

SILSDEN WITH STEETON & EASTBURN, NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Consultation ending 29.10.19

SwES011-1

INFORMATION WHICH NEEDS UPDATING

Since it was originally drafted in 2017 many of the facts in this document are now out of date and need amending:-

- | | | |
|---------|-------|--|
| Page 11 | 3.3 | [insert dates] Should the dates of this consultation be in these brackets? |
| Page 18 | 4.18 | Silsden now has only 2 pharmacies |
| Page 18 | 4.19 | Silsden now has 5 pubs (Kings Arms, Butchers Arms, Punch Bowl, Red Lion and The Robin Hood) 4 cafes (Christine's Kitchen, The Old Post Office, The Rolling Pin and Crumbs) plus the wine bar (The Counting House) and a coffee shop/bar (The Duck Pond) |
| Page 18 | 4.21 | Daisy Chain is now know as The Hive and has become a Community Interest Company (other references to this throughout the document also need changing). |
| Page 19 | 4.23 | The Town Hall – last sentence of this paragraph needs changing as the Friends of Silsden Town Hall has become a Community Interest Organisation charity and has now signed a 125 year Community Asset Transfer lease with CBMDC as of 1.4.19. |
| Page 20 | 4.26 | The green space around St James's Church includes the graveyard (not cemetery). Silsden cemetery is on Howden Road and does not appear to be mentioned in this plan – should it be? |
| Page 20 | 4.27 | The Friends of Silsden Park is now a community group. |
| Page 20 | 4.30 | When Hothfield Junior School and Aireview Infant school merged they became known as Silsden Primary school (this is not mentioned). Plans have been approved to build new school premises off Hawber Cote Lane and construction is due to commence at the end of 2019. (The same information needs updating on page 24, third paragraph down). |
| Page 21 | 4.31 | Could this confusing paragraph be re-written? It says flood or flooding 8 times in 3 sentences including 3 in one sentence. In the first sentence it should also probably say the fields to the South of the town rather than around the town. |
| Page 54 | Photo | Numark pharmacy no longer exists, could we have a more up to date picture of Kirkgate? |
| Page 61 | 6.48 | The list in the red box – the first item and the last item are saying the same thing. |

- Page 63 6.50 Silsden Post office (SWES 15/3) is now closed and the services have now been taken over by Twiggs newsagents. Map 12 on page 82 is therefore also wrong.
- Page 65 6.54 Local Green Spaces – The reference numbers in this document do not match those given in the separate ‘Local Green Space Assessment’ document. There is no explanation as to why SWES16 and SWES 17 differ from this earlier document and why some areas are no longer included.
- Page 75 Map 5 Some of the buildings identified on the map do not match the description on the list on page 40. SWES4/18 Former library building/board school is not shown on map 5 as it is in the area above the cut off point at the top of the map. On Map 5 SWES4/18 has mistakenly been incorporated into the Town Hall (as that is where the library is now run from). On Map 5 what is shown as SWES4/8 and SWES4/18 should just say SWES4/8 and the map should be enlarged to show the former library/board school building (which has recently been converted into 2 houses).
- Page 51, 59 & 65 Policies Map 1 is referred to several times in this document but it has not been included. I did find it in the local Green Space assessment. Many people will not have seen it if they did not know this. It should either have been included in the main NDP document or at the very least there should have been instructions as to where to find it.
- Page 53 6.35 The public toilets have now been turned into a commercial building so it will not be possible to re-open them.

COMMENTS

1. Throughout this document reference is made to CBMDCs Core Strategy and the need to tie in with this. However, the Core Strategy is currently undergoing a partial review which means that many references to it need to be amended either now, or after the partial review has been completed - for example the reference to the housing target of 1200 homes for Silsden (see page 30). How will the Neighbourhood Plan be revised to be consistent with the soon to be amended Core Strategy?

SwES011-2

2. Page 22 (4.34) Safe access for pedestrians and cyclists from Silsden to Steeton & Silsden railway station should not just include a bridge over the Aire Valley Trunk Road but also an off road route that meets up with any such bridge (to tie in with 6.28 b).

SwES011-3

3. Page 22 (4.36) The last sentence of this paragraph should be deleted. Building an eastern bypass for Silsden is not a sustainable option. It will only encourage more car use which goes against the sentiment of the CSPR. Instead more needs to be done to discourage car journeys (as in point 2 above) and more traffic calming measures introduced into the centre of the town.

SwES011-4

4. Page 35 (6.2) I do not support the NDP statement that Silsden be classified as a local growth area as this is leading to the overdevelopment of the town which is contrary to wishes of the residents and the Town Council.

SwES011-5

5. Page 36 (6.5)

SwES011-6

- b) There are open spaces in the town which need to be added to the list before I can agree with this statement.

6. Page 36 (6.7)

SwES011-7

- a) How is this to be realised when current developments are not meeting this criteria?
d) Climate Change targets – where are these documented?
i) No development on the edge of the settlement has or will improve access to the countryside as they are being built on that very countryside and are therefore permanently removing everybody's access to it. The current Barratt development to the south of Silsden has not enhanced the local landscape but has been very detrimental to it and to the views into and out of the town (see also 6.25 on page 45).

LOCAL GREEN SPACE ASSESSMENT (January 2019)

- 3.0 From the list on pages 5-8 a very short list of Local Green Spaces has been identified on pages 8 and 9 but no clear explanation is given as to why the areas on the long list have been rejected and, as I mentioned earlier, the short list which appears in the NDP is different again. Can you provide further detail of this process and how it was felt they did not meet the assessment framework?

SwES011-8