



BARDSEY CUM RIGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

FIRST DRAFT - INFORMAL CONSULTATION SUMMER 2015

RESIDENTS RESPONSES ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS AND PROPOSED AMENDS TO POLICIES



NOTES

- 1) **Layout:** This report is divided into sections to mirror each policy area in the response questionnaire. Thereafter each section contains the policies, as an aide memoir, the results of the agree/disagree analysis, and finally all comments relating to the policy area.
- 2) **Response:** A total of 154 responses were returned, out of approximately 1000 consultation packs delivered to residents, indicating a response rate of 15.4%.
- 3) **Scarcroft:** Of the 154 responses received, 5 came from residents now in Scarcroft (following the boundary changes). Technically these residents currently remain within the Bardsey Neighbourhood Planning Area, but we have recently been advised by LCC to conduct future consultation based on the assumption our NDP area will be synonymous with the *revised* parish boundaries. Results of this consultation have therefore been analysed both including and excluding these residents, and both results are shown throughout. As can be seen, any influence on the results is in any case minimal.
- 4) **Anonymity:** Respondents were asked to enter their names and addresses when completing questionnaires. Of the 154 responses, 144 identified themselves, and 10 did not: i.e. 93.5% did so and only 6.5% did not. (N.B. By definition, it cannot be determined whether any of the 10 are now Scarcroft residents, so for the purposes of analysis must be assumed to be Bardsey). All respondents have then been given an anonymous respondent number to maintain confidentiality when analysing data and publishing results.
- 5) **Interpretation:** All answers have been recorded literally as expressed, and no attempt has been made to 'second guess' a respondent whose 'vote' (agree or disagree) is missing or unclear, even where a subsequent or separate comment might give some hint. This is to avoid any risk of introducing bias into the analysis, and to maintain the integrity of the results. In the few cases where a clear indication has been given that a respondent both agrees and disagrees with a policy in parts, his or her 'vote' on the policy in question has been split and scored as 0.5 agree and 0.5 disagree.
- 6) **Comments:** There are a number of points to note:
 - a. In this report comments are collated by policy, in the expectation that this will better facilitate review of the policies in question. Thus the same respondents can potentially be found commenting in any or all policy sections – or not.
 - b. Respondents whose numbers appear in pink shaded cells are those now in Scarcroft.
 - c. Respondents whose numbers appear in blue shaded cells are those who responded anonymously.
 - d. Text in red in the second (comment) column denotes text redrafted by the respondent for intended replacement of text in the summary NDP. The third column (in red) specifies the response recommended by Steering Committee working groups. Rows highlighted in yellow are those where action has been taken in response to comment. Text in red in the policies themselves denotes changes agreed by the Steering Committee in response to residents' comments and/or comments by other stakeholders.
 - e. Many respondents (69% to be precise) identified the deliberate mistake in the questionnaire, i.e. the lack of a policy H5, either by making specific comment or by pointedly ignoring it! These comments are not recorded in the analysis, because they are not specifically relevant to refining the NDP.

SECTION 2 - VISION

*“Bardsey will continue to thrive as a distinct village community, proud of its long history and its tradition of offering the advantages of rural living in the heart of the Yorkshire countryside, alongside easy access to the amenities of the city of Leeds, nearby market towns and the rich cultural heritage of West and North Yorkshire. Our Parish ~~has~~ will conserve~~d~~ and improve~~d~~ its much admired and cherished character, **distinctly separate from neighbouring villages both physically and socially**, and ~~has~~ secured~~d~~ its long term identity, sustainability and **vitality viability**.”*

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
Vision	Agree	144.5	93.8%	140.5	94.3%
	Disagree	3.5	2.3%	3.5	2.3%
	No Indication	6	3.9%	5	3.4%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

RESPONDENT	VISION	Responses Proposed 22-09-2015 MW, SB, JJ, CS
6	Agree with some but not all.	Disregard - does not provide any specific criticisms or proposed changes.
13	Bardsey should not expand to Collingham to make a large village	Agree - See also 40
27	I think it sets out the vision well	Endorsement - no action required
33	Generally agree with only proviso being some change is inevitable.	Endorsement - no action required
40	The vision is fine but not exciting as a vision suggests future. 'Has conserved' suggests the past. Surely should be 'will conserve'	Agree - changes to be incorporated in the vision.
51	It would seem to cover all that is necessary for the village whilst still retaining its character.	Endorsement - no action required
54	'Wishes of residents' not local government.	This is what the NDP is - we believe this is what we have. In the absence of specific points no action required.
66	Bardsey has great community spirit which will be lost if it becomes large and sprawling	See 13 and 40
67	As long as we continue our rural heritage	Already covered in the draft - no amends required.
86	Needs to be forward looking and more expansive	Agree the vision statement needs to be amended to acknowledge positive change.
99	There needs to be 100% commitment to maintaining existing green belt boundaries. Only LCC has the authority to recommend any changes.	Appropriately addressed in Built Environment and more particularly housing.
101	Avoid 'strip' development from ring road incorporating Scarcroft, Bardsey and Collingham.	See 13 and 40.

107	Agree provided the wording is adjusted . The second part is a 'statement'. Needs to say that our parish 'will conserve and improve' and 'will secure its long term identity'.	See 13 and 40
112	I like the comment 'district village community'.	Comment only - no action required.
115	The last sentence is not a vision, but historical.	See 13 and 40.
124	The second sentence is not a vision - it is a report on past achievement. It needs to refer to the future by inserting 'will continue to' , or similar.	See 13 and 40
125	Just keep our wonderful village's character and charm.	Already covered in the draft - no amends required.
126	Trust no more of the parish is lost to another.	Not relevant to the NDP.
132	A well expressed vision statement.	Endorsement - no action required
137	I agree that local materials should be used and the street scene should be preserved to retain the cherished and much admired character of the village.	Endorsement - no action required.
144	It is too status quo and insufficiently aspirational. It must be more pro development if its sustainability and viability are to be assured.	Agree the vision statement needs to be amended to acknowledge positive change - see 86.
151	Brief and simple required, e.g. Bardsey will maintain its status as a location of choice for those wishing to take advantage of rural living, with easy access to Leeds and nearby market towns'	Already adequately expressed in the vision - no action required.
152	Bardsey will continue to thrive as a distinct village community, proud of its long history and its tradition of offering the advantages of rural life in the heart of the Yorkshire countryside, alongside easy access to the amenities of the city of Leeds; while preserving its rich historical cultural heritage for the benefit of West and North Yorkshire and beyond. Our Parish has conserved and improved its much admired and cherished character, both physical and social, and has secured its long term identity, sustainability and viability.	Not materially different to existing vision. See also other amends proposed. This suggestion adds little more. No additional action required.

SECTION 3 – OBJECTIVES

To see this Vision realised, we have developed the following objectives, supported by detailed policies:

- 1. To encourage proportionate housing development which is appropriate to the needs and wishes of residents in terms of *location*, volume, size and architectural design.**
- 2. To maintain and improve the quality and character of the built environment.**
- 3. To maintain & improve the sustainability, quality and biodiversity of the natural environment.**
- 4. To improve public highway safety and amenity for pedestrians and road users alike.**
- 5. To identify and conserve those assets considered to be of significant community value, including green spaces, across the Parish. *Whereas it is recognised that it is not within the gift of the Neighbourhood Plan to determine the status of green belt land, all stakeholders should note the strongly and repeatedly expressed views of the community in favour of preserving the green belt in and around the parish.***
- 6. To encourage appropriate and proportionate commercial activity, including home working.**
- 7. To encourage healthy and active lifestyles, and strengthening the social fabric of the community, by developing and improving sport and leisure provision.**
- 8. To improve pedestrian, *equestrian* and cycle access throughout the Parish by maintaining, extending and further connecting the network of footpaths and bridleways, to enhance and secure its position as an ideal location for walking, cycling and equestrian activities**

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
Objectives	Agree	142.5	92.5%	138.5	93.0%
	Disagree	5.5	3.6%	5.5	3.7%
	No Indication	6	3.9%	5	3.4%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

RESPONDENT	OBJECTIVES	Responses Proposed 22-09-2015 MW, SB, JI, CS
6	Some but not all.	Unclear - unable to consider, no action required
13	Significant effort made to provide postal services in Bardsey, even mobile.	Good point - review with policies E1 and E2. Community shop/internet cafe at the Village Hall??
14	Bardsey needs more leisure activities.	Already covered - no action required.
18	Prefer the word 'homes' rather than 'housing'. The former requires more land	HNS calls for smaller manageable units with less land. More appropriate as drafted - no action.
20	Whilst maintaining the integrity of the village especially within the conservation area	See vision - no further action.

29	Would not support designated cycle lanes or cycle access to footpaths	Minority of one amongst respondents - NDP seeks to be inclusive. No action proposed.
31	Item 8 – should also improve access for equestrian activity not just pedestrian/cycling	Good point - review wording of objective 8.
33	Emphasis must be more affordable homes and less 'mansions'	Already covered - see policies H1 to H4 - no action required
42	To ensure that the burden on local highways does not impact on the health and well-being of existing residents.	Already covered - see Objective 4. No action required.
50	Agree with majority of objectives but feel that a good balance of housing types are not being promoted.	Misinterpretation - covered in policies H1 to H4 No further action.
66	Maintaining the environment and community value is a must	Already covered in vision and objectives. No additional action required.
67	To identify and conserve those assets considered to be of significant community value incl. green spaces across the parish i.e. duck pond and Hetchell Woods	See 66
71	Apart from No.6 – 'allow' rather than 'encourage' commercial activity.	Disagree - NDP should encourage appropriate and proportionate business activity. Disregard.
75	Not keen on any new development	Contradicts NPPF - must ignore.
86	Could push the community aspect further	We consider this aspect already covered in multiple sections and policies. No additional action required.
88	All the ideas and objectives make common sense to retain the village environment and community.	Endorsement - no action required.
93	Public highway safety is especially a concern.	Already covered in Objective 4.No further action required.
96	Disagree because a number are clearly incompatible with each other.	Minority of one amongst respondents - no action proposed.
99	Full protection for Leeds Country Way, rural environment and landscape/habitats.	Covered in Objective 8. No further action required.
101	Footpath linking Congreves with Bardsey along the old railway line would make us more part of Bardsey.	Agree - this is our aspiration. Ensure inclusion in the NDP.
102	I would have liked to see greater reference to the protection of green belt land.	Reflects a lack of clarity on green belt policy/aspiration in the NDP draft. Consider revisions insofar as we can.
103	Need to add 'protect area from increase in traffic loading on the A58'.	Covered in Objective 4. No further action required.
110	What is meant by 'appropriate commercial activity'? Could this not mean heavy traffic through village?	Already adequately covered in Objective 6 and in policies E1 and E2 - no action required
112	The main one being 'proportionate housing development'.	Already defined by the HNS and in the NDP. No action required

113	Residents already have homes there is no need for any more.	Modest need already identified. (See HNS). No action required.
115	Objective 1: What about non-residents, i.e. those wishing to relocate to Bardsey.	NDP is principally for the resident of the Parish. HNS dictates the need and therefore the policies. No action required.
120	Objectives 4 & 8: Footpath promised in Castle Fields has not been fulfilled. Planners and builders must be sure of what they can achieve and not hoodwink the locals prior to building.	Agree and is being pursued through the appropriate channels. Not specifically relevant to NDP drafting, however. No action required.
128	However, with regard to Objective 1 it cannot only be the wishes of the residents. We have to accept our share of the wider need for increased housing due to a growing population.	LCC's responsibility through the SHLAA process. Not for the NDP.
134	Point 8 is of particular interest to connect the Congreves area to the village centre for pedestrians.	Already covered - no additional action required.
140	More explicit on the needs of the growing population of the greater Leeds area.	See 128.
145	1 add 'and location'. 4 We do not want traffic 'bumps' which are damaging to vehicles and can be dangerous as they distract drivers from seeing the wider view of the road. 5 Add both 'public and non-public' green spaces. (Non-public open space defines the character of the village). 6 This Objective needs to include a limit to prevent 'nuisance' in housing areas. We would NOT WANT any 'commercial; activity' near our house.	Objective 1 - agree. Amend wording of policy 1. Objective 4 - points already covered. Objective 5 - already covered. Objective 6 already covered in both objectives and policies E1 and E2.
149	What is proportionate housing? Needs quantifying.	Dealt with in policies H1 to H4. No action required.
151	New Objectives: 1. To challenge any unwarrantable urbanisation of its rural environment and any inappropriate development of its historical core. 2. To conserve and improve those characteristics distinct to a rural village	See vision 13 and 44.
152	1) 'To manage proportionate housing development which is appropriate to the needs and wishes of residents in terms of volume, size and architectural design while preserving the character and attributes of the village in accordance with the Vision stated in this Neighbourhood Plan'. 2) Why is the reference to home working necessary? It adds no real value here and could be used against the objectives of the plan. In any case it is covered adequately by E1 b).	1) Beyond the remit of the NDP to manage development in the general sense. The NDP already seeks to specify the attributes of acceptable development. 6) Home working mentioned as an example, and in the context of scale and nature - i.e. administrative type working such as accountancy, architecture, consulting etc. not just physical working. We believe the present wording is good and does not need to be changed. No action proposed

SECTION 4 – LANDSCAPE AND THE RURAL ENVIRONMENT

Policy LRE1: Conserving historic rural character

- (a) Development that has an impact on the rural and historic character of the Parish ~~as described in the Village Design Statement (2002)~~ will be supported only where it reflects the character of its **immediate** locality in terms of scale, design and materials. Should any new development occur outside current development limits, this should be sensitively designed, particularly where it is highly visible in open landscapes, and utilise appropriate planting and screening in order to minimise visual intrusion*. **Proposed development in highly visible skyline locations will not be accepted.**
- (b) All proposed development outside current development limits should ~~pay due regard to~~ **observe** the recommendations for conservation and enhancement of the rural landscape as outlined in the Leeds Landscape Assessment (1994).

**In line with the Leeds Local Plan*

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
LRE1	Agree	141.5	91.9%	137.5	92.3%
	Disagree	7.5	4.9%	7.5	5.0%
	No Indication	5	3.2%	4	2.7%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

Policy LRE2: Enhancing the Public Rights of Way network

- a) Proposals that incorporate improvements to our Public Rights of Way network will be supported, including improved signage, maintenance, retention and accessibility for all users, **including disabled users**, in line with the Leeds Rights of Way Improvement Plan.
- b) Bardsey will work closely with neighbouring Parishes towards improving and extending the network of footpaths, cycle ways and bridleways in the wider locality.**
- c) Opportunities to extend public rights of way, for example the former railway line running from the village centre through to Collingham (the former Leeds Wetherby line) which would include the section between the Congreves and Keswick Lane (a long term aspiration), will be continually reviewed. ~~has the potential to provide a new cycleway/footpath cycleway, footpath and/or bridleway for the benefit of the Parish and proposals that support the development of this facility will be supported. This~~**
- d) Motorcycles, quad bikes and 4 x 4s will not have access to designated footpaths, cycle ways and bridleways.**

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
LRE2	Agree	142.5	92.5%	138.5	93.0%
	Disagree	6.5	4.2%	6.5	4.4%
	No Indication	5	3.2%	4	2.7%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

Policy LRE3: Biodiversity conservation & enhancement

Measures to protect and enhance the Parish's rich heritage of habitats, ~~and~~ landscapes and historic features, including the Site of Special Scientific Interest at Hetchell Woods, will be supported, ~~Specific sites where particular attention is to be paid will be developed through consultation with the community and external stakeholders such as~~ where necessary through consultation with external stakeholders such as Natural England and Yorkshire Wildlife Trust.

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
LRE3	Agree	147	95.5%	143	96.0%
	Disagree	2	1.3%	2	1.3%
	No Indication	5	3.2%	4	2.7%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

RESPONDENT	LANDSCAPE & THE RURAL ENVIRONMENT	Responses Proposed 23-09-2015 ES, IF, MW, CS
6	Does this include protected pathway from Congreves to Keswick Lane circa 1976?	Agree it should - this is our aspiration. Ensure inclusion in the NDP. (See objectives respondent 101).
11	LRE1 – LCC do not seem to hold this view!	Opinion - not sure it is actually true. No action proposed.
14	Footpath would be excellent	Agree - See 6, footpath objectives to be written in to the NDP.
18	Should this also include some reference to protection of longer distance views to prevent skyline development?	Agree - LCC policy already opposes skyline development, but strengthen by adding to NDP.
22	LRE2 (b) Excellent idea	Endorsement - no action required.
25	Development of former railway line has the potential to create a construction site of considerable proportion.	Park field? Green belt - not for us to list.
27	Would be great to have cycleway through Bardsey	Agree - cycle way objectives to be developed and included in the NDP.

29	Motor bikes/quads/4x4's need to be prevented from the old railway track + (illegible words)	Agree - check status and if not already done designate as a bridleway. Review whether we need to add provisions on use of these vehicles in the NDP.
31	LRE2 again neglects equestrian requirements	Agree - develop objectives for bridleways to include in the NDP
41	Particularly approve of possible cycleway/footpath on former railway line.	Agree - see 6.
49	Despite living next to disused railway line we think it should be developed. LRE2 – minor concerns re loss of security and privacy to one home	Presumably for access rather than housing? If so agree - see 6 and 25.
50	Conservation should also encourage progress and LRE1 seems restrictive and isn't progressive.	Not restrictive - but does prescribe what the community wants in the event of development. Therefore OK. No action required
55	Regardless of extent of high quality developments, conservation will suffer with any type of development	Opinion - no action required.
64	Do not agree to development outside current development limits. Greenbelt should be left alone.	Noted. See objectives.
66	Enhancing public rights of way but not changing/restructuring them	Agree - objectives to be built into the NDP - see 6 and 49.
67	Vital	Endorsement - no action required.
75	Not keen on supporting any new development	Agree in terms of large scale - consider strengthening the draft by expressing preservation of the green belt as a general aspiration.
77	Prefer proportionate housing development on windfall sites and not on green belt.	Agree - consider strengthening the draft by expressing preservation of the green belt as a general aspiration.
84	A lot of the former railway line has been built on or incorporated into private land, so it would be difficult to implement this.	Agree - objectives to be built into the NDP - see 6 and 49.
93	Should OBEY recommendations, not just 'pay due regard'.	Agreed, but more a matter for enforcement than the NDP. Consider enhancing draft - perhaps 'observe'
97	LRE2 a, b, fine. Please be aware that maintenance will not be undertaken by LCC as we have been told repeatedly that there are no resources for litter clearance, removal of fly tipping etc.	Should not influence the development of footpaths, cycleways or bridleways which should remain policy. No action required.
98	New cycleway/footpath from Bardsey to Collingham is a great idea.	Agree – include in plan for expansion of footpaths, cycle ways, bridleways etc.
99	There should be no development in highly visible locations or by Leeds Country Way.	Agreed - see policy on skyline development.
105	LRE1: Not competent to form an opinion where 'current development limits' are involved.	Not relevant - ignore.

109	1) On street parking becomes a problem when a resident has a gathering, more so if residents themselves only have on street parking. What about bigger garages with doorways wide enough to take a vehicle? 2) Mature trees can present problems to neighbours. Perhaps in some case 1 mature tree could be replaced with two saplings.	Confusing. Outside the scope of the NDP. No action required
113	LRE1: There should be no development outside current limits.	Agree - consider strengthening the draft by expressing preservation of the green belt as a general aspiration.
116	Can this be amended to specifically call out equestrian activities as per objectives?	Agreed - objectives re bridleways to be included in the NDP - see 6 and 25.
124	LRE2 has a footnote reference (ROWIP) which is not explained - needs correction.	Agreed - acronym to be expanded in the draft.
128	These factors are what make Bardsey special.	Endorsement - no action required.
131	Where landowners purposefully allow fields to be grown over on the ruse they should be developed, these sites should be seen as wildlife areas do discourage this behaviour. The work of wildlife trusts should be encouraged.	Is this factual? Work of wildlife trusts already being encouraged. No action required.
134	If we can use LRE2b to connect our area to the village centre for pedestrians and cyclists, brilliant idea!	Yes - already covered. See 6 and 25.
135	LRE1 wording is far too loose. There should be no possibility of any new development where it is highly visible in open landscapes.	Agree. Consider strengthening wording of the draft policy. See 18.
144	LRE1: Point of this policy is unclear. The VDS is 'history'. LRE2: What is the delivery mechanism? LRE3: Is this not repetition of national regional policies.	VDS is still a valid definition of the desired qualities. LRE2 to be delivered as a project within the NDP. LRE3 may echo national and regional policy, but is Bardsey specific. Therefore no action required.
145	Policy LRE1 (a) There should be no development on and adjacent to prominent ridges as this would adversely affect the open character of the village. Development should not close any gaps between the existing different parts of the village.	Agree. Consider strengthening wording of the draft policy. See 18.
151	LRE 1 Fails to support a policy of preserving the green belt, or protecting the individuality and separation of the villages and Bardsey's subdivisions from creeping urban sprawl. LRE2: This needs a strong statement to support those with disabilities. It requires more commitment to seek investment by the Parish Council towards building a cycleway between the villages, given the current climate.	Agree - consider strengthening the draft by expressing preservation of the green belt as a general aspiration. Add provision for the disabled as part of the public access objectives project.

SECTION 5 – BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Policy BE1: High quality building design

All new development must demonstrate high quality design, responding to and integrating with the ~~surrounding community~~ **neighbouring character**, existing architecture, **materials** and landscape of the **locality**. The following set of key design principles should be adhered to:

- **Achieve high quality design** in all residential areas that respects the scale and character of existing buildings in the locality, as set out in the Village Design Statement and Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan.
- ~~Original detailing on existing buildings~~ **Any renovations, conversions, alterations or extensions** should respect the original design, detailing, character and materials of the building, and adhere to the provisions of policy H4. ~~should be conserved and replaced wherever renovations take place.~~ For example, in relation to doors and architraves, porches, steps; window styles and frames, sills, lintels, mullions; decorative brickwork, chimney stacks and pots.
- **Conservation Area guidelines** as set out in the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan ~~dated ???????~~ should be adhered to where development is located in this area.
- **Sustainable design and materials.** Consideration will be given to the use of sustainable materials and/or techniques in new build and renovations where these can be robustly demonstrated to be used in a manner sensitive to and respectful of the surrounding architecture and landscape.

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
BE1	Agree	147	95.5%	143	96.0%
	Disagree	2	1.3%	2	1.3%
	No Indication	5	3.2%	4	2.7%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

PolicyBE2: Improving streets and street scene

Proposals for new development should demonstrate conformity with the **current** Leeds Street Design Guide (~~2009~~) and the following set of key principles:

- All new street design and improvements to the current street arrangements will have an emphasis on people movement based on the hierarchy set out in the Leeds City Council Street Design Guide and the wider set of design principles that it sets out.
- Improvements to the opportunities for walking, **cycling and horse riding** wherever possible through practical measures such as the provision of and improvements to pavements, ~~and~~ paths, **cycle ways and bridleways** in the villages and improvements to the Public Rights of Way network across the ~~wider~~ parish **and beyond**.
- Limitation and reduction of unnecessary street signage where it is safe and practical.
- Ensuring that streets and pavements are accessible for those with mobility issues, installing drop kerbs and textured paving at street crossings. Wherever possible, it is preferable to avoid different colour surfacing for textured surfaces to avoid urbanisation of village streets, with the exception of demarcating village gateways where such variation in surfacing can act as an effective measure in slowing traffic entering built up areas.

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
BE2	Agree	145.5	94.5%	141.5	95.0%
	Disagree	3.5	2.3%	3.5	2.3%
	No Indication	5	3.2%	4	2.7%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

Policy BE3: Managing car parking

All new housing developments will need to ensure that car parking does not dominate the street scene and, as a rule, provides for a minimum of two car parking spaces per dwelling. Spaces may be located either on the property or in the form of well screened and designed dedicated on-road parking bays.

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
BE3	Agree	143	92.9%	139	93.3%
	Disagree	6	3.9%	6	4.0%
	No Indication	5	3.2%	4	2.7%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

Policy BE4: Maintaining dark villages

In order to conserve its historic rural character, new development in areas of the Parish which are traditionally unlit by street lighting should respect and maintain the 'dark' nature of the village.

- New street lighting will be discouraged ~~not be supported, except where there is clear majority support by residents.~~
- New security lighting should be carefully designed so that it does not create unnecessary light pollution ~~or cause nuisance to adjacent residents.~~

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
BE4	Agree	137.5	89.3%	134.5	90.3%
	Disagree	11.5	7.5%	10.5	7.0%
	No Indication	5	3.2%	4	2.7%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

Policy BE5: Integrating green infrastructure

- ~~Proposals for new green infrastructure incorporated into new developments will be supported in order to minimise impact upon the existing communities and to provide opportunities for habitat corridors, sustainable drainage and linkage to the surrounding countryside.~~ Green infrastructure incorporated into new developments will avoid adverse impact upon the existing communities and provide opportunities for habitat corridors, linkage to the surrounding countryside and improving drainage.
- New development should provide strong conservation measures in relation to existing landscape features including mature trees, historic hedgerows, rights of way and open spaces.
- New green infrastructure should seek to maximise its multi functionality, for example in relation to health, biodiversity, drainage and landscape/screening.

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
BE5	Agree	146	94.8%	142	95.3%
	Disagree	2	1.3%	2	1.3%
	No Indication	6	3.9%	5	3.4%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

RESPONDENT	THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT	Responses Proposed 25-09-2015 ES,IF,CS
4	Call for street lighting to prevent crime	90% in favour of the dark village policy. Propose not to amend the policy but to introduce a commitment by the PC to review it on a regular basis.
6	Appeal for solution in VH vicinity during events	Parking - specific issue not directly related to NDP policies. No action appropriate.
11	Planners care little for these laudable aims. This cause had been lost!	Opinion only - no action the SC can take.
12	More awareness of speed limits especially near School and playground.	Agree, but already covered - see objective 4. No further action required
14	Suggestion for lighting around bus stops.	See 4
18	BE1 welcome as some heritage feature detailing has been lost. B4 is important	Endorsement - no action required.
21	Street lighting urged.	See 4
27	Dark Village is supported	See 4
29	BE2 street drainage and grass verges need addressing	Agree, but a maintenance issue already actioned on an ongoing

		basis by the PC. No action required in respect of NDP policies.
39	BE3 Too many cars parked on roads when off street parking could be used.	Agree, and already covered in the policy. Scope to change this tendency in respect of existing housing is limited. No further action required.
40	Criticism of Castle Field development style. Scale and more car parking spaces need future attention.	Agree - hence policy BE3. Already covered, no further action required.
41	Unnecessary street signage and lighting spoils rural atmosphere.	Agree - review wording of policy BE2 and possibly add another bullet on this issue.
42	Managing the burden on local highways in conjunction with neighbouring villages impacting on Bardsey.	
50	BE3 Don't know - need more info.	Intentions entirely unclear - not possible to consider.
51	BE1 and BE2 are particularly important	Endorsement - no action required.
52	Especially the car parking and green infrastructure	Endorsement - no action required.
54	BE3 No front garden parking please	Policy does not encourage this - no action required.
55	Do not want new building in conservation area or green belt where possible	Agree - preservation of the green belt to be more clearly expressed as an aspiration. (See objectives)
56	Definitely BE3	Endorsement - no action required.
66	No objection to street lighting on main routes through Bardsey	See 4
67	Vital to keep conservation areas	
73	Ok for minor roads unlit but feel that A58 should be lit.	See 4
75	Reluctant to support any new development. BE3 and 4 very important	Endorsement - no action required.
84	BE4: Some existing houses should be reminded that we are a 'dark' village therefore their lighting is intrusive on other residents.	No authority to prevent private illumination such as security lights on private property. Street lights - see 4.
86	Strongly approve. Light pollution is an issue now, as is sustainability.	See 4
91	Would prefer limited street lighting.	See 4
95	BE4: Absolutely 100%	See 4
96	Lack of street lighting is unsafe, and a security risk. This policy should change to allow more street lights.	See 4
97	BE4: There should be no majority vote by residents in any particular area, this will ensure maintaining the 'dark' nature of the village	See 4
105	BE1: Need to be careful not to create a village in a time warp with village yokels in smocks chewing straws.	The NDP is all about maintaining vitality. No action required.

106	I'm not sure about the 'no lighting'. I remember being scared walking home in the dark many years ago!	See 4
107	BE1: It is inappropriate to say 'original detail on existing buildings should be conserved and replaced wherever renovations take place'. We believe statement could be appropriate for buildings of historic significance, but buildings in last 100 years can be improved through modern architecture and design.	96% in agreement with policy BE1. This comment in a minority of 1. Not appropriate to change the policy.
112	The dark village situation should be maintained.	See 4
113	BE3: How do you screen on-road parking? This is ridiculous.	Policy does not call for screening on road parking. Policy intent clearly misunderstood. No other similar comments. No action required.
119	Car parking on Church Lane needs to be addressed.	See 39.
120	BE1 - once again footpaths (Castle Fields promised but not delivered)! BE5 - hedges kept in character	Agree re footpaths - see Landscape and Rural Environment. Needs an action group setting up. Welcome endorsement re hedges etc.
124	Especially commend footnote 2 support for eco friendly techniques!	Endorsement - no action required.
125	A lighted area at bus stops would be good idea as coming home by bus is very hard when no street lighting whatsoever on the A58.	See 4
131	I am concerned by certain lighting already in place on either residential or agricultural buildings that clearly breaches the 'dark light' policy.	See 84
133	BE4: Some concern over the safety aspect, low level lighting in some areas may be a useful compromise.	See 4
134	BE5: Green land between village centre and the Congreves could be used to create a new centre for Bardsey Village as a whole for the long term if expansion is required.	Does this imply development? Very much in favour of better connections for pedestrians, cyclists and riders - already covered in the draft. Green belt site - couldn't be advanced by the NDP even if it had sufficient support within the community. No further action.
135	BE3: 2 car spaces per affordable home is excessive.	Disagree. Not realistic - personal transport necessary for working couples. No further action.
143	Do not change the demographic makeup of the village	Not appropriate and out with the scope of the NDP. Discount.

144	These include repetition of existing LCC policies. These are not Bardsey specific! Delivery in practice - how?	LCC policies can change, in which case our wishes need to be recorded in the NDP. NDP policies <i>are</i> written specifically in the context of Bardsey which may introduce different implications to those in LCC's general policies. Delivery through local action plan and implementation of the NDP in planning decisions.
145	Policy BE4 Amend to 'New street lighting will not be supported'. In our experience residents moving into the village from street lit towns want lighting and do not appreciate the dark character of the village. They should understand and accept as part of their consideration for moving here that this is a 'dark village'. Amend to 'New security and outside general lighting should not create light pollution or cause nuisance to adjacent residents'.	See 4
147	Could do with some street lighting as walking after dark is dangerous, especially for elderly or disabled.	See 4
151	BE2: The 'Street Scene' is important and a distinct characteristic of a rural village. Not only historic hedges but all hedges, trees and country fencing needs to be preserved, especially when it has an adverse impact on the greening of the village. BE5: There is a cross over between BE5 & BE2, 'preserving existing landscape features' and 'preserving a green rural village street scene'. This policy needs to include broader measures which include all hedgerows, country style fencing and low stone walls for instance.	
152	BE5: <i>Green infrastructure incorporated into new developments will avoid adverse impact upon the existing communities and provide opportunities for habitat corridors, linkage to the surrounding countryside and improving drainage.</i> Sustainable drainage implies that it may not need to be adequate.	

SECTION 6 – HOUSING

Policy H1: New housing

- a. New housing development should be located within existing development limits. ~~Where this is not possible any development should be located adjacent to existing built up areas.~~
- b. ~~All new development must and ensure that it improve~~ the sustainable connectivity of the parish by way of roads, rights of way and connecting green infrastructure.
- c. Sites which use back land and gardens and which serve to reduce the open aspect of the parish will not ~~normally~~ be supported.
- d. Sites which utilise previously developed land will be permitted before green field sites. Development proposals which are located on green field sites are therefore required to demonstrate there are no suitable brown field sites available.

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
H1	Agree	133	86.4%	130	87.2%
	Disagree	15	9.7%	14	9.4%
	No Indication	6	3.9%	5	3.4%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

Policy H2: Housing size and type

- New housing should contribute towards the needs of the parish and provide a mix of accommodation that is designed for families and for those seeking to downsize to housing more appropriate for their needs.
- Support will be given for new homes ~~called for by the Housing Needs Survey~~ which provide accommodation of up to 2 bedrooms per unit in a mix of type and size. ~~where developments are in excess of 5 units.~~

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
H2	Agree	130.5	84.7%	126.5	84.9%
	Disagree	16.5	10.7%	16.5	11.1%
	No Indication	7	4.5%	6	4.0%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

Policy H3: Supporting sustainable development

Proposals for new housing development ~~of 5 units or more~~ should be supported by:

- a. A Statement of Community Involvement demonstrating how the local community has been engaged with during the planning process and how and where their views have been taken into consideration.
- b. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan, demonstrating how key issues relating to drainage and flood prevention, traffic and transport and key services will be integrated in, or accessible to, the proposed development and how this will be achieved.
- c. ~~A statement confirming how the proposal contributes to meeting local housing needs. assessment that demonstrates how local housing needs will be met~~

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
H3	Agree	142	92.2%	138	92.6%
	Disagree	7	4.5%	7	4.7%
	No Indication	5	3.2%	4	2.7%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

Policy H4: Scale of development

Any new development, ~~renovations, conversions, alterations or extensions~~ should reflect their surroundings and be similar in terms of density, footprint, separation, scale and bulk of buildings in the surrounding area. Support will be given to developments which:

- Provide 1 and 2 storey housing in keeping with the rest of the built form.
- Provide appropriate landscaping to soften the visual impact of development.

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
H4	Agree	143	92.9%	139	93.3%
	Disagree	3	1.9%	3	2.0%
	No Indication	8	5.2%	7	4.7%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

RESPONDENT	HOUSING	Responses Proposed 01-10-2015 SB,JI,CS
2	How are extra residents supported by schools/doctors	Infrastructure provision is beyond Parish control, but there is already an aspiration to improve the school as well as transport and communications. The level of HNS

		development envisaged would not demand more than this. No action required.
3	Emphasis should be for smaller homes	Endorsement - no action required.
8	No view. Not interested	We can safely ignore then!
11	Needs to happen now.	Agreed, but depends on site availability and developers. Timescale already cited in the draft. No amendment needed.
18	Use Brownfield not Greenfield. H2 is welcomed	Endorsement - no action required.
29	Don't agree to ANY Greenfield site	We are not trying to list any, so no specific action required, but preservation of the green belt to be more clearly expressed as an aspiration. (See objectives plus Built Environment 55)
30	Need more 1 st time buyers homes	Agree, and the draft makes such provision as we are able. Therefore already covered.
33	Affordable housing is required	Agree, and the draft makes such provision as we are able. Therefore already covered.
35	Downsizing should not be a consideration (personal decision). Elderly need to be able to access healthcare (non-existent)	See 2. Yes it is a personal decision, but we have identified the need through the HNS. Extension of healthcare provision is outside the control of the Parish, however. No specific action required
42	Need to ensure smaller starter homes , not 4 bed homes	Strongly agree - recommend changing the maximum allowable under H2 to 2 bedrooms, max 3.
50	Urban development should be social-economic mix. Draft NP is for middle class/aged bias and doesn't promote cultural diversity	This is a rural parish, not urban, but do we need to be more proactive on this issue? Review in the SC.
51	Don't lose greenbelt. Need affordable housing to retain the Village young people	This is the issue! We believe we have the balance right in the light of feedback from the community and existing planning constraints. Already covered - no additional action required.
52	H1 – not backing on to gardens which would restrict views	Determined by green belt boundaries, planning regulations and the SHLAA process rather than the Neighbourhood Plan. NDP already prescribes nature of development and screening etc. No requirement for redrafting.
53	This resident does not support any development whatsoever of site 1027	See 52
59	Supportive of affordability for the young	Endorsement - no action required.

61	'Build lots of houses to spoil everyone's view just like you did mine'	NDP is not site specific, and locations are the province of landowners, developers and given the extent of green belt most particularly LCC. NDP already provides generic provisions of acceptable sites and development. No action required
64	Do not agree there is a need for extra housing especially large development	Endorsement - no action required.
66	YW/LCC have drainage problems in The Drive. 2 storey houses are a way of squeezing in developments. They are not affordable but profitable for builders.	Drainage is a local maintenance issue. NDP already prescribes 2 stories as a maximum (H4) and specifies size and scale of allowable development. No action required.
67	In moderation and in keeping with the conservation area.	Endorsement - no action required.
68	Agree with need for smaller homes for first time buyers and the elderly.	Endorsement - no action required.
71	H1b omit 'normally' which is open to misinterpretation. H2 not downsizing if accommodation up to 4 beds	H1b does not use the term 'normally' and is specific, requires no action. We agree re H2 and propose redrafting - see 42.
72	Building in gardens should be allowed if space permits	NDP specifies conditions under which it would be acceptable and does not prescribe it completely. We believe it is already well drafted - no action required.
75	Would prefer small number of large high end homes rather than a number of smaller ones.	Extreme minority view unsupported by every stage of public consultation and the HNS. Not appropriate to consider redrafting in response.
77	H2 should allow only smaller homes. Four beds still leaves the door open to high cost speculative development which is not required.	Agree - see 42 and 71. Redraft.
84	Most appropriate place to develop is the field in front of the school for access to the school and the rest of the village.	NDP is not site specific. Green belt site flagged red by LCC. Not within the remit of the NDP to reclassify in any case. Also unsupported by public consultation.
95	H1: Absolutely NO new building on green field sites.	See 29
96	The HNS figure of 55 manageable homes is almost certainly more a desire of a small number. The village is almost certainly full and can take very few, if any, new development.	Figure is derived directly from the HNS, which is the expressed need of the community. NDP needs to reflect this rather than individual opinion.
97	H2: Could developers be persuaded to build a few bungalows as well as houses, and should this be stated in the policy? H4: We understand any housing quota in Bardsey imposed by LCC should take into account previous	Bungalows unlikely to be economically viable for developers, so to prescribe these would limit potential for the development of HNS homes even further. Almost

	developments since this 'process' began. Could the number be quoted in correspondence, ongoing.	ALL previous construction has been larger homes and there are very few homes of the type required, so previous development does not satisfy the need. No redrafting required.
102	H2: Don't think this should be restricted to a minimum of 5 units.	Agreed - the SC should review H2.
113	H1a: Development should only be within existing limits. H1b: These sites always have been supported. H1c: If no brown field sites build elsewhere, not Bardsey. H2: What needs of the parish? Everyone has a house!! Mix of accommodation already exists. Support? Which is what, and why? H3: There are no <i>needs</i> , only <i>desires</i> .	A clear misinterpretation of the requirements of the community, the HNS, public consultation and the NPPF. No action required.
114	I would support the use of back land and infill	We remain satisfied that the drafting is appropriate in respect of garden infill and backland development. No action.
115	H1: Is a built up area 1 house? 20 houses? A single row or what? H2: What about single and dual occupancy.	H1 - agree we need to review the definition of 'built up areas' and the siting of developments to make it clearer and more precise. Occupancy in the case of private sector housing is entirely outwith the control of the NDP or local authorities. No action possible.
120	H2: What happens below 5 units?	See 102 - SC to review.
124	Not sure about second bullet point in H2 - are houses <i>limited</i> to 4 beds or <i>encouraged to have</i> 4 beds? H4 should not prevent good modern architecture by supporting 'Poundbury Pastiche' (may be addressed at BE1).	Re H2 - see 102. Sc to review. Point re H4 addressed in BE1
128	But H1b seems to contradict the comment re 'windfall sites' (e./g. Hetchell Court). It has to be hoped that LCC move from a Green Belt to a Green Finger approach. This would seem to answer many of the issues we face.	NDP draft does describe the conditions under which garden infill and backland development could be acceptable. The draft therefore covers this point adequately. No action required.
129	H2: Starter homes and downsizing homes should have 2 BEDROOMS MAX . There are plenty of 3 and 4 bedroom homes in the village.	Agreed see 42, 71 and 77. H2 to be redrafted.
131	I believe the arguments re downsizing are sometimes used for property development purposes. This goes against the clear need cases and actually the type of property needed for downsizing.	Policies are already in support of the expressed needs of the village through the HNS, not the preferences of developers. Already covered - no action required.
135	H1a: The wording is far too loose. It does not express any 'preferred locations'. New housing developments could be <i>anywhere</i> on the existing built up boundaries. H3: This wording would allow developments of up to 4 houses	H1a - NDP is not site specific and can't list green belt sites in any case. H3: Further research required re permissible wording of H3 - NDP must observe current planning

	without any community consultation.	regulations, which have changed recently, and needs to be reasonable.
136	H3: Very general. Specific to Bardsey, in addition to contours, flooding, must be transport. The A58 must play a dominant role - not mentioned.	Already agreed a review H3 by the SC to make sure the wording is precise. Other points relate to different policy areas and are already covered elsewhere.
144	These policies are a serious muddle. Clarity, certainty and method of delivery all missing. A 'sites for new housing' policy must refer to 'sites' or 'areas'.	The pros and cons of generic versus site specific have already been debated and the SC decided on generic.
145	<p>We have concern that the content of the First Draft of the Neighbourhood Plan will not prevent unwanted housing development in the Village.</p> <p>Policy H1 b) The infilling of gardens serves a housing need and is preferable to the use of Green Belt. It's character must be controlled to ensure that the new housing is at similar density to those in the area. E.g. large sites on Mill Lane could easily be developed without any adverse effect on the area, provided housing is not dense and has large spaces between.</p> <p>H1 c). Seen from the point of view of a Housing Developer wishing to build, it would appear that the only necessary procedure is to prove that there are no Brownfield Sites available. Once the Catholic Church has been developed the necessary proof should be no problem. In any case we are unsure of the legality of this provision as the Church site, in different ownership, would not be available to the Housing Developer and it is very probable that it's undeveloped status would prevent other needed housing.</p> <p>H2 and H4. Number of new houses. We can find no guidance on the size of any new housing development. If a Housing Developer wanted to build say 75 No. new homes, there is no wording to prevent this. The wording of the Neighbourhood Plan is in general terms and as such is open to interpretation leaving the Village in a weak position in any negotiation. We believe that specific guidance on the size of any new Housing Development should be given e.g.:</p> <p>'Sites with a maximum of 20 No. dwellings will be supported' 'Bardsey cum Rigton wishes to ensure that large scale housing developments are not built as this would have adverse consequences for the character and amenity of the village and existing facilities (e.g.</p>	<p>H1b - This is the intention of H1b. Consider redrafting H1b to make it clearer, and adding windfall sites and back land development to the wording. H1c - possibly misinterpreted the policy, which refers to green field sites, not green belt. The tightness of the green belt largely precludes green field availability. Green belt sites are subject to specific regulations and out with the prerogative of the NDP. Consider redrafting to make this clearer. H2 and H4 - Size, density and numbers are covered by provisions in H1, H2 and H4. Consider redrafting to tighten them. Infrastructure implications would be taken into account in any specific planning application. Consider whether we need to widen the list of Stakeholder Consultees for the NDP.</p>

	<p>the Primary School may have insufficient provision')</p> <p>Bardsey cum Rigton considers that any growth in the housing provision over the next 10 years must be related to the (??55 No.) units identified in the Housing Needs Survey.</p> <p>Policy H3 (b). Add 'statements from relevant Authorities should be included in the infrastructure Delivery Plan', (e.g. Education Authority, are there sufficient primary school places?).</p>	
151	<p>H1b: Should not be supported. Back land and large gardens suitable for development would normally form part of the 'greening' of the village. Garden grabbing and/or cramming would have a significant impact on the rural character of Bardsey village. This policy needs a stronger commitment on conservation to support BE5. H2: Our commitment to support housing units should not exceed the amount allocated by Leeds City Council. We should only support the type of housing identified in the housing needs analysis given the pressure on the green belt. Should the housing needs analysis only identify affordable/social housing or homes for those wishing to downsize, then accommodation of up to 4 bedrooms is too large. H3: Given the pressure on land within the development limit, we should recognise that affordable homes and those downsizing after retirement, should relocate to towns that can support their individual needs' We should be clear that in terms of the over 50s we do not have shops and medical facilities to support their needs.</p>	<p>H1b - see 35, 71, 78 and 128. H2 - agree 4 bedrooms is too large and the SC should review the draft. H3 - the needs have been determined by the community itself, and need to be included in the NDP process. We therefore disagree with some of these comments and propose H3 should stand. The policy should nevertheless be reviewed by the SC in the light of recent changes in planning regulations and suggestions the drafting should be more precise.</p>

152	<p>H1: The current text implies, if my understanding of the meaning of "existing development limits" is correct, that development on green belt will be supported if other sites cannot be found. A detailed indication of where intrusion into green belt would/would not be considered in these situations is essential. Also, allowing such development could be the thin end of the wedge of course! Again this is linked to the action proposed at CFZ so that it should cover both green field and green belt. Previous surveys have shown that 9 out of 10 consider that it is necessary to maintain the green belt. So why should the Neighbourhood Plan suggest otherwise even in exceptional cases and without defining what an exceptional case might be. If we have to allow this then perhaps the following would be better: "New housing development will be proportionate and located within existing development limits. In exceptional cases, where there is not a risk of setting a precedence leading to misuse of the exception and where suitable sites are unavailable, a deviation from this principle will be considered. In such circumstances, all development will not adversely affect the connectivity of the parish by way of roads, rights of way and connecting green infrastructure, existing properties or the character and attributes of the village in accordance with the Vision stated in this Neighbourhood Plan." Such exceptions also need to comply with the list of protected areas to be developed under CF2. In some cases it would not be desirable to develop adjacent to existing built up areas. After all is this not the reason why green belt was introduced.</p> <p>H2: The use of "should" is appropriate here.</p> <p>H3: With regard to b), Developers have in the past created problems such as flooding which were predictable before work started. In such cases it seems that the owners of the resulting properties are financially responsible for the inappropriate actions of developers which means that having adequate control of developments is essential.</p> <p>H4: "Provide appropriate landscaping to soften the visual impact of development while not adversely affecting the environment both for the village in general and those in close proximity in particular"</p>	<p>H1 - Agree, but green belt is out with the prerogative of the NDP and can only be controlled by LCC under the regulations covering green belt review. Add appropriate clarification on the status of green belt elsewhere in the NDP. H2 - already covered. H3 - beyond our remit, and covered by planning and building regs. H4 - already covered.</p>
-----	---	--

SECTION 7 – ECONOMY

Policy E1: Small business development

- a. The growth of existing small businesses and new start businesses will be supported where these do not have negative impact upon other local residents, including in respect of significantly increased traffic movements or the use of larger vehicles or Heavy Goods Vehicles.
- b. The conversion of or extension to existing residential space for business use will be supported where this enables people to work at home, where this has no negative impact on other local residents. Any such conversions will be subject to the business use remaining subsidiary to the residential use of the property.
- c. Proposals for change of use of existing business premises away from employment activity will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the existing use is no longer economically viable. ~~i.e. that the site has been marketed at a reasonable price for at least one year for that or any other suitable employment or service trade use.~~

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
E1	Agree	131	85.1%	129	86.6%
	Disagree	15	9.7%	14	9.4%
	No Indication	8	5.2%	6	4.0%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

Policy E2: Farm diversification

- a. The diversification of farms will be supported where this enables production from the land to continue. Proposals will be supported where:
- b. Diversification has no adverse impacts upon the landscape.
- c. It does not result in increased traffic by way of larger or Heavy Goods Vehicles on rural roads or restrict access resulting from additional on road car parking.
- d. Diversification provides for sustained or increased local employment.

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
E2	Agree	137	89.0%	135	90.6%
	Disagree	9	5.8%	8	5.4%
	No Indication	8	5.2%	6	4.0%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

Policy E3: Redundant buildings

Conversion of redundant buildings worthy of retention into new business accommodation will be supported where it can be demonstrated the building is no longer economically viable for its previous use, provided that:

- a) The appearance of the converted building will be in keeping with or enhance its surroundings; and
- b) The boundary treatment and landscaping are in keeping with or enhance its surroundings and, if appropriate, preserve the openness of the Green Belt.

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
E3	Agree	135	87.7%	132	88.6%
	Disagree	10	6.5%	10	6.7%
	No Indication	9	5.8%	7	4.7%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

RESPONDENT	ECONOMY	Responses Proposed 02-10-2015 ES,SB,CS
11	Many old buildings such as barns are not worth saving	Matter of opinion - not relevant to drafting the NDP. No action.
13	No shop facility in Bardsey may increase traffic to shop elsewhere. Could open a shop/PO in Bardsey	Agree, depending on viability. NP supports appropriate business activity already -no further action required.
14	Local businesses should be supported. Farms need to diversify!	Endorsement - no further action required.
17	What is diversification? We should keep as many working farms as possible.	Agree, but already covered. No additional action required.
18	Emphasis on 'enabling production from the land' welcomed. Food security is important.	Endorsement - no further action required.
24	Do not support any business development in what is primarily a residential village. Parking is already a problem.	Don't agree. Support for appropriate business development is an objective, and should be part of the NDP.
35	Home deliveries at anti social hours make E1a irrelevant. Opposing new commercial activities would be a restriction of competition.	Domestic rather than commercial activity, and not within the control of the NDP. No action appropriate.

39	E1: Providing it is not for motor repairs MOTs etc. Noise, traffic congestion and parking.	NDP draft already makes clear support is for appropriate business activity which is not a nuisance to neighbours. No additional action required.
42	Do not agree with housing development on existing farm land	Policies on housing development set out the intentions. No additional action required.
64	Farmland should not be considered for development.	See 42
66	Bardsey should retain its village identity and not become a town with lots of businesses operating from it.	Endorsement - no further action required.
67	In keeping with the conservation areas.	Agree, already covered - no action required.
71	Against any increase in commercial activity. Against redundant buildings being converted for commercial activity.	See 24
72	E1a & b, E2, E3 should not only be supported but encouraged	Endorsement - no further action required.
75	Do not support small business development unless serving the village - e.g. local shops.	See 24 and 39
86	Strongly agree. Commerce has a significant role to play in the local community and way of life.	Endorsement - no further action required.
110	Depends what is meant by 'small business development'. Bardsey should always be mainly residential.	Already taken into consideration. No action required.
113	E1b contradicts H1b	Doesn't contradict H1b. No action.
119	B1 should be the maximum permitted use.	Meaning unclear - cannot consider.
131	E3: I have a concern around allowing buildings such as stabling to be allowed to become redundant as a tactic for future development.	Determined by the NPPF and therefore out with the control of the NDP, except that planning applications would be subject to the NDP in any case.
132	Would object strongly to any wind farm proposals or solar panel farming.	See 131
133	The use of Armco barrier to create cattle holding pens should come under the control of planning since it is NOT in keeping with the countryside landscape.	Not within the scope of the NDP - cannot respond.
144	These policies are not Bardsey specific! Local residents' views can be very NIMBY .	Disagree - policies are as specific as they can be, and the NDP is entirely Bardsey specific in its scope. No action required.

145	<p>Policy E1. Businesses in residential areas must be kept small. Growth is mentioned and is a worry. If a business starts small it may grow and say 3-4 employees may not be appropriate for residential areas. Modify to limit the size of business, 1 or 2 people and quiet is OK, more and noisy is not.</p> <p>Policy E3. Link this to Policy E1 to ensure that there is control over business size, no nuisance etc.</p>	<p>All covered in the policies already. No redrafting required.</p>
-----	--	---

SECTION 8 – COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Policy CF1: Retaining key community services and facilities

The retention of the following community facilities in their current use will be supported:

- Community centers
- Sports clubs
- Village Halls
- Public houses
- Primary schools
- Places of worship
- Village shops

Any proposals for change of use will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that:

- a. the land or building in question has fallen out of use; and
- b. there is demand and support for the new proposed use by the majority of the community*; or
- c. Alternative replacement provision has been identified and secured and this is supported by the majority of the community*.

* As established by a clear majority of those parish residents responding to public consultation.

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
CF1	Agree	147	95.5%	143	96.0%
	Disagree	3	1.9%	3	2.0%
	No Indication	4	2.6%	3	2.0%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

Policy CF2: Local Green Spaces

Development that results in the loss of designated Local Green Spaces or that results in any harm to their character, setting, accessibility or appearance or amenity value will only be permitted:

- if the community would gain equivalent benefit from provision of a suitable replacement alternative;
- Where development is essential to meet specific and necessary infrastructure needs and no alternative feasible site is available.

An assessment of potential areas to be designated as Local Green Spaces will be undertaken and results of this consulted upon. Initial suggestions for consideration are shown below::

SITE
'Rest' areas
Village Pond, Rigton Green, West Well
Wooded areas
Hetchel Woods, Willans Wood, Hellpot Woods, Barkers Plantation
Green areas
Castle Hill Mound, Parish Council Field on Blackmoor Lane, Parkfield,
Sport and Leisure
Bardsey Sports Club, Bardsey Primary School Playing Field, Children's playground, Bowling club, Tennis club
Other
Scout Hut and land, Green area to the front of Grange Close, Allotments, Footpaths, Cycle Ways and bridleways

POLICY	RESPONSE	TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS		TOTAL EXCLUDING SCARCROFT	
CF2	Agree	136	88.3%	132	88.6%
	Disagree	11	7.1%	11	7.4%
	No Indication	7	4.5%	6	4.0%
	TOTAL	154	100.0%	149	100.0%

RESPONDENT	COMMUNITY FACILITIES	Responses Proposed 02-10-2015 ES,IF,CS
3	CF1. Only if they are used regularly and shops are financially viable	Endorsement - no action required.
11	Not at all costs - the market will decide. E.G. Bingley will struggle to survive. Shop PO in EK closed.	Opinion - no implication for the draft.
18	Could upper part of SHLAA 1027 be designated a protected green space to safeguard views from Leeds Country Way?	Good point - SC to consider.

22	Catholic Church and land is out of use. Contact Leeds diocesan offices. (Contact details provided).	Useful info - contact to be taken up by Steering Committee
25	How many of those using the sports ground actually live in the Parish? If as believed minimal, the sports ground has development potential.	Contrary to the vision statement and objectives - we need to maintain and indeed improve the sports ground as the primary village sports facility. No action.
33	Services are already limited, so any reduction would have a negative effect on the community.	Agreed - NDP already provides for this. No redraft required.
51	Vitally important to improve all infrastructure given the anticipated population increase.	Envisaged increase is actually very modest. Infrastructure provision is considered as part of the planning process, so already covered.
52	How will we be able to rebuild the primary school <i>and</i> protect it as a 'local green space'?	Important point - SC to review.
54	CF1: Add Scout Hut and land!	Good point - add to NDP list.
59	CF2a: No reason to allow replacement without a real need (which is covered by CF2b)	Endorsement - no action required.
64	The reason we live here is because of the lovely green space and we pay more for our homes in Bardsey because of it.	Agreed - NDP already recognises this. No redraft required.
65	CF1: Should the tennis and bowling clubs be included on the list as a separate item because they are in a different location to the sports club? I don't agree that the tennis and bowling clubs should be relocated under any circumstances.	Already covered in existing wording.
66	All of the current facilities bring young and old together to give Bardsey its individual identity	Endorsement - no action required.
67	To be in keeping with the conservation areas.	Already covered in existing wording.
71	Local green spaces should remain whatever the circumstances, especially green belt.	Already covered in existing wording, albeit that greenbelt is outwith the control of the NDP.
77	Cf1c: wording needs tightening - how is 'a majority' defined? Those affected? All residents? Those that choose to express an opinion? What?	Agree - SC to review the definition of a majority.
79	CF2: 'Harm to the character' needs to be defined or clarified in order to agree or disagree from an informed position.	Agree - consider redrafting and clarifying the definition.
81	With the closure of the East Keswick Snooker Club, is there an opportunity to have a similar facility in Bardsey?	In principle yes, depending on available facilities and/or ability to provide them. Same applies to any other new club activity.
84	When did Castle Hill become Castle Mound?	Correct - this to be changed.
86	Should include upkeep and provision of footpaths to and from.	Covered under objectives, but agree to add footpaths to CF2 'other'.
93	There is no 'suitable replacement' for sites of historical interest/importance.	Agree - already covered by listings and assets of community value.

96	Village green spaces and the green belt boundaries are of paramount importance if the village is to retain its character and attraction.	Endorsement - no additional action required.
97	CF2: This should include preservation of habitat for wildlife.	Agree - provision for natural environment and wildlife to be strengthened throughout the NDP.
98	Very much against any changes to Bardsey Primary School.	Disagree - school is not up to current required standards and must be improved as soon as possible. Discount.
99	Leeds Country Way should be included as a local green space.	Inclusion of footpaths in CF2 'other' will cover this. (Actually LCC's responsibility not Bardsey's)
112	These are vital to maintain our village environment.	Endorsement - no action required.
113	CF2a: How do you replace a green space? CF2b: 'Specific and necessary infrastructure needs' - such as? Sites: Castle Mound is private and can never be built on. Primary school is not accessible so can this be classed as a green space?	CF2a - Good point - propose changing the word 'replacement' to 'alternative'. CF2b - refer to David Gluck for clarification. Sites - the point is they are green, not that they are publically accessible, so drafting is OK.
115	Rest areas' should include fields on Tithe Barn Lane and between Tithe Barn Lane and Church Lane.	Cannot include these fields as rest areas because they are not public property. No action appropriate.
131	IN PARTICULAR , I support the sites listed as local green areas and spaces. These are key characterful sites supporting YOUR VISION .	Endorsement - no action required.
132	I would be very reluctant to see any existing designated local green spaces used for building.	Agree - that's why we have listed them! Thus already covered.
136	CF2: Specific to Bardsey	Yes.
137	I would support development of the old railway line to Collingham/Wetherby for walking/cycling.	Extension of the network is already an objective, so already covered.
144	How could an applicant obtain the views of 'the majority of the community'? What is such a majority?	Agree - See 77.
145	Policy CF2, What is the designation process. If it is to take 3-4 years this will be too late. We suggest that the list should be available early to the Planning Authority pending designation in which case Development may respect it. Table, add to title to make clear the site designation, 'Sites of designated Local Green Spaces'.	Good point - check with Ian Mackay and David Gluck.
152	CF2: See general comments at page 1 above.	