

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

Respondent	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Action
C G Pryce & P Pryce [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	No housing assessment has been specifically carried out for Scarcroft	Correct.	Schedule as a community action
	No improvement in facilities for the residents or increase of affordable housing despite the obvious needs	Policy seeks to develop facilities	No change
	The proposal of Wood Farm has been completely overlooked and that it offers a very sympathetic development for Scarcroft in terms of housing terms and nature features along the existing footpath.	Not overlooked but no site allocations	No change
Peter Bacon – [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Policy BE2 no. 1,2,3,4. Post office row No. 2 was the village P.O. probably for 100 years.	Noted	Alter plan
	Development which would result in the loss of any of the stated community facilities, as stated on The Neighbourhood Plan Map should provide alternative equivalent facilities wherever a sufficient level of continuing community needs is identified.	CF1	No change
	Development proposals for the provision of new community facilities within Scarcroft, of demonstrable use to the Scarcroft and wider community will be supported	CF1	
	Proposals for a small scale standalone food store will be acceptable subject to a Wetherby road location and the provision of off road car parking.	CF3	
Carter Jonas, Kate Broadbank MRTPI. Parish Clerk, Scarcroft Parish council, 3 Keswick Grange, East Keswick, Leeds, LS17 9BX.	Site 14 under policy GE3. Client does not feel that the site meets the requirements of LGS designation and we have been instructed to write to you setting out his objections and reasons why. (Site doesn't meet ALL of the criteria of paragraph 77) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land is located on the northern edge of Scarcroft and is considered to be reasonably close to the local community There is no public access allowed on the rest of the site. The community value of much of the site is therefore low. Designations are not appropriate for extensive tracts of land on the edge of settlements. The land is privately owned and therefore it cannot be guaranteed that the site would continue to be managed as per its current regime in the future 	Refers to Syke Lane/Wetherby Road Bridleway. Agreed. Not required. The value to the community is the bridleway. Not extensive and nothing in guidance makes reference to 'edge of settlements'. Public ownership not required.	Leave the proposed LGS in the Submission version.

Respondent	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Action
Natural England. Oliver Walton – Yorkshire and Northern Lincolnshire Area Team.	The Local authority will need to carefully consider the implications on the Draft Leeds site allocations plan HRA and SEA and the consequences should the neighbourhood plan come forward before the Leeds site allocation plan	Noted	None
	Where neighbourhood plans could have significant environmental effects, they may require a strategic environmental assessment (SEA) under the environmental Assessment of plans and programmes Regulations 2004	Noted	Not required
Historic England Yorkshire. Craig Broadwith, historic places advisor	The Scarcroft neighbourhood plan area is situated to the north east of Leeds's urban area. It contains 8 grade II listed buildings, 2 scheduled monuments and the Scarcroft conservation area. Scarcroft district is also likely to include buildings and sites of local historic interest, which may upon investigation be considered to be of greater significance.	Noted	No change
	We suggest that every time map is cited, the map number and page should be clearly referenced to in the text, and each map attributed with number a clear title to distinguish it.	Noted	Amend plan
	We suggest that each policy should have a unique number so it can be easily cited	Noted	Agreed
	Policy BE3.5. Normally be of two story's and employ regular fenestration.	Noted and agree	Amend policy
	Policy BE2: Potential Non-Statutory Heritage Assets. We suggest that the title of this policy be amended to "locally important Heritage Assets" and that the pre-amble text, be amended to use this terminology	Noted and agree	Amend policy
	Appendix 5 potential non-statutory heritage assets. We suggest that the title of this appendix be amended to "locally important heritage assets" and that the pre-amble text is amended to use this terminology.	Noted and agree	Amend Appendix
	We also suggest that the following text is added at the end of policy BE 2: "The plans assessment of the particular significance of any locally important heritage asset (including its setting), as listed in Appendix 5 and identified on The Neighbouring Plan Map, will be taken into account when considering the impact of any development proposal on such an asset.	Noted and agree	Amend policy
R.M Whitaker. ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████	We are hoping for an opportunity to purchase the land and buildings we farm.	Noted	No change
	Our business abuts this site as do the fields next to the cricket pitch which we farm. At various public meetings over the last few years the Parish Council has intimated they would like to have the use of this land for recreational purposes!	Not in the gift of the PC	No change

Respondent	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Action
[REDACTED]	There were rumours of the premises being converted into a hotel and leisure facility a few years ago. Surely this would have been a substantial enhancement to the village and provide local people with jobs.	Not in the gift of the PC	No change
	Mr Jackson has been offering various nature features along the public footpath and other benefits for the village. We think what he has been proposing for his tired buildings in the Conservation area would have been a long-lasting improvement to village life, especially if more reasonably priced houses were built.	Plan is not allocating sites	No change
	We feel a suitable development of Wood Farm should be included in your proposals and that you should re-consider exactly what the position is with the npower site.	Plan is not allocating sites	No change
Alex Jackson, Owner of Wood Farm, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	I request that the brownfield area of Wood farm is designated for housing as per the red line OS plan attached herewith produced by Leeds City Council in 2015.	Plan is not allocating sites	No change
	The reliance on a questionnaire carried out in 2012, that the villagers did not want any more houses in Scarcroft is flawed and outdated.	Most up to date available. Agree that undertaking a new survey post SAP would be helpful but too late for this Plan.	No change
	The aspect of the possibility of some market housing and the potential of the village doubling the width of the new playground (north) plus extending it rearwards (east) to the tree line could provide a 'win-win' situation.	Not required at this time.	No change
	This change from mixed use to all housing is potentially destroying the major employment opportunity in the village especially as the concrete 1970's office block and ancillary buildings could still become a hotel and leisure centre with a modicum of housing.	Not within the NDP's gift	No change
	30 per hectare for the NP site and only 10 per hectare everywhere else. This would be totally impractical for a developer and land owner to provide these categories of housing in a viable way at that density.	Noted opinion	No change
	Dictatorial plus housing densities showing favouritism to one site only, should be removed from the Neighbourhood Plan (SNDP).	Noted opinion	No change
	Within the SPC's consultation there are many other suggestions for amenity, leisure, medical and schooling facilities. The use and take up of these, given the many existing facilities in neighbouring villages and large sports complexes less than 20 minutes drive away could well produce a 'white elephant' development unless there is a thorough investigation and	Agreed	No change

Respondent	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Action
	research into any actual possible future usage if constructed. The schooling aspect should be analysed and evaluated and conjunction with surrounding parish councils.		
	The SPC should designate WF for housing in the Scarcroft Neighbourhood Development Plan 2017-18 and support attempts of the younger generation and those needing to live in the village into either affordable ownership or rent.	NDP is not allocating housing sites	No change
Leeds City Council – Tim Hill	3.1. The Plan seems to follow a similar format to a number of neighbourhood plans being prepared in Leeds. This is not good practice as neighbourhood plans should be locally-distinctive. Whilst it is understood that a number of communities in Leeds are seeking to address similar issues, it is important that NP policies are based on locally-specific and locally-evidenced circumstances, rather than re-iterating policies found within NPs in surrounding areas and making those policies fit to the Scarcroft Neighbourhood Area.	Noted.	No change
	3.3. Future-proofing is recommended, i.e. “emerging Site Allocations Plan”, “recent”, “today”. Will phrases such as these be relevant in 15 years’ time? (Local Economy section on page 6, for example).	Noted & agreed	Alter Plan.
	3.4. The Policies would benefit from being more easily identified within the Plan document, i.e. through the use of a text box or some colour. Currently, it would be easy for them to be missed or incorrectly conceived of as supporting text.	Noted & agreed	Alter Plan
	3.5. Rather than use the phrasing “Otherwise acceptable development...” at the start of each policy, policies could be reworded to make the “supported” item the subject of the policy statement. See comments for Policy GE5 for an example of this.	Understood – agree changes	Alter Plan
	4.1. Map titles and locations would benefit from being rationalised and references to them made clearer. Maps in the appendices would benefit from being correctly labelled and appropriately referenced throughout the NP text. The Council can assist with basic mapping.	Noted	Amend
	4.2. Map 1 title should simply read “Scarcroft Neighbourhood Area” with “October 2016” removed. The Council is happy to provide this.	Noted	Amend

Respondent	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Action
	4.3. It is assumed that “Scarcroft Neighbourhood Plan Map 1” on page 29 is the proposals map for the Plan. If so, it is missing a key. Should this not be Map 2?	Noted	Amend
	5.1. Front cover – the Plan should clearly state the Plan Period.	2017-2033	2017-33
	5.2. References to “District Council” should be “Local Planning Authority”.	Noted	Amend
	5.3. Some of the introductory text is repetitive, i.e. the description of housing types is provided twice on page 5.	Noted	Edit
	5.4. Page 6 – why is it assumed that those who live in affordable housing require access to public transport?	Not assumed – “may be a consideration” – how is that not accurate?	No change
	5.5. Page 6 – why is it assumed that only elderly people use chiropody services?	Delete reference to elderly people	Edit
	5.7. Page 10 – Should the first Vision Statement read “... and at the same time retain its established character, identity and status...”?	Agreed	Edit
	Green Environment Page 11 column 2 states that the SLA is defined on a map – but it is not apparent which map this is? Map 2 then appears at the end of the Plan. Suggest that this is moved to the relevant policy section to improve the readability of the document as a whole.	Reorder and define maps	Edit
	6.1. Policy GE1: The Collingham/ East Keswick/Bardsey/ Scarcroft/ Thorner/ Shadwell Special Landscape Area This policy is verbatim of Policy E1 of the Pre-Submission Draft Aberford Neighbourhood Plan. To some extent this policy mimics existing saved UDP special landscape policies. There is an opportunity to make this more locally-specific. Perhaps more clarity as to what would “seriously harm the character and appearance of the landscape.” How would a Development Management officer judge this when considering a planning application?	Noted	No change
	6.2. Policy GE2: Local Green Infrastructure This policy is verbatim of Policy E2 of the Pre-Submission Draft Aberford Neighbourhood Plan.	Disagree. Designed to maintain corridors.	No change

Respondent	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Action
	<p>The protection of Local Green Infrastructure from development is too restrictive as currently drafted. It does not have sufficient regard to national policy.</p> <p>Local strategic policies offer more flexibility in this respect. What evidence is there to support a 'tighter' policy?</p> <p>Suggest the policy refers to 'regard to'.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure corridors are not shown on Map 3 although they are in the appendices; suggest that they are included on Map 3 for context.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p>	<p>Check evidence</p> <p>Amend</p> <p>Amend</p>
	<p>6.3. Policy GE3: Local Green Space Appendix 3 sets out the Parish Council's assessment of candidate Local Green Spaces, but then goes on to designate all of the candidates as Local Green Spaces. An examiner will require a robust assessment. Please provide more information on the process.</p> <p>Paragraphs 77 and 78 of the NPPF state that Local Green Space designations will not be appropriate for most green spaces and that they must be "demonstrably special."</p> <p>The majority of the proposed Local Green Spaces are situated in the Green Belt. As such, the designation of these sites as Local Green Spaces will not afford them any additional protection. Numerous examiners have not recommended the designation of LGS in the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Robust analysis in appendix</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Different purpose to GB.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
	<p>6.4. Policy GE4: Local Green Space Enhancement This Policy is verbatim of Policy E4 of the Aberford Pre-Submission Draft NP.</p> <p>This policy appears more like a community aspiration for the spending of CIL monies. The parish council could identify CIL spending priorities in the neighbourhood plan. Could it be more specific in terms of shape, function, and location within new housing developments?</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Action
	<p>Many examiners will recommend that a policy like this is deleted and turned into a 'community action'.</p> <p>It may be better to change to 'The enhancement of the following Local Green Space sites will be supported.'</p>	Agreed	Amend
	<p>6.5. Policy GE5: Provision of New Green Space The locally-specific nature of this policy is welcomed, as it identifies evidenced deficiencies of greenspace typologies in Scarcroft.</p> <p>Nigel McGurk's recommended modifications to a number of NPs in Leeds have altered similar policies (recent examinations: Boston Spa and Bardsey-cum-Rigton). Suggested new wording:</p> <p>"The provision of the following greenspace typologies in new developments will be supported where appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity Green Space • Equipped Play Provision for Children and Young People • Allotments • Natural Green Space" <p>This would improve the clarity of the Plan Policies and the chance of passing examination.</p>	Noted. Useful comment.	Amend Plan.
	<p>Built Environment</p> <p>For information: Conservation Area should be capitalised.</p>	Noted	Amend
	<p>6.6. Policy BE1: Scarcroft Hill Local Heritage Area Clarity is needed on what a "Local Heritage Area" is and what it would mean in policy terms. How does it differ from a Conservation Area? Repetition of a CAAMP for an area that is not a Conservation Area isn't supported by enough evidence at Appendix 4 (a more thorough analysis would be beneficial).</p> <p>Clarity is needed on what "inappropriate infill" means. What qualities would make infill development appropriate?</p>	<p>More evidence if possible. Develop form of words that clarifies the difference between LHA and CA.</p> <p>All infill is inappropriate?</p>	<p>Amend where helpful to clarity and case.</p> <p>Amend.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Action
	<p>Recommend that the Key Views are plotted on the Neighbourhood Plan Map.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Provide new map.</p>
	<p>6.7. Policy BE2: Potential Non-Statutory Heritage Assets It is recommended that the policy simply identifies “non-designated heritage assets” which highlights the assets, removing “potential” from the title and policy wording.</p> <p>The policy is too ‘wordy’ as written. Perhaps something like: ‘The non-designated heritage assets listed below and identified on The Neighbourhood Plan Map should be considered in any development proposals. Their protection, preservation or sympathetic enhancement is encouraged.’</p> <p>The assessment of these assets at Appendix 5 is thorough and welcomed. Map 4 would benefit from being much clearer.</p>	<p>Agreed. Also add ‘local’ as per HE advice.</p> <p>Helpful</p> <p>Check map</p>	<p>Amend</p> <p>Amend</p> <p>Alter as required</p>
	<p>6.8. Policy BE3: Development and Design in Scarcroft Conservation Area The title of the policy refers to development within the Conservation Area, but the text of the policy then refers to sites adjacent to the Conservation Area. Much of this policy repeats text already stated within the draft Scarcroft Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan. Given the repetition, there is a risk that this would be deleted by the examiner. However, it is appreciated that this policy also refers to UDP saved policies.</p> <p>It is beneficial to state the use of appropriate materials; however the Policy could be more specific. Sandstone is a vague term – could this be “sandstone of the type used in historic Scarcroft”?</p>	<p>Change title</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Amend</p> <p>Amend</p>
	<p>6.9. Policy BE4: Development and Design outside the Conservation Area and Local Heritage Area It is recommended that supporting evidence is not referred to as “light touch”. How should a development “take account of...” the aspects listed?</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Alter wording to similar to BE3</p>	<p>Amend</p> <p>Amend</p>
	<p>6.10 Policy CF1: Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities This policy is verbatim of Policy CF1 of the Pre-Submission Draft Aberford NP.</p>		

Respondent	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Action
	<p>This policy is onerous and conflicts with Permitted Development rights for the change of use. It is recommended that this policy is re-drafted; one option could be as set out below:</p> <p>‘The loss of any community facilities as shown on The Neighbourhood Plan Map should result in the provision of alternative equivalent facilities within the village as defined on The Neighbourhood Plan Map unless a lack of need is proven. Commercial facilities must demonstrate they have been marketed for at least one year and are no longer viable.’</p>	Acceptable	Amend
	<p>6.11 Policy CF2: Provision of New Community Facilities Is this policy intended to apply only within the village of Scarcroft, rather than the whole parish? This should be shown spatially on the Neighbourhood Plan map.</p> <p>It is not possible for a planning policy to require a private business to continue trading, whether there is local demand or not.</p>	<p>Parish wide</p> <p>Policy does not this</p>	<p>Change words or redefine village.</p> <p>No change</p>
	<p>6.12 Policy CF3: Retail Development in Scarcroft Village The evidence section for this policy will quickly become outdated. It might be better for the NP to simply allocate a site?</p> <p>The Scarcroft-specific approach is welcomed. However, the evidence section would benefit from stressing how Scarcroft is currently poorly served in terms of shopping facilities. i.e., how close is the nearest shop? How does this adversely impact on traffic, etc. in the Parish? How would the provision of a small shop in Scarcroft contribute to local amenity?</p> <p>It is recommended that “small scale” is defined.</p> <p>Is this policy seeking to repeat the Core Strategy Policy? If so, it is likely that an Examiner would recommend that this Policy is deleted. The preference for a Wetherby Road location is understandable; however some locations on Wetherby Road are detached from Scarcroft village. Perhaps the Policy could say “in close proximity to Wetherby Road and within the existing residential area.”?</p>	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Check evidence</p> <p>Define</p> <p>Amend</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Action
	<p>Housing</p> <p>Outer North East HMCA not sector.</p> <p>“Already developed site” – brownfield site?</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Amend</p> <p>PDL or Brownfield</p>
	<p>6.13 Policy H1: Wetherby Road – Scarcroft Lodge Development Requirements (HG2-26)</p> <p>This policy should be shown spatially on a Map.</p> <p>This policy includes significant site requirements which raise concern over the impacts on viability, in particular with regard to green space, affordable housing and build quality. This would raise concerns at examination.</p> <p>Highways: What evidence is there for the additional highways site requirements? A residential scheme on the site may well have a reduced impact on highways issues compared to the previous office use which facilitated hundreds of commuters every day.</p> <p>Proportion of Development: Limiting development just to the east of Scarcroft Lodge reduces the site by about 50%. The Conservation Area and Listed Building site requirements in the SAP should be sufficient to ensure that the setting of Scarcroft lodge is protected without being overly prescriptive about the location of development. Limiting development just to the existing hardstanding areas could also result in an oddly-shaped residential development which could impact on the character and appearance of the redevelopment. The existing UDP Green Belt policies and the NPPF are more flexible and allow for land swaps to take place providing it has no greater impact on the Green Belt. The existing development is also 4 storeys in scale and has significant massing. The NP policy could miss the opportunity to spread some of this massing across the site.</p> <p>Archaeology: Where is the evidence to justify this part of the policy? The Council has previously consulted West Yorkshire Archaeology Services on this site and there have been no concerns raised.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Check evidence</p>	<p>Change Policies Map</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>Alter as necessary</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Action
	<p>Greenspace: Whilst off-site greenspace provision is a sound aspiration, it raises concerns over deliverability, as it is not clear whether the land is in the same ownership, as part of the land has recently been sold. This part of the policy could read “Where feasible... green space should be provided off-site within adjacent land, etc.” It is also not clear where the old Bowling Green and tennis courts are? The redevelopment of these facilities would be costly.</p> <p>Scarcroft Lodge: There are concerns over how this part of the Policy has regard to the NPPF and Listed Building Status. It is recommended that it provides more flexibility in terms of uses which may encourage the re-use of a Listed Building and would be encouraged by the NPPF.</p> <p>Community Facilities: Further consideration is needed with regard to deliverability and potential CIL receipts from the re-development of the site. It is recommended that the Policy suggests how the green space requirement may be delivered for the site, such as through the improvements to the cricket ground, pavilion and car parking.</p> <p>Consultation: Engagement with landowners is a crucial facet of neighbourhood planning. There are concerns that due to the recent sale of the land, the new landowners have not yet been consulted about the NP proposals for the site. It would be worthwhile to work with landowners on such schemes. This will be an important consideration at examination.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Disagree. Maintain as is.</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Have we engaged? Check.</p>	<p>Amend</p> <p>No change</p> <p>Amend policy</p> <p>Consult if not already done.</p>
	<p>6.14 H2: Development on Non-Allocated Sites The first bullet point of the policy should simply be the introductory statement.</p> <p>Some of the clauses are negatively-worded; could these be “flipped” to be positively worded? See below as an example.</p> <p>“Avoid adverse impacts on Scarcroft’s special environmental and built heritage features as detailed and covered in sections 5.1 and 5.2 of this plan;”</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Agree</p>	<p>Amend</p> <p>Amend</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Action
	<p>It would perhaps be better to say: "Maintain and enhance Scarcroft's special environmental and built heritage features;"?</p> <p>It is not good practice to cross-reference within a Policy.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p>	<p>Amend</p> <p>Delete</p>
	<p>6.15 Policy H3: Housing Density HG2-26 is not an allocated site. It is a proposed allocation.</p> <p>The NP previously mentions that there are some terraced houses in Scarcroft – do these exceed the 10dph as set out by this policy? In many cases, higher density may be appropriate. Are there "character area"-specific densities? The housing policies could make better use of this Character Assessment found in the appendices.</p> <p>10dph is very low and does not appear to promote sustainable development. The benefits of the policy need to be considered against the sustainability benefits of making efficient use of land (so that less greenfield and Green Belt land are required) and achieving higher populations in proximity to services and facilities as dictated in national policy.</p> <p>This policy would need to be supported by more robust evidence in order to pass Examination.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Consider a more nuanced approach which relies more on locality rather than NA wide policy.</p>	<p>Amend</p> <p>Redraft policy to make acceptable.</p>
	<p>6.16 Policy H4: Housing Mix</p> <p>How is the East Keswick Housing Needs Assessment reasonably applied to Scarcroft? This signifies a lacklustre approach, and it is likely that an Examiner would question this evidence.</p> <p>At a threshold of 5 units, it would be difficult to achieve the mix outlined by the Policy, but instead the policy could encourage a mix of dwellings, highlighting the preferred options.</p> <p>This policy seems to be in conflict with Policy H3 of the Neighbourhood Plan. H4 seeks to provide smaller units while H3 seeks to ensure very low</p>	<p>Best local evidence available</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. Smaller required as part of the overall mix not exclusivelt.</p>	<p>Add the need for a new HNS to community actions.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Action
	<p>density. We would question the viability of small units at such low densities.</p> <p>7. Monitoring, Review and Implementation</p> <p>7.1. Suggest that it is made clear that the inclusion of projects in the plan does not imply that the Council has agreed to undertake them.</p> <p>7.2. Examples for PROW improvement projects could emulate the Council's PROW Improvement Plan, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making all paths suitable for their extended use by improving the surface and drainage as appropriate; • Improving ease of access along key recreational routes by improving the standard of maintenance, path furniture and signing; • Identifying areas where paths could be made more accessible for those with mobility problems <p>7.3. The Plan could also mention the Leeds Country Way, a strategic recreational route part of which passes through the designated Neighbourhood Area.</p>	All noted	Make additions to this section as proposed
	<p>8. Appendices</p> <p>8.1. Throughout the plan there are references to the appendices, this could be highlighted further or more clearly. For example, the Community Facilities and Services section (5.3) makes a quick reference to Appendix 7 but it is easily missed. This would help with supporting the policies with robust evidence.</p> <p>8.2. Appendix 3 – refer to 'Local Green Space' rather than "green space" and to 'assessment' or 'conclusion' rather than "recommendation".</p> <p>8.3. Appendix 5 – delete reference to "potential".</p> <p>8.4. Appendix 6 contains information concerning Public Rights of Way, yet is not referenced within the Neighbourhood Plan or as part of a policy.</p>	Noted	<p>Check and clarify notations.</p> <p>Amend as required</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Action
	<p>Is the intention to include policies rather than just Community Actions concerning PROW? It is advised that the NP does not introduce new policies beyond the Pre-Submission Stage as these will not have stemmed from robust consultation and engagement.</p> <p>8.5. The figures used relating to lengths of Public Rights of Way are out of date. There are now 7.89km of PROW, 3.2km of which are bridleways leaving 4.69km of footpaths. There are no permissive paths, and there 3 claimed paths, on a footpath to bridleway upgrade, on a bridleway to byway open to all traffic upgrade (with limited evidence likely to be available) ad one new bridleway along the disused railway. There appears to be limited other routes that could be described as 'permissive' or 'unrecorded' paths.</p> <p>8.6. The Plan could include a Map showing the existing PROW within and adjoining the Neighbourhood Area. This could include the non-definitive routes. The Council's PROW section is willing to supply such information when requested.</p>	<p>Offer noted</p>	<p>Request from LCC</p>