**Cawthorne Neighbourhood Plan Public Consultation November 2017**

**Comments Comparison table**

|  |
| --- |
| **Draft Vision and Objectives** |
| VO1. Do you agree with the Draft Vision and Objectives? | Yes | 88% | No |  |
| VO2. Please provide any comments suggesting how they could be improved* The plan should support local farms to grow and diversify where planning is concerned
* Modern agricultural facilities should be allowed and encouraged while allowing farmers to develop their traditional farm buildings into housing or other diversifications
* Mention should be made of “Protection and continued support of local businesses large or small”
* Addition of tea shop to village store and 2 clubs
* Maybe more emphasis / focus on the speed of traffic through the village itself
 |
| **Landscape, Wildlife and Environment Policy Options** |
| L1. Should our NDP include policies to protect the local landscape character of Cawthorne? ……………………………………. | Yes | 100% | No |  |
| L2. Should the NDP include a policy encouraging development to incorporate features to support wildlife? | Yes | 100% | No |  |
| L3. Are there any other environmental issues which the NPD should address? Please explain your answer.* Noise from Cannon Hall Farm
* Light pollution usually from excessive security lights at private properties & Cannon Hall Farm
* Consideration should be given to a hydro-electric scheme at the weir below Cinder Hill
* Should avoid solar panels and photo voltaic panels in the Conservation Area as they can be an eyesore
* Problems with geese polluting the river and damaging crops
* Himalayan Balsam is becoming a problem in respect of pollution of Cawthorne Dike
* Dropping of litter and dumping of rubbish is an ever present issue in lay-byes – could litter bins be provided in these locations
 |
| **Community and Sports Facilities Policy Options** |
| CF1. Should the NDP include a policy identifying local community facilities and supporting investment to improve them? | Yes | 94% | No |  |
| CF2. Should the NDP include a policy which identifies one or more areas of Local Green Space for protection from development | Yes | 82% | No |  |
| If so, please identify them and explain why they are important* Supporting investment for the cricket/football areas and Village Hall
* Unclear what exactly CF2, CF3 and CF4 relate to hence no reply (1)
* Village Green for social gathering/events (2)
* Recreation Ground
* Orchard site
* Football Pitch
* The Red House – perhaps it should be noted that this is a Queen Anne house and possibly the first brick-built house in the village. It is very fine and the restored garden is very much in character
* Village could become too large and lose its character
* Provision of railings on the A635 edge of the village green re safety of children playing there
* Playground facilities are inadequate for children in the village
 |
| CF3. Should the NDP include a policy encouraging new development to link to existing footpath/cycle networks and have suitable vehicular access to adoptable road standard* Concern from farmers re walkers having no respect for their efforts, not keeping to paths and poor signage with walkers getting lost
* Ideally a walking/cycling route should start and end with a place to park (2)
 | Yes | 65% | No | 18% |
| CF4. Should the NDP include any complimentary actions for the Parish Council linked to improving local accessibility eg. improvements in signage, improvements to footpaths etc. | Yes | 76% | No |  |
| If so, what sort of actions would you like to see?* Install more 30mph speed limit repeater signs through the village
* Policy of liaising with BMBC re footpaths should continue
* Should also include removal of unnecessary signage
* Action on bridle path to keep in good repair by all involved ie. Cricket club, Water Board and private owners
* Make stiles, where needed, usable by less able
 |
| **Housing Policy Options** |
| H1. What sort of housing do you think is needed in Cawthorne? For instance, small, starter homes, affordable housing, housing for older people/sheltered housing, self-build schemes etc.* Housing for older people
* Starter homes (2)
* A mix of development is required for the future to allow those who live in the village to remain here when their lifestyle / lifestage requires a change in housing type – eg. young adults requiring in starter homes, older people downsizing etc.
* None
* Mixed housing in sympathy with existing buildings
* More affordable housing (4)
* There should be an advantage to existing local residents to any housing (2)
 |
| H2. Should the NDP identify site allocations for small housing sites within the development boundary? | Yes | 59% | No | 29% |
| Or |  |  |  |  |
| H3. Should the NDP just include a criteria-based policy (such as the one in the NDP) for new housing development that may come forward? | Yes | 65% | No | 12% |
| **Design Policy Options** |
| D1. What do you think are the significant local characteristics of buildings in Cawthorne?* The architectural characteristics mentioned in the Village Design Statement should be incorporated in this Statement.
* White painted windows now form a strong characteristic of the Conservation Area and this tradition should continue
* Taking the village as a while, there are no significant local characteristics. Cawthorne incorporates a large mix of different coloured bricks, stone etc. and in no way does it enjoy a uniform appearance in its housing stock.
* Many listed properties
* Stone built cottages and terraces
* Mixture of stone and brick properties with garden space
 |
| D2. Would you support more modern/contemporary designs sustainable/low carbon buildings* Covenants could be imposed on new housing developments, as done in the past on St Julien’s and Tivydale Close in respect of aerials and Sky discs on front of houses
* Agree but not in the Conservation area
* Providing to any new builds being appropriate to their location and character of village (3)
 | YesYes | 47%47% | NoNo | 47%35% |
| D3. Can you suggest any locally important buildings or features or special interest that should be protected in a Local List?If so, please explain why they are important* All existing buildings should be protected (all modifications etc. should be in keeping with all surrounding buildings)
* Important to keep new buildings in character with surrounding buildings, maintaining a low carbon build
* There used to be a great many wonderful chimneys – most have been replaced by modern, bland ones
* Compare old photos and paintings to note the changes
* All timber framed buildings should be either listed or included in the Conservation Area
* These are most likely already included in the Conservation Area
* Listed buildings because they are listed - 81 listed buildings
* No 2 Hill Top – this house blends beautifully with the village. It would be a travesty to pull it down
* Older cottages, the pub, the Forge, Golden Cross as they give the village its history and character
* Clapper Bridge - historic
 |
| **Tourism and Business Policy Options** |
| TB1. Should the NDP include policies supporting appropriate local economic growth, taking into account the Parish’s location in the Green Belt and impacts on local character and amenity?* Farms are not mentioned and have not been contacted by sub group
* Only after the pressing issues of infrastructure have been addressed.
 | Yes | 82% | No | 12% |
| TB2. Should the NDP include a policy supporting tourism related economic development in the area?* Clean up Daykin Brook – river that runs into Cannon Hall lakes (polluted) (2)
* Only after the pressing issues of infrastructure have been addressed
* Not in the village
 | Yes | 65% | No | 29% |
| **Infrastructure Policy Options and Actions** |
| INF1. Do you agree that the transport issues identified in paragraphs 9.4.1 to 9.4.3 are the key ones facing the village over the plan period?* In principle these are the key issues but the possible suggestions put forward to alleviate these issues appears to require much more detailed consideration eg. traffic calming/car parking. Relying on extra parking at Cannon Hall is unlikely to help as much of the weekend congestion on Tivy Dale is caused by people who want to avoid any form of parking charges
 | Yes | 71% | No |  |
| If not, what else should the Plan address?* One way system through the village to alleviate problems at Hilltop
* Bus transport to Penistone
* Any proposals for additional car parking should include hedge/screening to minimise impact
* Roundabouts would be a great idea for traffic calming
* Below Taylor Hill at junction with Tivydale Close – leaving the Close the traffic can come at you either way due to parking opposite Tivydale Close
 |
| INF2. The way in which a package of traffic calming, speed restrictions and limited additional parking could support the Plan’s vision is in the NDP.Which of these elements are you in favour of? |
| Slowing traffic to 20mph through the village | Disagree |  | Agree | 100% | Undecided |  |
| Reducing the speed limit on the Bypass | Disagree | 6% | Agree | 82% | Undecided | 12% |
| Changing road layouts and traffic calming | Disagree | 24% | Agree | 53% | Undecided | 23% |
| Introduction of yellow lines – only in the most congested areas and not to move potential customers away from businesses | Disagree | 17% | Agree | 64% | Undecided | 18% |
| Introduction of Residents Parking Schemes | Disagree | 18% | Agree | 41% | Undecided | 35% |
| Investigating the feasibility of a new link road between A635 and Cawthorne Lane to the east of the village | Disagree | 18% | Agree | 47% | Undecided | 29% |
| INF3. Would you support restrictions on on-street parking in the adjacent area if necessary?* Look at provision of Car park at the corner of A635 and Silkstone
* Restrict parking on the west side of the village green road
* Lack of a village car park near the centre of the village hinders the attraction of the village for tourism
 | Yes | 71% | No | 23% |
| INF4. Should the NDP include policies requiring development to support other infrastructure investment eg. flooding, new communications technologies and water/sewerage etc?* All new developments should be required to provide an impact assessment for matters such as those listed above. This should form part of the decision as to whether to award planning permission. As such we support this forming part of the NDP.
* Identify potential future flood areas and look to developing a plan to limit any impact on housing (2)
* Better broadband
* If there are any new technologies that can help then they should be used
 | Yes | 71% | No | 6% |
| **Other Matters** |
| GEN1. Are there any other planning issues which you think the Cawthorne NDP should address?* On Tivydale Drive the boundary line runs along the road and should include the properties on the left/field side of the road (Conservation Area)
* The issue of infrastructure is now of critical importance in and around the village. Sadly it is no exaggeration to say that Cawthorne is becoming a dangerous location in which to drive or be a pedestrian. Traffic calming and parking issues have to be addressed before the village can move forward with any future development in housing or helping build further our excellent local businesses.
* Main concern is speeding through the village on Tivy Dale and Darton Road and all proposals in INF2 would go some way to alleviating this.
* More pressure should be put on BMBC to provide more parking at the park or make it free. We should not be seen to be taking on the role of providing more parking facilities
* Parking at junction of Tivydale Close
* The new development planned for the house on Taylor Hill
* Reduction of the speed limit to 40mph on A635 and install speed reading approach signs would greatly help
* Parking for visitors to the village and those who park in the village to avoid paying in Cannon Hall Park who can only park on the road. A car park should be provided in the village perhaps at the rear of the Methodist Chapel (allotment area) could be used which would be central to all the businesses
 |