

WALTON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN: PRE SUBMISSION CONSULTATION (REGULATION 14) FEEDBACK ASSESSMENT

Respondent	No.	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Amendments to the NDP
Leeds Local Access Forum	1	The Plan, well presented and easy to read, acknowledges that Walton is the only parish within Leeds to have no definitive public rights of way (PROW). Nevertheless the Plan recognises the important role that walking and cycling play in improved health. Furthermore, the development of cycleways and footpaths increases connectivity. This is reflected in Policy T2, which the Forum welcomes and supports.	Noted	None
	2	One of the Key Community Actions is to develop an improved network of paths and tracks around the village, and to develop opportunities for path connections to all neighbouring villages. In this regard it would be helpful if the Plan included an extract from the Definitive Map which would show the PROW network in the adjacent LCC area, and, in particular, show two Thorp Arch footpaths meeting the boundary of the area covered by the Plan - Thorp Arch Footpath 1 in the north west and Thorp Arch Footpath 6 in the south.	Sensible addition to add proposed paths.	Agreed. Develop and include at p29/30 (RP).
	3	It would also be helpful to include on this map the aspirational routes shown on page 28, together with the route north to Bickerton. Officers in Public Rights of Way will be pleased to supply the extract from the Definitive Map.	Could be a key community action and/ or shown on the map.	Consider options and propose changes to Steering Group (RP).
	4	A final small suggestion is to replace 'footpath' by 'footway' in paragraph (e) on page 33.	Noted	Agree to change – p33 (BC).
Leeds City Council	5	The Parish Council may wish to explore the inclusion of a policy criterion that directs those wanting to pursue self-build on the smaller sites in the village.	Agreed	Amend policy H1 and section 4.4.1 (BC).
	6	As the Plan is allocating sites it could be more specific about potential CIL receipts from the proposed allocations/developments and tie these to the proposed	Agreed	Insert paragraph after H5 on p36 (RP)

Respondent	No.	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Amendments to the NDP
		community actions that come in each section of the Plan – Holbeck’s Delivery Plan is a good example of this.		
	7	Para 1.2 (page 6) and Map 1 (page 7) – Further explanation as to why the neighbourhood planning area differs to the Parish area would be useful.	Agreed	Add 3 paragraphs from TANDP on p6 after para 3 (BC).
	8	6 th line, 4 th Paragraph, (page 8) – should be “LCC Neighbourhood Planning Manager.”	Noted	Amend as stated (BC).
	9	Para 2.1 – 2.2 (pages 11-12) The history section could benefit from a description of how Walton village has developed incrementally, with the oldest parts of the village developing in a piecemeal way, resulting in a degree of variation between buildings. Would the community want to then reflect this historic development going forward?	Agreed	Incorporate additions to P11 after penultimate paragraph (BC).
	10	The first paragraph of each theme e.g. para 4.1.1 (page 16), para 4.2.1 (page 24) could be clearer. The opening part of each section should demonstrate how the following policies deliver the plan’s vision.	Agreed	Incorporate new words into the pre- amble for each theme. Pages 16, 24, 27, 30, 37 (BC).
	11	Core Strategy Policy G1 ENHANCING AND EXTENDING GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE partly covers Walton parish. This should be mentioned in terms of the need to retain, enhance or extend Green Infrastructure.	Agreed	Add statement to evidence on p18 after first para (BC).
	12	Any development on the edge of the village needs to consider Unitary Development Plan Policy N24 requirements (buffer to Green belt/open space).	Agreed	Amend Policy H1 (AM).
	13	There is an opportunity for the plan to make a more explicit reference to trees as they do influence character as well as contributing to carbon storage and air quality etc.	Agreed	Amend evidence in HG theme p16 after final para (TW). ⁱ

Respondent	No.	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Amendments to the NDP
	14	Appendix 1 contains a comprehensive Character Assessment for Walton. The supporting text to Policies could make better use of this Character Assessment to provide further clarity.	Agreed	Amend policy H1 (AM).
	15	<u>Policy HG1: Local Green Spaces</u> LGS1 Churchyard is proposed for green space designation in the Submission Draft Site Allocations Plan (G1465). LGS2 and LGS3 are not proposed for designation as such. The Plan should include clear evidence for the designation of these three areas against the criteria contained in the NPPF which could be clearer. Could the supporting evidence on page 17 make more of an explicit reference to the assessment process and include the reference to Appendix 2?	Agreed	Delete “(see Appendix 2)” from para 1 p17 and add new sentence (DG). ⁱⁱ Add NPPF criteria as a footnote in Appendix 2 (DG). ⁱⁱⁱ Consider including at Appendix 2 the full assessment of each candidate site rather than just the 3 that fully met the criteria and were subsequently selected (as currently shown). (BC).
	16	<u>Policy HG2: New Green Spaces</u> 1.12. a) Provision of green space through new housing development is embedded in Core Strategy Policies G4 and G5. The policy appears to be replicating higher order policy which is not recommended as most examiners delete such references. Could the first criterion be more explicit in the expected typologies that new housing development should deliver, i.e. to mitigate identified deficiencies.	Agreed	Alter policy HG2 on p21 at a) (BC).
	17	<u>Policy HG3: Local non-designated heritage assets</u> Similar to 5.1 above, could the supporting evidence for Policy HG3 on page 21 be more explicit about the assessment process with a clear reference to Appendix 3?	Agreed	Amend p21 after 2 nd para (BC).
	18	<u>Policy HG4: Local design</u> 1.13. It is suggested that the design policy (in the heritage and green spaces section) should be at	a. Leave	No change.

Respondent	No.	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Amendments to the NDP
		<p>least referred to in the Housing Section or may be relocated there.</p> <p>An illustration of the medieval tofts and crofts would be beneficial. It may also be useful to clarify whether this refers to new development outside the village core, or just within areas already of a toft and croft form. This could help to avoid generic suburban forms based around cul-de-sacs and encourage generous garden sizes. It is worth bearing in mind that whilst protecting the historic toft and croft layout is favoured, the proposed housing allocation at Policy H3 would not be policy compliant in this respect.</p> <p>The plan may benefit from some images of architectural details on vernacular buildings that could be referenced by new development.</p> <p>2nd bullet point under “....development proposals should:” - It would be beneficial to define and clarify “....the best of current design...” to ensure decision makers understand terms and phrases used.</p>	<p>b. Agreed</p> <p>c. Agreed</p> <p>d. Agreed</p>	<p>Photos to be provided to incorporate on p18. (MW)</p> <p>Provide photos to illustrate p23 (MW).</p> <p>See pt75 later for changes.</p>
	19	<p><u>Policy HG5: Key views</u></p> <p>1.17. Map 4 (page 20) - The images of key views from outside the village are clear to understand, however the views from within the village are slightly less legible.</p>	Not considered problematic	No change
	20	<p><u>Policy HG6: Former Thorp Arch Royal Ordnance Filling Factory</u></p> <p>1.18. This policy is a welcome approach.</p>	Noted	No change
	21	<u>Key Community Actions (page 23)</u>	Agreed	Add to p15 at end of para 2: “The delivery of these actions will also support the Policies in the Plan.” (BC).

Respondent	No.	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Amendments to the NDP
		<p>1.19. The 'Key community actions' inset is a little vague. The Parish Council may want to elaborate and clarify its intention; under 4.0 - perhaps the Parish Council could add "the delivery of Key Community Actions will also support the Policies in the Neighbourhood Plan."?</p>		
	22	<p><u>Policy CF1: Protecting and improving existing community facilities</u></p> <p>Para 4.2.4 the plan states "The following community facilities will be registered as Assets of Community Value with Leeds City Council" and lists the following assets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Peter's Church. • The Village Hall. • The Fox and Hounds Public House. • The Post Box. <p>The parish council can nominate assets of community value but the Council determines whether or not the asset meets the criteria set out in the Localism Act. The plan should make this clear. The legislation only applies to land and buildings so the post box would not be eligible for nomination or subsequent registration.</p>	Agreed	<p>Remove Post Box bullet p27 (BC)</p> <p>Add new bullet "2 Bus Stop shelters" (BC)</p> <p>Remove post box bullet on p25 (BC)</p> <p>Remove final para on p25 (BC)</p>
	23	<p><u>Policy CF2: New and improved community facilities</u></p> <p>This policy could be simplified to something like "Proposals to improve or provide new community recreational facilities with be supported."</p>	Suggest we leave this alone	No change
	24	<p><u>Policy T1: Traffic management</u></p>	Agreed	Amend p29 policy T1. New 2nd para. (BC) ^{iv}

Respondent	No.	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Amendments to the NDP
		The plan could be clearer and advise on the type of traffic calming measures – some features may be inappropriate for such a small village.		
	25	Housing The introductory section to the housing policies could say more about the strategic vision for the village which is about what the Plan is seeking to deliver as a whole – tying the sites together as well as other policies in the Plan.	Agreed	Amend 4.4.1 on p30 – new first para (BC).
	26	Para 4.4.3 – It would be useful to include further evidence to support the figure of 20 new dwellings in the Plan. The parish council may wish to consider what would be the implications on the other two sites if the larger site ends up being allocated and comes forward for 15 homes rather than 14.	Agreed	Provide new words (BC); and supplement further from HMA (AM). Insert changes p30 after final para.
	27	Para 4.4.4 – It is suggested that further information is included on how the original 7 sites were identified. It would be useful to put at least a summary of the analysis and information in the “Site Assessments and Rationale” supporting document into the plan so there is a clear, easily found rationale for their inclusion. This could be as an appendix.	Agreed	Input from site assessment document before final para p30. ^v Input further explanation as a new final para p30 ^{vi} Addition to para 2 of 4.4.4 on p31. ^{vii}
	28	The site specific policies could go further in setting requirements as well as design guides e.g. the Springs Lane Site policy (Policy H2) could include highways mitigation measures required, i.e. a S106 Agreement to provide a path (not the circulatory public footpath) but along Springs Lane to the centre of the village as currently there isn’t one. It is recommended that this is discussed and agreed with the Council after the pre-submission consultation.	Agreed	Review H2,3,4 and propose appropriate changes (AM).
	29	Policy H1: Sites for new homes The Core Strategy does make provision for limited housing development in rural areas as set out in paragraph 4.1.15 which talks of “limited development opportunities” in other	Agreed	Draft statement (AM)

Respondent	No.	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Amendments to the NDP
		rural locations and through Policy SP7. This policy sets a framework for the distribution of new housing allocations which favours the settlement hierarchy, but still sees 1% or 700 dwellings being located in the other rural areas. The Site Allocations Plan is currently proposing 617 dwellings. Policy H2 of the Core Strategy addresses development of windfall sites which ties the scale of development to infrastructure availability.		
	30	<u>Policy H2: Land west of Springs Lane / Walton Cricket Pitch</u> The Parish Council may wish to emphasise that red pantiles are just one roof material used in the village and that stone tiles are also common.	Agreed	Draft new statement for altering H2 (AM)
	31	<u>Policy H3: Land south of Main Street (Coal Yard)</u> This site could provide opportunities for downsizing as it is in the centre of the village with good accessibility which could be highlighted in the Policy.	Agreed	Draft new statement for altering H3 (AM).
	32	<u>Policy H4: Land north of Hall Park Road</u> The site is currently Rural Land but it is considered that a case can be made for infill development as there is already housing located either side of this site.	Agreed	Draft new statement for altering H4 (AM).
	33	<u>Policy H5: Residential car parking</u> 1.30. Clarification of “adequate off street parking” would be useful. The Leeds Parking Supplementary Planning Document provides guidance on parking provision. Clifford Neighbourhood Plan includes a Policy on parking – the Parish Council may wish to consider this.	Agreed	Amend H5 on p36 with new 2 nd para. (DG) ^{viii}
	34	<i>Business and Employment</i>	Agreed	Provide additional evidence after 1 st para on p38 (RP).

Respondent	No.	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Amendments to the NDP
		The evidence for the business and employment section could be improved. Further evidence justifying the support improved ICT capabilities and SME development on the TAE would be beneficial.		
	35	<p><u>Policy BE1: Information and communications technology</u></p> <p>1.31. “The Building Regulations 2010: Physical infrastructure for high-speed electronic communications networks, Draft Approved Document R1 In-building physical infrastructure” covers the provision of infrastructure and communications technology.</p>	Noted	Investigate if there is need for a change to this policy (AM).
	36	<p><u>Policy BE2: Supporting employment and enterprise</u></p> <p>1.32. a) – it would be useful to define “the character and vitality of the local area.”</p>	Agreed	Add after first sentence of a) in BE2 on p38 (BC)
	37	<p><u>Policy BE3: Thorp Arch Estate</u></p> <p>1.33. The Submission Draft Thorp Arch Neighbourhood Plan contains a policy on the Thorp Arch Estate (Policy LE1) http://www.leeds.gov.uk/docs/Thorp%20Arch%20ONP%20Submission%20Draft%20March%202017.pdf which the examiner, Rosemary Kidd, has recommended for deletion with the insertion of a community aspiration along the lines of “<i>The Parish Council will support the retention / allocation of the Thorp Arch Estate for mixed use employment.</i>” Whilst it is acknowledged that the Walton policy is less explicit, it is recommended that the Parish Council considers the Thorp Arch examiner’s report</p>	Noted	No change.

Respondent	No.	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Amendments to the NDP
		http://www.leeds.gov.uk/docs/Thorp%20Arch%20Examiners%20Report.PDF .		
	38	<p><u>Children's Services</u></p> <p>The Plan doesn't mention education or school places, particularly in relation to development of new homes. The Parish Council may like to include reference to the fact that the size of the proposed developments would generate relatively small numbers of additional children, the majority of whom would be likely to access school places within the Boston Spa or Wetherby area.</p>	Agreed	Develop additional words to add on p31 as a new para after the final bullet (BC).
Community feedback from Survey (substantive comments only)	39	Note: any new housing insist on parking for 2 cars otherwise you will have cars parked on the road (General)	Noted – full response on website.	No change
	40	I hope there will be some affordable houses and bungalows (General)	Noted – full response on website.	No change
	41	It must be remembered that most residents live in Walton because it is a rural village and wish it to remain a rural village. (General)	Noted – full response on website.	No change
	42	Green spaces – who will be responsible for maintenance? (Green space)	Question noted – not a NDP issue – full response on website.	No change
	43	How will local people gain access to LGS3? (Green space)	Question noted – no access proposed – full response on website.	No change
	45	Can the cricket pitch be part of this (LGS policy) including the pond near Springs Lane? (Green space)	Question noted – no – full response on website.	No change
	46	Benches near cycle track? (Green space)	Request noted – PC project – full response on website.	No change
	47	Any possibility of a green space at Smiddy Hill end of the village? (Green space)	Request noted – PC project – full response on website.	No change
	48	Views from Springs Lane to cricket field? (Key views)	Covered by Plan – full response on website.	No change
	49	Not quite sure what a 'design code' is? (ROFF design code)	Point noted - agreed to clarify.	Provide clarification as a footnote to 2 nd para of HG6 on p23:

Respondent	No.	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Amendments to the NDP
				“A design code is a set of illustrated design rules and requirements which instruct and may advise on the physical development of a site or area. The graphic and written components of the code are detailed and precise, and build upon a design vision such a masterplan or a design and development framework for a site or area.” (from CLG, ‘Preparing design codes: a practice manual’, RIBA Publishing, 2006)”
	50	Anything left Champagne Whin site on Springs Lane former munitions site to be retained? (ROFF design code)	Question noted -- full response on website.	No change
	51	Can the cricket club be included (Community Facilities)	Question noted – no – full response on website.	No change
	52	Provision of a community shop at the pub? (Community facilities)	Question noted – PC project – full response on website.	No change
	53	Entrance to cycle lane should be further up School Lane (Traffic management)	Noted – advice from LCC followed – full response on website.	No change
	54	Hall Park Road also used as a shortcut (traffic management)	Noted – full response on website.	No change
	55	20 mph zone through the village (Traffic management)	Noted – full response on website.	No change
	56	Increasing volume of traffic and HGVs using Main Street as a shortcut from B1224 to TAE. (Traffic management)	Noted – full response on website.	No change
	57	Improve parking at village hall (traffic management)	VH committee project – full response on website.	No change
	58	Reinstate path to Bickerton? (PROW)	Noted in Plan – full response on website.	No change
	59	Ensure new housing have suitable provision for sewerage/drains (New homes)	Noted – full response on website.	No change
	60	Spring Lane site – not suitable for single dwelling/starter/OAP homes. (Spring Lane/CC)	Noted – full response on website.	No change
	61	Implications of this site are huge re. subsequent infilling (Spring Lane/CC)	Noted – full response on website.	No change

Respondent	No.	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Amendments to the NDP
	62	Note the CC is now Walton Park Cricket Club (Spring Lane/CC)	Factual error - noted	Amend p25 5 th bullet
	63	Land north of Old Orchard/Meadowcroft would be a better site maybe taking development round the Village Hall? (Spring Lane/CC).	Assessed with all others and not proposed to take forward – full response on website.	No change
	64	Would this lead to building to the left (Coal Yard)	Question noted – no it should not.	No change
	65	If mobile mast needed please consider the Church tower (ICT)	Noted – thanks – full response on website.	No change
	66	Improved traffic management and HGV restrictions (TAE)	Noted – full response on website.	No change
Pegasus on behalf of Rockspring Hanover Property Unit Trust	67	Rockspring contend that there has been little meaningful consultation with businesses on TAE and there is no reference to any consultation with the British Library, which is understood to be the largest employer within Outer North East (One) area, nor with any business based on Rudgate.	Disagreed. Meetings held + surveys. Meetings and presentation with/to estate managers. BL consulted.	No change
	68	Policy HG3: Local non-designated Heritage Assets. (Accordingly), the proposed identification of non-designated heritage assets as part of the WNDP fails to accord with national guidance and is not in conformity with strategic policies of the development plan for the reasons set out above.	Disagreed. Advice taken from HE.	No change
	69	Policy HG6: Former Thorp Arch Royal Ordnance Filling Factory. This policy seeks to ensure a design code and design parameters are developed in order to secure the heritage significance of the TAE site. The plan states that the TAE is of national significance but this is not considered to be accurate. Rockspring have undertaken extensive archiving of the estate through West Yorkshire Archaeological Services (WYAS). This report of 2004 concludes that the TAE is not unique and records the poor craftsmanship and construction of the buildings. This report also identifies that the former ROFF was one of 44 Royal Ordnance Factories, was built on a standardised plan,	Not accepted.	No change. Full response in Evidence Base.

Respondent	No.	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Amendments to the NDP
		<p>that large sections have been redeveloped, it is therefore the layout of the estate that is of value and not the buildings themselves.</p> <p>It should be noted that the estate already has a Conservation Management Plan (see attached at Appendix E) and is considered an appropriate form to consider development proposals as they may arrive on TAE.</p> <p>As noted previously, TAE is a strategic site and it is contended that polices that would affect its redevelopment should be contained in the Local Plan and not in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
	70	<p>Policy BE3 Thorp Arch Estate. This policy seeks to support the growth of smaller medium sized enterprises on TAE and seeks to place restrictions on the development proposals on the estate. Enclosed at Appendix F is the independent examiner's report into the Thorp Arch Neighbourhood Plan where she recommended the deletion of a policy relating to Thorp Arch Estate at recommendation 10. At paragraph 3.116 the examiner identifies that TAE is an important employment site crossing the boundary of two parishes. In the following paragraph, it is identified that the requirements of development at TAE in the proposed policy LE1 are already covered by Local Plan policies and are therefore superfluous. Indeed, the examiner reports at paragraph 3.119 that:</p> <p><i>“in order to ensure that there is a consistent policy approach to the whole employment area which crosses parish boundaries, it would be appropriate for the policy covering future development proposals to be set out in the Local Plan”.</i></p>	Not accepted	No change. Full response in Evidence Base.

Respondent	No.	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Amendments to the NDP
		As a result of the above, it would be entirely appropriate for the WNDP to adopt a similar approach and leave policies for TAE to the Local Plan as recommended by the TANP examiner.		
	71	<p>CONCLUSIONS The WNDP fails to comply with a number of basic conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Basic condition 8(2)(a): the WNDP does not have appropriate regard to national policies and guidance. It does not support the strategic development needs of the Local Plan nor does it support the strategic objectives of the emerging Leeds Inclusive Growth Strategy and it fails to plan positively in seeking to include policies that are strategic and should be left to the Local Plan. Some policies, notably HG3 and HG6 are not supported by any robust evidence. 2) Basic condition 8(2)(d): the WNDP does not conform with strategic policies of the development plan and cannot do so until the SAP process has been completed. 3) Basic condition 8(2)(e): as a result of the above, the WNDP fails to promote sustainable 	Not accepted.	No change. Full response in Evidence Base.

Respondent	No.	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Amendments to the NDP
		<p style="text-align: center;">development.</p> <p>The conclusions and proposed modifications of the Thorp Arch Neighbourhood Plan examiner are clear in that this important strategic site should have consistent policies that should be set out in the Local Plan, and not having disparate and potentially conflicting policies in two separate Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>As a consequence of the above, it is necessary for the WNDP to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Delete policy HG3, particularly as relates to ammunition magazines, World War II pillbox, opening to a glass screen and Rudgate. 2) Delete policy HG6 relating to TAE and the requirement for a design code. 3) Delete policy BE3 Thorp Arch Estate. 		
Historic England	72	<p>Specific Comments</p> <p>Designated Heritage Assets</p> <p>Although each of the 4 “listed structures” in the Walton Conservation Area: “Conservation Area and the built environment”, they are not individually listed on the conservation area schedule. The 2 other designated heritage assets in the Neighbourhood Plan appear to be acknowledged within the document. These sites should be included in the Schedule of Designated Heritage Assets, and marked clearly on a map. The sites are listed below.</p>	Noted	No change.

Respondent	No.	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Amendments to the NDP
	73	<p>Policy HG3: Local non-designated heritage asset</p> <p>In order to be able to justify the identification of “local non-des suggest that the text sets out the criteria which have been used Specifically we would advise you to make reference Historic En Heritage Listing”.</p>	Agreed	<p>Add footnote in HG3 p22 after first sentence. (DG)^{ix}</p> <p>Add table as footnote to Appendix 3.(DG)^x</p> <p>Amend title of Appendix 3 and all other references in the appendix to read “assets” not “features”.</p>
	74	<p>We also suggest that the significance of each “local non-designat illustrated by a captioned image, and explained briefly within the and in detail in an appendix.</p>	Noted – covered in appendix3	No change.
	75	<p>Policy HG4: Local design</p> <p>We suggest that in the sub-section entitled “In addition, develop second bullet point should be expanded as follows:</p> <p>Reflect, respect and be inspired by the best of <i>the vernacul particular that represented by design in the Conservation A plot ratios, site disposition, density and layout of any new de extensions) is consistent with that found within the Parish.</i></p>	Agreed	Alter bullet 2 of HG4 on p23 as proposed.
	76	<p>Policy HG6: Former Thorp Arch Royal Ordnance Filling Facto</p> <p>We welcome the Neighbourhood Plan’s recognition of the signifi ROFF. We would stress that the site has elements which have diff the area known as Group 8 is considered to be the most significa example. In order to manage future development of the ROFF sit of the site is needed, which can then inform a Management Plan</p> <p>We would therefore suggest that paragraph 2 is ame</p>	Agreed	Amend para 2 in HG6 on p23 as proposed.

Respondent	No.	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Amendments to the NDP
		<p>In order to recognise this national significance, the existing statement used to develop a Statement of Significance, which can be used as part of a Masterplan and Management Plan for the site, including a set of parameters, positively promoting appropriate development, is produced in partnership between Leeds City Council, Walton and Woodhouse owners of the Estate and Historic England in order to provide a framework for bringing forward the detailed aspects of any future development recognising the heritage significance of the site.</p>		
	77	<p>Over and above the proposals set out in this section, we would suggest that the Thorp Arch ROFF should be specifically identified as a "Local Heritage Area", and the Thorp Arch ROFF (including the area of the ROFF which lies within the Neighbourhood Plan area) be designated by Leeds City Council as a Conservation Area. A Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan which supports the Masterplan and Management Plan mentioned above. You may wish to consider the criteria for identifying the ROFF as a Conservation Area, set out in Note 1 "Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management Plan".</p> <p>We suggest that specific policies are developed to assist in the appropriate management of the Thorp Arch ROFF. Initially we would suggest that any new development should respect the overall layout, form, scale, orientation and landforms within the Thorp Arch ROFF.</p> <p>Any new development should reflect, respect and be inspired by the character of the Thorp Arch ROFF, by ensuring the scale, plot ratios, site layout and the layout of any new development is consistent with the layout found within the ROFF.</p>	Agreed to proposed amendment at para 3.	<p>Add 3rd para opposite as a new para 3 in policy HG6.</p> <p>So, para 2 of the policy should read:</p> <p>"In order to recognise this national significance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A design code...significance of the site. b) Para 3 opposite"

Respondent	No.	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Amendments to the NDP
	78	<p>Policy BE 3 Thorp Arch Estate</p> <p>In the context of the comments made in relation to policy HG 5, policy is amended as follows:</p> <p>The estate is not intensively developed and maintains its importance consistent with its significance, as identified in the "Statement of Conservation Area Appraisal".</p> <p>No change proposed.</p> <p>All future development within the boundaries of the former estate will be undertaken within the context and parameters of an agreed <i>Masterplan and design code</i> for the Estate.</p>	Noted	No change at this stage.
	79	<p>Section 4.6, Policies Map 7 (page 39)</p> <p>This map includes the location of Local non-designated heritage assets. The colour used to highlight Housing sites is very close to the colour used to highlight Local non-designated heritage assets. We would suggest using a different colour to avoid confusion.</p> <p>We also note that the map does not indicate the location of the assets identified in policy HG3.</p>	Noted	Amend policy map to highlight location of "Opening to a blast screen".

ⁱ "Trees have an important role to play in enhancing the environment, helping to improve air quality and maintaining the existing character of Walton parish. They should be managed responsibly with over mature trees being replaced by native species whenever possible."

ii “...from the future designation. In order to secure the future of these sites, an assessment of all green spaces was undertaken against the 3 criteria set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The 3 spaces which met these criteria are set out in the table at Appendix 2.”

iii Note that the National Planning Policy Framework describes Local Green Space as follows:

“The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:

- where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
- where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty,
historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and
- where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.”

iv “Such measures could include applying 20 mph speed limits and electronic warning signs at the approaches to the village in order to reduce traffic speeds and heighten awareness; rumble strips at selected locations; warning signs regarding elderly people and controlled crossings at selected locations.”

v “As a first step, senior planning officers from LCC were asked to give an independent assessment of the village and its surrounding land to indicate all potential sites that they deemed suitable for residential development. They were informed of the villagers strongly expressed aspiration to protect views of the church from all approach roads into the village. In addition, sites known to have been previously considered and land that had previously been subject to planning applications were shown to them. “

vi “A full analysis of the process of site identification and assessment is set out in the supporting document entitled “Site assessment and rationale report” (July 2017) which is found on the Plan website.”

vii “This process resulted in 3 sites being selected and the criteria...”

viii “Development proposals, including infills, extensions to existing buildings and, where change of use is to occur to existing buildings or their sites, should not result in any development having parking spaces below the standards set by Leeds City Council for new developments.”

^x Footnote to read “As assessed against a broad set of criteria set out by Historic England in their “Local Heritage Listing Advice Note 7” (May 2016) – refer to Appendix 3 for detail.

^x Selection criteria for assessing suitability of assets for local heritage “listing” (Historic England)

Criteria	Description
Age	The age of an asset may be an important criterion and the age range can be adjusted to take into account distinctive local characteristics
Rarity	Appropriate for all assets, as judged against local characteristics
Aesthetic value	The intrinsic design value of an asset relating to local styles, materials or any other distinctive local characteristics
Group value	Groupings of assets with a clear visual, design or historic relationship
Evidential value	The significance of a local heritage asset of any kind may be enhanced by a significant contemporary or historic written record
Historic association	The significance of a local heritage asset of any kind may be enhanced by a significant historical association of local or national note, including links to important local figures
Archaeological interest	This may be an appropriate reason to designate a locally significant asset on the grounds of archaeological interest if the evidence base is sufficiently compelling and if a distinct area can be identified
Designed landscapes	Relating to the interest attached to locally important designed landscapes, parks and gardens
Landmark status	An asset with strong communal or historical associations, or because it has especially striking aesthetic value, may be singled out as a landmark within the local scene
Social and communal value	Relating to places perceived as a source of local identity, distinctiveness, social interaction and coherence; often residing in intangible aspects of heritage contributing to the “collective memory” of a place