

ABERFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

POLICY INTENTIONS DOCUMENT CONSULTATION – IMPLICATIONS FOR 1ST DRAFT PLAN

INTRODUCTION

This report is based on a review of the results from the consultation exercise carried out on the Neighbourhood Plan Policy Intentions Document (PID) over a six week period ending 26th June 2015.

The review focuses on the following matters considered critical for the production of a first draft Neighbourhood Plan:-

- Implications for the basic conditions which the final plan must ultimately satisfy;
- Comments pertaining to planning policy within the Neighbourhood Plan's remit;
- Key issues with a planning dimension not covered by the PID.

As such, planning matters beyond the plan's remit (eg Green Belt related), together with many non-planning matters (eg bus service reliability) and issues simply beyond the overall scope of the Neighbourhood Plan (eg complaints re historical changes) have not been noted for the purposes of this review. Obviously, non-planning matters will need to be properly assessed at some stage in order to produce a holistic Neighbourhood Plan.

In addition, the report also briefly highlights 'technical planning matters' identified by your consultant in relation to stated policy intentions which it is recommended be addressed in the first draft plan.

The report addresses each PID policy area in turn.

OVERVIEW

To place what follows in a general context, it should first be noted that the policies in all PID policy areas received large majority support from consultation respondents, with only 'Housing' and 'Transport' attracting, what might be called, 'significant minority opposition' ('teens percentages'). In all other policy areas, 'opposition' was more limited, ie 10% or less.

In general terms, there are few substantive implications for the first draft plan, even taking into account comments from Leeds City Council and AECOM on behalf of the Parlington Estate.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Consultation

Policy C1:-

- Some detailed comments re village hall, village shop, school (incl expand into chapel) and health facilities;
- More precise wording needed – eg to avoid perceived conflict with C2; dislike use of 'undermine'.

Policy C2 – more precise wording needed.

Technical Planning Matters

Policy C1 – full list of facilities to be protected is needed.

Other – how should NP address the village hall issue? What is latest situation?

HOUSING

Consultation

Policy H1 – define phrases such as “form of village” and “retain and reinforce”.

Policy H2:-

- Highlight need for housing for younger people, ie small/starter homes;
- Objective identification of housing need, ie assessment needed.

Technical Planning Matters

Policy H1 – suggest expanding this into a more detailed policy on ‘development on unallocated sites’, covering both locational and development principles/criteria. This would be a locally tailored version of an existing Core Strategy policy.

Policy H2:-

- Why ‘more than 6 dwellings’?
- Evidential underpin needed.

ENVIRONMENT

Consultation

Policy E1:-

- Football ground should be included;
- Drivers Verges should not be included because part of adopted highway.

Policy E2:-

- Meaning of ‘meaningful’?
- More usable spaces needed for older children;
- Cycle paths and walkways need to be considered;
- Duplicates Core Strategy Policy G4.

Technical Planning Matters

Policy E1:-

- LGS protection needs to be made clearer and stronger;
- Define list of LGS candidate sites to be produced and properly assessed against NPPF criteria;

- Enhancement needs to be separated out and covered by new policy in this section or as part of 'Design' or 'Development on Unallocated Sites' policy. Scope also for concept statement(s)/outline brief(s) for specific LGSs where particular enhancements envisaged;
- Buffer zones and 'links' better dealt with in separate 'Local Green Infrastructure' policy.

Policy E2:-

- Local tailoring required, ie what are Aberford's specific deficiencies, to avoid simply duplicating Core Strategy.
- Is there need/scope for location-specific proposals/allocations?
- If linking new green space to development, may be better dealt with in 'Development on Unallocated Sites' policy.

Other:-

- Consider scope for new policy on 'Non-designated Natural Heritage Assets', ie unprotected wildlife sites;
- Consider detailed Special Landscape Area policy in context of saved UDP policy as this designation surrounds village.

DESIGN

Consultation

No substantive comments.

Technical Planning Matters

Much expanded and more detailed policy/policies based on Conservation Area Appraisal and VDS to be developed.

HERITAGE

Consultation

Policy HE1 – revisit wording considered too absolute. Suggestions for list made.

Technical Planning Matters

Definitive list to be produced, separating out natural assets/Local Green Spaces from heritage assets and excluding listed buildings/structures, Ancient Monuments.

TRANSPORT

Consultation

Policy T1 – how workable is this?

Policy T2:-

- Locations for possible village parking area(s) suggested – Coal Staithe(s)/small area of Simpson’s Field; behind village hall;
- Not dissimilar to LCC guidance (NB Government ‘edict’ on NPs and parking standards – see below).

Technical Planning Matters

Policy T1 – might be better covered in ‘Development on Unallocated Sites’ policy.

Policy T2 – Contrary to Government policy on parking standards in development plans.

NEW ISSUES

- New/improved bus routes suggested – 174 evening service; 10 extended to Lotherton Hall; hourly bus to Garforth.
- Traffic management at Hook Moor.
- Employment is missing from the NP, but was in 2011 ‘Vision Masterplan’, ie potential renewable energy centre and live/work units or offices and/or workshops at Parlinton.
- Parlinton Estate – UDP Policy LT5B Major Leisure and Tourism Facilities still extant.
- Aberford Motors Site.