

SITE COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
Local Green Space Site 5 – Cross Roads Park	<p>Totally agree with the inclusion of Cross Roads Park in the Neighbourhood Development Plan and its protection as a local Green Space and note that development of this area would only be permitted in very special circumstances. A few comments to add, please see below:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-In addition to the comments cited by Haworth, Cross Roads &amp; Stanbury Parish Council we would like to add that it is now one of the few remaining green spaces in the village.</li> <li>-Its loss would turn the village into a “dormitory” village, increase traffic on the already congested roads, add to air pollution etc, as people drive further afield to access a green space or recreational facility and greatly and adversely affect the quality of life for village residents.</li> <li>-Wildlife or green infrastructure value – is listed as “limited” which is probably the case at this moment in time, but there are long term plans to plant further trees, shrubs, bushes, set up natural trails, introduce bird nesting boxes, insect and butterfly houses, bird and squirrel cams, linked to the school, which will not only enhance variety and volume of wildlife and associated habitat, but also give opportunity for an educational facility to be developed for visitors and the local primary school alike.</li> <li>-At that stage it would meet all 5 of the qualifying criteria. It is the nearest green space to the Youth Hostel situated in the village of Lees, reported to be the most visited Youth Hostel in the country (a facility used by groups of children and adults from all over the world), and therefore an asset for the Parish to “showcase” the area to visitors and promote the Worth Valley as a whole. Railway enthusiasts staying in the area either locally at the Bronte Hotel or Youth Hostel or in Haworth and surrounds, could</li> </ul>	<p>NOTED – respondent provides information that endorses the proposed LGS designation and that could be used to strengthen the LGS assessment.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – expand LGS assessment using information provided.</b></p>

	<p>spend a free evening or afternoon in the park, observing trains passing in the distance whilst relaxing in the park or taking part in an activity there.</p> <p>-Many children use this green space after school, especially in the summer months. For small children aged 4, having to travel to a green space further afield could greatly reduce the time they spend outdoors and for most parents/carers would not be an appropriate, convenient or realistic alternative.</p> <p>-It is a green space which can be accessed of all abilities whatever their degree of mobility or health. As the project develops once enhanced seating provision is made, it affords a green space close to people's homes, where people can simply sit and admire the views, recharge their batteries, enhance their physical and emotional wellbeing, in what is becoming a built up area.</p> <p>-Recent years have seen many more houses being built in the area (Over 170 on the Longacre Estate) and with more and more to come, retention, protection and enhancement of green spaces becomes even more important and essential if the incoming people are to have any recreational provision or experience of a green space in their vicinity.</p> <p>-It is a local accessible facility and provision which can be used by people across the full financial spectrum as it costs nothing to go there, either for transport or for using the facility.</p> <p>-This space takes children "off the streets" and involves them in activities where they are exercising without realising it, contributing to reduction in obesity, involvement in healthy exercise and relaxation in the fresh air, and learning valuable social skills, away from computers and electronic devices.</p> <p>-It is one of the few spaces where the whole of the village could congregate "en masse" and its very existence engenders community spirit – all having "their" green</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>space in common, a true community link across the generations.</p> <p>-It is of historical value ... it needs to be remembered that the park (and therefore the green space in its current form and curtilage) came into existence because of the sacrifice of people from the village who gave their lives during the First World War. Relatives of those who died and some of the survivors themselves and their families contributed to the installation of the park and its features almost 100 years ago today. Land was donated and some land purchased specifically for this purpose. Respecting this and ensuring its continuation is therefore of high importance to local residents.</p> <p>-The green space existed before the park of course but was not accessible to villagers as it was farm land/fields.</p>		
Local Green Space Site 6 – Lees School Field	<p>-We support the proposal to designate the above as Local Green Space.</p> <p>-It should be noted that in addition to the community uses listed the school field is an essential extension to the main building.</p> <p>-It continues to be used for the ‘traditional’ sporting and recreational activities of the pupils but with the ever developing curriculum this space is highly utilised for outdoor learning.</p> <p>-The withdrawal of such a space would stifle the delivery of both core subjects and the wider curriculum.</p> <p>-A number of extra-curricular clubs use the field throughout the year.</p>	NOTED – respondent provides information that endorses the proposed LGS designation and that could be used to strengthen the LGS assessment.	<b>ACTION – expand LGS assessment using information provided.</b>
Local Green Space Site 7 – Murgatroyd Wood	<p>1) Area shown (<i>nb on map supplied</i>) is OUTSIDE Murgatroyd Wood, which I own. I believe it is Skipton Properties land. This also applies to the small area between the play area and Murgatroyd Wood which should be included in plan. Ie the designated area needs re-naming. 2) A further concern is the ownership of the boundary wall (and fence). My deeds show this wall is the responsibility of the landowner outside Murgatroyd</p>	<p>1) AGREE – Site 7 to be re-named ‘Land Adjacent to Longacres Park and extended to include land north-west of the park.</p> <p>2) NOTED – maintenance of Site 7 is something that needs addressing.</p> <p>3) NOTED – the actual Murgatroyd Wood seems to have value as an open</p>	<p><b>1) ACTION – re-name and extend area of Site 7 as indicated. Review LGS assessment in the light of the expansion to ensure accuracy.</b></p> <p><b>2) ACTION – include ‘community actions’ re the maintenance of the site in the Pre-Submission NP.</b></p> <p><b>3) ACTION – assess Murgatroyd Wood</b></p>

	<p>Wood. In future, who would have responsibility for any repairs to wall and especially wooden fence/concrete posts by the play area. Would this be Skipton Properties or the council? Please ensure dog walkers in this area can dispose of dog waste, bottles etc in litter bins rather than by using Murgatroyd Wood!!</p> <p>3/4) NB Information was also supplied re the heritage, wildlife, open space value of the actual Murgatroyd Wood site, together with supporting maps (NB provided at Cross Roads drop-in 8/3/18)</p>	<p>space which needs to be assessed.</p> <p>4) NOTED – Murgatroyd Wood may have industrial heritage value associated with local railway and mill developments which needs to be assessed.</p>	<p>as candidate LGS.</p> <p>4) ACTION – research Murgatroyd Wood with a view to the possibility of Local Heritage Area/Non-Designated Heritage Asset status within the NP.</p>
<p>Local Green Space Site 11 – Allotments off Main Street</p>	<p>We confirm that our clients, the Trustees of the Green Emmott Trust own the above area of land identified as site GS14 and support its continued use as allotments and the contribution it makes as a Key open space area within the Haworth Conservation Area.</p> <p>Having visited the site and attended your consultation event on 6.3.18 we have discussed the proposed allocation of this land as a Local Green Space with our clients. We note the site lies within the Haworth Conservation Area Appraisal. The 2003 and 2007 versions of the Conservation assessment and appraisal state the document will be reviewed every 5 years and the 2007 document states the next will be 2012, though that does not seem to have occurred.</p> <p>We note the site is shown as a ‘key open space’ area in the 2007 Haworth conservation area appraisal. The current consultation process for the Neighbourhood Plan now wishes to consolidate and elevate that designation to a ‘Local Green Space’ under sections 76 and 77 of the NPPF 2014. We note at para 78 of NPPF it states: ‘Local policy for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts.’</p> <p>1) Paras 87 and 88 of NPPF respectively state: ‘87. As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt</p>	<p>1) NOTED – policy preamble could usefully reference NPPF para 88 as quoted.</p> <p>2) NOTED – it is considered that the preparation of the NP in cooperation with CBMDC fully satisfies the Core Strategy need in terms of working with communities to identify LGS and that no explicit reference in the NP is required.</p> <p>3) NOTED – respondent broadly endorses the proposed LGS designation.</p>	<p>1) ACTION – add reference to NPPF para 88 in policy preamble.</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p> <p>3) NO ACTION</p>

	<p>and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. 88. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.’</p> <p>The proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) policy GE2 Local Green Space only refers to the ‘very special circumstances’ from para 87 but does not include any justification based on the elements shown in bold above from para 88 which would clarify how the policy should be applied.</p> <p>2) We also note adopted Bradford Core Strategy Policy EN1 refers to working with communities to identify Local Green Spaces. These elements need to be consolidated.</p> <p>3) With that in mind our clients as owners of this land would be broadly supportive of site GE14 allotments at Main Street, Haworth being considered as a Local Green Space.</p>		
<p>Community Facilities Sites 17 &amp; 18 - Cross Roads Park Male and Female Toilet Blocks</p>	<p>We believe that the loss of these valued facilities should be guarded against as such a loss would vastly reduce the community’s ability to meet its day to day needs. Provision of toilet facilities for a community is essential both for comfort and health needs and lack of such provision not conducive to promote extended use of the park and surrounds. Their loss would be of detriment and a retrograde step, as such a provision has been in existence for almost 100 years.</p> <p>We believe the two toilet blocks need protecting as community facilities because:-</p> <p>-The nearest other public toilets are either in Haworth or in Keighley. It is unrealistic to expect that people using the park (especially visitors) would be able to drive to either alternative in time to access facilities elsewhere.</p>	<p>NOTED – respondent provides information that endorses the proposed ‘Community Facility’ designation and that could be used in strengthening the facility’s citation.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – use the information provided to strengthen the facility’s citation.</b></p>

	<p>-For small children and people with medical/health needs, often the need to use a convenience is “immediate”. Alternatives sited at a distance of over a mile are therefore not realistic alternatives.</p> <p>-In the 21<sup>st</sup> Century we consider provision of toilet facilities a very basic need rather than a wish. Lack of such a provision in a well-used public area could lead to anti-social misuse of the park with bushes, shrubs, plants, grassed areas being the only alternative if people are desperate.</p> <p>-Unlike other villages in the Worth Valley there is but one eating establishment/shop which has toilet facilities and those are designated solely for the use of its’ patrons. People can access the toilet in that provision if they purchase a meal or refreshments, but it is a small establishment and could not cope with the large number of park users on a daily basis.</p> <p>-The only other alternative would be to walk to the Bronte Hotel on Lees Lane – not a viable alternative for families with young children or the elderly/infirm people with medical needs to use a toilet. Continued overleaf/....</p> <p>-In the course of all our surveys/questionnaires people have acknowledged these toilets as beneficial to the community/their own use, albeit with a caveat from some that they would use the facilities more often if they were improved i.e. with lighting, hand washing facilities etc. We are pleased to note that development would be acceptable in principle which would improve the facilities for the benefit of Haworth, Cross Roads or/and Stanbury communities and that the Parish Council would encourage and support this. Part of the park project includes reinstatement of electricity to the building, ensuring the two toilet blocks can be lit, and perhaps hand drying facilities installed. Any upgrade/update or enhancement would need to be both in keeping and sympathetic to the original design.</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>-If Green flag status were to be sought, having available toilet facilities is essential to the granting of such an award.</p> <p>-Encouragement of wider and longer use of the facilities in the park can only take place if people have access to toilet facilities without returning home. They are essential for local residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>-Unlike other villages nearby there is but one shop on the main road which has toilet facilities and that can only be used by patrons of the establishment.</p>		
Community Facilities Site 24 – The Old School Room	We agree with the Policy. We think the shape of The Old School Room on the map is incorrect and it also includes the adjoining cottage.	NOTED – the Google Map was used for illustrative purposes only and was not meant to accurately depict the shape of the facility. The location of the facility will be indicated by symbol only on the Pre-Submission Plan Map.	NO ACTION
Community Facilities Site 25 – Lees Primary School	We approve of the proposal to identify Lees Primary School as a building to protect under CF1. We strongly believe that a local school for the children of the village should be maintained and the above building provides appropriate facilities for such a purpose. Previous development/expansion has enhanced provision. The building also provides a venue for local Scout Groups and the Youth parish Council.	NOTED – respondent provides information that endorses the proposed ‘Community Facility’ designation and that could be used in strengthening the facility’s citation.	<b>ACTION – use the information provided to strengthen the facility’s citation.</b>
Community Facilities Site 32 - Three Sisters and Bronte View Care Home	Three Sisters and Bronte View Care Homes are registered care homes which provide specialist support to 17 individuals with a wide range of disabilities including autistic spectrum disorders and Asperger’s Syndrome. Three Sisters and Bronte View are a short walk from the local shops in Haworth and the people we support are encouraged to make full use of the resources available in the area and become part of the local community. The Discovery Centre is a therapeutic and learning day service for adults with learning disabilities, which is situated on the same site as Three Sisters and Bronte View Care Homes. The Discovery Centre provides a safe and	<p>1) NOTED – respondent provides information that endorses the proposed ‘Community Facility’ designation and that could be used in strengthening the facility’s citation.</p> <p>2) NOTED – The Discovery Centre is run from a separate building, and so warrants a separate entry in the list of community facilities.</p>	<p><b>1) ACTION – use the information provided to strengthen the facility’s citation.</b></p> <p><b>2) ACTION – add Discovery Centre to list of community facilities to be protected.</b></p>

	<p>friendly environment for the people we support to develop new skills in areas such as farming, animal care, horticulture, cooking and engineering.</p> <p>On behalf of Three Sisters and Bronte View Care Homes, we support and welcome the proposal in the Neighbourhood Plan to protect Three Sisters and Bronte View Care Homes as community facilities given the essential service we provide to adults with disabilities from the local area and beyond.</p>		
Community Facilities Site 59 – The Friendly, Stanbury	<p>I am replying regarding your Community Facility 59 The Friendly on the map in the above correspondence. I believe that this development plan is designed to restrict or prevent a business from closing down and applying for a change of use for the premises. I disagree with the policy. Reasons being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-More red tape to determine what people can or cannot do with their owned freehold property.</li> <li>-Sometimes decisions to alter the use or close down a business are many fold and not always for monetary reasons.</li> <li>-The business or property may have been for sale over a long period of time without a deal being completed.</li> <li>-Ill health, family or personal reasons.</li> </ul> <p>These are only a few reasons that come to mind immediately. I'm sure that a decision to close any business is not taken very lightly. I bought the pub in 2001 when it was closed. I was offered the chance then to obtain a change of use to private dwelling but chose to re-open the pub. My family and I have worked very hard over the years to resurrect the pub from the dead, support the local community in many ways, and we will continue to do so for as long as possible.</p>	<p>AGREE – the reasons for objection are valid. Further investigation also suggests that the pub now plays only a very limited role in the community life of the village due to its small size, limited facilities and limited scope for expansion on both fronts. It could be argued that the 2 other pubs serving the village offer the community more. Recommend deletion from list of community facilities.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – remove facility from list of community facilities to be protected.</b></p>
Community Facilities Site 66 – Cross Roads Park Old Bowls Pavilion	<p>Bowling club has 80+ active members. 8 teams at present competing in 4 different leagues. Membership open to all. Crown Green Bowls a sport for all ages 8-80+. Hold open evenings to encourage new members. Gentle exercise for</p>	<p>NOTED – respondent provides information that could be used in strengthening the facility's citation.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – use the information provided to strengthen the facility's citation.</b></p>



	<p>eye/arm co-ordination.</p> <p>This building is a useful community asset in that it is the only building available for storage provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The Friends of Cross Roads Park group has equipment for its events which needs to be stored somewhere easily accessible.</li> <li>-As the park project progresses, if folding chairs were obtained this building would prove invaluable, enabling larger events and enhanced events to take place within the park, facilitated by this storage provision.</li> <li>-In the future it is hoped to have gardening groups, and litter picks, and an appropriate place for tools and equipment to be stored will become essential.</li> </ul>	<p>NOTED – respondent provides information that could be used in strengthening the facility’s citation.</p>	<p>ACTION – use the information provided to strengthen the facility’s citation.</p>
<p>Community Facilities Site 67 - Cross Roads Park Memorial Building</p>	<p>Memorial Hall/Jubilee Rooms are used by both Cross Roads Bowling Club and Friends of Cross Roads Park. Bowling club has 80 members and visiting teams who partake in consuming refreshments. The ‘Friends’ hold 5/6 events during the year. Disabled toilet/access. Council provide maintenance. Bowling club day-to-day upkeep – clean and tidy.</p> <p>We believe the Memorial Building deserves protection and enhancement for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-It is the only building within the park where indoor events can be held.</li> <li>-Events which take place within the building allow promotion of the park as a whole, conversations to take place regarding the history of the building and the park itself, and contributes greatly to community engagement and cohesion.</li> <li>-It is the venue for the community Remembrance service which is well supported by the community and local people in particular.</li> <li>-It has been the venue for all the Friends of Cross Roads Park events to date and has proved invaluable at times</li> </ul>	<p>NOTED – respondent provides information that could be used in strengthening the facility’s citation.</p> <p>NOTED – respondent provides information that endorses the proposed ‘Community Facility’ designation and that could be used in strengthening the facility’s citation.</p>	<p>ACTION – use the information provided to strengthen the facility’s citation.</p> <p>ACTION – use the information provided to strengthen the facility’s citation.</p>

	when the weather has not been favourable.		
Non-Designated Heritage Assets Site 80 – Bocking Mill	Owner’s Representative – made contact re implication of designation for property. As doesn’t want anything to change. Happy with explanation.	NOTED	NO ACTION
Non-Designated Heritage Assets Site 84 – Cliffe House	Owners – informed that property was in fact 2 properties (No1 West & No 2 East), split in 1900s; that built in 1835; that original internal features such as staircase remain in at least one of the properties. <i>(NB summary of views expressed at Haworth drop-in 7/3/18)</i>	1) NOTED – sites list needs to be amended to reflect fact that there are 2 separate properties – Cliffe House West (No1) & Cliffe House East (No2). 2) NOTED - respondent provides information that could be used in strengthening the NDHA assessments.	1) ACTION – amend sites list as indicated. 2) ACTION – use the information provided to strengthen NDHA assessments, including further research re referenced staircase.
Non-Designated Heritage Assets Site 88 – Lees Village Institute	I own 3 East Lees Hall which was originally part of the village institute. Our property still has the original staircase in and I would like to think that there would be restrictions or guidance if somebody at a later date decided to strip it out. The external of the property should have some kind of restrictions if in any way it was to be changed cosmetically.	NOTED – respondent provides information that could be used in strengthening the NDHA assessment.	ACTION - use the information provided to strengthen NDHA assessment.
Non-Designated Heritage Assets Site 90 – Myrtle House Gatehouse	I believe Myrtle House Gatehouse (known as Myrtle Lodge) is an ideal candidate for the ‘Non Designated Heritage Asset’ and fully support the proposal to retain all the remaining features.	NOTED – respondent endorses the proposed NDHA designation. Contemporary name of property to be reflected in asset name, ie Myrtle Lodge (Myrtle House Gatehouse)	ACTION – amend asset name as indicated.
Non-Designated Heritage Assets Site 91 - Cross Roads Park Toilet Blocks	We note that sympathetic enhancement of these two toilet blocks will be supported and encouraged. Totally agree with the inclusion of these as assets in the Neighbourhood Development Plan:- -They are iconic, original and immediately visible whether in a vehicle or on foot on the approach to the Centre of the village in either direction. -The probable designer of the 2 blocks lived in the village. -They form a “gateway” at the entrance to the park -They add character to the street scene. -They are both architecturally and historically important in addition to an important facility for park users.	NOTED – respondent provides information that endorses the proposed NDHA designation and that could be used in strengthening the asset’s assessment.	ACTION – use the information provided to strengthen NDHA assessment.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-They are in keeping with the surrounding stone built terraces and shops.</li> <li>-They are unusual in style and add aesthetically to the identity of the village.</li> <li>-We believe the two blocks should be conserved as near as possible to their original design and preserved for generations to come.</li> </ul>		
Non-Designated Heritage Asset Site 93 - Lees First School	The Historic Board School is a key landmark linked to the heritage of the village. Previous development/expansion has been sympathetic to the original building and have enhanced provision.	NOTED - respondent endorses the proposed NDHA designation.	NO ACTION
Non-Designated Heritage Assets Site 98 - Cross Roads Park Memorial Building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-It is a source of community pride as a Memorial Building, and adds to the rich heritage of the area as well as being a focal point on entering the park and traversing through it.</li> <li>-It is one of the 2 remaining buildings in the park, all the others have been demolished. It is an integral, iconic feature and as the very first building to be built is worthy of being protected and enhanced for the local and wider community.</li> </ul> <p>This building/feature is important in our opinion because:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-It is one of the 2 remaining buildings in the park. The rest having been demolished.</li> <li>-It was the very first building to be built in the park nearly 100 years ago.</li> <li>-The two remaining buildings are important as they provide contrast and focus in the softer landscape of the grassed areas and draw the eye, as items of interest.</li> <li>-The designer of the building lived in the village. Our Friends group motto is "Development of the park, by the people, for the people" and protection of this building, designed by a local resident, fits with that ethos and is important to us.</li> <li>-It is the location chosen by men of the village who served in the First World War, and unlike some of their comrades returned, and wished to make the area they lived in a</li> </ul>	<p>NOTED – respondent provides information that endorses the proposed NDHA designation and that could be used in strengthening the asset’s assessment.</p> <p>NOTED – respondent provides information that endorses the proposed NDHA designation and that could be used in strengthening the asset’s assessment.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – use the information provided to strengthen NDHA assessment.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION – use the information provided to strengthen NDHA assessment.</b></p>

	<p>“better place”. It was designated a “Rest Room”, presumably so that those who served their country from the village and suffered horrendous injuries, could enjoy the park they had helped create, within their physical abilities.</p> <p>-It houses the tablets which are a tribute/memorial not only to people from the village who gave their lives so that we can enjoy the facilities today, but also the people who served.</p> <p>-It is unusual as a memorial in style and design, being an indoor memorial as opposed to an outside cenotaph or tablet.</p> <p>-It is used on Remembrance Sunday to lay the wreaths where the whole community comes together to remember .... It is also a useful educational facility to pass on both the history of the men who gave their lives/served and the history of the First World War itself to children from the local Primary School and the various uniformed organisations.</p> <p>-Many of the original features are preserved within the building.</p>		
<p>Non-Designated Heritage Assets Site 99 - Cross Roads Park Old Bowls Pavilion</p>	<p>The building, whilst not over ornate or elaborate, provides a focal point in the park, a wind-breaker, a contrast to the softer landscaping surrounding it and an original feature when the park was installed over 100 years ago.</p> <p>We are keen to preserve this building as a Heritage Asset because:-</p> <p>-It is one of the 2 remaining original buildings/features of the park.</p> <p>-The probable designer of it lived in the village.</p> <p>-Whilst not over-elaborate it is iconic and provides interest and contrast against the softer landscaping of the grassed areas.</p> <p>-It has aesthetic value providing a backdrop to the bowling</p>	<p>NOTED – respondent provides information that endorses the proposed NDHA designation and that could be used in strengthening the asset’s assessment.</p> <p>NOTED – respondent provides information that endorses the proposed NDHA designation and that could be used in strengthening the asset’s assessment.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – use the information provided to strengthen NDHA assessment.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION – use the information provided to strengthen NDHA assessment.</b></p>

	<p>green and pathways.</p> <p>-It is in keeping with its surrounds as it was built when the park was developed almost a 100 years ago.</p>		
<p>Non-Designated Heritage Assets Site 104 – Spring House</p>	<p>Owner – made contact to inform that property should be called Spring Mount; that it is Edwardian not Victorian; and that many internal original features remain.</p>	<p>NOTED – respondent seems to endorse the proposed NDHA designation and provides information that could be used in strengthening the asset’s assessment. Correct name of property – Spring Mount - to be substituted for Spring House.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – amend asset name as indicated and use the information provided to strengthen NDHA assessment.</b></p>
<p>Non-Designated Heritage Assets Site 106 – The Toll House</p>	<p>As the owner of the above property we strongly object to the proposal to include our building in a consultation for a non-designated heritage asset, especially based on what we feel is a misrepresentation of the properties historical and architectural significance.</p> <p>There is very little (or no) evidence of any architectural significance or of historical interest and we have been unable to find anything documented that the house was actually a Tollhouse. Indeed, architecturally it bears no similarity to other actual Tollhouses in the West Yorkshire area. The engraved house plaque was installed by the previous owners, sometime around the time of the extensive changes that were made to the property in the 1980s.</p> <p>The property is a basic sandstone dwelling with no features distinguishing it from any other property on the same road. Most of the cornice and supports are not original and are in bad condition, needing replacement and repairs. The house has a modern extension to the rear and non-original outbuilding lean-to to the side with a raised and developed small garden area to the rear. The door at the front is not original and any fascia features of the original door opening have been removed many decades ago. What was the original front door is bricked up and the current ‘door’ is actually only painted wooden boarding and the original stone step has been cut back,</p>	<p>DISAGREE – while it is acknowledged that the property has been subject to alterations and extensions, it nonetheless still retains some original features and is recognisably a tollhouse. Further research indicates that the property is listed at turnpike.org.uk as Tollhouse No36, Halifax Road, Cross Roads, on the A629 just north of the junction of the A6033, Grid Ref 04627/37757. Ian Shackleton in his online history of Cross Roads notes it as ‘The Bar House’, built 1805 following the construction of the Ingrow to Denholme road in 1794, and in operation till 1870. As such it is of verifiable historical value meriting its inclusion on the proposed list of Non-Designated Heritage Assets</p>	<p><b>ACTION – strengthen NDHA assessment by addition of the extra information uncovered through research and undertake further research.</b></p>

	<p>damaged severely by weathering and traffic collisions and painted regularly with modern masonry paint (in an attempt to avoid further damage from passing traffic). We would not have purchased the property if it was designated or listed under any heritage interests, something that would put off any persons looking to purchase such a small and already compromised property. We will continue to object to its inclusion based on our above representation and the effect this would have on our ability to sell our property which we hope to do in the future.</p>		
<p>Non-Designated Heritage Assets Site 108 – Halifax Road Vicarage</p>	<p>Owner (Crosby) - Thank you for your recent letter, advising me that, my house has been identified as a Heritage Asset, which you are considering putting forward to Historic England. I note that, your letter did include a plan, but this referred to the original vicarage on Halifax Road, which I understand, was built as a vicarage.</p> <p>I am surprised that my house has been identified. It is my opinion that, it is of no interest or significance, in heritage terms. The property is not at risk, nor is it a unique design (there are many similar house in design terms from that era, in the area). The house does not form part of a grouping of buildings of any interest and the house has no historical connection with any famous people of the area, during its history.</p> <p>For your information, I have owned the property since 2007 and in that time have invested significantly in refurbishing it. I bought the property from Bradford Diocese and at the time, the house had been unoccupied for a while and had fallen into significant disrepair. The Diocese had acquired the property in 1965 and as I understand it, the vicar only lived here for a short time, although the property was used as a church group facility before being sold.</p> <p>The house was built in 1875 by a local butcher, as a private house and not a vicarage. It was originally known as</p>	<p>1) NOTED – there is no intention to put forward this or any other proposed /actual ‘Non-Designated Heritage Asset’ forward to historic England.</p> <p>2) NOTED – there is confusion re which property is being consulted on/ commented on – it appears that owner does not live at Halifax Road Vicarage (Site 108) but rather at ‘The Vicarage, Haworth Road’ not on the consultation list. This needs to be ‘squared’ with comments received re this same property from another ‘owner’! (see ‘Other – Haworth Road Vicarage’ below).</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION</p> <p>2) ACTION – amend asset name to ‘The Vicarage, Haworth Road (‘Woodbine Cottage’).</p>

	<p>Woodbine Cottage. Apart from being in the ownership of the Diocese, the house was used for only a relatively short period of its history as the vicar's residence.</p> <p>I note within the descriptions of the property, attached to your letter, that the property is described as having a dentil feature. The feature on the front and rear of the house, is in fact a simple corbel detail for gutter support. A dentil row is a more detailed architectural feature, found more commonly on more prestigious houses than this.</p> <p>I should be pleased to be updated, in the event that, the Parish Council, do consider putting this property forward to Historic England.</p>		
Non-Designated Heritage Assets Site 112 – Cold Knoll Farm	<p>Owner (Johnson) – feels proposed designation devalues his property. Stated that assessment is incorrect re 'impressive stone chimney stack' which was only built 10 years ago. <i>(NB summary of views expressed at Stanbury drop-in 6/3/18)</i></p>	<p>NOTED – the proposed designation is based on an incorrect assessment of age and architectural value which is not backed up by any documented evidence and which the owner refutes.</p> <p>Recommend removal from NDHA list.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – remove property from NDHA list.</b></p>
Other – Haworth Road Vicarage, Cross Roads	<p>Owner (Bateman) – made contact wanting clarification but was happy with policy once it had been explained.</p>	<p>NOTED – 'Haworth Road Vicarage' is not a consultation site – which site is respondent referring to?</p>	<p><b>ACTION – amend asset name to 'Former St James Vicarage'.</b></p>
Other – Murgatroyd Wood area	<p>Area features water courses and goyts at and leading to Vale Mill, including through Murgatroyd Wood. Also the Oakworth 'deviation' (railway line) in its entirety and Midlands Rail fencing along footpath through Murgatroyd Wood.</p>	<p>NOTED – Murgatroyd Wood may have industrial heritage value associated with local railway and mill developments which needs to be assessed.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – research Murgatroyd Wood with a view to the possibility of Local Heritage Area/Non-Designated Heritage Asset status within the NP.</b></p>
Other – Vale Farm	<p>Possible heritage interest.</p>	<p>NOTED – not assessed to date.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – assess property as candidate NDHA.</b></p>
Other – Butt Lane eastern end	<p>Cobbles leading up to railway of possible heritage interest.</p>	<p>NOTED – included within Haworth Conservation Area and specifically identified as an area of stone setts/flags providing a positive contribution to character.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
Other – Long Bridge	<p>Possible heritage interest.</p>	<p>NOTED – bridge is Grade II listed.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
Other – Limer's Gate, Oldfield Lane	<p>Packhorse 'hollow way' and old turnpikes – of possible heritage interest.</p>	<p>NOTED – not assessed to date. Much of Oldfield Lane lies outside the</p>	<p><b>ACTION – identify locations and if within NA assess as candidate NDHA.</b></p>

		Neighbourhood Area. Exact location of Limer's Gate needed.	
Other – the reservoir railways	Possible heritage interest.	NOTED – not assessed to date. Exact locations needed.	ACTION – identify locations and if within NA assess as candidate NDHA.