown on Policies Map.	Still reference to site K which was removed from reg 14, Burley Woodhead SCHOOL This should be deleted.
<b>BW17 PROTECTING EXISTING COMMUNITY FACILITIES</b>	The relevant extent of the existing community facilities, proposed to be protected under this policy, must be shown precisely on a policies map to enable the policy to be properly applied to any development proposal.		Facility g.) constitutes a single public house. No evidence or justification has been made available as to why it is appropriate to do so, and not seek to include all public houses within the policy.