

**RESPONSE OF HAWORTH CROSS ROADS AND STANBURY PARISH COUNCIL  
(THE QUALIFYING BODY)  
TO QUESTIONS RAISED IN THE COMMENCEMENT OF EXAMINATION PROCEDURAL NOTE**

- 1. Would the QB confirm that there are no other Neighbourhood Plans relating to the NP area?**

The QB can confirm that there are no other Neighbourhood Plans relating to the NP area.

- 2. Would you provide me with copies of the correspondence from the environmental bodies to the consultation on the SEA and HRA screening report of July 2018 and the HRA update report of May 2019?**

Re the July 2018 report – copies of the correspondence are included as a separate accompanying folder to this response document.

Re the May 2019 report – no additional consultation was carried out specifically with regard to the update report as it was considered that no material changes to the plan had occurred, following post-Regulation 14 plan amendments, since the original screening report.

The QB notes that both Natural England and Historic England have made representations in respect of the Regulation 16 consultation on the plan and have raised no issues in respect of the updated SEA and HRA screening report. The Environment Agency made no representations suggesting that they have nothing to add to their earlier comments (re the July 2018 report) in which no issues were raised.

- 3. Would the QB provide me with a paragraph to state how the plan and the plan making process have taken account of Human Rights legislation?**

The Neighbourhood Plan has regard to the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the European Convention on Human Rights and complies with the Human Rights Act. In preparing the plan, the parish council has consistently taken steps to ensure that the views of all sections of the community including hard to reach groups have been canvassed and taken into account. This approach to consultation is summarised in Chapter 3 of the plan itself and fully detailed in the Consultation Statement. In particular, the following steps may be highlighted.

At every consultation stage, drop-in sessions were held in all 3 constituent communities, most notably in the isolated Pennine village of Stanbury to ensure that its rural community was fully integrated into the plan preparation process. The 3 primary schools were specifically consulted at all stages and drop-ins held in some of the schools. All community/voluntary groups with community facilities in the area were individually consulted at all stages, including care homes, centres for the disabled and all churches. Disability Action Yorkshire were also specifically consulted.

More generally, face to face conversation and discussion was encouraged through meetings and drop-ins held variously in schools, churches/church halls and public houses; full and effective coverage of the villages was achieved with door-to-door mail drops with supporting questionnaires; and the Worth Reading magazine delivered to all parish properties was utilised to keep the community informed of key stages of plan development. Every attendee at village drop-in events was met, welcomed and encouraged to participate by a member of the Steering Group; specific and focussed engagement events were put in place to engage with the business community, the elderly and young people.

**4. The Policies Map shows the Non Designated Heritage Assets and Community Facilities with coloured circles. Is there a background evidence report showing the boundaries of these properties that can be used by decision makers in determining whether a development proposal would affect one of these properties?**

No, there is no background evidence report showing boundaries for either Non Designated Heritage Assets or Community Facilities, for the following reasons:-

Re Non Designated Heritage Assets (NDHA) –the plan has deliberately adopted the approach of Historic England (HE) in respect of listed buildings. The HE website’s entry for all listed buildings includes a map which indicates such buildings simply by use of a small blue triangle on the building/structure in question. The QB considered that if this was sufficiently detailed for HE and for the local planning authorities working with the listed building system, then it should be sufficient for NDHA. Each asset identified by a map symbol is supported by a detailed description in Appendix 3 of the plan, indicating which buildings/structures are covered by the designation, e.g. if walls, gate piers etc. are included. It is felt that the two together provide enough information for development management decision makers.

Re Community Facilities – the map symbol, together with the name of the facility, as included both on the map, in the relevant plan policy and in Appendix 7, is considered sufficient to clearly identify the property/properties constituting the facility in question in each case. It is the property/properties providing the facility which is pertinent here.

The QB notes that this map symbol-based approach to NDHA and community facilities has found favour with other examiners/plans on which the QB’s consultants have worked. NDPs for Aberford, Otley and Horsforth, all within the Leeds City Council area, have received favourable examiner reports in this regard and have gone on to be successful at referendum, being all now ‘made’ plans. In short, there are clear approved precedents for this approach.

**5. What is the mauve shaded area on the west of the plan area shown on the Magnification Section? It does not appear to be included in the key. Is it the South Pennine SPA/SAC?**

The QB can confirm that this is the case. It is actually shown in the map key in the Non-Neighbourhood Plan Designations section, although the notation appears paler than on the map. This can be remedied in the final version of the map.

**6. The introduction to the Plan does not include any information about the strategic context of the Neighbourhood Plan. Would the QB and LPA agree a few sentences to be included in the NP to list the strategic plans and the timescales for the emerging Site Allocations**

**Plan? Would you explain the strategic planning context for the Neighbourhood Plan e.g. the status of the villages in the settlement hierarchy and the level of growth anticipated in them to provide the context for the housing and employment policies in the NP. Would you explain how it is intended that the requirements set out in Policies H1 – H4 are to be taken forward?**

This information is being provided by CBMDC – ref separate paper.

- 7. What is the LPA's process for designating non-designated heritage assets? Is it intended that they should be designated through the NP or is does the LPA have a separate procedure?**

This information is being provided by CBMDC – ref separate paper.