



**Campaign to Protect Rural England**  
North Yorkshire Branch  
registered charity 500333

October 2015

**APP/C2708/W/15/3134174**

PINs via email

Dear Sir

The Campaign to Protect Rural England has examined the files associated with this appeal. We have consulted with local residents and considered their views in association with both the national planning policy framework, the local council policies and historic applications on this site.

We are of the firm opinion that the harm caused by this proposal outweighs any potential benefits. Planning permission has already been refused twice and an appeal dismissed on this site. The application site forms a natural and important break between the villages of Sutton-in-Craven in North Yorkshire and Eastburn in West Yorkshire.

Furthermore, we submit that to permit this development places unrealistic pressure on the neighbouring council (Bradford Met) upon whose shoulder's the responsibility to maintain the distinct gap between settlements would then fall.

The neighbouring parish of Steeton with Eastburn (within Bradford Metropolitan Council's planning boundary) also place great importance on the maintenance of the individual settlements character and again, the pressure on the neighbouring parish and county would be unrealistically increased.

We fully support and endorse the recommendation for refusal of the Planning Officer, Mr Neville Watson and support the Council's refusal of this planning application. We support the local residents of Sutton in Craven and their Parish Council, the first tier of local government who also object strongly to this proposal.

Taking all these factors into account, we respectfully request that the decision to refuse this major housing application be upheld and the appeal dismissed.

Our supporting rational is attached.

Yours Sincerely

JM W Marley  
Chair CPRE North Yorkshire

**Campaign to Protect Rural England North Yorkshire Branch**  
President The Lord Crathorne KCVO, Chair Mrs JM W Marley  
Honorary Treasurer Mr P Whitaker, Vice Chairs Mr R H Bennet and Mr S White  
% Bendgate House, Long Preston, Near Skipton, North Yorkshire BD23 4QR  
[www.cprenorthyorkshire.co.uk](http://www.cprenorthyorkshire.co.uk) [cprecraven@me.com](mailto:cprecraven@me.com) 01729 850567

**Planning application number 66/2015/15334**

**Land off Sutton Lane**

**OUTLINE 50 new houses, associated access and landscaping**

Neville Watson Senior Planner (Delegated authority) refused 3 June 2015

Prior applications on this site

2014 66/2014/14777 29 houses - application withdrawn CPRE objected

1986 TAPP/A/86/54799/PS appeal dismissed

Council's rationale for refusal

1. The proposed development would compromise the gap between Sutton in Craven and Eastburn and would constitute large scale development beyond the settlement boundary which would be harmful to the landscape character of the area .and the approach to Sutton. In terms of the presumption in favour of sustainable development it is considered that the adverse impact in relation to the individual character and identity of the settlements, their overall character and appearance and that of the area generally would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

2. The application site exceeds 1 hectare and although the site is in Flood Zone 1 no flood risk assessment has been carried out in accordance with the technical guidance to the NPPF. In the absence of such an assessment the Local Planning Authority cannot be satisfied that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable flood risk.

# **1 The importance of maintaining undeveloped gaps between settlements**

## **General**

1a Areas of countryside between existing built-up areas play a particularly important role in maintaining the physical and visual separation of settlements. The land within the gap performs an important role in defining the settlement character of the area and separating settlements at risk of coalescence. The undeveloped gaps between settlements help preserve and promote landscape and wildlife corridors between the countryside and urban areas.

1b Strategic gaps should be protected from development in order to retain their predominantly open and in certain areas, rural appearance. These gaps retain the physical and psychological benefits of having open land near to where people live.

1c Development on the edge of settlements will reduce the physical extent of the gaps. Peripheral development or development anywhere else within the strategic gaps would reduce the visual separation of settlements in a variety of ways, introducing urban features into a predominantly rural landscape, being visually prominent, it could require the removal of trees, woodland or other topographical features that perform an important screening function or it could reduce the feeling of openness or the undeveloped character of the gaps. The cumulative impact of developments over time could reduce the effectiveness of important gaps in maintaining the separation of settlements.

1d Settlement boundaries are a well utilised planning tool for guiding, controlling and identifying limits to development for an individual village. A defined development limit in planning terms provides a clear distinction between those parts of a settlement where development is acceptable in principle and those areas to be treated as open countryside where restrictive policies towards development should apply.

1e The core planning principles set out in paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework or NPPF, include the need to take account of the different roles and character of different areas, recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and to conserve and enhance the natural environment.

1f The need for housing is not the only consideration in national planning policy. Looking at the NPPF more widely, protection and enhancement of the natural environment is identified as a key dimension of sustainable development which the planning system is intended to achieve: see paragraphs 7 and section 11 "Conserving and enhancing the natural environment".

1g The purpose of paragraph 49 was to prompt local planning authorities into updating their Local Plans, and meeting the housing supply requirements in paragraph 47. Unfortunately, the process of adopting a new Local Plan is often a lengthy one, as demonstrated in many local councils - perhaps longer than the Minister anticipated when drafting the NPPF.

1h The size of gaps between settlements will potentially be very different in nature according to character and landscape form of the area in question therefore to argue that there is no definition of the extent of the gap required takes no account of the character, landscape, administration boundaries of any individual area. It is therefore important that the significance of these gaps is recognised and that new development does not dilute their contribution to maintaining the distinct form of these settlements, their landscape setting and separation from other settlements. Gaps between settlements, including the setting and nocturnal character of the landscape, must be maintained.

supporting information

APP/N2535/A/13/2207053 in July 2014 Inspector Brendon Lyons determined in the case of an appeal which risked the coalescence of settlements in Lincolnshire that:

*'The fact that the site was not of high quality in landscape terms did not undermine the importance of preventing coalescence. This gap could not, as asserted by the appellants, be maintained by ensuring adequate space between houses and the provision of a 'village green'.'*

*Appeal Decision Summary DCS Ref: 200-002-612 Call in 2014 Inspector: J VYSE*

*Authority: WEST SUSSEX*

*Description:*

*The secretary of state has refused a called in decision for 81 dwellings on 4.3ha of land in the Sussex countryside due to it being located in a local gap.*

*Abstract:*

*The secretary of state agreed with an inspector that, although the site lay outside a built-up area and was not allocated for housing, the council had a significant shortfall in its five-year supply of housing land such that the housing land supply policy, and the settlement boundary to which the local plan policy related, should not be considered up-to-date. Therefore the proposal was to be considered in the context of the presumption for sustainable development. However, although the policy relating to development within the local gap was also determined to be out of date, the secretary of state considered it still carried substantial weight by continuing to serve an important planning function in preventing the coalescence of nearby settlements and maintaining their separate identities and amenity. The secretary of state considered that the application scheme brought into conflict the local plan and the NPPF taken as a whole, in terms of failing to meet the environmental dimension of sustainability. **He concluded that the gap continued to serve a useful and much valued planning purpose and that an increase in built development would result in a small but nevertheless significant diminution of openness, harming the character of the local gap.** Additionally, since the inspector had submitted her report, the submission version of the neighbourhood plan had completed its public consultation and was now at the formal examination stage, reaffirming the local gap designation in the local plan. In the light of this, the secretary of state agreed with the inspector's conclusion that the scheme could not be regarded as sustainable development.*

## **The Gap between Sutton in Craven and Eastburn and North and West Yorkshire**

The application site consists of three agricultural fields between Sutton in Craven and Eastburn. The application site forms an important, clear and physical gap between the two villages and the two counties. It is close to the village marker sign on Sutton Lane.

1.1 The proposed development will erode the important undeveloped gap between Sutton-in Craven in North Yorkshire County and Eastburn in West Yorkshire Country damaging the individuality and character of two settlements. The application site forms an important, clear and physical gap between two settlements and two distinctly different counties.

1.2 The undeveloped gaps between settlements are critical to the character of the Craven area and, although this application is not within their planning boundary, equally critical to the character of the greater Bradford Metropolitan Council area. These gaps maintain and enhance the identity of settlements.

1.3 Sutton-in-Craven is clearly defined as a distinct settlement.

1.4 It is important to contain individual settlements and maintain their individual identity and to allow the *'the sense of leaving one place before you get to another to occur'*.

1.5 The application site, outside development limits and on such an important gap between settlements and planning authorities, would damage the connection between people and places and would not integrate into the natural and built environment

1.6 Craven is famous for its villages, market towns and rural character. Sutton-in-Craven should not be dismissed because of its proximity to West Yorkshire. The distinct character of the mill villages is as important to Craven as the predominantly agricultural, rural character of some of the farming settlements in the north of the district.

1.7 Pre-industrial revolution, Sutton was entirely agriculture based. After the industrial revolution, the centre of the village was dominated by the mills with agriculture surrounding the village. Sutton is an excellent example of the two different, historic industries both important to the history of Craven as a whole. The application site consists of three agricultural fields on the outskirts of the village.

1.8 The appellant submits in their Statement of Fact that

*'Sutton-in-Craven has no such buffer with Crosshills and Crosshills has no buffer with Glusburn without detriment to either.'*

We would refer to the Planning Inspectorate's decision to dismiss

APP/C2708A/12/218731 where The Inspector recognised and endorsed the importance of the individual character of settlements and referred to it regularly in his findings. In para 34, the conclusion to the report, he stated:

*'The proposed development would compromise the gap between Sutton in Craven and Glusburn .... I consider that on balance, the adverse impacts in relation to the individual*

*character and identity of the settlements, their overall character and appearance and that of areas, generally sufficient to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as whole'*

Thus illustrating that the Planning Inspectorate found the buffer between settlements important and any detriment to that buffer was unacceptable.

1.9 Furthermore the Sutton Parish Profile clearly refutes the appellant's claim that the buffer between settlements is not relevant as the profile clearly states:

*'Areas allocated as Green Wedges are present to the north of Sutton. These areas have been allocated with the aim of **preventing the merging of Sutton with Glusburn and Cross Hills to the north and in order to retain openness between the villages.**'*

1.10 In 1986 the importance of the gaps or buffers between the villages of Sutton, and Eastburn was also endorsed by the Planning Inspectorate in relation to the land off Sutton Lane. Appeal reference TAPP/A/86/54799/PS

in point two of the decision to dismiss the appeal, the Planning Inspector states the following:

"the proposal would erode the visually important gaps between Sutton and Eastbourne.

1.11 Both key dismissals of appeals illustrate clearly that a buffer between settlements is important and that to remove or erode that buffer would clearly create an adverse impact or degrade the individuality of settlements.

1.12 The pressure on Bradford Metropolitan Council should this appeal be upheld would be unrealistic placing all the responsibility to maintain the buffer between the two settlements and counties on them.

1.13 The neighbouring Parish of Steeton with Eastburn themselves have indicated the importance of the individuality of the settlements in their village plan which states:

*'Local people regard the natural and historical character of the villages as very important and want to see it remain as a semi-rural community, 56% of questionnaire respondents wanting it to stay as it is and 92% replying that the surrounding countryside is very important or important to them. They do not want to see the village character swamped by large housing developments.'*

1.14 The Appellants statement of fact argues that the amount of buffer required between settlements has not been identified. In fact, it is the opinion the required amount of buffer between settlements and counties exists already, in the shape of the undeveloped fields between giving a clear sense of leaving one place before entering another.

1.15 The application site is not screened from long distance views as it lies on sharply rising hillside. It is close to the Ravenstones Woods, a clear and physical feature recognisable in the wider landscape. The woods lie above the village. There are clear views into and across the site from Sutton Lane and the wider area. Therefore, the openness of the site and the gap it maintains between the settlements and different planning authorities is apparent and important.

1.16 Importance of the gap between settlements conclusion:

**Taking into account the National Planning Policy Framework, the emerging local plan and the views of local residents it is the view of CPRE North Yorkshire that this appeal should be dismissed because it clearly erodes the vital gap between settlements and counties.**

Purple line = North Yorkshire/West Yorkshire boundary

Green line = current green wedge

Red line = application site running right up to the county border





The position of the road markers indicating both Sutton in Craven and the entry to North Yorkshire are clearly identified on the road side at the Eastburn end of development.

## 2. THE EROSION AND DEGRADATION OF THE NATURAL GATEWAY TO SUTTON-IN-CRAVEN

2.1 There currently exists a natural and traditional gateway to Sutton in Craven illustrating the villages historic relationship to the textile industry, an important asset which endorses and enhances the character and individuality of Sutton in Craven.



2.2 Image The straight rows of traditional terraced houses at the end of Wilson Street create the natural gateway to the village.

2.3 The importance of the “natural gateway” to the village is further supported by the Planning Inspector’s report from 1986 Appeal mentioned earlier.

“The opposing ends of the stone terraced cottages in Wilson Street and Harker Street serve as a ‘gateway’ to the village ”

2.4 Development of the land off Sutton Lane would loom high and over dominate this feature of Sutton and obscure the terraces from the entrance to the village.

2.5 The natural gateway to the settlement enhances the individuality of Sutton in Craven and contributes positively to the feeling of leaving or entering a place

Para 61 NPPF identifies a need to recognise the relationship between people and place - Decisions should address the connection between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural and built environment.

Paragraph 7 of the NPPF, emphasises the need to protect and enhance the natural and built environment.

The core planning principles set out in Paragraph 17 include the need to take into account the different roles and character of different areas, recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and to conserve and enhance the natural environment.

Section 7 emphasises the need for good design. This goes beyond aesthetic considerations and the visual appearance and architecture of individual buildings -

### **The erosion and degradation of the natural gateway to Sutton in Craven conclusion**

**We submit that development of this site will degrade the natural gateway to the village of Sutton in Craven. The degradation would reduce the identity of the settlement and a loss of individuality of settlement.**

The application should be refused as it fails to satisfy

Para 7 of the NPPF

Para 17 of the NPPF

Para 61 of the NPPF

The importance of the natural gateway was established in 1986 in the Planning Inspector report.

### **3 Landscape**

#### **Craven District is renowned for its outstanding landscape quality**

3.1 The quality of Craven District's landscape outside the Yorkshire Dales National Park and the Forest of Bowland AONB was previously recognised as an "Area of Great Landscape Value' under the West Riding County Development Plan. In 1991 North Yorkshire County Council's Conservation Strategy identified areas of the County where the landscape quality is high and and worth of recognition is a regional or county context. This document indicated a Special Landscape Area or SLA across the whole of Craven District outside the National Park and the AONB. This was not saved by CDC. However, Harrogate Borough Council did save SLA landscape status.

3.2 The landscape character is described as Semi enclosed intermediate landscape.

Pasture with wooded gills and woodland.

*This rolling pastoral landscape of medium sized fields is enclosed by an intact network of dry-stone walls which impose a strong pattern on the landscape making a significant contribution to the landscape character. Deciduous woodland along becks follows the topography of steep sided gills creating a distinctive element within the landscape. A number of wooded gills and pockets of woodland are Ancient Woodland...(list includes Lumb Clough Ancient Woodland, Sutton in Craven) ..Intermittent areas of vegetation along field boundaries and small pockets of woodland, often enclosed by walls are scattered across the landscape. The medium tree cover provides a degree of enclosure to the open upland pasture. Small linear settlements and villages situated within the valleys are common within this landscape character type. Narrow roads wind throughout the area often bounded by dry-stone walls giving a sense of enclosure and obscuring views.....*

3.3 The village sits in a cleft or clough surrounded by hills from Ravenstones, Aden, Earl's Cragg down to the Manor House. This development would impact adversely on the landscape of South Craven. The development site is a steep gill rising up to the Ravenstones Woods from the valley bottom. As clearly stated by the Planning Inspector in 1986 in his response to a smaller development on this site:

*The appeal site (Land off Sutton Lane) is a grass field just beyond the edge of the village. It lies a little above the roadside and rises increasingly steeply towards attractive wooded hillsides...In my view, residential development on the rising slopes of the appeal site would be especially prominent and the attractive nature of the countryside here would render that prominence especially damaging*

**We submit that this new proposal would create unacceptable and irreversible harm to the character of the landscape in this area and should be refused**

## 4 Housing need

4.1 The most recent housing position statement from May 2013 indicates that Craven has a 6.23 land supply.

4.2 There is a need to build affordable new homes in England. To provide these homes in the most sustainable way their numbers and locations should:

- be agreed through a democratic and transparent plan-led system, that uses phasing to make sure that the most sustainable sites are developed first;
- be based upon a robust and up to date evidence base, including realistic economic forecasts, which are regularly reviewed;
- be closely related to household need in terms of location, size, type, tenure and affordability, and be designed to support mixed communities;
- take account of environmental, social, service and infrastructure capacity;
- make best use of our existing stock;
- respect any local, national and international environmental designations, and also the historic character and landscape of the area;
- include provision and protection of accessible urban green space;
- achieve the highest possible standards of design and environmental performance; and,
- support thriving communities.

4.3 This is a 'plan, monitor and manage' approach. New homes should not be provided simply on the basis of a crude 'predict and provide' policy, which uses past trends to determine future projections. Planning for housing is not just a simple numbers game.

4.4 The NPPF includes, as one of its core planning principles, recognition of the 'intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'.

4.5 Craven landscape outside major settlements is predominantly used for agriculture. Steps must be taken to protect agricultural land from use as development land.

4.6 Craven District is the only authority in the North Yorkshire area to have seen an increase in the number of long term empty homes with 235 available for the 2012/2013 period.

4.7 We accept that the area is without a local plan however, the need for housing should be clearly and logically identified before more of our precious

countryside is forever lost to predominantly market value sites. There is no identified need for market value homes. Whilst Craven District Council is 'without a local plan', developers used para 14 on an all too frequent basis to justify housing in the open countryside, outside development limits.

4.8 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF provides that *"where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date" planning permission should be granted "unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole"*.

4.9 Paragraph 215 provides that *"due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)"*.

4.10 Also to be noted: para 213 Authorities are urged to get their plans (in the form of new style local plans) UP TO SPEED AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE.

4.11 NPPF 213

*Plans may, therefore, need to be revised to take into account the policies in this Framework. This should be progressed as quickly as possible, either through a partial review or by preparing a new plan.*

4.12 Whilst Craven is without a local plan, the rules and regulations, quotas, obligations in relation to planning are constantly moving goal posts.

We take exception to the Agent's design and access statement justifying SC040 as a reason to approve this application.

4.13 Craven District's Council's Local Plan is currently being drafted. The draft document is neither approved nor has been presented to the Inspectorate.

a) SC040 is a 'preferred site for *consultation* meaning it a *potential* site. This application cannot be judged against consultation and potential.

b) The Parish Council, the first tier of local government and representative of the village and its people objected to site SC040.

c) The Parish Council have suggested several brownfield sites which would be in line with need to develop brownfield first in line with the NPPF Para 11

4.14 Paragraph 11 NPPF:

*Planning policies should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land) provided that it is not of high environmental value*

#### 4.15 Paragraph 12 NPPF

*Planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings with succinct local and neighbourhood plans setting out a positive vision of the area.*

4.16 In short, people can't say no to housing. They can be influential in where it is situated. In the case of Sutton in Craven, the people have tried to suggest and adapt to the housing need for Craven District Council.

4.17 CPRE was indeed so concerned about this site that a comment was made and submitted to Craven District Council in our report entitled

'Craven District Council Local Development Plan  
Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment:  
Phase 2 Checklist'

In relation to site SC040 our comments were:

*All the fields making up the entrance to Sutton Village are now included in the SHLAA. This would join up the villages of Sutton and Eastburn which is West Yorkshire in built form. These fields are currently outside the development limits. They are gently sloping sites sitting below Ravenstone Woods. The fields absorb the run off water from the hillside which would otherwise land on Sutton Lane. The area is crossed with dry-stone walls providing habitat for insects and small mammals and walls which form part of the biodiversity super highway which is essential (see CPRE report on biodiversity) Access would be onto Sutton lane which is unsuitable for heavy traffic. An application in the 1980's was dismissed at appeal because the PI deemed it harmful to the nature of the countryside, the natural gateway to the village and outside development limits. There are numerous TPO's in this area.*

4.18 According to the work of the Sutton In Craven group protesting regarding this proposal:

*'The appellant also claims that there has been no affordable housing supplied in Sutton in the period 2011-2015. This is categorically untrue – 65 affordable units were delivered in the Greenroyd Mill development (brown-field) in July 2011 – see article at <https://www.yorkshirehousing.co.uk/4081/derelict-mill-in-8-million-revamp-provides-65-affordable-homes>. Additionally, the original condition for a proportion of affordable houses at the ongoing West Lane development was discharged, further evidence to support that Sutton does not need additional affordables. Sutton now has around 320 affordable units, some of which are still empty, and some of which have been filled by non-locals, due to lack of need for local people.'*

## **5 Tranquillity**

5.1 Tranquillity is a highly valued characteristic of the English Countryside and one of the most important indicators of its quality. CPRE has championed research to define, map, protect and enhance tranquillity since the 1990's.

5.2 The National Planning Policy (NPPF) uses the term tranquillity for the first time in planning policy. This can apply to relatively confined local areas as 'local green space' or potentially more extensive area of tranquillity worthy of protection.

Tranquillity does not only refer to sound but is visual and sensual.

5.3 Places that make us feel tranquil take us away from the stresses and strains of everyday life and help us to relax — but they face a multitude of threats and are shrinking in size.

5.4 NPPF para 17 sets out as one of the 12 core planning principles that: 'planning should take account of the different roles and character of different areas.'

5.5 Whilst many assume tranquillity applies only to large tracts of open moorland miles from civilisation, this is not the case. Tranquillity or calm between settlements is vital and a key characteristic of village life. It is as important to retain the feeling of tranquillity in more developed areas of the district as it is in the more remote areas.

**Approval of this application would result in a loss of tranquillity of the landscape surrounding Sutton resulting in a reduction of the sense of well being of residents.**

## **6 Sustainability**

### PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS:

6.1 CPRE Craven submits that this development is not sustainable and therefore should be refused. It should be remembered that sustainability is three fold in terms of development:

Environmental, Economic and Social. This development fails to meet these criteria.

6..2 Whilst emphasising the economic and social benefits of development including new housing, the NPPF makes it clear that the planning system also has an environmental role. To achieve sustainable development, the economic, social and environmental roles of the planning system should not be undertaken in isolation, as they are mutually dependent.

6..3 Craven District Council's own saved policy states:

#### **'2. Sustainable Development**

2.1 *All development must take full account of the need to protect the environment so that present day demands do not compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs or enjoy a high quality environment. All development must therefore reflect the needs and the quality of life of residents, conserve resources and protect the plan area's essential character and environmental assets such as:*

- *The character and quality of the landscape*
- *The undeveloped nature of the countryside*
- *The areas recognised nature conservation conservation value*
- *High quality agricultural land*
- *The quality of air and water supplies*
- *The open spaces within, between and surrounding settlements.*
- *The buildings and areas of important townscape, historic and architectural interest*
- *Land of recreation and amenity value'*

6.4 The application fails to reflect the needs of the quality of life of residents (both current and those who would live on the site if it were approved).

6.5 The application fails to recognise and protect the character and appearance of the landscape

6.6 The application fails to recognise the undeveloped nature of the countryside in between Sutton and Eastburn

6..7 The application would present a loss of valuable grazing land.

6.8 The application fails to address and recognise the importance of open spaces between and surrounding settlements.

6.9 The application fails to address the loss of tranquillity

6.10 Our comments are further supported by Craven District Council's policy team who, in relation to sustainability make the following comments in their document Preferred Option Key Issues Produced February 2012

Settlement Strategy:

*"The appropriate scale of growth, infrastructure problems and outside/cross boundary influences all remain UNRESOLVED in Glusburn/Cross Hills/Sutton."*

The report goes on to state clearly that:

*"There is a danger of urban sprawl in South Craven and Skipton"*

**This application is not sustainable and should be refused.**

## **7 Highways issues, traffic generation and access**

7.1 The impact of additional traffic in the locality and wider area would be adverse. The roads are relatively narrow, especially at the 'gateway to village'. There are many localised congestion issues at peak times. CPRE Craven spoke with local residents who all expressed concerns about speeding traffic and congestion. The objections from local people on line confirm this and whilst CPRE Craven were conducting their site visit two large HGV's were trying to pass in Sutton Lane, with difficulty.

7.2 Saved Local Plan Policy T2 is permissive of development proposals that are appropriate to the highway network where, amongst other things, they do not generate traffic in excess of the highway network; any new or greater use of an access onto a primary, district or local distributor road is acceptable in design and road safety; and the highway impact has regard to the surrounding landscape.

7.3 The village profile compiled by the village and Craven District Council identifies that the majority of people residing in Sutton in Craven commute to West Yorkshire and elsewhere in Craven therefore it is reasonable to assume that there will be a marked increase in vehicle movements.

According to Streamlis

46.78% of the households of Sutton has one car  
26.96% of the households of Sutton has two cars  
6.16% of the households of Sutton has more than 2

7.4 THE NPPF, emphasises the economic and social benefits of development, including housing. However, the NPPF makes it clear the planning system also has an environmental role. To achieve sustainable development the economic, social and environmental roles of the planning system should not be undertaken in isolation as they are mutually dependent.

It could be argued that the commuters will use the local railway station for the 7.5 commute however this still means a car journey down the narrow road to Steeton or Cononley. The local Cross Hills & Kildwick railway station was closed down in 1965

## 8 Infrastructure and Services

8.1 Historically, the issue of sewerage has been a major concern in this area. There are numerous reports regarding the inability of the sewage system to cope with the increase in housing already experienced in the Aire Valley.

8.2 The waiting lists for the three hospitals serving residents of Craven are at an all time high with 28,000 people on waiting lists according to new NHS Data. Note these figures apply to the local health authority which covers three hospitals: Airedale, St Lukes and BRI)

[http://www.thetelegraphandargus.co.uk/news/local/localbrad/11336236.Nearly\\_28\\_000\\_patients\\_wait\\_for\\_treatment\\_at\\_Bradford\\_district\\_39\\_s\\_hospitals/](http://www.thetelegraphandargus.co.uk/news/local/localbrad/11336236.Nearly_28_000_patients_wait_for_treatment_at_Bradford_district_39_s_hospitals/)

8.3 Objections from local people lodged on the Craven District Council web site in relation to this application endorse this and include concerns regarding waiting lists for Doctor's surgeries, dentists.

8.4 It is increasingly apparent from reading through objections that local people are suffering. We must ensure that the drive to meet so called targets and constantly moving numbers does not overshadow the fact that people require access to basic health services.

8.5 The strain on infrastructure was clearly identified in the document Preferred Option Key Issues Produced February 2012 produced by CDC

Settlement Strategy:

"The appropriate scale of growth, infrastructure problems and outside/cross boundary influences all remain UNRESOLVED in Glusburn/Cross Hills/Sutton."

## Summary

The Applicants Family applied and appealed against the refusal to build on this site in 1986. 28 years later, the need to protect valuable landscapes has intensified. This proposal would have significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, tranquillity, setting, and amenity of the village, surrounding countryside and residents. It would destroy the important gap between Sutton in Craven and Eastburn and North & West Yorkshire. The proposal would create an adverse and unacceptable impact on the 'natural gateway to the village. Brownfield land is available within Sutton in Craven. The development is not sustainable.

Taking in to consideration ALL the points raised in this objection, the benefits of this development do not outweigh the negatives when read against the NPPF as a whole.

We respectfully request that this appeal be dismissed.

