Richmondshire District Council
Local Plan Core Strategy
Proposed Submission
August 2012
Representations Form

Please read the guidance notes before completing this form

This form comprises two parts:
Part A: Personal details
Part B: Your representation(s)

Both Part A and Part B of this form need to be completed in order for your representation(s) to be valid. Please complete a separate sheet (Part B) for each representation you wish to make. Further copies of this form can be downloaded from www.richmondshire.gov.uk/localplan.aspx . You do not need to fill out Part A for each representation, provided that all representations made are securely attached.

Your completed form must be returned to the following address to reach us no later than **4pm on Friday 14 September 2012:**

Planning Policy, Richmondshire District Council, Swale House, Frenchgate, Richmond, DL10 4JE

Alternatively, you can email: localplan@richmondshire.gov.uk and submit this form as an attachment.

Please note, all representations will be made available for public inspection on our website www.richmondshire.gov.uk/localplan.aspx with personal details (i.e. email address, telephone number and signature) removed.

Part A – Personal details

	Your Details	Agent's Details
Title	Dr	
First name	Rupert	
Last name	Hildyard	
Job title (if applicable)	University Lecturer and Farmer	
Work/organisation (if applicable)		
Address	Colburn Hall Colburn Catterick Garrison	
Postcode	DL9 4PE	
Telephone No.		
Email address		

Part B - Your representation

Please use a separate sheet for each representation.

Name/Organisation	R.D.Hildyard

Q1.To which part of the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document does this representation relate? (Spatial Principle, Sub Area Strategy or Core Policy)	
Policy number (e.g. SP2, CRSS or CP8)	CRSS
Page/paragraph number(s)	Pp37-40; Fig 8

<u>Please note:</u> Your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to fully support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations. <u>After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.</u>

Q2. Do you consider the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document is…?						
(a) Legally compliant	Yes		No		Don't Know	
(b) Sound	Yes		No	X	Don't Know	
If you answered 'No' to (a) or (b) above, please continue to Q3, otherwise continue to Q5.						

Q3. Do you consider the Core Strategy is unsound because it is not: (please refer to the guidance notes)	
(a) Justified	X
(b) Effective	X
(c) Consistent with national policy	
(d) Positively prepared	X

Please give details of why you consider the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible:

I consider the vast majority of the document to be a sound and sensible policy for the future of the plan area. However I have concerns about one part of the CRSS. This is Fig 8 on p37 which has significant deficiencies in terms of clarity – it omits for instance both Colburn Lane and Colburn back (West) lane. It appears to indicate that the land adjacent to the A6136 and on its north side should not be developed. This runs contrary to the various principles and policies that prioritise housing development areas in the Garrison that optimize 1. Proximity to town centre 2. Sustainability and especially public transport links 3. Access to services. The land adjacent to the north side of the A6136 benefits from all these advantages, and is clearly more favourable to them than for instance land south of Sour Beck. It is also of very low agricultural value, and would facilitate improvements to the A6136 which is one of the main constraints on development in Catterick Garrison. As a site with easy access and little disruption to neighbours it might also facilitate District Heating system or other infrastructural improvements.
The gap between Colburn and Hipswell is mentioned under Core Policy 12 at 2.d.iv and its preservation is a worthwhile aim. Development of the area adjacent to the north of the A6136

would enhance the separate identities of Colburn and Hipswell by sealing off the land to the north from further development. Colburn actually consists of five quite distinct neighbourhoods: Colburn Village, Colburn Town, Brough with St Giles housing estate, The Chase, and Cravendale/Hildyard Row. (Some of these are already closer to Hipswell.) The identities of the two parishes will not be diluted by development along the busy A6136 corridor of this very small fraction of the 'gap', and it would be premature and short-sighted to rule out for possible development a site with these very strong advantages.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Q4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q3 where this relates to soundness. You need to say why this change will make the Core Strategy legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible:

Under CRSS, paragraph 3.2.9 should be revised as follows. Sentence 3 to read

This assessment supports a 'town centre first' strategy, which prioritises development within the built up area, preferably on previously developed land and extending south eastwards from there, favouring sites that have proximity to the town centre, access to public transport and that facilitate improvements to the A6136, before reaching ultimately into an area of greenfield land south of Sour Beck. A strategic growth area has been approximately defined (Fig 8), which is well related to the existing landscape and complements the existing settlement pattern. This area benefits from… [et seq]

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)
Q5. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document, please use the space below to set out your comments:
(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

If your representation is seeking a change to the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?	
No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	
Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	Yes

If you have selected 'No', your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:
As a stakeholder in the community and owner of land that might be considered for development.

If you wish to be notified of future stages of plan preparation, please tick the appropriate box(es) below.			
Submission for Examination	**x**	**Notify me by:** (please tick)	
Inspector's Report Publication	**x**	Post	
Adoption	**x**	Email	**x**

Please Note: The Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature:	Rupert d'Arcy Hildyard
Date:	14 September 2012