

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
g	1	Resident	General	<p>I really appreciate the time and effort that volunteers have put in to develop such a comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>My preference would be for there to be a Plan which would succeed at the referendum stage. However, I think that the Plan, as currently drafted, is not sufficiently tightly worded. I give several examples of this below. My concern is that if the Plan passes as drafted, it could be used as evidence to suggest that the local population supports measures beyond the scope of what is actually intended. I have tried to identify the main areas affected by this and given suggestions below of how they could be tightened.</p> <p>In my view the document is far too long – by around 250 pages. The length of the document will no doubt mean that some people who do have an interest in the future of Garforth, but who are either busy or are just not used to reading such long documents may be put off of reading, commenting, contributing or voting. I would anticipate that this will mean that the respondents to the consultation are not representative of the demographic mix of Garforth as a whole. I think the aim should be for a 10- to 20-page document which puts almost all of the detail currently within the Plan into separate documents which can be cross-referred from the main body. Further advantages of this approach would be:</p> <p>It would allow for a more dynamic approach; whereby other documents could be updated without needing to amend the whole Plan.</p> <p>Currently, the Plan could do with proof-reading and copy-editing (unfortunately I don't think it's yet cohesively written enough). This would be an easier task if the document was condensed.</p> <p>I have provided specific comments below. I have commented by exception - where I have not commented, I am generally supportive.</p>	<p>Garforth has many complex issues and the length of the Plan reflects this. The detail and evidence has to be available for the eventual examination. Much of the evidence is in the appendices which make up more than 100 pages of the Plan. Given that the Plan, if approved, will be considered by planners at LCC and developers it is important that the detail is there.</p> <p>To ensure the main thrust of the Plan was available widely a summary leaflet was sent to all households in Garforth as part of the consultation in early 2021.</p> <p>The final revised version will be proof read again.</p> <p>We will address specific comments as we read them.</p>	
g	15	Resident	General	<p>GNPF Demographic</p> <p>Inaccurate Population Numbers</p> <p>Flawed Research Survey</p> <p>Lack of Cross-Representative Sample</p> <p>Lack of appropriate support for the Policy Intention Survey</p> <p>Lack of Statistical Significance</p>	<p>The Forum has always been open to all Garforth residents and every effort has been made to encourage participation from the community. See Introduction section 1.1 Background to the Plan. A history of all the consultations involving residents will be available on the website.</p>	<p>Wording in Introduction checked to ensure it accurately reflects what happened to involve Garforth residents in the initial stages of</p>

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					<p>GNPF's survey approach has been consistent with what other NP groups have done at pre-submission consultation stage and meets the requirements of NP Regulation 14.</p> <p>Population numbers have been derived from available data – there is an opportunity to capture Census 2021 information should the timing be OK. Otherwise we can use Mid-Year estimates from the Census for Garforth & Swillington Ward (again these are difficult to ascertain for the Garforth Neighbourhood Area specifically so a number of assumptions will have to be drawn)</p> <p>The purpose of the informal Policy Intentions Survey was not to gain a specific % of support from residents, rather to check in on the direction of travel – it is not a requirement to do this stage and is an informal part of the consultation process.</p>	the Forum's establishment.
g	25	Resident	General	<p>The Missing Age Group 20-39</p> <p>Its quite clear Garforth has an unbalanced demographic with more over 60's which is a problem. In Garforth the aging population i.e. those over 65 is around 5.5% above the UK average, a more significant problem exists with those aged 20-39 which is actually around 5% under the UK average.</p>	Comments noted	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>The more concerning item which should be made explicit in the report is the decrease in people aged between 20-39 living in Garforth, which is significantly less than the national average. In fact the Arc survey highlights the 2.5 decline in people aged between 33 and 54 also.</p> <p>It cannot be stressed how important this demographic is for the continuity of Garforth in its current form.</p> <p>Working age is now defined as those between the ages of 16 and 64, on average those aged between 30 and 64 have higher household expenditures compared to those under 30 or over 64 (ONS).</p> <p>An ageing population results in reduced expenditure resulting in less being spent in local shops and on local services and a general economic decline. The stated vision of the Garforth Plan is for “a town centre which is vibrant and re-invigorated. There would be a broad range of shops and businesses; many of these would be local. One of our objectives talks about creating a town centre that is more attractive and more active”.</p> <p>Its difficult to see how this will actually be realised if the average household expenditure in Garforth declines as a result of failing to address the changing demographics of the working population and the reduced number of families who are likely to find the area attractive to move to.</p>		
g	28	Resident	General	<p>Economics</p> <p>The report appears to deride the charity shops, takeaways and hairdressers on Main Street, these shops will arguably persist as the area becomes more economically disadvantaged. As the number of working age adults with disposable income to spend on services declines, the number of younger people on lower income increases and the recommendation to have more flats, cheaper rent and smaller homes are implemented, its difficult to see how this will improve Main Street.</p> <p>Worryingly the working age demographic group is not particularly well represented in the Garforth Plan by the very nature that they don't make up the current population, whereas the over 60s are over-represented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q28 – What recommendations does the Garforth plan make to actively encourage those of working age to move to Garforth? <p>The report seems to recognise a decline in “younger” age groups however the messaging is mixed and its not clear if “young” are in the demographic between 18 and 24 or broader. The conclusions drawn within the report appear to favour smaller accommodation for single individuals or young couples.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q29 – Can the definition of “young” be clarified or made more consistent within the report? <p>One obvious point is that the needs of families seeking larger homes who may have moved away from Garforth due to the size of housing is not even</p>	<p>Comment on charity shops noted.</p> <p>Actively encouraging people of working age to move to Garforth is not within the remit of the Plan.</p> <p>Q 29 comment accepted.</p>	<p>Remove sentence in 3.2 Town Centre referring to “over abundance of certain types of outlets”. Remove Bullet under Key Issues, Town Centre referring to “ over representation”</p> <p>Add definition of “ young” to glossary as those between 18 and 35.</p>

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				considered. The Arc survey was explicit about this, but this has been selectively ignored in favour of a downsizing strategy.	Comment on Arc survey noted	Arc survey will be looked at again.
g	419	Garforth Independents (GI)	General	Garforth and Swillington Independents will be offering a comprehensive response to this pre- submission consultation document ahead of the finalising of the Garforth Neighbourhood Plan which, we understand, could go to referendum as early as 2022.	Thank you for taking the time to read and comment on our Plan.	
g	420	GI	General	We think it is important that local residents who take part in this consultation have a fuller view as to the benefits and indeed implications of developing a plan but, equally, wish to set into context the nature of how this document has come to pass and how the situation around its development to get us to this stage has changed within the last six years.	<p>In terms of the benefits and implications of developing a NP, this will ultimately depend on the policies that are included in the neighbourhood plan and on the national and local planning issues/policies in the future. There is some uncertainty over this at the present time given imminent planning reforms. However, the main benefits of having a NP are considered to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The policies in the neighbourhood plan will be statutory local planning policies (once the plan is Made) and will allow local people to help shape development that takes place in the future - Greater protection will be given to local greenspaces than otherwise would be 	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					<p>the case (subject to LGS designations)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Having a Made neighbourhood plan will mean extra CIL will come to Garforth (25% as opposed to 15%) - The existence of a neighbourhood forum is important for the understanding, capacity building and status of Garforth now and in the future. <p>Regarding the implications of having a neighbourhood plan, it is accepted that plan should be 'risk aware' regarding unintended consequences in relation to the policies or the supporting text.</p> <p>A check to ensure this is the case will be undertaken prior to submission for independent examination. The background to the development of the Plan is included at the start of the document.</p>	
g	421	GI	General	Whilst we accept that any neighbourhood plan is drafted, finalised and progressed through referendum on that basis, this is a fundamental fact of the process under the act that cannot, and indeed should not be ignored.	Agreed, although the interpretation of the Localism Act is open to differing opinions. Housebuilding will	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					take place in every neighbourhood in the country over the plan period, whether there is a neighbourhood plan in place or not. The neighbourhood plan offers an opportunity to shape housebuilding and to benefit from it through an additional CIL receipt where there is a Made neighbourhood plan.	
g	422	GI	General	In Garforth in 2015 we faced an extremely serious situation. The Labour council had earmarked our area for tens of thousands of houses to be built East of Garforth and North of Garforth on the ancient woodland known as Parlington.	The proposed allocation has been deleted by the Council. Comment noted.	
g	423	GI	General	An added complication was that the land to the east was parish land under Aberford who would have benefited from any potential Section 106 or community infrastructure levy (CIL) monies. The land to the north at Parlington was, actually, in a different housing market characteristic area (HMCA) and therefore, Garforth would not have benefited from any financial windfall generated from volume housebuilding.	With a Made neighbourhood plan, Garforth will receive 25% of CIL on eligible housing development within the Garforth Neighbourhood Area. Part of the proposed allocation was within the Garforth Neighbourhood Area.	
g	424	GI	General	This was the worst of all possible situations. Six years ago it was our opinion that Garforth needed a plan to clearly demonstrate where our needs lay in terms of infrastructure and green/recreation facilities, but an informal agreement was reached with Aberford that any monies generated in terms of CIL would have come to Garforth. Nevertheless we were of the opinion that a plan was required to demonstrate to any party that the community had a clear and coherent view as to where any monies should be spent that was generated from volume housebuilding.	The need for a clear plan regarding infrastructure and green/recreation facilities is agreed and understood.	
g	430	GI	General	We must express our disappointment that the process has taken six years.	Of the 17 NPs completed in Leeds so far, the average time taken is 6 years 2 months. Of course, there is huge variety in the size of these different communities. Some are small	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					<p>villages with few planning issues, others are large towns with complex needs and problems. The size of a neighbourhood plan and effort involved determines the time required. Garforth is a large community, with complex issues. Of the comparable towns within the Leeds Metropolitan area that have completed their plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Horsforth took 7 years and 3 months • Otley took 8 years and 4 months • Wetherby took 7 years and 5 months 	
g	431	GI	General	In that time, and this is not meant disrespectfully, the group has progressed a series of other agendas over and above their core purpose of developing a plan which, ironically, in our opinion now leaves much of the plan looking somewhat outdated in terms of housing development that we are all keen to avoid or, at the very least, see developed in a much more sustainable way.	<p>The core purpose of the Forum has always been the production of a Neighbourhood Plan. However, neighbourhood forums can, if they wish, seek to achieve other things too (as has happened elsewhere in Leeds and across the country). The Plan is in the process of being suitably updated to reflect the current situation.</p>	
g	432	GI	General	One significant concern we do have is, in the six-year process, the group put forward a larger piece of land for development on Selby Road that has led to the developers winning on appeal, and creating more unnecessary	The Forum has not put forward any land for	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change																												
				unsustainable houses. Had the group focused on the core principle of developing a plan, and indeed waited patiently for the site allocation process to be settled which significantly reduced housing requirement numbers, Garforth would not now find itself in the position of having 200+ more units been built in an unsustainable location (in our opinion).	development at anytime in its history.																													
g	433	GI	General	We have raised, previously, where the initial grant money was used because, again in our opinion, had it been used to progress the core functions of the Neighbourhood Planning Forum we would, perhaps, have found ourselves with a plan that was more suitable for the time when we would have hoped it had been delivered?	<p>Reports on income and expenditure are routinely given at monthly Steering Group meetings. On more than one occasion local councillors were invited to attend these meetings but were unable to. The AGM also has an annual finance report.</p> <p>Total funds received are £13,173 broken down as follows:-</p> <table><tr><td>Donations</td><td>729</td></tr><tr><td>Locality 2015</td><td>7056</td></tr><tr><td>Locality 2017</td><td>1005</td></tr><tr><td>Locality 2020</td><td>2100</td></tr><tr><td>Lottery 2018</td><td>174</td></tr><tr><td>MICE</td><td>490</td></tr><tr><td>TESCO</td><td>1620</td></tr></table> <p>Total expenditure to date is £12,965 broken down as follows:-</p> <table><tr><td>Events</td><td>704</td></tr><tr><td>Professional</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Services</td><td>5785</td></tr><tr><td>Publicity</td><td>4965</td></tr><tr><td>Room/venue</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Hire</td><td>761</td></tr><tr><td>Stationary</td><td>749</td></tr></table>	Donations	729	Locality 2015	7056	Locality 2017	1005	Locality 2020	2100	Lottery 2018	174	MICE	490	TESCO	1620	Events	704	Professional		Services	5785	Publicity	4965	Room/venue		Hire	761	Stationary	749	
Donations	729																																	
Locality 2015	7056																																	
Locality 2017	1005																																	
Locality 2020	2100																																	
Lottery 2018	174																																	
MICE	490																																	
TESCO	1620																																	
Events	704																																	
Professional																																		
Services	5785																																	
Publicity	4965																																	
Room/venue																																		
Hire	761																																	
Stationary	749																																	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
g	434	GI	General	There is no doubt that this is a substantial document with bold aspirations but, again, we must question if those aspirations are now fitting for 2021 based on the revised and settled site allocation process and, again, because of the somewhat delayed nature of the document we would urge the examiner to delve into the fine print and claims of the document as many of the issues alluded to are now outdated.	The plan that will be submitted for independent examination will be up-to-date in terms of the latest on local and national planning policy and issues. The forum will work carefully with the Council to ensure that this is the case.	
g	451	GI	General	We are where we are in terms of COVID-19 but we do feel that had this plan been developed much sooner, there would have been more opportunity for fuller engagement including, essentially, public meetings. Should the examiner decide that the consultation has been sufficient then we would strongly recommend that if the matter does go to referendum in 2022 it is on the understanding that there are a series of public meetings where the authors of the report will be open to public scrutiny and questioning in a democratic format.	<p>It is accepted and agreed that face to face discussions and public meetings are better than online generally speaking. However, online engagement does connect with some who would otherwise not attend meetings so there is a balance to be struck.</p> <p>The business of the forum is open and transparent, with minutes, agendas, emerging plans and evidence all on the forum's website for information and inspection. Ultimately, the independent examiner will come to a view about the adequacy of consultation and engagement.</p>	
g	452	GI	General	We strongly urge all residents to take part in this and please take the opportunity to read our response. You may find points of interest embedded within our responses.	Comment noted.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
g	453	GI	General	We will comment further once all responses are submitted as per the outline above.	A list of the comments made and the forum's responses will be sent to ward members once complete. Comments that help prepare and finalise the revised plan for submission and independent examination will be welcomed.	
g	454	GI	General	This is the start of the plan, not the finish, and when the final document does go for referendum we will be making further comment, public and through the formal process and helping to steer the community towards a plan that is fit for purpose, protects the wildlife and green space and does not expose us to unwarranted volume housebuilding.	The forum has the same aims and will endeavour to ensure that the revised neighbourhood plan is 'fit for purpose' and meets the needs of Garforth.	
g	455	GI	General	We will, as public representatives, take a full and active part in the referendum process but sincerely hope that the comments we have made to the examiner find favour and that the report is scoped in such a way that is more reflective of our community in 2021, protects and preserves our green space, our environment and our commitment to the city carbon aspirations whilst at the same time protecting us from rampant, unsustainable and unnecessary housing development.	As above.	
g	456	GI	General	It has always been our considered view that as and when in the future, housing does need to come forward, it should be shaped in a sustainable way that actually fits the needs of the community in terms of more sheltered housing, more social housing and a housing stock that reflects the needs of the community.	Noted and agreed.	
g	457	GI	General	Frankly because of the delayed nature of the plan this is not currently going to happen as we are still exposed to the large, expensive, volume housebuilders, who do not share these aspirations and the planning legislation currently has a hierarchy over the Localism Act, if not in principle then certainly in practice, as the city is still currently passing volume housebuilding and ignoring neighbourhood plans that have already been passed.	The preparation of the Garforth Neighbourhood Plan has been a lengthy process, however it has had no impact on the granting of planning permissions for volume housebuilding in Garforth, as none have been made.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					Planning decision are made using local strategic policies, national planning policies and neighbourhood plans. There is no example in Leeds where volume housebuilding has been granted against a neighbourhood plan policy.	
g	458	GI	General	We urge residents to think about that before they would sign up to this particular document as it appears in draft form.	The neighbourhood plan will be revised as a result of this consultation to reflect the views of Garforth residents as far as possible.	
g	459	LCC	General	Thank you for providing Leeds City Council with the opportunity to comment on the presubmission draft Garforth Neighbourhood Plan. It is clear that an immense amount of work has been undertaken by the forum and for this the forum should be congratulated, especially given the many challenges that have been faced along the way. Officers have worked closely with the forum's writing group and will continue to do so in making changes to the plan prior to independent examination. The comments set out here have been compiled from a range of specialists from across the Council and are intended to make the plan better and to increase the chance of a successful examination.	Noted	
g	460	LCC	General	Since work on the preparation of the neighbourhood plan commenced, there have been a number of significant changes in national and local circumstances. At a national level, changes to national planning policy (including neighbourhood planning) have taken place at numerous intervals and the plan captures this. However, there is a sense in the plan that it is written with significant housing development in mind and perhaps this is due to much of the work and thinking on the plan taking place when the Council was proposing housing development at East of Garforth in the Site Allocations Plan (SAP). As you know, the SAP has since been adopted and does not include a major housing allocation in Garforth. Perhaps this point could be made more explicit. In this respect more generally, we would recommend a review of all policies in the Plan which either imply or anticipate major housing development. This would reduce confusion at referendum but also minimise any risk of unintended consequences arising. While the inclusion of the vast array of supporting evidence, including references to	We note these helpful comments with regard to the revised SAP and the Consultation Statement	<p>We will review all policies regarding major housing development.</p> <p>Move much of the supporting evidence to the Consultation Statement .</p>

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				consultation events, surveys, etc. is helpful in the pre-submission draft document, much of this information should be transferred into the Consultation Statement which will be submitted alongside the revised plan.		
g	461	LCC	General	Similarly, references to existing development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework can be transferred into the Basic Conditions Statement, ready for submission. This should help to bring the wording down. It is recommended that a check is undertaken of the evidence presented, to determine whether that evidence is still relevant in 2021. We are happy to work with you to bring down the size of the document.	Thanks for this comment.	Work with LCC to transfer relevant statements to Basic Conditions Statement
g	462	LCC	General	Timing / Risks As you may be aware, Government have announced a programme of planning reform including changes to the Use Classes Order, extended Permitted Development Rights and a new Planning White Paper 'Planning for the Future' which seeks to speed up and simplify the planning process. It is recommended that an analysis of these planning reforms is undertaken to scope the impact on policies in the draft plan and identify any changes that may be required. The Council will support the Forum in this exercise to ensure that the plan meets the Basic Conditions and minimise the risk of the plan becoming out of date.	Thank you for this helpful comment clarifying these planning issues	Work with LCC to analyse planning reforms and effect necessary changes
g	463	LCC	General	Basic Conditions At examination, a neighbourhood plan will be judged on whether it complies with the Basic Conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). These are: a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State b) The making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) contributes to the achievement of sustainable development c) That making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority. D The making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations. e) The making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. It is considered that the draft Garforth Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions subject to taking account of the comments set out in the Council's response. A Basic Conditions Statement will need to be prepared to accompany of the submission of the plan for independent examination which sets out how the plan meets the Basic Conditions and other relevant legal requirements.		To work with LCC to ensure the Draft Plan meets Basic Conditions
g	464	LCC	General	Mapping There is no need to repeat maps within the policy boxes itself. As long as the Map Number is referenced within the policy – this is OK. It would be better for	We propose deleting maps from policy boxes but	We will take advice from LCC

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				maps to be shown as landscape across the full page (using a section break within Word to change the orientation). This would improve legibility. It would be beneficial to have an overall policy proposals map at the end of the plan, which captures those parts of the maps that are specifically related to the proposed policies. A lot of the maps contain contextual information that whilst helpful to plan readers does not specifically show proposed NP policies. It would be beneficial for the overall policy proposals plan to be shown on a single map, there is also an opportunity to show this using GIS using an interactive map linked within the plan document itself.	retaining any maps within the body of the text. We do not understand the legibility comment.	mapping section on the production of a single policies map.
g	465	LCC	General	<p>Introductory Sections</p> <p>Foreword – perhaps this could be more positively worded and focus on the engagement work done by the Forum, the contributions made by people from across Garforth, and recognising the opportunities for neighbourhood planning in Garforth? Section 1.1 Background – some of this information can be put into the Consultation Statement and Basic Conditions Statement. Section 1.3 Garforth Today – the section noting the strengths and opportunities in Garforth is welcomed, perhaps this could be carried over into the Vision statement. For example, the vision could recognise the existing strengths of Garforth that will continue up to 2033, e.g. “There will continue to be a strong sense of community...” Should the reference here to obesity instead focus on the ‘health crisis’? Mentioning health at this point would help to build the narrative of how the golden threads of the plan have been developed. Moreover, mentioning obesity at this point focuses on weight rather than a more holistic understand of health and wellbeing. Section 1.5 The Golden Threads – the focus on health and wellbeing within the plan is welcomed and supported, as is the focus on climate emergency. As the Forum will be aware, Health and Wellbeing is a key priority for the Council, and the Council made a Climate Emergency Declaration in March 2019, meaning that the strategic focus for the city is to become carbon neutral by 2030. Suggest that the Vision statement therefore reflects the Leeds 2030 target rather than the 2050 target set nationally. Additionally, whilst the plan seeks to embed health and wellbeing and climate emergency up front, perhaps the different policy sections within the plan (under ‘How does theme X help to meet the vision and objectives for Garforth) could make reference to the golden threads, too? In this vein, perhaps the diagram on page 16 could be flipped – so that Health and Wellbeing and Climate Change become the themes that encompass the themes within the plan?</p>	<p>Thank you for your helpful comments.</p> <p>By implication, meeting the Vision and objectives includes the golden thread as it is imbedded in there.</p>	<p>We will review the Foreword and Background sections.</p> <p>We will revise the Vision statement as suggested.</p> <p>We will alter the wording in 1.3 Garforth Today, removing the word obesity and focussing on health in general.</p> <p>We will alter the Vision to reflect the LCC target of 2030 .</p> <p>We will reconfigure the diagram on P.16 to stress climate and health more</p>
g	474	LCC	General	I hope these comments are useful and help the neighbourhood planning group to review the draft Garforth Neighbourhood Plan before it progresses to examination. As mentioned, we are happy to advise further on this starting	Thank you very much for your helpful suggestions	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				with a consideration of all of the representations received. Yours sincerely, David Feeney Chief Planning Office		
g	554	Resident	General	<p>Dear GNPF,</p> <p>Response to the consultation of the Garforth Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020-2033. (Pre-submission regulation 14 Draft 9).</p> <p>1. I have read the above document with interest.</p> <p>2. I am impressed about the thoroughness you and your Team have undertaken in many aspects of the GN Plan now and into the future.</p> <p>3. It looks as if you have had some help on how to lay the various topics out. It that the case, and how much assistance was given and by whom? Nevertheless, I offer the following comments.</p> <p>1. I refer to the various sections of your Documents and then give my response.</p> <p>2. Many of the topics I do not wish to comment upon, and therefore, my views remain silent, as I am reasonably content with your assumptions, and proposals, and go along with them on a general basis.</p> <p>3. However, there are some topics which you have raised which need to be 'significantly bolstered up' to show the 'gravity of the impact of these topics'. I have highlighted them in bold text and, set out my response.</p>	<p>Thank you for your supportive comments.</p> <p>We received assistance from 2 planning consultants and a lot of ongoing advice and support from Leeds City Council planners.</p>	
g	596	Resident	General	<p>I have received your neighbourhood plan and I am pleased to see that at last Garforth is going to have a development plan. I agree with the key issues but feel that one major issue needs to be added.</p> <p>When moving to Garforth in the 70s I received a notice that this area was going to be a clean air zone. I was pleased about this as I had moved here to have the benefits of living in the country with fresh air.</p> <p>This zone was not implemented. I now feel that this needs to be implemented.</p> <p>Over the past few years I have noticed more and more smoke in the atmosphere and, when cleaning windows, soot. At times it is impossible to enjoy my garden in an evening due to the smoke in the air.</p> <p>It has become very obvious that when houses in the area change hands the first house improvement the new owners do is to install a log burner.</p> <p>I have now read in the newspapers and watch on T.V. that the particulates from this burning is extremely dangerous to health. I would very happy to send to your committee detailed information about the dangers not only to our health but also that to climate change.</p> <p>I understand that Leeds City Council is keen to reduce air pollution in the city but I think that this should include the suburbs as well, after all this is where the city's population live and it seem short sighted to reduce pollution in the city centre and ignore where people live.</p> <p>The quality of the air in Garforth is of great concern. I have notice in the years</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We share your concerns regarding air quality however, this is not a planning issue and cannot be directly addressed in our Plan.</p> <p>To the best of our knowledge the Government is trying to restrict the burning of wet wood.</p> <p>There is also a group forming in Garforth, Eco Friendly Garforth, which will be trying to address a variety of environmental issues, of this kind over the next 4/5 years.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				that I have lived here that the air quality has changed especially when the motor link opened and now with the new trend of open fires with the trendy installing of log burners. We appear to have suffered uncontrolled development with little thought of the needs of the people who live here. It is a breath of fresh air to see a neighbourhood plan. Thank you to all concerned.		
g	597	Resident	General	It seems over the past few years people are turning to burning logs on their wood burners . Not wanting to be a moaning Minnie but can't Garforth be made a smoke free zone/area As we know we are supposed to keep our houses ventilated at this time and it it impossible to do so due to the smoke outdoors. I have complained to the council but they do nothing . We have all just contracted covid 19 and it's really difficult sometimes as the air around where I live is smokey a lot of the time . On top of this we have the pollution from the Selby road (I love on Scholars Gate) This road is constantly busy and it is a shame that we have to have the HGV wagons bounding along the road at all hours of the day and night when they could easily stay on the motorway and come off for the a1 past Garforth on the ridge road to the Peckfield roundabout . I'm wondering if you are taking any of these things into consideration .	We share your concerns about air quality. Please see our comments to the previous response.	
g	598	Resident	General	Hi. I have recently received the Garforth Plan leaflet. The plan seems well thought through, taking into account the legal constraints around the process. I would be interested to join any Zoom meeting that is held to discuss it.	Thank you.	
g	599	Conservative Councillors	General	Thank you for forwarding your plan. On behalf of Leeds Conservative Group on Leeds City Council we are satisfied and happy with your proposals and have no comments to make in terms of any proposed or suggested changes/amendments or wording.	Noted	
g	600	Resident	General	I just wanted to thank everyone involved in producing this plan. It can't have been an easy task but a very comprehensive document both well thought out and well written has been produced. I've lived in Garforth since 1987 and I'm proud to call it my home. It has great amenities and community spirit - as demonstrated by the fact that a group of people have put their own time and effort into producing this plan for the benefit of everyone who lives here. Communication about the plan and engagement with the community has been excellent too. Great work and thank you!	Thank you for your supportive comments.	
g	606	Resident	General	This is a real labour of love and I applaud the hard work that the members of GNPF have put into this plan. Having read the entire document, I do have a	Thank you for your support. Your comments are noted.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				number of comments, mainly relating to the HBE objectives, but I fear there won't be enough room in this comments box. In the light of reading your report, I am both appalled and incensed that Leeds City Council have actually consented to the Persimmon build south of Selby Road, given that it will do absolutely nothing to address the lack of provision of right size or affordable accommodation in the area, nor will it increase the provision of greenspace for local residents. You have done, and continue to do, a tremendous job. Thank you.		
g	610	Resident	General	I have noted the Neighbourhood Plan contents re Housing and the other 5 sections. It clearly has taken much thought and work to develop and contains much that is to be applauded. However while a legal document which needs to be considered in any future development it seems it has no power to bind the council or developers to any of its policies and is in effect more of a wish list. It is not clear if adopted how long this Plan will have to be compiled in any future development plans. Is it a fixed number of years or is it open ended? Is the Plan organic in essence in that it can be altered or revised at any time to reflect changes in social, technological or other change that may take place?	Thank you for your support. As the NP will become part of the Development Plan for Leeds, legislation states that development proposals should be “determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise” – the plan will have statutory weight in the same way that the Core Strategy and other planning policy documents do be “ The Plan runs until 2033. Plans can be altered, but it is not straightforward. There are 3 levels of modification which require different approaches; please see the Government website Neighbourhood planning - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)	
g	612	Resident	General	Has the plan for a bypass ever been raised. And a review of traffic flow through residential streets by through traffic. It's all very well growing Garforth, but it will be gridlocked all day like it is at school hours, Something major developments fail to address.	Yes, a bypass has been considered, but we are not aware of any definite plans at present. This is not within the scope of the NP.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
g	613	Resident	General	Dear Sir/Madam, Further to reading your painstakingly written Garforth Neighbourhood Plan, I am writing to commend you on this document; express my gratitude to all of you for doing something constructive and proactive to save the community of Garforth and to offer some feedback on the neighbourhood plan.	Thank you for your supportive comment.	
g	621	Resident	General	Re Bypass Question the hotspots highlighted are valid the ones missed are church lane. bar lane, and oak crescent station fields. The latter taking the brunt of through traffic, as the bar lane bridge is a major bottle neck, as are the parked cars on church lane. when schools are open , ninelands is awash with parents too lazy to use the carparks on ninelands and the gym. again creating traffic chaos, now with the stocks development filling up this will only get worse. As for the bypass route you highlighted this would run from one bottleneck to another, the bypass needs to run from garforth cliff before the gardencentre, to the m1 at 45 or 46 away from the town altogether. what are your thoughts.	We, like you, are concerned with the issues around traffic congestion in Garforth. We regularly highlight these issues when we respond to planning applications on behalf pf the Forum. Our Plan promotes active travel as one way of combatting congestion. Detailed highways matters are not within the scope of the NP	
g	624	Highways England	General	Thank you for the consultation in regards to the Garforth Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14, Pre-Submission. In this instance however there are no formal comments which Highways England wishes to offer as the proposals therein will form an integral part of the overall Leeds City Local Plan aspirations, this being one component part thereof. As you may appreciate, we are heavily involved in the overarching Local Plan consultation process once all the Neighbourhood Plans have been amalgamated into a single focal point, which the Secretary of State for Transport will then be able to comment on. Thank you for the time in having consulted Highways England directly, and I hope that the rest of the consultation goes well. Please be assured that I continue to work at a strategic level with the Council in order to help realise the numerous neighbourhood plan aspirations, through the wider Leeds Local Plan.	Noted	
g	625	Sport England	General	Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above neighbourhood plan. Government planning policy, within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the	Noted The NP does give consideration to additional sports/leisure facilities in Garforth	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.</p> <p>It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 96 and 97. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document. https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy</p> <p>Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded. https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications</p>		
g	626	Sport England	General	<p>Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded. https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications</p> <p>Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 97 of the NPPF, this takes the form of assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.</p> <p>Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to</p>		

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England's guidance on assessing needs may help with such work. http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance		
g	627	Sport England	General	<p>If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes. http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</p> <p>Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.</p> <p>In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.</p> <p>Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.</p> <p>NPPF Section 8: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities</p>	<p>Health and Wellbeing is the golden thread running through our Plan. We are acutely aware of the issues surrounding promoting active lifestyles by design.</p> <p>However, current greenspace provision in Garforth does not meet the existing LCC greenspace policy criteria.</p> <p>We cannot see how this situation will improve as more development occurs unless there is a clear commitment from developers and LCC to provide additional greenspace.</p>	
g	628	Sport England	General	<p>PPG Health and wellbeing section: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</p> <p>Sport England's Active Design Guidance: https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign</p> <p>(Please note: this response relates to Sport England's planning function only.</p>	Noted	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>It is not associated with our funding role or any grant application/award that may relate to the site.)</p> <p>If you need any further advice, please do not hesitate to contact Sport England using the contact details below.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Planning Administration Team</p> <p>planning.north@sportengland.org</p>		

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
g	629	Resident	General	<p align="center"><u>Garforth Neighbourhood Development Plan Pre-Submission Draft</u></p> <p align="center">COMMENTS FROM MIKE CROWHURST</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan/Parish Area. The boundary is clearly outdated. The M1 and A656 are now the logical parish boundaries to the north & east, and as & when the new A63 is built it would be logical to adopt this too as the new parish boundary from Garforth Bridge roundabout to Peckfield roundabout.</p> <p>Period of validity. Presumably the Council determine this, but 13 years 2020-33 seems an odd choice. If it is based on 20 years from 2013, then we will be half way through before anything is adopted.</p> <p>1.2 History. This section is commendably brief, so my comments should not carry too much weight, but the first paragraph needs a rewrite as it is wrong to equate Ermine Street with the modern A1. Whilst they both performed broadly the same function in the national network, the routes only coincided for two short sections between Huntingdon and Grantham. As the OS maps show, Ermine Street came nowhere near West Yorkshire, but ran via Lincoln, crossed the Humber by ferry at Brough, then past Market Weighton to approach York from the <i>east</i>. North of York it becomes Dane Street, and does indeed follow the modern A1 between Boroughbridge and Scotch Corner, then across country to Corbridge on Hadrian's Wall, and on into Scotland.</p> <p>Sometime later an alternative (unnamed) bypassing the Humber Ferry and York, opened up via Doncaster, Pontefract, Castleford, Aberford and Wetherby, and seems to have become the "Great North Road" into the coaching era (Aberford being a classic coaching stop). Only with the introduction of route numbers in the motoring era a century or so ago has the "A1" via Ferrybridge and Micklefield replaced the old North Road via Castleford. So three distinct routes down the years, which should not be conflated.</p> <p>If the M62 (10 miles away) merits a mention then on the rail side we could mention the prospective HS2 (if it happens by 2033, or ever!) and the Kippax branch, closed in 1951.[I considered the Fly line, but as it closed in 1924 and I believe only briefly carried passengers, it is best left to the section on footpaths.] Some dates would be nice. I can tell you that the main line (to Selby) opened around 1835 (one of the earliest), the Fly Line shortly after, and East Garforth station in May 1987, but I don't have an opening date for the Kippax branch.</p> <p>1.3 Garforth Today - Retail (para 2). I beg to differ on the trend to shop local. My observation of the covid effect suggests that the trend is entirely to mail order and an explosion of courier / home delivery vans. The whole retail sector has been the loser, but small local businesses have taken the brunt of it, except perhaps for convenience stores. Premises in Main Street change hands frequently, and the range of shopping seems to get less. If any, the stores in Aberford Road have benefited most.</p> <p>3.1 and Glossary. Housing etc. The term "affordable housing" is widely used here. The trouble with it is that it means</p>	<p>The boundaries of the Plan area were defined by LCC.</p> <p>The plan period for the NP aligns to the Plan Period for the Core Strategy. This is to make the NP more robust and give support to the general conformity argument. It also will help to minimise ongoing risk of the NP becoming out of date timings.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>Remove reference to A1 and Ermine Street.</p>

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
g	644	Environment Agency	General	<p>Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency regarding the above mentioned proposed draft plan. We have reviewed the information submitted and we wish to make the following comments</p> <p>Strategic Environmental Assessment</p> <p>We note that the Council has a responsibility to advise the Parish Council if there is a need for formal Strategic Environmental Assessment of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. You are seeking our views in order to inform the Council's decision on this matter.</p> <p>We have considered the draft plan and its policies against those environmental characteristics of the area that fall within our remit and area of interest.</p> <p>Having considered the nature of the policies in the Plan, we consider that it is unlikely that significant negative impacts on environmental characteristics that fall within our remit and interest will result through the implementation of the plan.</p> <p>Draft Plan</p> <p>We have no objections to the draft plan, we are pleased to see the you have noted the flood risk issues with this area but this could have been put into policy.</p> <p>We also note you have placed information in relation to green spaces which will help with wildlife and biodiversity in the area.</p> <p>Allocation of sites</p> <p>If you decide to allocate land please discuss this further with local planning authority especially if this is not already within the local plan.</p> <p>Following are other environmental issues you could look at putting into your plan.</p>	A Strategic Environment Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment screening exercise has already been undertaken by the Council and was available as part of the pre-submission consultation material. The Environment Agency's further clarification that they do not consider that any significant negative impacts will arise from the implementation of the plan which serves to support the Council's SEA/HRA Conclusions	
g	650	Resident	General	<p>Mrs X lives on.... Not on internet for zoom meeting but wanted to know if leaflet, and notice on lamp post were anything to do with grass area in front of her house. I said only that we wanted to preserve it. She said she didn't want them to build on it.</p>	This notice will have been about the proposal to designate the area as a Local Green Space.	
g	651	Resident	General	<p>Your work on the plan is amazing and there is so much to think about. I liked how you mentioned the need for more suitable housing for older people and mentioned the lack of public toilets.</p> <p>I think some other things that are important are street furniture- maybe there could be more seats in different parts of the area, work on cafes allowing people to use the toilet even if they are not customers may be outside the brief of the plan.</p> <p>Accessible walks and attractive green spaces can also make things more age and family friendly which you have partly addressed.</p> <p>It would be good to hear your views. If things are age friendly in a community</p>	Your suggestions are welcome. We address ways of promoting Main Street in section 3.2.2 Town Centre under "Projects"	


G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				they are probably good for everyone? Is there any more that can be added at this stage?		
g	652	Resident	General	<p>The plan is really good, really thorough, a very well thought out sustainable plan for the future of our town. As you have mentioned in the Plan, I look forward to working alongside you and giving help and advice were I can to see if we can make ideas and projects happen. As you know I have no affiliates, and I am also Apolitical. I feel that we need to work on more GREEN SPACE bringing down EMISSIONS, and working more on COMMUNITY and LEISURE. I see this as a square with it's 4 points with them all working together to help each point succeed.</p> <p>As you know my background is PR and Marketing and my whole plan has been to create better connections between community and business and this has grown in the past 7 years that I have been influencing and working with both business and community. I have always been working on 10 year plan, and hope to bring more reasons for people to stay local, and to work with yourselves to create a better and healthier community going forward.</p>	We welcome your response and look forward to co-operating in the future.	
g	654	Other local NP forum	General	<p>We had already noted that you had submitted for your reg 14 consultation. We particularly admired your plan.</p> <p>We plan to submit our plan for examination before March 1st. There are loose ends that need still need tying and I have a designer to chase, but I think we will make it. We are leaning towards choosing Tony Burton as our examiner, but I'll confirm that when we definitely decide.</p>	Thank you for your comments.	
g	655	Lib Dems, LCC	General	<p>The link is excellent. We will advertise this on our party website. Congratulations on getting to this stage. I know how much work this takes.</p>	Thank you for your support	
g	656	Labour party, LCC	General	<p>Thanks for sending this though Brian.</p> <p>I'm copying in Lisa as requested</p>	Thank you.	
g	657	Local Labour Party	General	<p>Subject: Re: Garforth Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Thank you very much, Brian - a comprehensive document.</p> <p>I presume you're happy for us to post this on our website and social media pages for those within Garforth to comment on?</p>	Thank you for your supportive comments.	
g	660	Resident	General	<p>Just a few thoughts about the Garforth Neighbourhood Plan. While there are some good ideas and aims let's not kid ourselves - the main thrust of this is housing. Leeds City Council may pay lip service to the green dream but that will go out of the window if it means more houses and more money in the council coffers.</p> <p>We know from previous attempts that it took a gargantuan effort to block major schemes as at at Parlington - all credit to our local councillors.</p> <p>So, although I agree with large parts of this plan I'm worried that the council will ignore points about infrastructure, flooding, green spaces, parking, traffic etc as long as they can press n with increased housing in Garforth.</p> <p>I would like you to submit this to Leeds City Council on my behalf,</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>As the NP will become part of the Development Plan for Leeds, legislation states that development proposals should be "determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise" – the plan</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					<p>will have statutory weight in the same way that the Core Strategy and other planning policy documents do</p> <p>LCC will be able to read all comments when we pass the final Draft Plan to them prior to examination.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
g	667	Resident	General	<p>Response to Garforth Neighbourhood Development Plan Pre-submission Regulation 14 Draft</p> <p>I requested a printed copy of the above document and while I drew the line at linking in to every website referred to, I read the entire draft finding it readable, interesting, well researched and presented.</p> <p>It has, however, taken a long time to reach this stage and it seems that an opportunity to mount an appeal against an application for a development of considerable size, south of Selby Road, was missed, or even misconstrued by the absence of a report, either printed or verbal, at that point.</p> <p>I was in full agreement with the aims of every policy mentioned though concerned that most offered get-out clauses of one sort or another giving builders the chance either to bypass the main aim of the policy altogether or then, possibly, renege on any half promises they might have made.</p> <p>The overall effect of this document seems to be a concession to the expectation that we will have to accept development after development after development into the foreseeable future and, indeed, many of the admirable aims for the well-being of the population of Garforth would seem to depend entirely on massive expansion. Garforth is a compact, thriving little community and these characteristics risk being lost to the grasping pockets of 'fat cat' developers if we are not very careful.</p> <p>Another of my concerns is the constant reference to compliance with LCC policies. Is this absolutely necessary in order to have the document ratified? LCC can be very two faced, claiming 'green' aims and policies with one hand and signing off highly polluting schemes with the other e.g. axing the clean air programme for one of the most polluted cities in the country and granting the application to expand Leeds Bradford Airport. Garforth itself has had to fight off LCC inroads against sporting, leisure and green space amenities as well as potential further loss of green and recreational space to HS2 and industrial development along the M1 corridor.</p> <p>I would like to make reference to a couple of mistakes and omissions: Pp 148 and 155 refer to the IPCC. This is actually the International Panel on Climate Change which initialises as IPCC not IPPC.</p> <p>Appendix 4 is fascinating but the house referred to as Augustus Walker House has never, so far as the current owners are aware, been so known. The plaque is fairly recent and the house is currently designated as 27 Lidgett Lane but was formerly known as Claremont built in 1870.</p> <p>At this point might I enquire why nos 25-11 Lidgett Lane get no mention at all in the Non-Designated Heritage assets? They are all central residences of some age (25 at least being built in 1870) most displaying interesting features, more so, I contend, than many of those picked out and illustrated.</p> <p>Pp 200-201 I was unable to detect any mention of the flood storage areas on Barley Hill and Glebelands playing fields. These would need to be taken into account if considering extension of facilities and particular care would need to be taken not to plant trees where the roots could compromise drainage or sewage pipes. Also any installations should be sited so as not to draw youngsters towards the storage lakes.</p> <p>Permeable surfaces are good but not enough in Garforth because of the existence of repeated layers of clay. Alterations of front gardens to hard-standing driveways or parking areas require planning permission and any slant towards the road should incorporate a long drain generally with access to a surface water drainage system.</p>	<p>GNPF is not promoting development and has chosen – given the strength of feeling in Garforth- not to propose any sites for development. However, where development does get approval we are trying to ensure it is done in the best way possible for the benefit of Garforth now and in the future.</p> <p>The NP has to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development – not within the scope of neighbourhood planning to say no to all new development. To meet the Basic Conditions requirements our Plan needs to broadly conform with local and national planning policies.</p> <p>Thank you for your helpful comments</p>	<p>IPCC change made.</p> <p>References to Augustus Walker removed.</p>

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					The NDHA list was drawn up following consultation via the NP forum members and a notice placed in the Library inviting suggestions. Comments on flooding noted.	
g	669	Swillington PC	General	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the current attempt to create a neighbourhood plan for Garforth.</p> <p>As custodians of Swillington boundaries we are somewhat reassured to see that the plan boundaries have been re-drawn.</p> <p>As a village council we support the initiative as it is a way of giving local people control over aspects of their environment.</p> <p>At this time we have no reason to doubt the integrity of the intent encompassed within the plan.</p>	Thank you for your comments.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
g	670	Historic England	General	<p>3rd March 2021</p> <p>Dear Ms. Crosland,</p> <p>Garforth Neighbourhood Plan Pre-submission Consultation Response</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Historic England in connection with the Pre-submission draft of the Garforth Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We do not wish to comment in detail upon the Neighbourhood Plan. We note that the Neighbourhood Plan area is located 10.9 kilometres/6.8 miles east of Leeds city Centre. The Garforth Plan Area contains 10 Grade II Listed Buildings. It is also likely to contain many local non-designated heritage assets</p> <p>We also note that the Neighbourhood Plan incorporates Heritage and Heritage Asset policies. These policies should be worded in a way which will help to protect these sites and their settings and ensure that any change is managed appropriately.</p> <p>Historic England provides comprehensive guidance on its Neighbourhood Planning webpage, as well as publishing Historic England Guidance Note 11, Neighbourhood Planning and the Historic Environment. You may also wish to view our Neighbourhood Planning webinar.</p> <p>We consider that the planning and conservation staff at the Leeds Council are best placed to assist you in the development of your Neighbourhood Plan and, in particular how the strategy might address the area's heritage assets. Consequently, we do not consider that there is a need for Historic England to be involved in the further development of your plan.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We have, as you suggest, taken advice from Leeds City Council with regard to heritage assets and our policies are intended to protect the town's existing heritage.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
g	671	Historic England	General	<p>If you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the staffs at the West Yorkshire Archaeological Advisory Service who look after the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Record. They should be able to provide details of not only any designated heritage assets but also locally important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may also be available on-line via the Heritage Gateway (www.heritagegateway.org.uk). It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as the local Civic Society or local historic groups in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We hope the above is of assistance, but if you require clarification, please do not hesitate to contact us.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>  <p>Craig Broadwith Historic Places Adviser E-mail: Craig.Broadwith@HistoricEngland.org.uk</p>		
g	672	Resident	General	<p>Obviously a lot of time and effort has gone into producing this plan, which goes well beyond the usual "NIMBYism" and is carefully considered and well presented. Whilst I'm still working through the Plan (it's quite a weighty tome!), it is apparent that Garforth seems to be at a disadvantage (in a planning context) to it's neighbours which have Parish Councils, so the formation of the Planning Forum and the production of the plan looks like the next-best thing. Which got me to wondering about other areas of Leeds (which don't have Parish Councils) and whether they have formed Planning Forums? And if so, to what extent their plans are aligned with the Garforth plan? Indeed, whether there was any consultation with other wards which may have produced a plan?</p>	<p>WE have taken advice from LCC on this.</p> <p>We have consulted neighbouring Parish Councils and have looked at a number of the other Plans in Leeds to help us draft our Plan.</p>	
g	673	Coal Authority	General	<p>Thank you for the notification of the 11 February 2021 consulting the Coal Authority on the above Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body which works to protect the public and the environment in coal mining areas. Our statutory role in the planning system is to provide advice about new development in the coalfield areas.</p> <p>Our records indicate that within the defined plan area there are approximately 82 mine entries, recorded and probable unrecorded shallow coal workings, reported surface hazards and extraction of coal by surface mining methods.</p>	<p>Noted and thank you for your supportive comment.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				However it does not appear the Neighbourhood Plan allocates any sites new sites for future development and on this basis we have no specific comments to make. We wish the Neighbouring Planning Forum every success in preparing the plan.		
g	692	Resident	General	Have just read the The Neighbourhood Plan. Great job. Well done and thanks for all the work you have put in to it.	Thank you.	
g	694	Garforth NET	General	Dear Julie Many thanks for your email. I and the board of Trustees of the Neighbourhood Elders Team shall certainly look into the proposal of the Garforth Neighbourhood Plan and get back to you with our comments by 29th March 2021. Kindest regards	Noted	
g	695	GPP	General	Hi wonderful people Just wanted to thank you all for your immense work and commitment to everything you are doing for each and everyone of us in Garforth and our future. Our future is in very good hands thank you Kindest regards, deepest appreciation and in peace Garforth Peace Project	Thank you for your supportive comments.	
g	707	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	General	Thank you for consulting Yorkshire Wildlife Trust on the above application. Yorkshire Wildlife Trust works across the Yorkshire and Humber region managing more than 100 reserves and with a membership of over 44,000. Yorkshire Wildlife Trust is the second oldest of the 46 Wildlife Trusts which work in partnership to cover the whole of the UK. The Trust's principal vision is to work for a Yorkshire rich in wildlife, valued and enjoyed by people. Garforth Neighbourhood Plan appears to be thorough and is clear that greenspaces and connectivity characteristics are of great importance to the local community, a theme which runs throughout the document. However, we feel there are some aspects which are missing within the plan, or considerations which could make it stronger, in particular with regards to biodiversity.	Noted	
g	718	Resident	General	"The plan covers all important issues needed to protect the Garforth area and support residents wellbeing. I would add we are lucky to have a fire station . The police station should reopen to the public.It would be a vital link in helping the prevention of crime."	Noted	
g	719	Resident	General	Generally I support the plan	Noted	
g	721	Homes England	General	Dear Sir / Madam Re. Garforth Neighbourhood Planning Forum – Public Consultation on the	Noted	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan</p> <p>I would firstly like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the consultation relating to the aforementioned review.</p> <p>Homes England is the government's housing accelerator. We have the appetite, influence, expertise and resources to drive positive market change. By releasing more land to developers who want to make a difference, we're making possible the new homes England needs, helping to improve neighbourhoods and grow communities.</p> <p>Homes England does not wish to make any representations on the Forum's Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan proposed document at this time.</p> <p>We look forward to continuing to engage with you in the future and consider any further consultation requests, as appropriate.</p>		
g	725	Resident	General	<p>I refer to my E-mail dated 3.2.21. and your response dated 10.2.21.</p> <p>As I originally stated my main concern was the loss of existing green belt and I see this is going to be severely compromised by the application for 80nr dwellings on green belt off Selby Road (application 20/06036/RM).</p> <p>Your other responses to matters raised by me, did not, in my opinion, address reality but it is pointless getting into drawn out correspondence with a quango when the real power rests with Leeds City Council. Nevertheless I hope that your aims for Garforth come to fruition.</p> <p>Regards</p>	The Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate sites. The Selby Road site was removed from the Green Belt by LCC under the (then existing) UDP in 2006 and earmarked specifically for future housing development.	
g	726	Resident	General	<p>Did my best to read, but 271 pages . . . Have to say a lot of skimming!!</p> <p>The red route line of HS2 interesting. The farmer told us where it was going and we thought he meant HS4 and 2 not coming through Garforth?</p> <p>A lot of information.</p> <p>Garforth Station disabled facilities ... think Alec Shelbrooke been dealing with for 10 years or more. Still no facilities.</p> <p>You have all been very busy and put a lot of work and effort into the plan</p>	Comments noted and thanks for your support.	
g	690	Resident	General	<p>Many thanks for the excellent leaflet about the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>It is very helpful as is the information on the website. I look forward to the second leaflet and am sure the consultation process you have designed will engage lots of residents.</p> <p>Thanks to your team for their time and commitment on behalf of residents,</p> <p>Much appreciated</p>	Thank you.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
g	727	Resident	General - HS2, response to previous reply	<p>Further response to the consultation of the Garforth Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020-2033. (Pre-submission regulation 14 Draft 9).</p> <p>Thank you for your prompt email reply dated 11th March 2021 to my written submission of 6th March 2021 in response to the consultation of the Garforth Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020-2033. (Pre-submission regulation 14 Draft 9).</p> <p>I am grateful you have logged the submission and will consider the issues I have raised at the end of your consultation process.</p> <p>I am pleased you have received expert assistance in preparing the Development Plan. I am aware from my own professional background that the wording used for the Plan and its Policies must comply with all known Planning Protocols.</p> <p>Matters relating to HS2.</p> <p>So, I cannot stress how important it will be for you to examine the HS2 Route proposals (particularly in three dimensions) as they now stand, since they will pose a very significant impact on the Garforth settlement, and the health and wellbeing of its inhabitants in the years ahead. This is a mammoth Project which is clearly stacked against any individual or Organisation to contest.</p> <p>I am sure that if a Poll were undertaken to ask the residents of Garforth what they know about HS2, and the impact of the Route around Garforth, that the result would be a resounding extremely small percentage of the population.</p> <p>Perhaps if you were to consider a special detailed chapter in the GNDP about HS2, and the impact of the Route around Garforth, it may start to generate more awareness and interest in residents' minds raising their own objections.</p> <p>Finally, should you find that a meaningful level of objection is contemplated to the HS2, and the impact of the Route around Garforth, then I respectfully suggest you would need to engage a totally independent firm of specialist expert consultants to contest the Project even through to any Public Inquiry. I cannot recommend any but there are several big companies who would be able to match all those promoting HS2.</p> <p>I am still waiting a reply by 24th March 2021 or sooner, from HS2 to my email dated 4th March 2021 concerning my objection dated 21st January 2019, that I had re-sent to them on 4th March 2021.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments on HS2.</p> <p>HS2 falls within the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) regime and is by definition outside of the scope of the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Garforth.</p>	<p>Discussed with LCC, no change required to NP position.</p>
g	729	Resident	General - HS2, response to previous reply	<p>I have always been interested in local affairs in Garforth since we moved here in 1976!! I responded to the first Local Plan way-back in the past when David Leroy and Mr Bishop were involved in the Garforth Community Association when transport matters were then on their Agenda.</p> <p>I attach a 'transcribed version of a word document' of an email reply I have received from a Ben Drapper of HS2, in response to my letter to them dated 4th March 2021 about my earlier letter to 21st January 2019.</p>	Noted	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>Towards the end of para 3 he states: “Although we are not at this time seeking views through a formal consultation regarding our design, I have shared your comments with my colleagues and they have been noted”.</p> <p>Clearly there is an opportunity to proceed with formulating thoughts on how to proceed with meaningful comments through the GNDP should that be a course of action you feel appropriate to being that process sooner than later to get a ‘voice clear heard and more importantly listened to and acted upon by HS2 and Others’.</p> <p>In the meantime, I have read through all his material and come to the conclusion it mainly provides an incite as to their ‘blinkered thinking approach’ and only offers a ‘status quo’ scenario or ‘holding position’.</p>		
g	691	Resident	General (GSRE). Correction required re. age of Montague Crescent. Replied.	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I have just had an enthralling afternoon reading through the above online. What a fantastic achievement to have put this together. I am full of admiration.</p> <p>I have lived in Garforth all my life (apart from 5 years in Kippax when newly married) and I am now 60. Before the pandemic hit I was interested in volunteering with Greening Garforth as I felt it was so important, in the face of all the development, to try keep Garforth green. Reading the GNDP today has inspired me to keep up this ambition.</p> <p>I am so pleased that Hawks Nest Wood being under threat from HS2 has been mentioned within a few different sections. It is such an important bio-diverse area that would take many years to re produce so re planting would be a poor consolation (I am still hopeful that this will not happen). I also have memories of sitting in it as a teenager and it being a wonderful, peaceful haven.</p> <p>It is also encouraging that even small green areas have been noted within GNDP thus hopefully protecting them from disappearing and even improving them.</p> <p>Could I mention that I live on Montague Crescent and my house was built in the 1960's and is brick built with bay windows upstairs and down. Built by the same builder that constructed the ones on Brunswick Gardens (Ryan). The information on the GDPR states that Montague Crescent was built in the 1980's.</p> <p>The section which points out all the historic buildings in Garforth is enthralling. Obviously, all places that I have walked past hundreds of times but not recognised their significance.</p> <p>Once again I have had an enthralling time reading this and will try to keep up to date with all this in the future.</p> <p>Many thanks</p>	Thank you for your comments	Alter date for Montague Crescent to 1960s

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
g	688	Resident	General and BETC; replied	<p>Good Afternoon,</p> <p>I have received your very informative leaflet through my door this morning. I have spent my lunchtime reading through the Garforth Plan online. The plan lays out some really good points and facts regarding our Town.</p> <p>Myself and family moved to East Garforth 2 years ago and we absolutely love it (even through a pandemic) my son plays for Garforth Tigers and we spend our Saturdays watching Garforth Town compete in the League.</p> <p>Since been made redundant in March 2020 I have started my own company in Electrical installations including Electric Vehicle charge points. I am now negotiating on the rental of one of the unused office spaces in the town centre above the Parade of shops and also a light industrial unit near Tesco.</p> <p>Our main clients are working on behalf of Leeds City Council and Mears. With recent success we have taken on a school leaver who at the moment is working at my home address. In the coming 6 – 12months we aim to have office space in Garforth (if we can find one at a reasonable cost) and recruit 2 further school leavers.</p> <p>I would love to be involved with any future plans that are made in the Garforth area and wondered if I could be part of the discussion?</p>	<p>Thanks for your supportive comments.</p> <p>You would be welcome to become a member of the Neighbourhood Planning Forum by emailing garforthplan@gmail.com</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
g	630	Resident	General	different things to different people. Too often it means old unmodernised and energy inefficient properties. Private developers always resist building any because they <i>cannot make a profit</i> from it. Either local councils have to subsidise it or build it themselves.	Affordable housing is defined in our Glossary	
			HBE	There is an apparent <i>non sequitur</i> on page 22. Talking of older folk, you say “people are being forced to leave”, yet in the very next sentence “consequently the percentage of over 60s is <i>above</i> the average”, when surely the effect would be the opposite. This cannot be right.	Agree with your comment	Reword section in 3.1.1 to reflect more accurately the reality of the situation.
			HBE11	My personal impression is that there is quite a few bungalows etc designed for old folk, -for example the Springfield area around the Bird in Hand, and the Westbourne area (some of which is I think sheltered housing) and some council built, as in Oak Road area. If it is any guide, our block (22 flats, about a third normally rented, two storey, 2 bedroom although the second very small, built 1988 on a brownfield site) has always had a mix of retired couples or widowed singles, and younger working singles or couples starting up (although these usually move on once the first child becomes mobile as flats are not ideal for children). As to areas for housing development generally, I am <i>not</i> in favour of further eastward growth either on the Meakin land or east of Green Lane. The town is already overextended to the east with its central functions concentrated near the western edge. Even less the Parlington Woods proposal, which is completely isolated yet will never be fully “self contained”. Instead after the Ninelands Lane and Selby Road sites are completed, I would look first to the triangle between Barrowby Lane and Wakefield Road, but only as far as Clear View and Moorhouse farms. This area is close to the centre and station, and would restore some balance to the town. Beyond that I would seek to expand nearby Micklefield as a clearly distinct settlement which needs more facilities of its own independent of Garforth but with close links to it. 3.1.2 Flooding. Being near the catchment divide (Cock Beck side), we have not had any flooding here. (Only drains problems!) But your flood group may have noticed that this very week (late January) Network Rail had a minor flood on the track in Garforth station, which took 3 days to clear. It too looked like a drains problem, but the recent resurfacing of the entire expanded car park may have contributed to the problem by increasing runoff. A lesson there perhaps? The main area of Garforth prone to flooding is evidently around Garforth Bridge roundabout. The cause seems to be the stream that starts near the bottom end of the Stocks Blocks site and flows west, parallel to Selby Road right across town, mostly in culvert, joining Lin Dyke just north of the roundabout. Presumably being covered over is part of the problem, and I wonder if the pond proposed on the Stocks site will help resolve it or add to it? 3.1.3 Selby Road Site HG3-18. Until I see at least an outline layout for the <i>whole</i> site, <i>including</i> the proposed new A63 road alignment, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions on any aspect of the proposals. Geoff did find me a couple of detailed layout plans (not mutually consistent) for the western end of the site, which relate to an application by Redrow, the present status of which is not clear to me.	Noted	
					Noted	
					Noted	
					Noted	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
g	668	LCP	General Made Contact	<p>I work in the Local Care Partnerships (LCP) development team, and one of the areas I support is the LS25 & LS26 LCP.</p> <p>As an LCP, we have identified tackling obesity as a priority for this area, and have been awarded some money from West Yorkshire and Harrogate Partnership to embed active travel in the area using the idea of 20 minute neighbourhoods.</p> <p>As it stands, we have been looking through recent engagement, including our own survey, that has happened in the area to understand barriers to people walking or cycling rather than using the car, which is where I came across the Garforth Plan. I note that your plan has the intention for new developments in Garforth to enable people to actively travel rather than rely on cars. I have attached a scope of our project for information, but you will see we have a small fund, which we will concentrate on behavioural changes rather than the infrastructure changes as likened to in your plan.</p> <p>I was wondering if you are in contact with anyone from the Highways team? And if so, who? As it would be really worthwhile us having the same link, to understand what, if any, changes they are planning to improve paths and cycle lanes etc. in the area.</p> <p>It would also be really good to have yourselves involved with our project, or the LCP wider. Let me know if you fancy a chat about LCPs?</p>	<p>Thanks for your comments. We will arrange to contact you.</p>	<p>Contact made</p>
g	601	Resident	General Climate change	<p>Really like the emphasis on sustainability as part of the plan. Note the point on climate change - many people/organisations are now referencing the climate crisis to bring climate to the fore - could this be altered in this plan? Could more sustainable travel (i.e. instead of encouraging car park use) community volunteering, climate resilience projects, sustainability education in schools and local community (including growing food and spaces to do so) be included? There is still emphasis on housebuilding, cars and other aspects which some could consider as unsustainable - more consideration on this would be interesting to see in the climate context. Could we ask local businesses to consider and mitigate climate impacts/contribute to local community (i.e. through murals, planters etc). Would be great to see more trees (edibles) planted. More work on flood resilience and tidying up litter.</p>	<p>We hope that our policies on energy efficiency and active travel will address some of these issues. We are also trying to promote bio diversity and an increase in green spaces.</p> <p>Working through Eco Friendly Garforth will be an additional way of highlighting these issues.</p>	
g	653	Resident	General Reply sent to these points	<p>I have read the brochures and information and the sweeping statements and buzzwords about turning Garforth into a Shangri La and would make the following comments.</p> <p>According to the various maps I see there is one entitled "Proposed Garforth Neighbourhood Plan Boundary 23/05/2014". Why do a number of the statements refer to works outside the boundary shown on the GNP Boundary 23/05/2014. Can this point be clarified.</p> <p>How does one "develop Town End into a cohesive approach to Main Street"; its a meaningless statement.</p>	<p>A comprehensive reply was sent. The key points were :- Referring to the Introduction to the Draft Plan where a detailed explanation of the Boundary is given.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>Provision of "new public car parking near the Town Centre"; this means building on green space or demolishing existing properties to provide the land.</p> <p>It does not address where all the funds will come from to build all the various developments mentioned in the report. Developers are not going to fund developments if there are no end users.</p> <p>It says the "NP will become a statutory document to influence Leeds City Councils planning decisions in our area". The word "influence" does not imply it will have any legal authority.</p> <p>As far as I am concerned the only issue that matters is to prevent any encroachment onto existing green belt areas.</p> <p>Much as I would like to see the majority of your proposals materialise I believe the instigators of the plan are living in Cloud Cuckoo Land and need to return to the real world.</p> <p>It will be interesting to see how the Residents Referendum is to be structured; will it be a straight over 50% carries the day so we end up with the same fiasco as the Brexit referendum or one where, say, 75% of the votes are required to carry the point.</p>	<p>An explanation about the importance, nationally, of town centres.</p> <p>The location of the Town End car park being on old brownfield site.</p> <p>Information about S106 and CIL funding.</p> <p>A link to the Locality website to provide information on the force of a made Plan.</p> <p>A link to the GOV.UK Neighbourhood Plan section to explain how the referendum process works.</p>	
g	684	Resident	General. Replied	<p>I have read in detail your pamphlet delivered today and looked at the plan / vision online with interest.</p> <p>In summary yes wonderful it all looks fluffy and nice, but what actual legal teeth does forming this plan and vision have?</p> <p>If it has teeth great love it.</p> <p>If not then it's just a warm fuzzy vision.</p> <p>If residents of Garforth say they don't want another takeaway or charity shop spoiling Main Street , will it stop this happening?</p> <p>If residents say they don't want a housing estate building on Green space will it stop that happening? Or can residents choose where the housing is built?</p> <p>If that is possible and we can have some degree of control in our town then brilliant but if not I fail to see anything other than a wish list and government/ town planners will do exactly what they want.</p> <p>If you are saying it won't stop plans happening but we choose what colour roof tiles are used then it's only marginally more control than no control.</p> <p>It would also be good to know what background each member of the committee has ?</p> <p>What affiliations they have?</p>	<p>As the NP will become part of the Development Plan for Leeds, legislation states that development proposals should be "determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise" – the plan will have statutory weight in the same way that the Core Strategy and other planning policy documents do developers.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					The Steering Group members come from a variety of backgrounds with a range of qualifications and experience. The group is apolitical.	
g	706	Resident	General; Question re. School places. Replied	Very impressed with the way the document is organised. Interesting to read, very good quality and lots of work gone into it. If the Mining building had been left on the Stocks site, it would have had to be a museum or something. Question: What has happened to the school placements now the Redrow Houses have been built? Surely all the schools are full!?	Thanks for your supportive comment. LCC are aware of the situation with regard to school places; this issue has been highlighted in the Plan in 3.6.1 but the responsibility lies with LCC.	
g	683	Resident	Replied	Further to the letter delivered today at 16.35. Can you please give further information regarding policy HBE13 as I am unable to find any details on the web sites referenced.		Relevant information sent
g	737	Resident	Town Centre	Main St is crucial. There are opportunities presented by more home working and changes in travel patterns. The offer on Main St could be strengthened and parking was not the only important issue. She added that improved public transport would help reduce car usage and have a positive effect on cycle use, too. Maybe limit parking through time or payment. She accepted some things were beyond the scope of the Plan but maybe the issues have at least been raised.	Agree that Main St is crucial. Parking emerged as a key issue from several surveys. In 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 there are policies and projects aiming to strengthen the offer and trying to address issues around parking.	
g	703	Resident	Visual accessibility; correction to NDHA	Highly complemented leaflet, though black print on a brown background-difficult for him to read. Requested a paper copy of the penultimate draft plan. Page 167 Item 20 shows houses as Salisbury Terrace but the photo is the wrong one. He took the sign off his house and it said Salisbury House underneath. The numbers used to go the other way and he was number 1. (Now 15 Aberford Road) On the inside wall of the house next door, there is a plaque dating the house before 1890..	Aware of visual accessibility issues re leaflet and will bear this in mind during redrafting of Plan.	Paper copy sent. Photo to be changed.

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				He complemented the draft plan and acknowledged that a lot of work had gone into it. He let me pass his number to Maurice Norman regarding character assessment and wrong photo.		
i	2	Resident	Intro	<p>Section 1 – Introduction</p> <p>In general, I think this is a useful section of the document, but I believe it has two main weaknesses:</p> <p>If there is to be a section 1.5 about how health and wellbeing became a golden thread, then I think there ought to be an equivalent section on how climate change became a golden thread; else it appears that they do not have parity of esteem.</p> <p>There is a comment at the end of page 15 that says that connection is shown clearly by the diagram on page 16. I disagree that this diagram shows a clear connection.</p>	<p>The issues on Health and wellbeing were raised at workshops at the inception of the Plan and they were seen by residents as key to drafting the Plan. Climate Change has become a more important issue as evidenced by LCC declaring a climate emergency in 2019. Climate change was not specifically highlighted by residents in the earlier stages of the development of the Plan and was not thought of as a golden thread. This is not to detract from its importance, hence the inclusion of a statement in the Vision.</p>	<p>A stronger paragraph on Climate Change to be included at 1.5</p> <p>Diagram to be revised.</p>
i	720	Aberford & District PC	Introduction and Appendix 7	<p>On behalf of Aberford and District Parish Council I wish to make the following comments on the Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Draft of the Garforth Neighbourhood Development Plan. The background to this is that the Aberford Neighbourhood Plan boundary originally included part of an area mentioned in your plan. Leeds City Council advised us that this area could not be included in our plan and our plan boundary was therefore revised to exclude that area. In order to make it clear that Aberford & District Parish Council was not actively excluding residents, businesses and landowners within the Garforth part of its Parish, we would like the following statements amending.</p> <p>Page 193 currently states</p> <p>Part of Area 3 and Area 4 are within the Barwick and Aberford parishes respectively but are not within either of their Neighbourhood plan areas.</p>		

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>We feel that, in order to clarify the statement, this statement should add. "The decision to exclude area 4 from the Aberford Neighbourhood Development Plan was at the request of Leeds City Council"</p> <p>Page 194 currently states</p> <p>.... Access from Garforth is via Town End and the narrow single-track road under the railway bridge. and tracks from the Barwick Road. Part of Area 4 is within the Aberford parish but is not within their Neighbourhood Plan area contains Hawks Nest Wood classified by the LCC SAP as Natural green space and it bears repetition that this wood will be decimated when HS2 is constructed.</p> <p>We feel that, in order to clarify the statement, this statement should add. "The decision to exclude area 4 from the Aberford Neighbourhood Development Plan was at the request of Leeds City Council"</p> <p>Councillor Mike Oakes Aberford & District Parish Council</p>	Noted and agreed	Make changes as requested.
i	450	Garforth Independents	NDHA	<p>"51 non-designated heritage assets are identified as important considerations where there is a future planning application."</p> <p>No real issues with this statement or the areas highlighted within the report, except to say that, with the site allocation process now been agreed, it is highly likely that any of these designated sites would've been in jeopardy anyway but, in principle, we have no issues with this statement remaining in any revised plan.</p>	Noted, no action required	
i	467	LCC	Objectives	<p>Objectives The housing objectives would benefit from combining the first two into one, to simply say 'To help ensure that any new housing in Garforth during the Plan Period will help to deliver local housing needs, specifically affordable housing and homes for younger people and families'. The other objectives would benefit from a review to ensure they are realistic, within the scope of neighbourhood planning and clear</p>	We expect to make a number of changes to the housing section following further discussion with LCC and these proposed changes will from part of that discussion.	
i	436	Garforth Independents	Vision	<p>Whilst we would share the aspirations outlined in the comment regarding what the town should look like by 2033, we would politely assert the fact that Garforth already has a strong sense of community and is indeed, already a great place to live.</p>	<p>It was not the intention to imply Garforth was not currently a great community. We were simply describing what it would look like in 2033.</p>	Alter statements to reflect the existing strong sense of community.
i	437	Garforth Independents	Vision	<p>We would also suggest, again politely, that the statement shows something of a disconnect between the planning forum and the many community activists who work on the ground to already make Garforth a brilliant and diverse place to live</p>	<p>Many people in the Forum are very active in the community and will continue to support</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					the numerous groups of which they are members.	
i	438	Garforth Independents	Vision	We are also troubled by the statement that we will respond positively to the economic growth and expansion strategy of the city because, frankly, this also overtly includes volume housebuilding, which is the long-term aspiration of the Labour Council in Leeds. We strongly feel that this statement should be removed.	Noted and to be discussed with LCC	
i	439	Garforth Independents	Vision	We are supportive of increased and improved transport links and we agree that the town currently is, not will be, surrounded by accessible green space. The difference in our approach is that the plan, and its tacit approval towards housing development, could potentially jeopardise much of the existing surrounding green space and therefore, for us this appears contradictory.	The Plan is neutral with regard to housing development. However, should development occur, the Plan is trying to shape the kind of development in order to address issues around climate change, green space and the well being of the people in Garforth.	
i	440	GI	Vision	We would politely remind the forum that the town already has a very diverse mix of commercial offerings. This consists of High Street chains to small independents, as well as a range of offices offering a range of services.	Noted	Add wording at start of Vision to show current situation.
i	441	GI	Vision	Indeed, since the group started work on this document, the local ward members have ensured a former Brownfield site has been brought back into play to deliver a mixed commercial opportunity on the Aberford Road. Our significant concern is a further growth of commercial development would be onto the green space on Wakefield Road, which is the long-term ambition of the Labour-controlled city council and something we are desperately keen to avoid.	The Vision talks about commercial and industrial areas “ thriving and offering a wide range of jobs”; there is no mention of expansion. LCC has designated an employment site by J47 on the SAP; this location is in fact outside the NP area.	
i	442	GI	Vision	"Away from the centre, the town’s commercial and industrial areas will be thriving and offering a wide range of jobs." This is a deeply worrying statement because, having utilised the only large piece of Brownfield property to develop a commercial opportunity, this would inevitably lead to encroachment onto the greenbelt or green sites which, as stated, is the long-term aspiration of the Labour Council which is part of the core strategy document in 2016.	See above	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
i	443	GI	Vision	"There will be access to a range of well designed, sustainable homes that meet the needs of all its people at all stages of life. New developments will be in a high-quality setting with appropriate infrastructure such as parks, schools and leisure facilities designed to benefit the community as a whole." Again, worrying, as this links the delivery of any new facilities and services for residents to being paid for through the community infrastructure levy as a result of volume housebuilding. It is clear that with the dispensation that the community has been granted until at least 2028 this statement could, as has happened before, play into the hands of avaricious developers and lawyers who wish to make the argument that Garforth has tacitly approved, or indeed overtly approved, volume housebuilding in exchange for enhanced facilities.	Agree that the current wording implies large scale developments. As this wording was influenced by the initial threat of thousands of houses, and this has now been removed, we are happy to change the wording.	Delete 2nd sentence in Para 5 of Vision
i	444	GI	Vision	Garforth has a whole range of community groups and an extended network of volunteers and, as the elected members, we believe that the town is open and transparent about its decision-making and that there are clear mechanisms that demonstrate this. We have no idea what is meant by the terms 'tokenism' or 'straplines' and think it is incumbent upon the forum to explain themselves? This, for us, again demonstrates a disconnect between the authors and the community as it is in 2021 and, indeed, has been for many years.	Noted Because many Vision statements contain lofty words which in the end are not acted upon we were keen that this should not be the case here.	Changes made to Vision statement to accurately reflect current as well as future situation
i	445	GI	Vision	We have no issues with this. We believe a commitment to 0 carbon by 2050 should be embedded in a truncated neighbourhood plan.	Noted. We will be moving the deadline to 2030 to be in line with LCC .	
i	446	GI	Vision	We have no issues in health and well-being and climate change to be two threads that should run through any truncated neighbourhood plan.	Noted, no change required	
i	447	GI	Vision	The plan is too top-heavy on the reliance and tacit support for volume housebuilding which, we believe, should be removed in favour of a simplified plan focusing on the issues highlighted above.	Noted, no change required	
i	466	LCC	Vision	Vision The Vision could perhaps simply delete the reference to "Garforth will respond positively to the economic growth and expansion of Leeds". Whilst this is a positive statement and to be welcomed it could be misinterpreted by local residents at Referendum and by others that use the Plan in the future. Suggest that the vision should say "Garforth will remain a great place in which to live, work and play" or will "become an even better place in which to live, work and play". This approach could be applied to other parts of the vision. In so doing, it might be better to reduce the number of words.	Thanks for your comments	Vision to be reviewed and revised in the light of comments.
i	3	Resident	Vision + Objectives	Section 2 – Vision and Objectives for the Future of Garforth I find a few of the points in this section ambiguous or not sufficiently	Thanks for your comment. We will be altering P.17 to reflect	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>stretching targets. In particular:</p> <p>Page 17 states that the Plan has a net zero carbon target of 2050. However, page 52 of the Plan says 2030. It should be clearer which of these targets the Plan is aiming to be consistent with. Without clarity on this point, it is not clear whether the Plan requires an element of short-term carbon negative development in order for Garforth to achieve the targets.</p> <p>Page 18 section B, bullet 4 states that an objective is to “help ensure new developments/businesses do not adversely affect traffic flow within the town centre area”. I believe this ambition is too weak. As well as not adversely affecting traffic flow, development should also be required not to increase total traffic in the town centre area. I appreciate that this is a challenge, but the point should be that new development should come with investment in public transport or active travel, so that increased car movements due to development are offset by other journeys switching to other transport modes.</p> <p>Page 18 section B, bullet 5 states that an objective is “to help ensure car parking supports the viability of the town centre”. I find it difficult to agree or disagree with this point, as it is ambiguous as to whether this implies an increase or a decrease in the overall amount of parking.</p> <p>Page 18 section C (Transport) does not include anything in relation to Garforth’s transport connectivity with other places. This seems like an important omission, and it would be consistent with page 76 for the connectivity point to be addressed here on page 18.</p> <p>Page 18 section D – the fourth and fifth bullets relate to maintaining access to Public Rights of Way (PROW) and the countryside. I think that “maintaining” access is too weak, and the objective here should extend to increasing access to PROW and the countryside.</p> <p>Page 19 section F – the first bullet states an objective to “support the provision of sufficient primary and secondary school places for all those of school age living within the town”. I think this is too weak, and should incorporate an allowance for those travelling in from the surrounding towns and villages to be educated in Garforth.</p>	<p>the LCC target of 2030. We feel the 2030 target is extremely challenging and are under no illusions about how difficult it will be to achieve.</p> <p>Whilst we agree with the need for developments to invest in public transport and active travel, the Planning Forum has no control over how CIL money is currently spent. We have ,however, included active travel in our 2 policies in the Transport section of the Plan.</p> <p>We note your comments on parking and feel that the key outcome of any decisions on this issue should be to support the viability of the town centre.</p> <p>On connectivity, Garforth is well connected with other places by road and public transport. The key focus for our Plan is to improve connectivity and encourage active travel within the town .</p> <p>With regard to PROW, one of the projects in GSRE 3.4.2 aims to improve access to the countryside.</p> <p>P19 section F . This bullet point was in connection with</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					concerns raised by Garforth residents about a lack of sufficient school places.	
p	10	Resident	betc	<p>I disagree with the assertion on page 57 that “insufficient parking” is a key issue. Instead, I believe that the key issue is that although there are already a large number of parking spaces close to main street, competition for these spaces is very high. This suggests to me that transport options other than private cars are insufficient – for example, there are no cycle paths providing access to Main Street, and there is no ‘town circular’ bus service allowing those who are less mobile to access Main Street without relying on their cars. Bus services from neighbouring villages are also infrequent.</p> <p>I believe it is inappropriate to use the word “only” in the second bullet point under the heading “Objective Evidence” on page 72. The objective fact is that a survey was carried out which indicated that 24% of parking spaces were vacant. The use of the word ‘only’ implies a lack of objectivity, in that it suggests support for the opinion that this is insufficient.</p>	<p>The comments on parking in the key issues section reflect the views expressed in surveys as well as anecdotal evidence; they do not necessarily reflect the views of GNPF.</p> <p>In addition there are 2 policies supporting Active Travel, policies T1 and T 2 in the Transport section of the Plan (3.3)</p> <p>Agreed</p>	Remove the word “only” on P.72 Objective Evidence point 2
p	469	LCC	betc	<p>Business, Employment and Town Centre The locally specific nature of this topic area is a particular strength and demonstrates a high level of understanding. However, suggest the wording is cut down significantly for the submission plan and a review is undertaken of the evidence presented and its relevance to the circumstances in Garforth today.⁸ The introductory section is understood but perhaps it should be ‘taking a step back’ and thinking about the impact of Covid-19 on business and any climate change opportunities from disused or derelict sites. It may also be worthwhile to consider issues around the conversion and re-use of commercial buildings also.</p>	<p>Thanks you for your comments.</p> <p>We will reconsider this section to see where wording can be reduced.</p>	
p	618	Resident	betc	<p>Page 55 BETC -Encourage more of those who live in Garforth to work locally too. This is something Leeds City Council needs to be held accountable for. Instead of granting planning permission to profit hungry developers for new builds that don't benefit the community, it should be more proactive in facilitating more employment opportunities in the local area.</p>	<p>It is not within the remit of GNPF to provide more employment opportunities but the Plan highlights some advantages of, and opportunities for, working locally.</p> <p>In addition policies BETC 1 and BETC 2 offer support for existing and new employment sites on brownfield land.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					A large employment site has been allocated near junction 47, but this is outside the Garforth NP boundary.	
p	662	Resident	betc	<p>Main Street traffic lights.</p> <p>Dangerous junction for drivers turning right. At the very least the lights should have a turn right only function.</p> <p>Better still the whole junction should be enlarged by using some of the vacant land where the garage was to make a separate sliproad into Barwick Road which is now a busy road. This would remove that traffic from the main junction which is busy enough...stand and watch the lengthy queues grid-locked down Main Street.</p>	<p>This is a difficult junction.</p> <p>However, it is not within the scope of neighbourhood planning to effect these kind of alterations.</p>	
p	678	Resident	betc	<p>fair rent to encourage new businesses to the area and support those already there.</p> <p>Rent for businesses in Garforth is prohibitively high due to private landlord approaches.</p>	<p>This is not within the scope of neighbourhood planning.</p>	
p	735	Resident	betc	<p>talked about the need to safeguard the future of Main St. and the importance of balancing the desire for more parking with other things. The impact of Covid on working patterns could help Main St. To what extent are concerns about parking from 2018 going to be as relevant in a post Covid world? Is there a new norm?</p>	<p>It is difficult to be certain what the eventual impact of COVID will be on working patterns and on Main St. The policies and projects in Town Centre (3.2.2) are aimed at ensuring Main St remains vibrant and plays a key role in the future of Garforth.</p>	
p	736	Resident	betc	<p>She asked if consideration could be given for starter homes or flats on the vacant land at the end of Main St instead of a car park as more people might continue to work from home, thus reducing the pressure on parking as is evident in the Station car park currently. The resident also asked if people had noticed a reduction of use in the car parks on Main St over the last year?</p>	<p>The land at the end of Main St. is not, at present, available to buy.</p> <p>It appears from casual observation that traffic and parking levels on Main St are returning to pre pandemic levels.</p>	
p	715	Resident	betc, GSRE, CL, General	<p>"The plan document is a very interesting read - thorough and very informative, thanks to all those who put it together.</p> <p>My wife and I moved to Garforth around 4yrs ago. We had no link to the area, but we've grown very fond of it, and share the sentiment expressed by the plan that Garforth is somewhere that's going places.</p>	<p>The Draft Plan deals in some detail with the future of Main</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>I'd like to highlight what I see as five key priorities/objectives. The plan touches on all these too...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Creating a better public realm around Main Street. It seems to do well in spite of being quite a hostile environment for pedestrians/cyclists, but I think something akin to Rothwell in terms of road design would work well - a shared space. I don't think closing it to cars and buses is plausible, but creating an environment where they don't dominate the space would massively improve things. As would some tree planting and general improvements to street furniture - ala the Headrow in the city centre. 2. A focal point public/civic space. This would make sense within the centre as a square or plaza of sorts - perhaps on the BT exchange if this ever becomes vacant. Could have a focus on the town's mining heritage, a story which seems under-told. 3. A more appealing park or green space, most likely through improvements to existing spaces such as Glebelands. Something with some more vegetation and/or a central water feature would be nice. Kennet woods are wasted at present and it's depressing the developers weren't forced to do more to connect these with the new housing estate -an opportunity missed. 4. Improved leisure facilities - the squash/badminton centre is ripe for a rebuild with swimming and broader gym facilities being much needed for a town of Garforth's size. 5. Better traffic calming measures. The blanket 20mph zone is fantastic. Compliance with it - less so much. In our opinion, the situation has worsened during lockdown - it's not uncommon to see cars doing 35-40mph down Fairburn Drive and Ninelands Lane. This is not only dangerous, it acts as an impediment to promoting walking and cycling. More effort could be placed on electronic speed signage, along with things such as priority narrowing. For Ninelands, 'shared space' surfacing all along from the Podger to the end of the Primary school would work wonders - given there's so many facilities in that space which are aimed at children, the current situation of narrow pavements with cars happily flouting the speed limit is an accident waiting to happen and could be immeasurably improved. <p>Thanks for providing this opportunity to feed into the process. I look forward to seeing what comes next.</p>	<p>Street. Policy BTEC 7 in particular focuses on the Public Realm and outlines what would be supported in terms of developments seeking to improve the Town Centre. A town square is mentioned here.</p> <p>In Appendix 9 Area 2 mention is made of an opportunity with regard to converting Glebelands into a park with an all-weather peripheral path.</p> <p>Policy CL3 supports proposals for a swimming pool and leisure centre.</p> <p>Stricter compliance with 20 mph limits would undoubtedly be a good thing. However, highways alterations are not within the scope of the neighbourhood planning.</p>	
p	168	Resident	betc1	<p>The rigidity of necessitating 12 months active marketing needs amending to no more than 6 months and each case should be judged on its own merit. Post pandemic, it is possible that less Businesses will require premises if staff are happy to work from home. Empty premises are unattractive and may deter potential users facilitating the area. E.g. The change of use from warehouse to retail on the Lidl site has greatly enhanced the area and improved what was an eyesore for years.</p>	<p>Advice was taken from LCC with regard to the active marketing period.</p>	<p>Option for 6 or 12 at our discretion. Alter to 6 to match CL1</p>

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	169	Resident	betc1	There are always empty industrial units and offices in Garforth. Empty office space could become apartments as long as LCC deducted these from Garforth housing allocation. (in other words an "instead of" not an "as well as") I would have thought 6 months active advertising was enough not 12 months or more. There is a plethora of empty offices at Thorpe Park.	Policy BETC5 supports proposals for the change of use to residential above shops in Garforth town centre. Shops/employment uses benefit from Permitted Development Rights to convert to housing BETC4 (c) supports proposals to revitalise and restore under used space or vacant buildings for community benefit.	
p	315	Resident	betc1	This map seems to imply to me that the neighborhood area will be filled with housing. It's probably just the label of "neighbourhood area"	An application was made for the designation of a neighbourhood plan area. The Neighbourhood area is determined by LCC.	
p	316	Resident	betc1	Surely "the market" should have a greater influence on whether a business survives. The policy has a touch of soviet planning about it.	The policy states that the locations will be safeguarded in their existing uses and does not seek to determine the fate of individual businesses.	
p	317	Resident	betc1	Businesses that can be located into area 5 but are currently scattered throughout Garforth eg on Green Lane, should be positively encouraged to move their offices/warehouses/factories into that area. This would reduce heavy lorries driving through the streets of Garforth and make the town healthier and safer. Stock Blocks was a good example of a site in the wrong location. This does not apply to retail businesses and their delivery trucks	A significant majority of businesses are already located in the Lotherton and Newfold Industrial Estates.	
p	495	LCC	betc1	BETC1 Employment Land: OK in principle. The supporting text indicates that the plan is seeking to go further than CS Policy EC3 in protecting the estate from changes of use to nonemployment uses. However, the policy defines employment uses differently to the Core Strategy because it specifically includes "retail". The CS defines employment uses as offices, R&D, industrial and storage & distribution uses but specifically excludes retail which is considered under a different set of policies. The supporting text (page 59) refers to a fitness gym in the estate as an example of an employment use	Thank you for your helpful comments.	Remove word "retail" from BETC 1.

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>that the plan is seeking to retain. Again leisure uses are not “employment uses” for the purposes of LP policy. In general, retail / leisure uses are employers and the NP is seeking to retain job opportunities but the specific definitions here are important to the interpretation of policy. If there is an application for a change of use from an industrial to a retail use, it could be argued that Policy BETC1 would allow this - as it is going from one ‘employment use’ to another as defined in the Garforth NP.</p> <p>However, under NPPF and LP policy a retail sequential test would be required and the proposal would need to be assessed against Policy EC3. It would therefore be a weakening of the policy approach in these circumstances and more permissive to non B uses in the estate, particularly retail uses. The inclusion of the SAP employment allocations in the list of sites under the policy also suggests the any ‘Garforth NP defined employment use’ is acceptable on the sites. This contradicts the SAP and CS which would only allow ‘general employment uses’ (unless the criteria in Policy EC3 are met) excluding office and retail uses.</p> <p>We are sure this is not the intention so a tightening of the wording is advised and retail is removed for the definition of employment uses. Our concern is that the whole estate could be lost to retail (and possibly leisure uses as well if the supporting text wording is interpreted that way) without any consideration of the impact of loss of job opportunities in the industrial/distribution sectors which Policy EC3 seeks to achieve. This could reduce the diversity of job opportunities in Garforth and would be against the aspirations of the plan. It is therefore recommended that the policy is worded as follows:</p>		<p>In 3.2.1 Why is business etc. important, remove sentence relating to fitness centre / gym from penultimate paragraph.</p>
p	496	LCC	betc1	<p>Policy BETC1 Employment Land</p> <p>The following employment locations (including office, research and development, light industrial, general industrial and storage and distribution uses) as identified on Map 11 will be safeguarded in their existing uses.</p> <p>Proposals for the change of use of buildings or sites away from an employment use will not be supported unless it is demonstrated that the site is no longer viable in its existing use or in an alternative employment use, through a period of active marketing for no less than 12 months.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Lotherton Industrial Estate - Character Area 5 in the Character Assessment Document as shown on Maps 9 and 11 2. SAP site EG1-40 Newhold Estate as shown on map 11 3. SAP site EG1-41 Newhold Estate 4. SAP site EG1-42 Newhold Estate 		<p>Reword Policy BETC1 using the suggested wording, but have 6 month marketing period.</p>
p	197	Resident	betc10fincom	<p>The policies are all worthy but I have concerns as to how these policies would be implemented.</p>	<p>Will discuss with LCC concerns around implementation of BETC policies.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					May need new policy to cover points 197, 198, 338	
p	198	Resident	betc10fincom	maintain road access for HGV to safely service existing industrial areas, where retail is created safe customer parking must be considered	BETC1 talks about supporting developments which avoid adverse impacts on local highway network and road safety.	
p	338	Resident	betc10fincom	maintain road access for HGV to safely service existing industrial areas, where retail is created safe customer parking must be considered		
p	170	Resident	betc2	You need to state what the requirements of UDP Policy E3B(4) are, here, not expect people to look them up. Special Needs inclusion.		Add definition of UDP to Glossary and include link to relevant website within policy.
p	171	Resident	betc2	Brownfield sites within the Garforth Plan area should be allocated to housing which should be deducted from our allocated numbers to save Green Belt land.	The Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate sites for housing. Location of brownfield sites is important in determining their suitability for future housing. Not all vacant sites would offer suitable locations for housing development. Some sites, such as the former Stocks Blocks site on Ninelands Lane, have proved suitable. This issue would need to be considered on a case by case basis.	
p	172	Resident	betc2	Development near housing estates should be screened by trees. eg Aberford Road	Policy BETC 2 addresses the issue of avoiding adverse effects on visual and neighbour amenity as well as on biodiversity.	Add to BETC2 (h) e.g. screening by tree/hedge planting.
p	318	Resident	betc2	I more or less agree but the eight or nine necessary conditions might scare off a really brilliant proposal.	Agreed	Include "where feasible" in BETC

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
						2 after "considerations" in opening statement.
p	319	Resident	betc2	some brownfield land sites have more wildlife than green space as it's been left to nature, this should be considered at time of applications.	See BETC 2 (g)(h)	
p	320	Resident	betc2	Brown field sites in residential areas should be built back as housing/greenspace/community facilities. There is ample space in the land segment between Barwick Road and Aberford Road to accommodate more industrial development than Garforth will ever need	Please see response to comment 171 on previous page.	
p	497	LCC	betc2	BETC2 Employment Opportunities: Again, OK in principle. The policy considerations may not be possible for all new employment development (e.g. the development of a single unit may not be able to ensure access to cycle routes through new connectivity measures) so it is suggested that the policy includes 'where feasible'. The reference to UDP Policy E3B(4) for Newhold Industrial Estate is welcomed. Again, there is a concern that the plan is effectively defining retail as an employment use, which would not be in conformity with Local Plan definitions (in terms of employment and retail policies). Suggest that the policy reads "Proposals for the development of new employment uses..."	Thank you for your comment.	Add " where feasible" to end of first statement in BETC 2 after "consider-ations" Change "sites" to "uses" in first sentence of policy.
p	173	Resident	betc3	I support this in theory but in practice it won't work because people will just jump in their cars to come to work. Given the low unemployment rate in Garforth it will lead to an influx of more motor vehicles and pollution. Very few, if any, are going to come on the bus, train or cycle.	The intention is to ensure new major developments take measures to promote active travel; it is not possible to prevent people opting to travel by car.	Include "see glossary" in relation to new major development.
p	174	Resident	betc3	Just stating that it is on a bus route is not sufficient. There needs to be a frequent bus service.	Agreed but that is not within the scope of neighbourhood planning	
p	321	Resident	betc3	Lowther Way, Ash Lane, Newhold and Isabella Road should be connected up to enable heavy goods traffic to easily exit the industrial estate towards junction 47. By connecting all of these roads you remove the 4 dead ends that currently exist. A through route would facilitate a bus route through the industrial estates. Limited road access to housing estates seems to be a feature of Garforth, presumably to prevent rat runs. That hardly applies to an industrial estate	It would be good if it were possible to connect the roads as suggested but this is beyond the scope of neighbourhood planning.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	498	LCC	betc3	BETC3 Connectivity to Employment: OK in principle, again this is in line with the overall approach of the NP to support active travel measures.	Thank you.	
p	175	Resident	betc4	We already have more than enough takeaways. In my opinion upmarket restaurants should be supported but we already have more than enough fast food takeaways.	Noted	
p	176	Resident	betc4	Independent Businesses should be supported. Business start ups by Garforth residents with a focus on under represented groups e.g. young people, people who are disabled etc. should be supported. Businesses which provide a physical presence for online business should be supported. Businesses which always accept cash should be supported.	Policy BETC 4 supports developments which will diversify and improve the vitality of the town centre but it is not possible or helpful to be more specific. The risk is that by listing categories we omit and therefore disadvantage some categories which are not included in that list.	
p	177	Resident	betc4	c) This depends on how this is interpreted by the planning officer involved. The supplementary planning document on hot food takeaways does not in reality offer much protection for nearby residents. Noise, light, odour, on street parking and ability of town to meet day to day shopping needs is all very subjective! See Core Strategy P4 The need to maintain retail uses as the predominant use and prevent inactive frontages during the day.	Agreed, but we are always dependent on Planning decisions.	
p	178	Resident	betc4	The same restrictions in terms of planning should also be applied to hairdressers /beauticians and perhaps incentives could be offered for shop/business types that are underrepresented or where there is only 1 of (eg greengrocers or butchers)	It is not possible to restrict hairdresser/beautician type businesses as they fall within new Use Class E (which includes shops) – premises can switch between E uses at leisure The restrictions relate to noise and odour and are focused on takeaways. There is no scope within neighbourhood planning to offer incentives to certain businesses.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	322	Resident	betc4	I don't know what sui generis is but there are too many takeaways and mostly serve the same pap	<i>Sui generis</i> is a planning term which means that it falls outside of any of the Use Classes as defined by the Use Class Order	Add definition of <i>sui generis</i> to Glossary and to policy BETC4
p	323	Resident	betc4	Very good idea - I really support that.	Thank you.	
p	324	Resident	betc4	I support a mix that enables the town centre to be attractive to visitors both daytime and in the evening. So bigger, better public spaces on Main Street, more restaurants, entertainment. Evening takeaways only require parking spaces, not prime high street locations, so close Main Street to traffic on an evening, allow pubs and restaurants to move outside on to the paved areas, put entertainment on, no parking on street in evening etc.	Closing Maion Street in the evening is an interesting idea and could be considered as part of the Projects which appear after Policy BETC 8	
p	372	Resident	betc4	Any new shops/businesses on Main St that offer new job oportunities would be welcome	Thank you	
p	417	Resident	betc4	I had to look up what sui generis means, advise the term should be removed as it does not seem to make sense of the sentence.	See comment 322 above	
p	499	LCC	betc4	BETC4 Town Centre Mix: Reference could be made within the supporting text for this policy to how Garforth 'bucks' the national trend in many respects, particularly in terms of the strength of the independent offer. As is acknowledged, Main Street businesses tend to provide a more local, friendly and interactive service which, when combined with an online presence, is helping neighbourhood centres to increasingly meet the needs of communities and thereby increasing their market share (as is seen in the high pre-Christmas sales). In this sense, Garforth may therefore be more resilient to the challenges facing many of our high streets because of its unique offer. The support for Garforth to retain the current mix of businesses and retail is welcomed, and should help Main Street to flourish. The Forum will be aware of the recent changes to the Use Classes Order which reclassified a number of uses into a new Use Class E. This has significant implications for Town Centres in terms of the flexibility of new Use Class E. Suggest that Map 12 is moved closer to BETC4/BETC5/BETC6/BETC7 in the document (currently it appears after Map 13).	Thanks for your comments.	Resurvey Main Street to check on number of independent shops. Include more detail on above in narrative in Town Centre section. Move Map 12 to Page 68/69 facing Policies BETC 7 & 8
p	179	Resident	betc5	The majority of the buildings on the right hand side looking down Main Street from Town End were originally residential properties. Empty shops should be converted back to housing.	Policy BETC supports change of use to housing above ground floor shops. This aims to provide extra accommodation while at the same time maintaining Main	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					Street as a viable shopping centre at the heart of the community.	
p	180	Resident	betc5	Access to walking & cycling and/or sufficient public transport should be a key consideration in any change of use. Provision of housing for young people and/or local people should be a key consideration in any change of use.	Policy T1 deals with the need to integrate active travel into new developments. Policy HBE1 prioritises developments which meet the need of younger people. It is not possible to specify provision of housing exclusively for local people.	
p	181	Resident	betc5	There are 3 vacant retail premises at present and 2 more are undergoing constructed. Many retail shops have closed and replaced with suis generis , hair saloons, wine bars and hot food take aways. Some retail premises have above ground floor frontages. Could we encourage these and offices to take the vacant ground floor premises and adapt first floor into residential accommodation which would be more affordable. We need to include specific policies that the new classes E,F1 and F2 are supported / encouraged	Policy BETC 5 promotes the use of above ground floor spaces for residential accommodation.	
p	325	Resident	betc5	On the fence with this one, shops can have upstairs spaces, not great for accessibility.	Agreed – however it may be appropriate to make use of the space	
p	326	Resident	betc5	I support this as long as it doesn't become a dampener on using the town centre on an evening	Having more residents on Main Street might actually increase footfall in the evening.	
p	373	Resident	betc5	This may have a negative impact on parking availability for shoppers.	Possibly, but this is an unknown. It could be that anyone choosing to live there would need to make a choice based on the lack of nearby car parking spaces.	
p	500	LCC	betc5	BETC5 Residential Development in the Town Centre: OK in principle. The Forum should be aware of a recently closed Government consultation (which ran between 3 December and 28 January) which proposed a new permitted development right for the change of use from Commercial, Business and	Thank you for the information.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				Service use (Class E) to residential to create new homes. Whilst only a consultation document at this stage, this would allow for the change of use of most Town Centre premises into residential dwellings through Permitted Development Rights.		
p	182	Resident	betc6	Yes I support it but in reality in my opinion it's a pipe dream regarding cycle accessibility.	Agreed that this might seem like a challenge at present but in the context of climate change, and at a time when active travel is being widely promoted, this seems worthwhile as a goal.	
p	183	Resident	betc6	We should consider closing one side of Main Street to on street parking to improve the overall traffic flow and accessibility - maybe the northbound side.	An interesting proposal. This is something that could be considered in the Projects which follow Policy BETC 9.	Add bullet point to Projects on P.74
p	184	Resident	betc6	What would these proposals mean in practice?	Making it easier and safer to get to Main Street on foot or by bicycle.	
p	327	Resident	betc6	Yes, bicycle parking spaces wherever possible	Thank you. There is currently cycle parking for about 14 bicycles on Main St. This could be increased with demand in the future if required.	
p	328	Resident	betc6	All housing development should be within 20 minutes walking distance of Main Street. If it is not it isn't sustainable	Current criteria from LCC require a 5 minute walk to a bus stop. LCC are pursuing 20 minute neighbourhood principles as part of the Local Plan Update.	
p	374	Resident	betc6	Parking on Main Street needs to be reviewed , currently dangerous for pedestrians. Consider replacing zebra crossings with pelican crossings .	Parking was reviewed by LCC in 2012. It is hoped the measures suggested can be implemented (see Projects after Policy BETC 9)	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	375	Resident	betc6	Removal of on-street parking on main street would make the street safer, more accessible and attractive for people to cycle. There also needs to be better cycle parking on main street to encourage more people to cycle.	There is a balance to be struck between the needs of traders / shoppers and cyclists / pedestrians. See comment re cycle parking at p327 above	
p	376	Resident	betc6	I and Garforth Traders Association do not support pedestrianisation of the Main Street	Thank you. The NP does not promote pedestrianisation; please see comment above.	
p	501	LCC	betc6	BETC6 Town Centre Accessibility: OK in principle and is in line with the overall aims of the neighbourhood plan. The policy should reference the Town Centre boundary as shown on Map 12.	The Town Centre as shown on Map 12 is referenced in the Policy.	
p	185	Resident	betc7	You need to state what Policy HBE 10 is, here, not expect people to look it up. Special Needs inclusion.	Thank you for this comment. It is not clear what the comment on Special Needs Inclusion means.	Add a comment in brackets to explain Policy HBE10 in Policy BETC 7
p	186	Resident	betc7	The front of some of the shops in recent years is too cluttered with signage. Thanks for including this in BETC7 f. (Boston Spa High Street is a good example of appropriate shop signage)	Thank you.	
p	187	Resident	betc7	Can't visualise where the space would be found for a "hub" or town square would be found. There were public toilets in the car park just off Barleyhill Road. Closed down because they were rarely used because they were dirty, smelly and vandalised. Don't see how this can be rectified without a full time attendant. Don't see LCC paying for this but if we had a PC we could pay for it. In the meantime there are toilets in the library and you don't have to be a member to use them. Barclays Bank building is soon to be empty. Would make an ideal space for community groups since LCC made the old council offices into apartments instead of public use.	The aim would be to engage interested parties – LCC, Main St Traders, residents and councillors – to explore possibilities and learn from others' experience in order to improve Main Street.	
p	188	Resident	betc7	Planters which are also cycle racks should be considered. Sufficient numbers of seating must be provided.	See above comment	
p	189	Resident	betc7	How would this be implemented? I cannot find any core strategy policy which planning officers could use to support this policy	LCC guidance on Shop fronts: https://www.leeds.gov.uk/docs/Shops%20and%20shop%20fronts%20design%20aid%20LCC%20doclr.pdf	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					UDP Policy BD7: ALL NEW SHOP FRONTS SHOULD RELATE ARCHITECTURALLY TO THE BUILDINGS IN WHICH THEY ARE INSERTED. WHERE SECURITY MEASURES ARE TO BE TAKEN, THE USE OF SECURITY GLASS OR OPEN MESH GRILLES WILL BE ENCOURAGED AND SOLID SHUTTERS PERMITTED ONLY IN EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES.	
p	329	Resident	betc7	Every business on Main street should be required to place and maintain a bench in front of its frontage. The public toilets at the Miners Welfare hall and the library should be sign posted and the Library and Welfare hall should be required to maintain these facilities and make them available between set hours	These suggestions are not within the scope of neighbourhood planning.	
p	377	Resident	betc7	Much more needs to be done to make the main street more attractive and appealing. There is too much concrete. There needs to be more greenery. This would facilitate making it a destination.	Noted	
p	378	Resident	betc7	Public toilets were located on one of the car parks but were removed as LCC had little funds for maintenance and cleaning. Shoppers are now directed to the Library toilets	Noted	
p	502	LCC	betc7	BETC7 Appearance and Public Realm: Criteria a) should be clarified that only the design and character guidance relating to this Character Area (Character Area 7) would apply.	Agreed	Change Policy to specify Character Area 7
p	622	Resident	betc7	How about a public toilet? There used to be public toilets in Garforth and also in Kippax.	Noted	
p	190	Resident	betc8	Should be a car park.	Noted see Map 13	
p	191	Resident	betc8	A interesting community focal point/memorial should considered - maybe around the 3 phases of Garforth's history - "Corn, Coal & Commuting" to make it simple	This is a good suggestion and is addressed in more general terms in Policy BETC 8 (b)	
p	192	Resident	betc8	Townend is recognised as a ' congestion hotspot ' in the SAP background infrastructure paper. How could we ensure that any finances available would not just be used to increase / improve the traffic flow?	Policy BETC 8 (c) aims to improve crossing facilities for pedestrians. Leeds City Council's travel strategy aims to reduce car usage.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	330	Resident	betc8	Could be a useful area. As mentioned I would suggest and provide if needed benches for the edge adjoining the fields	Thank you.	
p	331	Resident	betc8	I think it must be the hill that makes this end of town somewhat under used. Extra parking, plus benches would encourage more people to wander up there. If Main Street is pedestrianised the bus route should be at Townend. Perhaps the carpark should incorporate a small bus station to generate footfall.	Thank you. As you can see There are a number of comments regarding Main Street and our policies are aimed at securing its future.	
p	332	Resident	betc8	I think this would be a great option for this piece of land. I would suggest that Dedicated car parking spaces along the main street for Electric only vehicles to park with Charge point facilities, would greatly reduce pollution to the main main street and be an added income to our town. This would make a great and close alternative area to park.	Please see above.	
p	379	Resident	betc8	This area has been derelict +overgrown for a long time so it would be good for it to be re developed	Please see above.	
p	380	Resident	betc8	Really support this. It's currently 'dead space', and could be used to create a much more welcoming environment to the centre.	Please see above.	
p	381	Resident	betc8	I believe there are many cables under the pavements in that area which will affect any change of layout	Noted	
p	503	LCC	BETC8	BETC8 Town End: The site boundary for Town End (as shown in light blue on Map 13) could be expanded to capture the car park site as well to ensure that proposals for the car park also contribute to the objectives of improving Town End in line with policy objectives.	Thank you.	Adjust site boundary on Map 13 in line with suggestion.
p	11	Resident	betc9	I disagree with policy BETC9. It is not consistent with the 'golden thread' of Climate Change to be supporting any increase in car parking provision.	The policy has been developed from surveys carried out over the last few years. Parking is seen by many of the traders, and other people, as a key issue in safeguarding the future of Main Street, and by extension, of Garforth. At the same time, the provision of extra car parking spaces could help reduce congestion and thereby pollution on Main Street.	
p	193	Resident	betc9	People from villages 2 or 3 miles away often have difficulty parking in Garforth so are shopping elsewhere.	Noted	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	194	Resident	betc9	As regards (d) my opinion is that the demand for parking will increase. If you want to attract people to Main Street the majority are not going to come on the bus or walk with maybe 2/3 children and then carry the shopping home.	Noted	
p	195	Resident	betc9	The % of electric vehicle charging points should be as high as possible.	Noted	
p	196	Resident	betc9	d) What is the evidence for this statement? A large proportion of houses in Garforth would be outside the 20 minute walk for many residents, several roads entail a walk uphill and carrying heavy shopping for many people is not an option even with the time to spare walking.	LCC Transport Strategy aims to significantly reduce car usage and promote active travel. A realistic response to the climate emergency leaves us with few other options.	
p	333	Resident	betc9	<p>Enforcing 10% Electric Charging will likely prohibit any possible development, as coupled with the high cost of acquiring the site, any developer (and the council) will see that the electric installation requirement will make it cost prohibitive to develop. The only real solution for a Town End Car Park is if it is part of a shared development, such as a larger retail development (number of shops etc), or Supermarket (Which placed centrally to town would act as a nucleus for shoppers in 'One Trip' shopping journeys (See Mary Portas review)). If the Council is now willing to work with developers to allow minor use of the fields adjacent (required for the size/access of supermarkets interested), high interest from these retail/supermarkets would as part of the planning permission provide the funds and deliver a shared car park which would solve the issue of parking, whilst providing a further nucleus effect to bring shoppers into the town center, hopefully reversing some of the trend which has developed from allowing supermarkets to be built outside the Town Center. There are hundreds of studies which show a Supermarket acts as a nucleus to a town center, and the negative effects of out of town stores, and many more shopping trips are undertaken in towns with a Supermarket within its location. The additional cost of 50-100 spaces is negligible in the development of a supermarket, coupled with the prized position within a Town Center, the interest would be very high, and in my view, very likely to get delivered.</p> <p>Put bluntly, it takes the pockets of a supermarket/developer to fund the sort of thing you seek to achieve, and it can be done. Positive influence on trade, and parking solved. All stakeholders are open to development of the sites.</p> <p>Previous representatives at the Council have sought to negate any development whatsoever on Town End, hoping they would bully/squeeze the current owner into a cheap sale. When they should've been working with stakeholders/developers to bring forward a joint solution which could've been</p>	As far as we are aware the owner of the land is willing for it to be used as a car park and we understand this will be funded by Leeds City Council.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>funded by the devleopers as part of the deal, and benefited the town as a whole, not just their own objectives. This is strongly proven by the councils initial call for sites in this location at the very beggining of the SAP process. It was identified as an area for retail expansion, with a specific call for Supermarkets to develop it. It was only removed from consideration due to the narrow views of councillors at the time.</p> <p>If you want to see a solution to parking on this site, in my view, its only chance is as part of a larger development, because the costs to develop it without that support are too high for the council alone to justify/afford.</p> <p>It's one thing developing a policy to allow you to do something, and I'm sure it will gain huge support from most, but if its not deliverable, its pointless. It's in that mind you should be wary of the conditions you wish to place on it, because that will only make it less attractive to a developer/supermarket. You need to be thinking bigger/smarter than just 'Will the council build us a car park'..</p>		
p	334	Resident	betc9	Something better can be built there than a car park, car parks are ugly (not good for your welcome area to town) and you state less people will be driving in the future.	The intention is not to increase car usage but to provide the car parking to reduce congestion and pollution on Main Street. We understand there are no plans by the landowner to develop the land for any other uses.	
p	335	Resident	betc9	A good proposal and I hope I live long enough to see it.	Thank you.	
p	336	Resident	betc9	Charging points in car parks but not on Main Street itself, to encourage car park use ahead of on street parking.	Agreed.	
p	337	Resident	betc9	I can understand the need for Electric Vehicle charge points but as this is on the road into the main street I feel the 10% would be far better located on the main street. After all the main street is the most congested area for pedestrians where car fumes are more easily breathed in. We have Halliday court which is ideally located for LCC residents to walk up and down main street for essentials and socialising in outdoor restaurants/bars/Coffee shops. Electric only charge points on the main street would be a great way to reduce the pollution in the air.	Noted	
p	382	Resident	betc9	See previous comment section 6.		
p	383	Resident	betc9	Fully appose this. What about the talk of a climate emergency and the traffic problem in Garforth? With this proposal we making it easier for people to drive to a local destination. People should be encouraged to walk and cycle	We do not dispute the reality of climate change. The	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				to the main street, which starts with making it more difficult to park. The concept of the 20 minute neighbourhood is amenities you can reach in 20 minutes. The main street is reachable in 20 minutes on foot or by bike by the whole of Garforth. If you provide more parking you will get what you are designing for, 99% of people driving to the main street. Active travel is not a personal choice, it's a consequence of the conditions and environment we create. We are making it easy for people to drive to the main street and so that's what you'll get.	intention is not to encourage people to drive to Main Street. The idea is to provide parking for those who will drive in order to limit congestion and pollution. Ultimately we will all benefit from a reduction in the number of cars driving along Main Street.	
p	384	Resident	betc9	<p>The planning application for the carpark will be submitted on 8th March with the layout outlined below. As you can see your guiding principles have been met.</p> <p>We will then be able to change Main street car parks to short stay to allow shoppers to easily access free parking without driving around endlessly and polluting the area. Garforth Traders Association is against charging for this short stay car parking. There are no parking charges at Thorpe Park or Lidl retail park and so any in Garforth would encourage our customers to shop elsewhere. Shop & office workers will be relocated to the new long stay car park and will receive subsidised parking fees.</p> <p>PROPOSED CAR PARK LAYOUT 140 General Parking Spaces 11 Electric Charging Point Spaces 9 Disabled Spaces 15 Motorcycle Spaces 10 Pedal Cycle Spaces Total Parking: 185 Parking Spaces All parking bays to be 2.5m wide and 5.0m long, with 6.0m aisle widths. NEW SITE ACCESS TO BE CONSTRUCTED AND USED AS PROPOSED CAR PARK ACCESS AND EGRESS Proposed landscaping and planting around the boundary of and within the proposed car park. Existing pedestrian access point to be retained Proposed pedestrian access point to be constructed adjacent to</p>	Thank you for this detailed information.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>traffic signals/pedestrian crossing</p> <p>EXISTIG PEDESTRIAN CROSSING POINTS</p> <p>Proposed Street Lighting column. Type to be agreed with LCC PFI Contractor - SSEC.</p> <p>Proposed Tree to be planted along northern boundary of site. Type to be agreed with LCC Forestry section.</p>		
p	504	LCC	betc9	BETC9 Town Centre Car Parking: OK in principle. The Forum will be aware that the Council is actively working on the Town End Car Park. Perhaps the policy title should be changed as it relates specifically to the Town End car park project rather than general town centre car parking.	Thank you.	Change title of policy as suggested.
p	619	Resident	betc9	<p>Page 70-Main Street will not attract new residents if parking provision isn't improved or cycling routes are not developed: too many cyclists who lack the confidence or skills to ride on the roads are using pavements to get around Garforth without considering the impact on pedestrians.</p> <p>Page 72-Enforcing times limits in existing car parks around Main Street is an excellent idea.</p> <p>Page 74- Town End Car Park. This is also an excellent idea- we definitely need EV charging points</p>	Thank you. Noted.	
p	661	Resident	betc9	<p>PARKING</p> <p>I forget how many pages of verbiage I had to wade through before I could make any sense of what the people were trying to say.</p> <p>I confess I didn't make it to the end, but perhaps that is the idea of this "residents' plan." I defy any normal Garforthonian in the street to sit down and read to the end never mind making any sense of it but then again it has to be in council speak!</p> <p>This research seems to have been carried out over some years and is partially out of date.</p> <p>Instance: The researchers, while surveying Main Street and Lidgett Lane parking make reference to parking spaces at the Liberal Club (now Wetherspoons); the NHS clinic in Lidgett Lane (now housing) and the One Stop Shop in Main Street (now in the Library.) Hardly up-to-date.</p> <p>Another idea they came up with was to get all the private car park owners in Main Street (offices etc) to give up one space for a shopper to park. This brilliant plan would result in freeing up an extra 13 places on the public car park!</p> <p>Parking is a major problem in Garforth. Solving it needs radical thinking. Maybe a second storey on the Barclay's car park with a green wall to minimise the view of resident, with built in electric charging points which would bring some income may be worth thinking about.</p>	<p>Appendix 8 describes the current state of car parking in Garforth. References to the Liberal Club relate to the fact the survey was carried out in 2017 when the Liberal Club existed.</p> <p>Reference to Medical Centre is an error; thank you for pointing this out. It should have said " The former clinic"</p>	P.197 remove reference to "Medical Centre" and change to "former clinic"

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	472	LCC	CL	Community and Leisure The locally specific nature of this topic area is a particular strength and demonstrates a high level of understanding. However, suggest the wording is cut down significantly for the submission plan and a review is undertaken of the evidence presented and its relevance to the circumstances in Garforth today.	GNPF will look carefully at where wording can be reduced.	
p	674	Resident	CL	"Garforth has been let down over the last few years by lack of investment in recreation and sporting provision, due to Garforth being a prosperous area, no funding is available, however house builders should of contributed more to improvements to the area, which is why we need a parish council. Sports facilities desperately require improvement and a sporting hub set up to improve facilities for the many different sports clubs in the area, by clubs working together I would like to see facilities improved and shared at garforth Town FC, the church lane cricket club if relocated by the crusader to have a community clubhouse to be used by other clubs and the real possibility of land behind he industrial units on Lotherton Way, to have a sports facility built to include all clubs "	The policies in the Plan seek to safeguard and improve existing facilities as well as setting criteria around the development of new ones. There are clearly huge financial considerations when looking at new sporting provision of the type you describe.	
p	199	Resident	CL1	Cricket pitches? Football pitches? Are these protected?	See Map 3 Policy GSRE1	
p	200	Resident	CL1	Out lying villages also rely on these facilities. After 40 years in Garforth we recently moved to Aberford but still use many of these facilities.	Noted.	
p	201	Resident	CL1	I think there needs to be some distance restriction on replacing a leisure facility. This would have been helpful when NET closed on Main Street and relocated to the outer reaches of East Garforth.	As far as we understand it there is no legislation around this.	
p	202	Resident	CL1	Please make sure all the schools are included because Strawberry Fields and St Benedicts are not included at present. Please include the "Fly Line" Public House & Restaurant on Aberford Road as the name is a memorial to the historically important Fly Line and the mining heritage of Garforth. Please consider including any Post Offices if this is the right category for them. The four churches on the list should be included for the sole purpose of protecting their buildings/grounds and their role within the historical, cultural & social lives of the Garforth district. The churches should NOT have been included for any religious reason whatsoever. We should be mindful of number of the number of pubs and pub-like facilites as we may have already reached the maxium number - or even gone passed that - that is sustainable and healthy for Garforth - we have 11 pubs, 2 clubs and 1 bar at the Leisure Centre by my count!	Thank you for your comments. Churches are included because they provide a facility for the community to meet not because of their religious purpose. Other venues are included for similar reasons or because they provide opportunities for sport/ fitness activities or meeting places for local groups / societies.	Discuss with Steering Group criteria for inclusion in list. Revise definition of Community Facility. Revisit list to ensure full compliance with revised definition and criteria.
p	203	Resident	CL1	I am unsure how this policy would be implemented given the threats by LCC over the years to close council owned premises. eg Ninelands Lane leisure centre, Bowling club on Barleyhill road.	Noted	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	339	Resident	CL1	I didn't know we had so many things worth protecting, thanks!	Thank you.	
p	340	Resident	CL1	Generally a good policy so long as it is applied sensibly with a good eye on the future as well as the past	Noted	
p	341	Resident	CL1	Missing cricket ground Green Lane	Thank you for your comment.	Add Green Lane cricket ground to list.
p	342	Resident	CL1	<p>Not sure about privately owned buildings could make things very difficult for private owners. Not at all sure of the Cricket clubhouse on Church Lane as I understand it is in a poor state and there are insufficient funds to rebuild or substantially refurbish. I actually support the building of retirement homes and facilities on this site which I think would bring more custom to Main Street and, if approved could incorporate a widening of Church Lane into the plan. A new clubhouse and cricket ground would be sited near the fire station so would not be lost to Garforth.</p> <p>I also notice that Garforth Fire Station is not on this list and what about Main Street Post Office as the ones on Fairburn Drive and Aberford Road have already been list.</p>	<p>The decision regarding Church Lane cricket club is in the hands of the developers and Leeds City Council Planning Department.</p> <p>This is not within the remit of neighbourhood planning.</p>	
p	343	Resident	CL1	is there any wording that can be added that says " plus any others we may have must "?	Please see above comment p 202 and response.	
p	521	LCC	CL1	<p>CL1 Safeguarding Existing Community Facilities: The requirements for a marketing campaign could be clarified. Is this about marketing to encourage increased use of the facility, or is it about marketing for an alternative community use? A few of the identified facilities are leisure facilities (e.g. gyms, soft play), so perhaps the requirement and policy title could be broadened to community or leisure use?</p> <p>A few of the facilities, e.g. the coffee shop and communal lounge at a sheltered housing scheme do not generally fall under the definition of a community facility, which leads to a question of whether the policy should apply to them. What if circumstances change? Should a coffee shop be required to provide a community space? However, the fact that the coffee shop is run with a social purpose is acknowledged. Perhaps the justification for their inclusion could be clarified.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We are reviewing the definition of Community Facility and will be revisiting the list of facilities – see response to comment p 202.</p>	
p	204	Resident	CL2	The people of Garforth and surrounding villages should have a modern leisure centre and swimming pool. (Not as part of KS3 school.) This has been talked about for 50 years.	See Policy CL3	
p	205	Resident	CL2	In some instances building improvements being in character with the structure may not be the best outcome. If we had a community facility that looked like the Factory Shop that is a look that shouldn't be retained under any circumstances.	This policy is about improvements to existing buildings and not about the	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					construction of brand new buildings.	
p	206	Resident	CL2	Any proposals should enhance the ability to walk & cycle to them and/or travel to them by public transport. Any proposals should enhance the environmental performance of the existing facilities.	The need for access by foot / cycle is required by LCC Core Strategy to which the NP broadly must conform.	Add sub section “(d) should seek to deliver enhanced environmental performance via retrofitting wherever feasible through building regulations.”
p	207	Resident	CL2	c) how would 'harm' be identified?	Normally “ harm “ in this context is taken to mean noise or odour.	
p	344	Resident	CL2	Personally I'd be happy for the 70s style block of shops including co op on mainstreet to be updated but this is just personal taste.	Thank you	
p	345	Resident	CL2	I believe this small piece of land that was used as a Petrol station at one time I believe? Has massive potential for a number of developments. The land seems to have been left vacant for many years now and would be of great benefit to Garforth and our residents to be developed in to a useful space in such a prime location.	See Policies BETC 8 & 9.	
p	385	Resident	CL2	garforth requires a parish council to best serve the community,	The formation of a Parish Council is separate from Neighbourhood Planning.	
p	522	LCC	CL2	CL2 Improvements to Existing Facilities: Criteria b) is a little repetitive, suggest that the policy reads 'Proposals for the improvement of existing facilities...' and criteria b) reads 'proposals should be sympathetic...' Suggest criteria c) reads 'or exacerbate areas of identified parking stress (as shown on Map 12A and Appendix 8)'.	Thank you.	Adopt suggested wording.
p	208	Resident	CL3	CL3 d) Garforth covers a large area. Is it possible to find a site that is within walking distance of all households in the area? Would permission be refused if a proposed development was not within walking of every house?	The focus here is on accessibility not distance. The idea is that any new site should be accessible by foot, but not necessarily within easy	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					walking distance of every single house in Garforth.	
p	209	Resident	CL3	Parking during, office hours, is a real problem for those of us who live in villages 2 or 3 miles away.	We are aware of parking issues in Garforth and these are dealt with in Policy BETC 9 and the associated projects	
p	210	Resident	CL3	Wherever a leisure facility was situated people will use the car. The leisure centre on Ninelands lane when operational has at the most 1/2 bikes outside and they generally belong to members of staff and the car park is nearly full. What we need is something like the new swimming pool at Pontefract.	Noted	
p	211	Resident	CL3	Any proposals should be easily accessible by public transport and/or walking & cycling. Any proposals should be environmentally friendly as possible.	Agree with your comments.	
p	346	Resident	CL3	If the proposed car park could have benches on the perimeter to make the most of the wonderful view over the fields that would be fab. I would be happy to contribute/build/purchase such seating.	Thank you for your suggestion. Extra seating throughout the town would be welcomed as it would enable those slightly less mobile to enjoy the area and keep active.	Pass on details of suggestion to Garforth Traders to talk to LCC.
p	347	Resident	CL3	It would be great to have a swimming pool in Garforth	Agreed. Policy CL3 would support a proposal for a swimming pool.	
p	348	Resident	CL3	I'd like a running track round some of the playing fields and other athletic facilities	This idea is proposed as an "opportunity" for Character Area 2 – Church Garforth and is mentioned in Appendix 9, Area 2 Section D.	
p	349	Resident	CL3	Must also be appropriately located, ie a community centre must be in the local community area, a facility for the whole of Garforth should be in Garforth, not Kippax like the swimming pool or the proposed relocated cricket pitch.	Agreed. The opening sentence of the policy says "within Garforth."	
p	350	Resident	CL3	I'm not sure that the space is large enough to accommodate a leisure facility without putting strain on the local areas car parking.	No particular space has been allocated.	
p	386	Resident	CL3	Garforth requires a community sports ground, with changing facilities , not to be used by one club, but by all sports clubs and community schools	This is a good idea but would require significant input in terms of resources and	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					ongoing management. LCC would need to be involved.	
p	387	Resident	CL3	As long as a new community hall would not have a negative affect on the Miners Welfare Hall	That would not be the intention. The most recent survey of community facility (see GNPF website for details) usage suggests pressure on availability of venues for existing groups.	Consider appropriateness of proposal for community hall Add in to Policy CL3 under "c" the following, "and does not have a detrimental impact on the viability of existing community facilities"
p	418	Resident	CL3	The proposed car park at Town End may need an improved pedestrian crossing.	This would be a Highways decision.	
p	523	LCC	CL3	CL3 New Community Facilities: Criteria b) as above with criteria c). Suggest criteria c) reads 'and is accessible for all ages.'	Section e of the policy says, "suitable for all ages."	
p	212	Resident	CL4fincom	How do we ensure that these policies will be implemented?	As the NP will become part of the Development Plan for Leeds, legislation states that development proposals should be "determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise" – the plan will have statutory weight in the same way that the Core Strategy and other planning policy documents do.	
p	351	Resident	CL4fincom	Many of the policies and their components could well slip down the "wish list" when other sectors are given their proper priority.	The Plan, if approved, will require monitoring but the	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					process for that has not yet been put in place. Such a monitoring process will clearly be required.	
p	473	LCC	EH	<p>Education and Health The locally specific nature of this topic area is a particular strength and demonstrates a high level of understanding. However, suggest the wording is cut down significantly for the submission plan and a review is undertaken of the evidence presented and its relevance to the circumstances in Garforth today. To give the NP longevity and prevent data from becoming out of date and inaccurate, it is recommend that the forecast demand information on page 131 is replaced with a paragraph that sets out that the demographic landscape should be monitored by the local authority to ensure that a sufficient supply of learning places continues to remain available to meet the needs of the local population as new housing comes forward, generating additional demand. The pupil product ratio information in the table at page 132 is incorrect, the correct PPRs are 25 primary aged children and 10 secondary aged children per 100 family dwellings and this applies to all dwellings with 2 or more bedrooms. The S106 rates quoted in the table at page 132 are also incorrect, and it is recommended that this reference is removed completely given that the amounts quoted change annually according to the Department for Education's Basic Need Grant Funding Assessment for LCC (the money that local authorities are paid to create new school places). Including this also suggests that the Council will receive S106 funding from all housing development in the future, which has not been the case since the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).</p>	<p>Happy to remove any inaccurate data. Need further guidance on slimming down the rest of the narrative in this 3 page section. Will include a paragraph explaining LCC's responsibility to monitor demographic changes and ensure sufficient school place provision.</p>	<p>Remove inaccurate table on P.132. Include para on LCC responsibility for ensuring provision of school places.</p>
p	555	Resident	EH	<p>2.2 Objectives. To support and encourage the provision of a comprehensive range of primary healthcare facilities within Garforth with equitable access to health services for all residents. My response: 1. Many areas of the Leeds Met District have seen the growth of very large brand-new Medical Centres, eg Wortley, Wetherby etc. 2. Garforth for some reason does not have a similar facility. For one practice, patients must travel to Kippax Health Centre to get treatment as the bungalow on Hazelwood Avenue is too small and outdated, and is especially not disable friendly, and the surgery is quite frankly past it sell by date!! 3. Therefore, I propose that serious consideration be again given for a brand-new centrally located Medical Centre. It could be built on the Church Lane Cricket Ground notwithstanding any development proposals that may or may not have been approved on that site.</p>	<p>The location of new health facilities is the responsibility of the local Clinical Commissioning Group.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	728	Barwick and Scholes Parish Council	EH, General	<p>Thank you for allowing us to comment on your Neighbourhood Plan as part of your Regulation 14 consultation.</p> <p>We have two comments as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In section 3.6.2 Community Healthcare Facilities it is mentioned that Garforth has 3 medical practices, one being a satellite surgery of a Kippax practice. It is not highlighted that Garforth Medical Centre provides services to neighbouring populations in Aberford and Barwick in Elmet with a branch surgery in each village (Aberford temporarily closed). • Subject to the formal examination of the plan and its adoption by Leeds City Council, care must be taken to ensure that there is a process in place which is effective in monitoring the plan. <p>We trust that you find these comments helpful.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Keith Langley</p> <p>Clerk to the Parish Council</p>	<p>Thank you for pointing out the information on health provision.</p> <p>Again, thanks for your comment. It is important that monitoring takes place assuming the Plan is adopted. The precise nature of this is as yet to be determined.</p>	Amend 3.6.2 to reflect provision of services to Barwick and Aberford.
p	33	Resident	EH1	As the population of Garforth increases with more houses we obviously need more facilities for educating our children in safe and pleasant Surroundings.	This is a decision to be made by LCC. The Plan does point out the need to address infrastructure requirements. Please see 3.1.2 re physical infrastructure and flood prevention, opening paragraph.	
p	34	Resident	EH1	Need more primary provision in Garforth. Replacement buildings were needed for Ninelands, Green Lane and East Garforth when I worked in Garforth 10 years ago.	Please see above	
p	35	Resident	EH1	The way the population of Garforth is increasing it might be worth contemplating a new school altogether rather than expanding the existing ones.	Please see above	
p	36	Resident	EH1	In practice I believe the only school that could comply with (a) is East Garforth Primary Academy.	Noted	
p	37	Resident	EH1	EH1 b) how could we ensure that the C footprint of existing schools would be reduced as finances would presumably only be found for the new building? EH1 c) given that there is already congestion around schools when children arrive and depart how could adverse impacts be avoided given that there will be more children attending.	b)The policy wording is that proposals “should seek” to reduce its carbon footprint; clearly without knowing the specifics of an individual building it is difficult to be more prescriptive. The	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					implementation will depend on planning considerations. c) Thank you. This comment will be taken into account in an addition to Policy EH1	Add wording to EH1 c based on EH2 (b)
p	213	Resident	EH1	Very good points, especially retaining open space for the well-being of the children	Thank you	
p	215	Resident	EH1	Point a should say close proximity to the school. For example Green Lane school should not have to go to Glebelands but that may be acceptable for Ninelands school.	The decision on distance would be one made collaboratively between the school, planners and the education department at LCC.	
p	524	LCC	EH1	EH1 Support for Existing Schools: The requirement in the policy for no net loss of outdoor space may be impossible to balance against the need for school expansion, and could prevent the expansion of all schools altogether (which would be contrary to the other aims of the plan in terms of increasing school places). Perhaps the emphasis of the policy should be on ensuring that proposals don't compromise the quality of outdoor space provision? It may be difficult for proposals for the expansion of school buildings to reduce the carbon footprint of existing buildings, perhaps this part of the policy should focus on measures that contribute to minimising the carbon impact of the school as a whole where feasible (which could be included as part of a scheme without affecting existing buildings).	Any loss of space resulting from expansion could be offset as long as there remain suitable areas – green and “tarmac” - for the needs of the pupils for outdoor recreation/teaching/ activities. See comment 37 above P.58	Alter wording of EH1 (a) to reflect our response. “Any potential loss of outdoor space should have no adverse impact on pupils / staff and the ability to deliver activities on site; these activities include recreation/ sport / teaching/ community activities”
p	38	Resident	EH2	Quality counts	Noted	
p	39	Resident	EH2	Personally, as a sixth form student at Garforth Academy, there are a lot of students who drive to school and can't park anywhere (even teachers struggle to park) down Ringway and Knightsway. I feel there should be space for cars to park and a scheme which encourages people to car share / electric cars to benefit the environment	Agree that it would be beneficial to reduce emissions. The best way to do this is not necessarily to increase car	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					parking provision but rather to promote active travel.	
p	40	Resident	EH2	Some of the KS1 and KS2 buildings e.g. Ninelands will need replacing. Built in 70s to last a fixed number of years. Well past that now. These buildings are constantly being repaired. The roof windows were removed at Ninelands when it was reroofed (1990s?) This reduced ventilation. Then windows replaced. Further reducing ventilation. Glazed & south facing. Often had to leave the KS2 classrooms and teach outside. Green Lane buildings were the same as Gibson Lane which was replaced 20 years ago. Are these buildings still fit for purpose? Excellent grounds though. Hope they can keep these fields.	Thank you for your comment.	
p	41	Resident	EH2	Agree where practicable	Noted	
p	42	Resident	EH2	All worthy principles but how could we ensure that they would be implemented?	We can not ensure this but are relying on the proper and rigorous application of the planning process.	
p	525	LCC	EH2	EH2 New School Provision: Criteria c) should be an aspiration rather than a requirement (these matters will be clarified through the Local Plan Update). The final paragraph should clarify that this applies where the need for a new school as part of a development has been identified.	Thank you for the comment on carbon neutrality. We will alter the policy. We will also add conditionality to the final sentence	Amend EH 2 by adding "aim to" after "and". Final sentence to start "If any new housing allocations are identified, they should.."
p	43	Resident	EH3	Encourage more walking.	Agreed	
p	44	Resident	EH3	Maybe this is covered in another section, should there be a presumption that parents should send their children to the nearest school to cut down on the need for car travel?	That is not a presumption a neighbourhood plan can make.	
p	45	Resident	EH3	Can the 'snickets' be improved. Are these footpaths accessible and maintained so children can travel on bikes and scooters?	This is dealt with in Policy GSRE7 Accessibility and Connectivity (including PROW)	
p	46	Resident	EH3	It's far healthier for children to walk to school	Agreed	
p	47	Resident	EH3	Still will need adequate drop off points because unless kids live on the doorstep they aren't going to walk. If they do live on the doorstep parents going to work will drop the kids at school.	The Plan promotes active travel wherever possible in	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					view of both health issues and the climate emergency.	
p	48	Resident	EH3	Given the congestion already in Garforth how and where would investment be sourced?	This would be an LCC project	
p	352	Resident	EH3	Need more cycle lanes and footpaths cleared of waste and litter	This is primarily the responsibility of LCC. There is an active group in Garforth , “Garforth Wombles” who do litter picking.	
p	526	LCC	EH3	EH3 Accessibility to Education: This reads as more of a statement rather than a policy though the aspiration for supporting increased active travel opportunities for schools is acknowledged. This may work better as a project.	Agreed.	Convert Policy EH3 into a project entitled “Safe Routes to School”
p	14	Resident	EH4	I do not understand why policy EH4 does not contain a similar principle of carbon neutrality to that which is included in policy EH2.	Agreed	Add point c from EH2 to new EH3 as point g
p	49	Resident	EH4	Protect green space and play areas where children can run free.	See Policy EH3 (f)	
p	50	Resident	EH4	Not sure how space for additional facilities will be found without encroaching on green space, especially if an area for trees and shrubs is needed.	The provision of additional facilities does not necessarily imply the construction of new establishments. It is equally possible that existing buildings e.g. large private houses, could be converted to provide pre school facilities.	Alter new EH3 introduction to add “ private or public” after “additional.”
p	51	Resident	EH4	Must keep the green spaces	Agreed	
p	52	Resident	EH4	I totally agree. In my personal experience over nearly 3 decades East Garforth Primary Academy provides all of the above and not many years ago the use of the Aagrah car park was more than adequate for parents bringing children to school. In the present day the car park is always full, it is a nightmare getting in and out on the Aberford Road. Parents are parking down Newhold and then crossing the busy Aberford Road. Many have resorted to parking on the cul-de-sacs leading from Braemar Drive and jostling for space. This is partly because children don't just come from Garforth. They come from Aberford, Great Preston, Kippax, Allerton Bywater, Barwick, Micklefield and Sherburn. In some cases to ensure a place at the Academy by being in a	Thank you for your comment.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				feeder school and others because East Garforth provides education from Nursery right through to year 6 and things aren't going to improve.		
p	53	Resident	EH4	again worthy principles but how would they actually be implemented? Is there a or would there need to be a supplementary paper recognised by LCC on facilities required. d) and f) need to be included in EH2	This would depend on an effective monitoring system being in place. This is a role often undertaken by a Parish Council. (d) is included as item (f) in Policy EH2. Including (f) may not always be practical.	
p	527	LCC	EH4	EH4 Support for Pre-School Facilities: OK in principle, though criteria f) is not wholly necessary as this is covered within the LGS designation itself.	Thank you for your comment. (f) will be left in.	
p	54	Resident	EH5	As the population of Garforth grows we need to keep essential services, not lose them as we did with the clinic, which was taken away as the population grew.	Whilst many people would like to have seen the clinic remain, the decision to remove it was made by NHS bodies, looking at the situation on a Leeds wide basis.	
p	55	Resident	EH5	Moorfield House is a small surgery and more personal than the Medical Centre.	Noted	
p	56	Resident	EH5	Given the pressure on GP services any change of use would necessitate replacement premises.	Noted	
p	528	LCC	EH5	EH5 Community Healthcare Facilities: OK in principle, however consideration should be given to what would happen to the site in the event that the healthcare use ceases, and no alternative community/wellbeing use could be secured.	Agreed	Add to EH5, " If at the end of a 12 month marketing period, this proves impossible, other uses may be considered."
p	57	Resident	EH6	I feel they need to place it in an area where it's easily accessible for the elderly population as they struggle the most to get around Garforth and the demographic of Garforth is predominantly of an older generation	Thank you for your comment	
p	58	Resident	EH6	A new Gp's surgery is well overdue in Garforth. It's difficult getting an appointment (not due to Covid)	Noted	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	59	Resident	EH6	Depends what is meant by accessible. Anywhere away from Main Street isn't going to be accessible for the majority unless its on your doorstep. The Factory Shop site would be good for a medical centre. Bus stop outside.	Accessible is defined in the Core Strategy Accessibility Criteria; it is generally accepted as being within a 20 minute walk or 5 minutes to a bus stop .	
p	60	Resident	EH6	What are the LCC standards for off street parking ? This has not been implemented in Kippax.	The standards can be found in Leeds City Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Transport standards?	
p	61	Resident	EH6	These proposals look to be well considered and worth supporting	Thank you	
p	216	Resident	EH6	Everything seems very well thought out	Thank you	
p	529	LCC	EH6	EH6 New Healthcare Provision: The final paragraph should clarify that this applies where the need for a new healthcare facility as part of a development has been identified.	Thank you.	Remove final paragraph from EH6
p	620	Resident	EH6	Page 137- Following the completion of the Charles Church build off Selby Road, there will be a woeful lack of health and social care provision for a town of Garforth's size. Page 140- Policy EH6 Leeds City Council needs to be held to account for ensuring there is sufficient in curtilage off-street parking commensurate with the scale of developments. We need to be mindful of the impact of new builds not just within Garforth, but also those in neighbouring villages- especially Micklefield. There are so many substantial developments currently in progress, which will inevitably lead to a surge in the population of what used to be a small village and yet there has been no development of retail outlets to accommodate this growing population. There is only one small primary school in the locale and I am not aware of healthcare provision in the village. so the new residents of this area will put even more pressure on the infrastructure in Garforth.	Thank you for your comment. Thank you for your comment. The Garforth Neighbourhood Plan can only cover issues within its designated area. Other neighbouring villages can develop their own plans to address relevant issues.	
p	63	Resident	EH7fincom	My main concern is how to ensure that all these policies would be implemented.	This would depend on an effective monitoring system being in place. This is a role often undertaken by a Parish Council.	
p	64	Resident	EH7fincom	As per \kippax, there is a glaring lack of a larger full service clinic able to deal with multiple minor issues that otherwise may end up in A&E or require day case treatment...not everyone is able to travel to Kippax	Noted	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	217	Resident	EH7fincom	Impressive work, I'm fully behind this	Thank you	
p	218	Resident	EH7fincom	There are 4 major education polices including 17 sub policies and in health there are 2 policies which include 8 sub policies. None of these sub policies can be contradicted and all are important. However it is unlikely that all of them can on can be funded and I wonder if we should be at least highlighting particular priority areas.	Each policy has a number of statements making explicit what should be considered in its implementation; these are not in priority order.	
p	388	Resident	EH7fincom	"I support all the proposals! Thank you for all your endeavour's	Thank you	
p	471	LCC	GSRE	Green Space and the Rural Environment The locally specific nature of this topic area is a particular strength and demonstrates a high level of understanding. However, suggest the wording is cut down significantly for the submission plan and a review is undertaken of the evidence presented and its relevance to the circumstances in Garforth today. The introductory section sets the scene well and is comprehensive in the range of issues that it covers. However, it would benefit from a reference to Covid-19 and the increased value and importance of green spaces. P81 Green Belt Map – this could be misleading in that it suggests that the Green Belt is only within the Garforth Neighbourhood Area boundary. Suggest the map is retitled to Green Belt within Garforth Neighbourhood Area or that it shows the whole extent of the Green Belt in this area.	Thank you for your comments	Retitle Map 5 to say “Green Belt within Garforth Neighbourhood Area” Add reference to COVID and importance of green spaces.
p	530	Developer	GSRE	Plan not in conformity with either the local or national planning policy and do not meet the basic conditions set out in para. 8 of schedule 4B to the town and country planning act 1990 as amended	The independent examiner will determine whether Plan meets basic conditions.	
p	531	Developer	GSRE	Cricket club facilities significantly outdated and do not meet the required minimum standards	Noted	
p	532	Developer	GSRE	To facilitate the purchase and investment in new facilities the current site is proposed to be redeveloped...	Noted	
p	533	Developer	GSRE	25 support comments from residents and 11 individual	It would be good to have the objection count, too.	
p	534	Developer	GSRE	An opportunity to create a much needed elderly living scheme in the heart of Garforth at a sustainable location.	Noted	
p	535	Developer	GSRE	GNPF has not engage with the cricket club nor asked them to provide comments on draft policies	A notice regarding Regulation 14 asking for comments on the Draft Plan was attached to their gate post in the absence of any way of delivering it to the Club. There is photographic evidence of this.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	536	Developer	GSRE	Cricket club site green space G1226 not identified within the GNPF greenspace analysis report	Agreed that it is missing and apologise for this oversight. However, it is included in the Draft Plan, more than once. It appears in the list of green spaces in Policy GSRE1 and is shown on Map 16. It is also included in Appendix 14- New Green Space Designations	Amend green space analysis report on website to add cricket ground.
p	537	Developer	GSRE	There is no evidence to justify 'retaining green space close to centre of the population or the historic rationale for selecting and designating this site'	The site was designated by LCC in the 2013 " Issue and Options Consultation"	
p	538	Developer	GSRE	Green space assessment not updated since 2017, no consideration given to club's desire to improve facilities etc. They claim that as proposed relocation site is larger it will help to meet current deficiency.	The assessment was still valid after 3 years when the Draft Plan was written. Although some proposal have come forward for adding a few small green spaces there have been no suggestions from the community for any major changes. The Club has not been in contact with the Forum to explain its intentions.	
p	556	Resident	GSRE	. Issues, Evidence and Policies. 3.4 Green Space and The Rural Environment (GSRE) Introduction The objectives of the plan include maintaining, improving and increasing the provision of green spaces, to promote healthy lifestyles, to protect and maintain access to the green infrastructure around Garforth; to protect and enhance the rural environment, landscape and the habitats network around Garforth. Easy and safe access to local green spaces is vital in providing opportunities for addressing health and wellbeing inequalities and social sustainability enabling social interaction, play and recreational activities. Green spaces provide the infrastructure necessary to support the growth of trees, hedges and other vegetation to improve air quality, carbon sequestration and flood risk mitigation, all of which contribute to the solutions necessary to address the climate emergency. The rural environment, a	Thank you for your supportive comments on greenspace. Thank you for your detailed comments on HS2. Whilst we agree with many of the points you make, we are informed that Neighbourhood Plans are not permitted to have policies on national infrastructure projects such as HS2.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>natural heritage, also provides opportunities for sustaining wildlife especially pollinating insects vital to food production.</p> <p>My response - concerning the effect of the proposed HS2 route on the Rural Environment, and Health and Wellbeing of the inhabitants of the Community: The Impact of the HS2 Route around Garforth.</p> <p>1. I have registered my written objections to the route of HS2 around the western perimeter of the Garforth settlement for a considerable number of years now to the HS2 Organisation.</p> <p>2. My latest objection letter 21st January 2019 attached for your information to HS2, appears not to have acknowledged, or any of my objections answered. So, I have re-sent it on 4th March 2021 by email to them.</p> <p>3. So, I was interested to see that you had mentioned about HS2 in your response:</p>	<p>From recent reports in the media, it seems highly likely that the future of the Leeds leg of HS2 is in doubt.</p>	
p	557	Resident	GSRE	<p>"Hawks Nest Wood, although outside of the neighbourhood area, is a designated natural greenspace site but will be reduced by half and the remainder will be seriously affected by the construction of HS2. The proposed mitigation to relocate the site to an alternative will not replace the natural area lost for several decades. It is the strong belief of the Forum that designated green spaces of all typologies should be retained in their current location. Additionally, the Forum feels that alternative equivalent natural greenspace sites within the Garforth Neighbourhood Area should be designated and with a planting strategy in place to replace the land permanently lost by HS2."</p> <p>My response:</p> <p>1. However, this led me to re-examine the current HS2 website information. I have not been on the website for several months now and find there have been some big updates as soon as 21st January 2021 especially about the 'Safeguarding of Land' for the Route.</p> <p>2. This is a very serious development and confirms my worst fears that alternative routes for HS2 have been abandoned.</p>	<p>Please see response to 556</p>	
p	558	Resident	GSRE	<p>The HS2 Website 28th February 2021 says:</p> <p>"A decision on the inclusion of the proposed Eastern Leg refinements will follow the conclusion of the Integrated Rail Plan for the North and Midlands, which the Government plans to publish before the end of the year.</p> <p>Safeguarding</p> <p>In order to ensure that land needed for HS2 is protected from conflicting development, safeguarding is in place for the Eastern Leg of Phase 2b. You can find more information about this on the HS2 safeguarding section on gov.uk."</p> <p>I attach the relevant links to the safeguarding drawings:</p> <p>https://www.hs2.org.uk/phase-2b/eastern-leg/</p> <p>HS2 Phase 2b safeguarding maps: Wakefield, Leeds and North Yorkshire -</p>	<p>Please see response to 556</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)</p> <p>This next link takes a short while to load up: 2C864-MCL-PL-MAP-100-000030.indd (publishing.service.gov.uk)</p> <p>Then scroll down for the three detailed maps to see the land being safeguarded round Garforth: SG-02-248, SG-02-248-L1 and SG-02-249.</p>		
p	559	Resident	GSRE	<p>My response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You see from the scale of the 'land width' referred to that the Route poses an incredibly significant impact on land and property it passed through. This type of high-speed travel does demand great swaths of land being affected. 2. These plans only refer to the 'birds eye view'. However, when the three-dimensional effect is considered, the true scale and size on the enormous embankments and cuttings proposed, emphasise how much property and land is actually required for such a new rail scheme, made worse by the fact the trains will be travelling at a much higher speed of between 225mph and 250 mph than our local rail travelling at 90mph. As such the high-speed trains need much longer slower curves to negotiate the bends safely at speed. 3. So, my latest letter of objection Dated 21st January 2019 still awaits a response but covers in much greater detail the enormity of such a major project and the horrendous impact it will have on our Garforth settlement. 4. The proposed Route will decimate and destroy the very distinctive ancient treelined Barrowby Lane track and trees. 5. There will be significant noise from the passing trains. 6. There will be disturbance during the construction period of the Route resulting in increased noise levels, air pollution and the inconvenience of re-routing the local road network. 	Please see response to 556	
p	560	Resident	GSRE	<p>Other thoughts on the HS2 Route locally at Garforth and beyond:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notwithstanding some sceptical pundits who claim that HS2 to Leeds and beyond will never be build, it is absolutely imperative to object in the strongest terms possible now, as if it is to be built, rather than waiting until building starts, as it would be too late to do so. 2. It is worth noting that the residents of a brand-new house estate in South Yorkshire must continue to be devastated that the 'Route' still goes through the middle of their housing estate. 3. Here are the details of that estate: Strata Homes, Shimmer Estate, Comelybank Drive, Denaby Main Nr. Mexborough 	Please see response to 556	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	561	Resident	GSRE	<p>I liken it to the 1956 Song, sung by Alma Cogan on a 78rpm record: "The Railway runs through the middle of the House". https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j1pAQgB5oZc</p> <p>.....</p> <p>This is the latest HS2 information on their website dated 28 Feb 2021: https://www.hs2.org.uk/phase-2b/</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Earlier this year the government made clear in its response to the Oakervee Review its commitment to Phase 2b of HS2, ensuring we boost capacity, improve connectivity between our regions and share prosperity. 2. As part of this, the government plans to present an Integrated Rail Plan for the North and Midlands by the end of the year, informed by an assessment from the National Infrastructure Commission, which will look at how to deliver HS2 Phase 2b, Northern Powerhouse Rail, Midlands Rail Hub and other rail programmes better and more effectively. 3. In the meantime, the government has asked HS2 Ltd to pause work on the Eastern Leg. We recognise that this causes uncertainty, and our Eastern Leg community engagement teams remain in place to support you. 4. The government has asked HS2 Ltd to proceed with the development of the Western Leg of Phase 2b (from Crewe to Manchester). A Western Leg bill is being prepared for deposit to Parliament in early 2022, or sooner if possible. Whilst plans may be subject to change following the Integrated Rail Plan, the potential for significant change to the Western Leg is limited. 	Please see response to 556	
p	562	Resident	GSRE	<p>Design Refinement Consultation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Between 6 June and 6 September 2019, the Secretary of State for Transport consulted on 11 proposed refinements to the HS2 Phase 2b proposals. 2. In October 2020, the Minister of State for Transport, having considered the responses received, published his decision on whether to include the refinements proposed for the Western Leg. 3. A decision on the inclusion of the proposed Eastern Leg refinements will follow the conclusion of the Integrated Rail Plan for the North and Midlands, which the Government plans to publish before the end of the year. <p>Safeguarding</p> <p>To ensure that land needed for HS2 is protected from conflicting development, safeguarding is in place for the Eastern Leg of Phase 2b. You can find more information about this on the HS2 safeguarding section on gov.uk.</p> <p>My final comments on decision making and alternative routes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The total insensitivity of the Government and HS2 blindly following the 	Please see response to 556	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>Proposed Route and not developing less sensitive alternative routes, is unbelievable, and so blinkered, that I despair that common sense can ever prevail.</p> <p>2. So, I respectfully and strongly request that the Garforth Neighbourhood Development Plan should more adequately reflect the enormity of the impact of the HS2 Route around the western side of Garforth. The clear aim would be to get it re-aligned along a less sensitive Route completely away from the Garforth settlement, in a more southerly direction. This would be in the interests of the Communities' Health and Wellbeing, such that those noteworthy GNDP Policies can be reach maximum achievement.</p>		
p	605	Development Worker	GSRE	<p>Please note that I am writing not as a resident, but as someone interested in climate and sustainability through personal interest and because of my role as development worker in Garforth in the climate emergency climate action project (CECAP)</p> <p>Green areas The plan mentions the loss of Hawksnest wood and the impingement on other green areas as a result of HS2. Do you accept HS2 as a given, or do you see any scope to influence whether it is built and/or where it runs?</p>	<p>We are informed that Neighbourhood Plans are not permitted to have policies on national infrastructure projects such as HS2. This does not prohibit individuals or groups from expressing views on these issues.</p> <p>From recent reports in the media, it seems highly likely that the future of the Leeds leg of HS2 is in doubt.</p>	
p	638	Natural England	GSRE	<p>Notification of Regulation 14 Consultation for Draft Garforth Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 11 February 2021</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood</p>	Thank you for your comments	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				Plan.or any further consultationson your plan,pleasecontact:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.		

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	639	Natural England	GSRE	<p>Annex 1 - Neighbourhood planning and the natural environment: information, issues and opportunities</p> <p>Natural environment information sources</p> <p>The Magic¹ website will provide you with much of the nationally held natural environment data for your plan area. The most relevant layers for you to consider are: Agricultural Land Classification, Ancient Woodland, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Local Nature Reserves, National Parks (England), National Trails, Priority Habitat Inventory, public rights of way (on the Ordnance Survey base map) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (including their impact risk zones). Local environmental record centres may hold a range of additional information on the natural environment. A list of local record centres is available here².</p> <p>Priority habitats are those habitats of particular importance for nature conservation, and the list of them can be found here³. Most of these will be mapped either as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, on the Magic website or as Local Wildlife Sites. Your local planning authority should be able to supply you with the locations of Local Wildlife Sites.</p> <p>National Character Areas (NCAs) divide England into 159 distinct natural areas. Each character area is defined by a unique combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural and economic activity. NCA profiles contain descriptions of the area and statements of environmental opportunity, which may be useful to inform proposals in your plan. NCA information can be found here⁴.</p> <p>There may also be a local landscape character assessment covering your area. This is a tool to help understand the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape and identify the features that give it a sense of place. It can help to inform, plan and manage change in the area. Your local planning authority should be able to help you access these if you can't find them online.</p> <p>If your neighbourhood planning area is within or adjacent to a National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the relevant National Park/AONB Management Plan for the area will set out useful information about the protected landscape. You can access the plans on from the relevant National Park Authority or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty website.</p> <p>General mapped information on soil types and Agricultural Land Classification is available (under 'landscape') on the Magic⁵ website and also from the LandIS website⁶, which contains more information about obtaining soil data.</p> <p>Natural environment issues to consider</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework⁷ sets out national planning policy on protecting and enhancing the natural environment. Planning Practice Guidance⁸ sets out supporting guidance.</p> <p>Your local planning authority should be able to provide you with further advice on the potential impacts of your plan or order on the natural environment and the need for any environmental assessments.</p> <p>¹ http://magic.defra.gov.uk/ ² http://www.nbn-nlbr.org.uk/nlbr.php ³ http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habitsandspeciesimportance.aspx ⁴ https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making ⁵ http://magic.defra.gov.uk/ ⁶ http://www.landis.org.uk/index.cfm ⁷ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/807247/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf ⁸ http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/natural-environment/</p>		

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	640	Natural England	GSRE	<p><u>Landscape</u></p> <p>Your plans or orders may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes. You may want to consider identifying distinctive local landscape features or characteristics such as ponds, woodland or dry stone walls and think about how any new development proposals can respect and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness.</p> <p>If you are proposing development within or close to a protected landscape (National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) or other sensitive location, we recommend that you carry out a landscape assessment of the proposal. Landscape assessments can help you to choose the most appropriate sites for development and help to avoid or minimise impacts of development on the landscape through careful siting, design and landscaping.</p> <p><u>Wildlife habitats</u></p> <p>Some proposals can have adverse impacts on designated wildlife sites or other priority habitats (listed here⁹), such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest or Ancient woodland¹⁰. If there are likely to be any adverse impacts you'll need to think about how such impacts can be avoided, mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for.</p> <p><u>Priority and protected species</u></p> <p>You'll also want to consider whether any proposals might affect priority species (listed here¹¹) or protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced advice here¹² to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected species.</p> <p><u>Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land</u></p> <p>Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services for society. It is a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, a store for carbon and water, a reservoir of biodiversity and a buffer against pollution. If you are proposing development, you should seek to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality in line with National Planning Policy Framework para 171. For more information, see our publication Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land¹³.</p> <p>Improving your natural environment</p> <p>Your plan or order can offer exciting opportunities to enhance your local environment. If you are setting out policies on new development or proposing sites for development, you may wish to consider identifying what environmental features you want to be retained or enhanced or new features you would like to see created as part of any new development. Examples might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing a new footpath through the new development to link into existing rights of way. • Restoring a neglected hedgerow. • Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site. • Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape. • Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds. • Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings. • Think about how lighting can be best managed to encourage wildlife. • Adding a green roof to new buildings. <p>⁹http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx</p> <p>¹⁰https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences</p> <p>¹¹http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx</p> <p>¹²https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals</p> <p>¹³http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/35012</p>		

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	641	Natural England	GSRE	<p>You may also want to consider enhancing your local area in other ways, for example by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting out in your plan how you would like to implement elements of a wider Green Infrastructure Strategy (if one exists) in your community. • Assessing needs for accessible greenspace and setting out proposals to address any deficiencies or enhance provision. • Identifying green areas of particular importance for special protection through Local Green Space designation (see Planning Practice Guidance on this¹⁴). • Managing existing (and new) public spaces to be more wildlife friendly (e.g. by sowing wild flower strips in less used parts of parks, changing hedge cutting timings and frequency). • Planting additional street trees. • Identifying any improvements to the existing public right of way network, e.g. cutting back hedges, improving the surface, clearing litter or installing kissing gates) or extending the network to create missing links. • Restoring neglected environmental features (e.g. coppicing a prominent hedge that is in poor condition, or clearing away an eyesore). <p>¹⁴ http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space/local-green-space-designation/</p>		
p	664	Resident	GSRE	"The question of infrastructure is critical in any new development. Green infrastructure is dealt with fully in the Green space and Environment section	Thank you for your comment.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>of the Plan. Suffice it to re-iterate here that, as the town already suffers from a significant deficit in terms of green space (using Leeds City Council guidelines), it is vital that all new developments take the opportunity to provide the required amount." -GNP</p> <p>We all want green space in Garforth but I can't see LCC falling into line...don't forget they are the council who wanted to build 5,000 houses at Parlington and a load more at East Garforth. That's an awful lot of green space that would have been destroyed and tarmaced over.</p> <p>They're also the council that wants to close bowling greens, removing a valuable community asset.</p> <p>Of course the council will pay lip service to the green plan but when the next developer comes along wanting to build a new housing estate the first thing the council will see is pounds signs in their eyes...and out goes the green dream.</p>		
p	675	Resident	GSRE	<p>I am writing in support of the suggestions for developing Glebelands further as a park, given in Appendix 9, page 192. An all weather peripheral path would benefit so many different people: parents pushing prams with accompanying children on bikes and scooters, Older people needing to exercise on a level surface due to balance or other issues which make walking on the field more difficult, Users of mobility scooters who are currently excluded from some paths by the gates designed to exclude motor cycles, Younger people looking for a good path to roller skate on, beginner and returner cyclists looking to build up confidence, people using the leisure centre wanting to run laps as part of their session. People just wanting a longer walk in a park throughout the year than is currently possible in Garforth. This will remain important to the people who are working from home and likely to continue to do so, as a lunchtime break. Currently during much of the year the grass is too boggy for use by many of these groups.</p> <p>Decorative tree and flower planting as well as opportunities for fruit trees and edible beds alongside the track could provide shade as an extra benefit for the summer months and increase biodiversity as part of our response to the Climate change emergency. As suggested the path needs to be wide enough for use as a shared path by pedestrians and those on a variety of wheeled transport. Garforth Tigers seem minded to develop their facilities for wider community use so there may be opportunities for them working in partnership with other local groups like Garforth Community Greening Group, Incredible Edible, Garforth in Bloom, the Neighbourhood Plan, and the Climate Response group to seek funding to make this happen along with the other excellent ideas suggested in the plan for developing this further as a park. I would also like to add my thanks to all of the people who have given</p>	Thank you for your supportive comments. GNPF, too, hope this will be realised .	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				so much time and effort over the last six years to producing such a carefully considered plan.		
p	713	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	GSRE	Building with Nature is a voluntary approach developed by practitioners, policy-makers and academic experts, and tested with the people who will use and benefit from the framework. There are three levels of accreditation; Design, Full (Good) and Full (Excellent) and schemes can be assessed at pre-application, reserved matters and post-construction/in-use stages. Further information can be accessed via the website: https://www.buildingwithnature.org.uk . Yorkshire Wildlife Trust has two Building with Nature trained assessors and is keen to progress this approach with developers.	Thank you for the information	Insert as first sentence in GSRE 10 , "Development proposals which seek accreditation under YWT's Building with Nature framework will be supported."
p	716	Resident	GSRE	i would like to highlight the importance of green spaces hedgerows and trees throughout Garforth especially near the centre to cut down on pollution from vehicles and to encourage wildlife as we have lost far too many trees etc in the area , this could also help with flooding issues	Agree. The importance is recognised throughout the GSRE section. See particularly GSRE 14 and the projects following.	
p	717	Resident	GSRE	I am very concerned about trees and hedgerows being removed in Garforth. I would like to see more planting of hawthorn and mixed hedgerows, which offer nesting and roosting to birds. There should be more green corridors for wildlife. More open spaces to encourage residents out into these space, with trees and perhaps a lake which would be beneficial to wildlife. Chapel Close has already been affected by losing a number of large trees as well as a considerable length of hedgerow.	Agree. Please see comment above.	
p	710	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	GSRE 5 & 6	Furthermore, we are glad to see consideration has been made for improving the connectivity of greenspaces, and for development to contribute to this connectivity and enhancement of existing greenspaces.	Thank you	
p	680	Resident	GSRE 5,6,7	The plan looks to take a balanced approach to development and improvement in the coming years but past experience shows this has not happened. The housing developments that have taken place in Garforth over the last 50 years have been dictated by the development companies who have sought to provide the maximum amount of houses on the minimum amount of land. This has resulted in very few community facilities on the different estates and very little green space. The estates have all developed as separate bubbles	Thank you for your detailed comments. Much of what you say is true. There are some examples of green space being created e.g. on the Ninelands	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>with little interconnection by road or footpath to other estates or to the town centre. Few of the estates have any green space of note and little or no playground areas. The Longmeadows Estate is a prime example. This needs to change in the new plan.</p> <p>A similar pattern has developed with the industrial estates to the north of Garforth which have all developed piece meal with no connection between them and little thought to the entry or exit except onto pre-existing roads. The Lotherton Way Industrial Estate is another prime example. This needs to change in the new plan.</p> <p>Much of Garforth is based on the 18thC road network with Selby Road and Aberford Road running east-west and Lidget Lane/Main Street and Ninelands Lane running north-south. The inner roads of Church Lane and Barleyhill Road connect most of inner Garforth to Main Street. However these roads have seen little improvement in 100 years with the exception of traffic lights at Ninelands Lane and Kippax Road end. Most of the roads are heavily congested with Church Lane, a bus route, being almost single track due to parked cars and Ninelands Lane/Bar Lane being restricted by a single track bridge.</p> <p>None of the developments have sought to improve this infrastructure apart from the recent retail development on Aberford Road. This cannot be allowed to continue and the infrastructure should be improved as matter of urgency BEFORE any more development takes place.</p> <p>There is also a lack of community facilities in Garforth such as a park land or swimming pool and, although previous populations might not have supported this the number of residents now should warrant an improvement in these facilities -LCC take note.</p> <p>In short this is about development going hand in hand with infrastructure and whilst small pockets of development can be absorbed into an existing structure the rapid development of Garforth in recent years and any future plans must take this into account.</p>	<p>development on the old Stocks site there is now some new green space.</p> <p>The Draft plan talks in the introduction to the HBE section in 3.1 of the importance of new developments providing green infrastructure.</p> <p>Additionally in Policy HBE11 – Selby Rd- there are several guiding principles which focus on green space being provided or maintained.</p> <p>There is no doubt that many new developments do not improve infrastructure and this is something the Neighbourhood Plan is trying to address.</p>	
p	681	Resident	GSRE 7 GSRE 6 CL 3	<p>Hello, new to the area with my young family.</p> <p>Three points: Map 20 with the footpaths seems incorrect. The green footpath leading to Barrowby Hall is actually cut off (next to the Pond Shop) and you are unable to access the rest of the path. From the other side it is cut off by "private" signs. This needs investigating.</p> <p>More trees and wildlife. There's so few trees in the green spaces we have (plus local residents cutting them down in their gardens). Please plant more trees and wildflower. This is particularly noticeable on the high street where</p>	<p>Map 20 was supplied by LCC. The footpath in question is shown as “claim/review” and not “definitive”.</p> <p>Agreed. Policy GSRE14 deals with planting opportunities and related “Projects” aim to</p>	<p>Explanation will be given in the text whether footpath is open to public.</p>

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>there is nowhere green and open to sit and meet people etc. I had hoped the area designated for car park would become a mini-forest. We need more wooded areas and wildlife. It's a sterile town to say we're in the "countryside"</p> <p>There need to be a community area for people working at home. other local areas have set up community centres for meeting in a local space with WiFi, tables, power etc to allow those working from home to work in a more social environment. Could this be the Miners welfare etc.? I'll be working at home another year probably. It'd be great to have an area in town I could turn up with my laptop and work, but also meet people and buy lunch etc. Could this be run by volunteers etc. It wouldn't need much maintenance. Meanwood have a great abandoned old warehouse now working as a space for self employed and working at home start ups etc.</p> <p>Happy to help</p>	<p>work with Greening Garforth to create new tree cover.</p> <p>This is a good idea but would depend on finding a suitable location, volunteers and possibly some funding. Perhaps this could be a project for the future.</p>	<p>Include as a new bullet under BETC Projects(P.69) "GNPF to support local traders and others in exploring possibility of establishing a co-working space"</p>
p	708	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	GSRE Hawks Nest Wood	<p>In the first instance, whilst Hawks Nest Wood is recognised as a local green space, it has not been considered with its official designation of 'Local Wildlife Site' (LWS). This omission downplays the value of the site as LWS (formerly known as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation) which are of great significance as core wildlife-rich habitats of substantive nature conservation value and taken together with Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), they represent a major national asset, essential to nature's recover. LWS play a critical conservation role by providing wildlife refuges, acting as stepping stones, corridors and buffer zones to link and protect nationally and internationally designated sites – improving ecological coherence and connectivity and contributing to a climate resilient landscape. With no statutory status, their only form of protection is through good planning policy and decisions.</p> <p>For a long time, it has been recognised that, whilst they are important, SSSIs are not together with the statutorily protected sites, contain most of the country's remaining high quality natural habitat and threatened species.</p>	<p>Hawks Nest Wood is not within the Neighbourhood Plan boundary though it is of importance to the community.</p>	<p>It can be confirmed that Hawks Nest Wood can be included in the Leeds Wildlife sites list.</p>
p	739	Resident	GSRE map 16	<p>I've started to respond to these policies and was exploring them all before setting about completing the response forms.</p> <p>It seems to me that within the Green Space and Rural Environment Policy the numbers on Map 16 do not correspond to the list above!!</p> <p>Garforth Community College seems the obvious example but several others seem to have been mis-numbered. East Garforth Primary School seems to feature twice.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The map and list will be checked and any necessary alterations made.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				Hopefully this isn't too difficult to correct - assuming I'm not more confused than usual!!! All the best		

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	635	Resident	GSRE GSRE7	<p>The Linesway path, in contrast, is quite suitable for sharing by walkers and cyclists. [See also Sect 3.1.3 on Character areas and Sect 3.4.2 on Green Space and PROWs.]</p> <p>At the Townhead intersection, where the cycleway negotiates the signalled junction, in theory it cuts across the triangle of land between Aberford Road and Barwick Road. This involves users cutting across the footway at an acute angle, and due to the presence of a pedestrian fence in <i>exactly the wrong place</i>, encourages conflict with pedestrians at this point, as well as further along on this side of Aberford Road, plus the sort of bad behaviour often seen on the blind corner opposite (mentioned above) -i.e. taking shortcuts to avoid traffic lights. This is difficult to explain in writing, and really needs a map or site visit. I did point all this out to the Council officers when it was first proposed, suggesting that at the very least the cycle cutoff should be clearly marked on the ground, so that pedestrians are at least aware of the hazard we face, but nothing was done. (Just like all the other matters I have tried to bring to the attention of councillors or officers over the years, with similar lack of result!)</p> <p>I'm sorry to dwell on the subject, but it is a serious issue that has to be addressed. Throughout the report the pedestrians and cyclists are bracketed together. Their needs are very different. Cheap and simple remedies often make all the difference. For instance, in Station Fields there is a barrier across the road separating the unadopted street from the rest. It has a pedestrian gap, which inevitably cyclists also make use of, again usually without warning. This can easily be remedied, -by giving cyclists their own gap, wide enough for two-wheelers only, but not next to the pedestrian gap as this would produce a combined gap tempting for cars to use.</p> <p>3.4 and Appendix 7. Green Space and Rural. If map 5 is right, we have already had one bite out of the Green Belt -the site below the water tower. HS2 will take a bigger slice (if it happens), as well as some out of the wildlife area off Ash Lane including its main asset, the pond and reed bed. Sadly recent governments seem to have forgotten what green belts are for, and constantly try to abolish or undermine them.</p> <p>If the area south of Selby Road and east of the Kippax corner is green belt, and unavailable for development, then the line of the new road should be kept as close to the old one here as practical. Certainly we need clear green space between Garforth and all neighbouring towns including Kippax, Micklefield and of course Leeds itself. As for HS2, I have always believed that a route between Garforth and Kippax would be as good or better (and shorter).</p> <p>Use of similar numbering for Character areas (map 9) and rural Sections (map 37) is confusing. Could letters not have been used for one or other? Most of area 9 is of course now housing (p192). And Barleyhill Recreation Ground most certainly contains paths (round the sides) and at least one bench (by the Wakefield Road exit) so qualifies as a park (p190) albeit with no flower beds. Did the surveyor not venture beyond the sports grounds?</p> <p>3.4.2 Footpaths, Public Rights of Way etc. At least two paths shown green on map 20 are <i>not</i> open to the public: that through Barrowby Park past the Hall, and part of that along the top of Garforth Cliff, -as well as the Dale Croft railway crossing closed indefinitely by Network Rail. HS2 proposals for footpath crossings</p>	<p>One is relying on the good sense of both pedestrians and cyclists to avoid conflict. At the same time, this way of negotiating the Town End junction is much safer for cyclists than turning right at the traffic lights.</p> <p>Based on the experiences of some regular cyclists this route does not seem problematic either for pedestrians or cyclists.</p> <p>Having reviewed the maps and their location in the Draft Plan it does not seem likely there would be much risk of confusion. However we do need a heading for Map 37 on the final page of the Plan. With regard to Barleyhill, you are correct.</p>	<p>Insert heading and title to Map 37 on P.271</p> <p>Delete final sentence on P.90</p>

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					The map of footpaths was provided by LCC.	Parks and Gardens. Check with LCC on accuracy of map.
p	722	Leeds Local Access Forum	GSRE, Map 20 and Glossary	<p>This letter constitutes formal advice from the Leeds Local Access Forum. Garforth Neighbourhood Forum / Leeds City Council are required, in accordance with section 94(5) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 to have regard to relevant advice from this Forum in carrying out its functions. Thank you for the opportunity for the Leeds Local Access Forum (LLAF) to comment on the Garforth Pre-submission draft of the Neighbourhood Plan. The LLAF, established as a statutory advisory body under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, has as its main purpose the provision of independent advice on the improvement of public access to land within Leeds for the purposes of open air recreation and enjoyment of the countryside, and also for 'functional' or 'utility' access such as using the public rights of way network to get to work, school, shops and local amenities.</p> <p>The LLAF is pleased to note that the Plan, in Objectives C – Transport and D – Green Space and Rural Environment, recognises the importance of the public rights of way (PROW) network in providing good pedestrian and cycle links to local amenities and access to the countryside around Garforth. The Forum is pleased to see Transport and Green Space and Rural Environment policies that support developments which offer protection and, where appropriate, enhancement of the PROW network to improve accessibility and connectivity.</p> <p>The inclusion of Map 20 showing the PROW network within the Plan area is welcome. However, the LLAF suggests the following additions:</p> <p>For reference purposes, it would be helpful to mark each PROW with its unique number as used on the Definitive Map – the legal document recording public rights of way. Also it would be helpful to include, as an Appendix, the description for each right of way as set out in the Definitive Statement which accompanies the Definitive Map, in the same way that the designated heritage assets are described and listed in Appendix 3.</p> <p>· The map should show the PROW network extending beyond the Plan area – the rights of way do not stop at the boundary. This would be helpful, for example, in highlighting circular routes, and identifying where additions to the network within the Plan area would offer the opportunity of creating new circular routes.</p>	Advice was sought from LCC regarding these suggestions. It is possible this extra work could be undertaken in the future in conjunction with LCC.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				For help with obtaining this readily available information, please contact: Bob Buckenham, Public Rights of Way Manager: Tel: 0113 378 2902 e-mail: Bob.Buckenham@leeds.gov.uk Claire Tregembo, Principal Definitive Map Officer: Tel: 0113 378 2875 e-mail: Claire.Tregembo@leeds.gov.uk		
p	723	Leeds Local Access Forum	GSRE, Map 20 and Glossary	<p>For help with obtaining this readily available information, please contact: Bob Buckenham, Public Rights of Way Manager: Tel: 0113 378 2902 e-mail: Bob.Buckenham@leeds.gov.uk Claire Tregembo, Principal Definitive Map Officer: Tel: 0113 378 2875 e-mail: Claire.Tregembo@leeds.gov.uk</p> <p>This letter constitutes formal advice from the Leeds Local Access Forum. Garforth Neighbourhood Forum / Leeds City Council are required, in accordance with section 94(5) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 to have regard to relevant advice from this Forum in carrying out its functions. Thank you for the opportunity for the Leeds Local Access Forum (LLAF) to comment on the Garforth Pre-submission draft of the Neighbourhood Plan. The LLAF, established as a statutory advisory body under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, has as its main purpose the provision of independent advice on the improvement of public access to land within Leeds for the purposes of open air recreation and enjoyment of the countryside, and also for 'functional' or 'utility' access such as using the public rights of way network to get to work, school, shops and local amenities.</p> <p>The LLAF is pleased to note that the Plan, in Objectives C – Transport and D – Green Space and Rural Environment, recognises the importance of the public rights of way (PROW) network in providing good pedestrian and cycle links to local amenities and access to the countryside around Garforth. The Forum is pleased to see Transport and Green Space and Rural Environment policies that support developments which offer protection and, where appropriate, enhancement of the PROW network to improve accessibility and connectivity.</p> <p>The inclusion of Map 20 showing the PROW network within the Plan area is welcome. However, the LLAF suggests the following additions:</p>	See response to 722	
p	689	Resident	GSRE, Map 5. Replied	<p>Good Afternoon,</p> <p>Sorry to bother you, was just looking at your Garforth Neighbourhood Plan leaflet, had a look online at the maps etc, we live in the 2nd house (sunnyside) on Nannygoat Lane, we have always believed it to be Green Belt land. Your map, number 5 I think cuts through our property (field) not the house which now looks like it is going to be removed from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Could you please advice on what is going to happen, as HS2 is planned to be right behind us, the house next door (Treetops) has already been bought</p>	A comprehensive reply was sent. In summary it explained that Nanny Goat Lane is in the Green Belt. Map 1 clearly shows this. There is an anomaly where certain areas which people consider part of	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				by HS2 as the lady needed to sell and White house farm at the end of the lane is going all together. Any advice would be much appreciated Thank you,	Garforth are actually outside the designated Plan area.	
p	449	GI	GSRE/HBE	"Local Green Spaces are identified to be protected from development." No real issues with this statement but our concern is what it doesn't say. That is that we must protect the community as a whole from volume housebuilding and unsustainable development.	Comment noted.	
p	435	GI	GSRE+HBE	We remain of the view that whilst Garforth does need a plan in terms of protection of green space, smaller pockets of property and our conservation and wildlife areas, this could be delivered in a much simpler and truncated form which is more reflective of 2021 rather than 2015.	Wording which implies there was an expectation of large scale development on Garforth Cliff is to be removed wherever possible.	
p	132	Resident	gsre1	Every company that wants to dig these spaces up and cover them with concrete will think their circumstances are special. Needs very tight regulations.	Very Special Circumstances is a planning term which is well defined through policy, guidance and case law.	
p	133	Resident	gsre1	East Garforth and St Benedicts schools are include twice. Please consider including the two small areas of green space on Cotswold Drive where it borders Selby Road, the small area between Fairburn Drive, Woodlands Drive and East Garforth Railway Station, and finally the small triangle area in the middle of the Grange Estate which is on the road heading directly south from the Bird in the Hand Pub and the parade of shops. We should consider supporting any developments on these local green spaces if they will improve the ability to walk & cycle within Garforth and the surrounding area e.g. a path on the northern/eastern perimeter edge of the Garforth Community College green space enabling people to walk/cycle from the Linesway to Lidgett Lane.	After checking , it does not seem there is an error. The areas suggested will be investigated and consideration given to their being added to the list.	
p	134	Resident	gsre1	How can we ensure that these green spaces will be protected given the core strategy policy G6 (ii) which allows for replacement green space in the same locality? Eg G1226 Church Lane cricket club.	This will require ongoing monitoring assuming the Plan is made at referendum.	
p	283	Resident	gsre1	Should the cemetery be counted as green space? This may allow it to encroach further onto the useable green space of glebelands	This is an LCC definition.	
p	284	Resident	gsre1	With the exception of Garforth cricket club which I would be happy to see relocated. I appreciate that for those who live very locally, it would be disappointing if this site was lost but for the cricket team and wider Garforth the re-siteing could be beneficial.	Comment noted. There is an existing planning application.	
p	285	Resident	gsre1	Need to add some wording that says plus any other current green spaces we've missed	The Policy needs to be specific.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	359	Resident	gsre1	It is such a pity that Garforth does not have a proper park. We have sports grounds and children's playgrounds but nowhere with gardens and seating!	Policy GSRE4 seeks to address this issue.	
p	413	Resident	gsre1	Please add the area of green space on the south side of East Garforth station.	Please see comment 133 above.	
p	507	LCC	gsre1	P81 Green Belt Map – this could be misleading in that it suggests that the Green Belt is only within the Garforth Neighbourhood Area boundary. Suggest the map is retitled to Green Belt within Garforth Neighbourhood Area or that it shows the whole extent of the Green Belt in this area. GSRE1 Local Green Spaces: It is inadvisable to give a specific example of Very Special Circumstances in the policy as each case is considered on its own individual merits in line with national planning policy. National planning policy for Green Belt (which would apply to the Local Green Spaces) does allow certain types of development, which does not need to provide a Very Special Circumstances justification, and this is not reflected in the policy. 11 The Local Green Space assessment needs some further work in terms of justifying the proposed designation against the LGS criteria. In addition, a map of the individual sites should be included within the assessment in the appendix.	Thank you for your comment. Thank you.	Retitle map as suggested In Policy GSRE1 Remove “ for example...”
p	539	Developer	gsre1	Policy wording does not conform with NPPF para 97b	Policy GSRE1 relates to the protection of LCC designated green spaces and new ones proposed by the community in line with NPPF para. 99	
p	540	Developer	gsre1	No differentiation within the policy between different typologies	The purpose of a LGS designation is different to a categorisation of the sites. For the policy that designates the sites – no need to differentiate between different site typologies	
p	541	Developer	gsre1	No evidence to support all 40 sites	Garforth's growing population has less than the designated green space per head of population identified in core strategy policy G3 standards for open space, sport and recreation. Sites 18-40 re	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					already identified by LCC. Additional ones are helping to supplement the shortfall. See Landscape character assessment, Appendix 7 4.	
p	542	Developer	gsre1	No requirement to demonstrate very special circumstances in order to develop.	NPPF policies define the approach for considering applications on LGS	
p	543	Developer	gsre1	Not in conformity with Core strategy G6 ii. (Which Lists criteria for development)	See response to p540 above	
p	546	Developer	gsre1	GSRE1 should be redrafted to identify typologies	See point 540	
p	547	Developer	gsre1	Provide robust evidence for designations	See point 541	
p	548	Developer	gsre1	Update green space analysis to include reference to cricket clubs.	Agreed	Amend analysis
p	549	Developer	gsre1	Remove wording to demonstrate very special circumstances.	See point 542	
p	550	Developer	gsre1	Cricket club site should be removed from list of local green spaces	Garforth cricket club site is designated as local green space by LCC G1226	
p	551	Developer	gsre1	Plan should recognise the unsuitability of present cricket ground.	Not within the scope of the neighbourhood plan.	
p	552	Developer	gsre1	Add in the proposed site at the Selby Road	No decision has been taken on this at the time of writing.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	666	Resident	gsre1	<p>I represent the owners of the land identified by the council as Kennet Lane Meadows, located at the end of Kennet Lane, Garforth.</p> <p>I have become aware that this land is to be included in the Garforth Neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>This has been done without any consultation with the owners. Please remove any reference to it from your plan.</p> <p>This is private land and your advertising of it can only lead to issues of trespass and possible damage to fencing.</p> <p>It seems that this land has been designated by the council as local green space, again, without consultation with the owners. Had we been consulted we would have resisted the decision since it does not meet the criteria that define such a designation.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Mr Phillip Clarkson.</p> <p>></p>	<p>Reply sent at time of Regulation 14 consultation explaining that GNPF included all the sites already designated as LGS by LCC. Given that the owners say they were not consulted by LCC the site will be removed from the list in the Draft Plan.</p>	<p>Remove Kennet Lane Meadows from list of LGS</p>
p	709	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	gsre1 Stubbs Wood	<p>The plan also fails to identify Stubbs Wood as an area of Ancient Woodland, a habitat which is considered to be irreplaceable under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). As such, it should be protected from both direct and indirect impacts.</p> <p>Inclusion of these specific designations will strengthen the planning balance towards their protection and retention throughout the lifetime of the plan.</p>	<p>The small area within the Garforth Neighbourhood planning area north of the railway line has been identified as an additional green space for protection. The remainder is within the Aberford Parish boundary.</p>	<p>Identify as ancient woodland.</p>
p	564	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>We write on behalf of our clients Morbaine Limited and Garforth Cricket Club, to submit representations in respect of the current public consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft of the Garforth Neighbourhood Development Plan (GNDP), made under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.</p> <p>Morbaine Limited is working with Garforth Cricket Club and McCarthy Stone to deliver the proposed redevelopment of the existing Garforth Cricket Club to create a retirement living scheme (application reference 19/02248/FU), along with the relocation of the cricket club to the site at Selby Road, on the edge of the settlement of Garforth (application reference 19/02404/FU).</p> <p>To facilitate the purchase and investment in the new site and facilities at Selby Road, the club's existing site is proposed to be redeveloped for a retirement care village. The cricket club is working in partnership with Morbaine and McCarthy Stone to achieve its relocation to the Selby Road</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The policies are drafted in conjunction with the LCC neighbourhood planners and meet the relevant criteria.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>site.</p> <p>These representations focus on Draft Policy GSRE1 'Local Green Spaces', Policy GSRE4 'Improvements to Green Spaces' and the supporting Green Space Analysis Report. In particular, we focus on the lack of conformity of the draft policies with both adopted local and national planning policy, and the absence of a robust evidence base to support the drafting of the GNDP. It is our clients' view that the policies of relevance are drafted in such a way as to not be in conformity with either local or national planning policy, and therefore do not meet the Basic Conditions as set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.</p>		
p	565	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>The Draft GNDP would have direct implications on the delivery of the redevelopment of and relocation of the Garforth Cricket Club, imposing overly stringent policies which would instead specifically seek to restrict the redevelopment of the cricket club site and not provide for the exceptions as currently set out in local and national planning policy for existing playing fields.</p> <p>The representations also set out how the development of the GNDP has not followed the staged approach as set out by the government in the Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (updated in September 2020), through the lack of engagement with key landowners and stakeholders within Garforth.</p> <p>This letter should be read in conjunction with the representation prepared by The Planning Bureau Ltd on behalf of McCarthy Stone.</p> <p>Garforth Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>It is important to note at the outset that our clients are generally supportive of the aspirations of Garforth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to prepare a neighbourhood plan for the area.</p> <p>In this regard, it is acknowledged that the GNDP will assist in guiding appropriate development within the area, and help to ensure that in accordance with the government's guidance, it will choose where a range of land uses will be built, guide what developments should look like and grant permission for new buildings which the area would like to see go ahead. They also recognise the importance of providing an opportunity to set out a positive vision for how Garforth and the local community can develop over the short, medium and longer terms and make sense for local people.</p>	The decisions remain with the planning department at LCC. Regarding consultation please see response to point 535, page 73.	
p	566	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>However, given that the GNDP (if successful at examination and referendum), would become part of the statutory development plan, it is imperative that the drafted policies conform with the existing adopted local plan and the national planning policy guidance and do not unnecessarily restrict development which would otherwise comply with planning policy.</p>	Please see response to 565	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>Ensuring that policies within the GNDP conform with both local and national policy are two of the Basic Conditions for formulating neighbourhood plans (as set out in more detail below).</p> <p>Garforth Cricket Club – Background</p> <p>Garforth Cricket Club is currently located on Church Lane within the Garforth Neighbourhood Plan Area. The facility opened to the community over 85 years ago and is a highly popular and successful Club, and provides an important outdoor sports facility for the local community.</p> <p>However, their facilities are now significantly outdated. Specifically, their grounds do not meet the required minimum standard for a cricket pitch, and the club house and the changing rooms are substantially below standard and smaller than what is typically required to run a club. The Club therefore does not meet the required standards of the England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB). In this regard, the ECB and Sport England are supporting the club's relocation to provide substantially improved facilities for not only existing and future players but also the local community (see Appendix C).</p> <p>As such, the Club have aspirations to relocate to a larger and more suitable site within Garforth, and after a detailed site search within the settlement, have identified a site at Selby Road which would meet their current and future needs.</p>		
p	567	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>In light of the above, a planning application was submitted to Leeds City Council for the relocation of the Club (ref. 19/02404/FU) in April 2019: 'Creation of cricket club facility including clubhouse, football training pitches, parking area and new access'. A copy of the proposed site plan is included at Appendix A for reference.</p> <p>The proposed scheme comprises a grass cricket pitch, together with an associated club pavilion building and car parking area with direct access proposed off Selby Road. Also proposed is a two-lane practice net facility to the south east of the cricket pitch, ball stop fencing, and a scoreboard adjacent to the cricket pitch.</p> <p>The proposed club pavilion comprises a freestanding single storey building and will provide changing rooms for home and away teams and the umpire; a bar area and clubroom; players' lounge; toilets; a kitchen; office and storage facilities. A veranda will provide a covered viewing area for spectators. The pavilion design is fully compliant with the ECB guidance note TS5 'Pavilions and Clubhouses'. A total of 78 car parking spaces will be provided to the north of the pavilion, including 4 disabled car parking spaces. Cycle parking will also be provided.</p> <p>To enable the Club's relocation, they are working in partnership with Morbaine Limited and McCarthy Stone.</p> <p>To facilitate the purchase and investment in the new site and facilities at</p>	Please see response to 565	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				Selby Road, their current site at Church Road is proposed to be redeveloped into a retirement living facility operated by McCarthy Stone. McCarthy Stone submitted an application in May 2019 to Leeds City Council for the following development (ref. 19/02248/FU): 'Retirement Care Village of 64 apartments and 29 bungalows (C2), with associated activity lawn, landscaping and car parking following the demolition of pavilion/social club building'. A copy of the proposed site plan is included at Appendix B for reference.		
p	568	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>25 comments in support of the relocation of the Cricket Club and provision of the retirement village have been received from local residents; and 11 comments have been separately received to the relocation application from local residents.</p> <p>The ECB and Sport England have confirmed in their response to the application (see Appendix C) that the proposed site is wholly suitable for the relocation of the club, and that the design of the new facilities is acceptable. Overall, the ECB concludes that:</p> <p>'The relocation, will in our opinion, support the club and the community of Garforth in ensuring sports provision is retained for the enjoyment of all in the community for many generations to come. It will provide an inclusive and welcoming space that will increase community cohesion and will ensure cricket can be played safely in an environment which is more suited to modern day cricket.'</p> <p>As such, if the application is approved, benefits of the scheme will be material and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of a larger and level playing field for the club which meets ECB guidance and represents best practice; • The ability to attract new members at all ages, helping to increase participation; • A new accessible pavilion; • The provision of a new clubhouse, providing the club and wider community with a larger, modern function facility; and • The opportunity to create a much needed elderly living scheme in the heart of Garforth, at a sustainable location. 	<p>Please see response to 565.</p> <p>Although 25 comments supported the application (some from outside of Garforth) there were 98 objections.</p> <p>The Plan is not opposed to the improvement of the cricket club but seeks to protect open greenspace within an already heavily developed area of Garforth.</p> <p>Also see point 541 above.</p>	
p	569	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>As we set out in more detail below, the current drafting of the GNDF has the potential to directly impact on the proposed positive development which will help support the future of the cricket club within Garforth and provide new retirement living accommodation which will also assist in the wider housing market in the local area.</p> <p>Lack of Engagement with the Cricket Club</p> <p>Whilst the club is an active land owner within Garforth, and is currently a key stakeholder in the application to relocate and improve their facilities at Selby</p>	<p>Neither the cricket club, nor the developers informed or consulted with GNPF about these proposals.</p> <p>During regulation 14 GNPF posted a notice about the Plan on the gate of the club</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>Road, the Cricket Club has not been approached to discuss the formulation of the GNDP, or to provide comments on draft policies which will clearly have direct implications on the applications.</p> <p>This approach does not accord with the key stages in neighbourhood planning as set out at paragraph 065 of the Neighbourhood Planning Guidance.</p> <p>In this regard, Step 2: Preparing a draft neighbourhood plan or order, states clearly that the qualifying body develops proposals through (amongst other means) engaging and consulting those living and working in the area and those with an interest or will be affected by the proposals, and talking to land owners and the development industry.</p> <p>The national guidance has not been followed in this case, and no direct contact with the club has been made.</p>	<p>premises. There was no access to the ground to be able to deliver the leaflet, nor was any contact information to be found online.</p> <p>This also relates to point 535 above.</p>	
p	570	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>Basic Conditions</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans must meet the 'Basic Conditions' as set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. These are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. regard to national policies and advice in guidance issued by the Secretary of State; d. the making of the plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development; e. the making of the plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority; f. the making of the plan doesn't breach EU obligations; and g. prescribed conditions are met in relation to the plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the plan. <p>There are two key conditions of relevance to these representations set out above. Firstly, point (a) and the requirement for neighbourhood plans to have regard to national policies, and secondly point (e), in that neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of authority.</p> <p>As we set out below, the draft policies GSRE 1 and GSRE 4 do not meet the Basic Conditions as set out by the Planning Act.</p>	Please see response to 541	
p	571	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>Green Space Analysis Report</p> <p>The Draft GNDP is supported by a number of evidence base documents. The key document which underpins Policies GSRE1 – GSRE4 is the Green Space Analysis Report, which is largely based on the Green Space Background Paper (July 2015).</p> <p>The Green Space Analysis Report firstly sets out to identify all of the green and open spaces in Garforth, using the Leeds City Council LCC Greenspace document for the Outer South East, to identify whether there</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. This oversight will be amended.</p> <p>Also see response to 541.</p>	Amend greenspace analysis to include Garforth cricket club (p.190)

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>is sufficient green space against established population standards. The site is referenced as site number 12 and given a rating of 6.4.</p> <p>Although the current Garforth Cricket Club site is identified as one of these recognised greenspaces, as per the Site Allocations Plan, it is not identified within the report as contributing to Garforth's open space or outdoor sports provision at Page 5. There is no justification as to why the cricket club has not been included within the list of outdoor sports provision, despite the list specifically referring to cricket pitches.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that on Page 85, the GNDP makes specific reference to the cricket club site. The text states:</p> <p>'Some of the designated green spaces within the Garforth Neighbourhood Plan area have been the subject of planning applications for a change of use to housing development specifically G1226 (Garforth Cricket Club).</p> <p>Whilst the Core Strategy policies do consider a change of use provided a similar facility is provided elsewhere it does not mention the need to retain particular greenspaces close to the centre of the population or the historical rationale for selecting and designating the site.'</p> <p>Unfortunately, there is no further evidence or justification to support the comment made within the GNDP, other than (we assume) to lead to the designation of the site as a Local Green Space. The proceeding text then refers to the Green Space Assessment.</p>		
p	572	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>The Green Space Assessment was prepared in 2017 and does not appear to have been updated since. As such, given the date of the report, there is no consideration of the requirements or aspiration of Garforth Cricket Club to relocate to benefit from improved facilities, or consideration of the impact of the proposed new site at Selby Road on the quantitative or qualitative open space standards for the settlement. Given that the Cricket Club's proposed relocation site at Selby Road is subject to a live and well progressed planning application, the new site (which is larger and will be of a better quality than the current site) should be included. The proposed size of the cricket square is 1.4 ha, which meets the ECB standard. The new facility also occupies a total site area of 1.8 ha.</p> <p>It is unclear as to why the application has not been referred to, given that the development will assist in meeting the current deficit in outdoor sports provision; and the requirement of the neighbourhood plan to take account of current proposed development.</p> <p>In light of the above, if the Report is to be relied upon in order to support planning policy within the GNDP, then it needs updating to reflect the current position.</p> <p>Policy GSRE1 'Local Green Spaces'</p> <p>Draft Policy GSRE1 'Local Green Spaces' designates the existing cricket club</p>	See responses to points 565 and 568.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>site as a Local Green Space (ref. G1126). The Policy states: 'The following sites as set out in map 16 and Appendix 7 are designated as Local Green Spaces. Development of these sites will not be supported unless there are very special circumstances for example, it is essential to meet specific necessary utility needs and no alternative feasible site is available.'</p> <p>The supporting text preceding the policy at Page 89 states (without any further justification) that the policy conforms with Policies G3, G4 and G6 of the Leeds Core Strategy and Paragraph 91 of the NPPF.</p>		
p	573	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>We set out below how the policy does not conform with the wording of local or national planning policies.</p> <p>Regard to National Policies Paragraphs 96 to 101 of the NPPF set out the policy guidance in respect of open space and recreation.</p> <p>Paragraph 97 relates specifically to the designation of open space, sports and recreational buildings and land (which includes playing pitches).</p> <p>Paragraphs 99 to 101 provide specific guidance in relation to the designation and protection of Local Green Spaces. The paragraphs therefore relate to two types of designations, and provide separate guidance in respect of both. In this regard, Paragraph 97 of the NPPF relates to the loss of open space or sports grounds and provides three exceptions where building on these is permitted:</p> <p>'Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or b. the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity or quality in a suitable location; or c. the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use.' <p>Paragraph 97(b) provides the second exception test, which allows for the redevelopment of sports and recreational buildings and land where the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity or quality, and in a suitable location. The Cricket Club relocation application details how the proposal at Selby Road will comply with this part of the policy, in delivering better provision in terms of both quantity and quality in a suitable location.</p> 	Again, this decision lies with the LCC planning officers.	
p	574	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>Paragraph 99 then sets out guidance in respect of the designations of Local Green Space through both local and neighbourhood plans, stating that communities are able to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them. The guidance is clear that Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or updated, and be capable of</p>	LCC SAP Greenspace Background paper for the OSE identifies all the required evidence.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>enduring beyond the end of the plan period.</p> <p>Paragraph 100 then goes on to set out that Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is (amongst other things) demonstrably special to a local community, and holds a particular local significance.</p> <p>Policy GSRE1 of the GNDP sets out to designate a total of 40 sites within Garforth as 'Local Green Spaces' despite the various typologies and quality of the open spaces within the settlement. In this regard, there is no differentiation within the draft policy between 'open space, sports and recreation' and 'Local Green Spaces', as is required by the NPPF. Instead, the GNDP is grouping all 40 sites identified under Policy GSRE1 as Local Green Space designations, which the NPPF makes very clear at Paragraph 100, should only be used where the green space is 'demonstrably special'. It is clear that there is no evidence to support the GNDP's designation of all 40 sites as Local Green Spaces, or indeed any assessment of each site against the requirements of Paragraph 100 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>There is a clear evidence base for sites 1-17 and this can be found in Appendix 14 and Map 16 of the Draft Plan.</p> <p>Sites 18 – 40 have already been designated by LCC.</p>	
p	575	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>As a result, the current drafting of the Policy restricts any redevelopment of the 40 designated Local Green Spaces to 'very special circumstances'. Whilst this will clearly be appropriate for certain green spaces, the NPPF advocates the imposition of policies managing the development within a Local Green Space at Paragraph 101 and makes it very clear when this policy should be applied. Given the specialist and targeted nature of this policy approach (i.e. protecting green spaces that are demonstrably special to the local community) it should not simply be applied to all identified green spaces across the designated neighbourhood irrespective of their importance or overall quality. It is evident that the approach taken in the GNDP to 'Local Green Space' is very much a 'blanket approach' rather than a focused targeted policy seeking to protect those spaces which are truly special and which can be justified by robust up to date evidence.</p> <p>In this regard, the test in the NPPF has been adopted by the Secretary of State as being appropriate to safeguard open space and sports buildings, but also provide suitable exceptions to allow their redevelopment in certain cases. These exceptions provide for opportunities to improve on the existing provision where suitable sites are available, whilst ensuring open space is protected.</p> <p>There is no requirement in national policy guidance to demonstrate 'very special circumstances' in order to develop on all designated open space. Instead, this test relates to designated Local Green Spaces, which as the NPPF states should only be used when the sites are demonstrably special. The draft Policy GSRE1 is therefore imposing an overly-stringent policy test to all 40 sites identified within Garforth, which would unnecessarily restrict the</p>	<p>All if the proposed green spaces for designation do meet the criteria as set out in NPPF paras. 100 and 101.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GPNF Response	Action Change
				<p>redevelopment of open space or sports buildings, even when the exceptions test as set out at Paragraph 97, can be demonstrated.</p> <p>Therefore, the Draft Policy does not fulfil the requirements of Basic Condition (a) as it does not have regard to national policies within the NPPF.</p> <p>Furthermore, the GNDP is not supported by robust evidence to support the designation of all 40 sites at Policy GSRE1 as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Conformity with Strategic Policies</p>		
p	576	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>In addition, the GNDP is also not in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of authority.</p> <p>Paragraph 20 of the NPPF confirms that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for: '...the conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure...'. The Leeds Core Strategy (adopted November 2014 and amended September 2019) provides the strategic policies for the area, while the Site Allocations Plan (adopted July 2019) identifies sites for housing, employment, retail and greenspace.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy G6 'Protection and Redevelopment of Existing Green Space' is of direct relevance and states that:</p> <p>'Green space (including open space and pedestrian corridors in the City Centre) will be protected from development unless one of the following criteria is met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. there is adequate supply of accessible green space/open space within the analysis area and the development site offers no potential for use as an alternative deficient open space type' ii. The green space/open space is replaced by an area of at least equal size, accessibility and quality in the same locality; (our emphasis) iii. Where supported by evidence and in the delivery of wider planning benefits, redevelopment proposals demonstrate a clear relationship to improvements of existing green space quality in the same locality.' 	<p>LGS is a different designation to that envisaged by Policy G6 – the Core Strategy does not consider Local Green Spaces .</p> <p>No issues of general conformity as a Local Green Space is not the same as a Green Space addressed by Core Strategy Policy G6</p>	
p	577	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>Policy G6 of the adopted development plan broadly reflects the guidance contained within the NPPF and is therefore of relevance in determining applications which relate to designated green space.</p> <p>The Site Allocations Plan identifies the site at Church Lane as a green space proposed for designation (ref. G1226). As such, the same conclusions as set out above in respect of the conformity with the NPPF apply in relation to the policy's conformity with the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>Again, there is no requirement within the local plan to have to demonstrate</p>	<p>The policies are drafted with the guidance of LCC neighbourhood planning offers and in conformity with the National Neighbourhood Planning policy set out by Locality.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>'very special circumstances' when seeking to develop on open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, and that subject to one of the three criteria being met (which broadly follow the criteria set by the NPPF), then the redevelopment is considered to be acceptable.</p> <p>As such, Draft GNDP Policy GSRE1 is not in general conformity with CS Policy G6.</p> <p>Policy GSRE4 – Improvements to Green Spaces Draft GNDP Policy GSRE4 'Improvements to Green Spaces' identifies sites which have a below acceptable quality score and therefore fail to meet the standard required by the Leeds Core Strategy Policy G3.</p> <p>Proposals to improve three outdoor sports sites are made. The list does not include Garforth Cricket Club, despite it being recognised as a site with a below acceptable quality score within the Green Space Analysis Report.</p>		
p	578	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>Regard to National Policies</p> <p>We consider that Draft Policy GSRE4 is not in accordance with national policy as set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>Paragraph 92 of the NPPF states:</p> <p>'To provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should:</p> <p>a. plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and other residential environments;</p> <p>b. take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all sections of the community;</p> <p>c. guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs;</p> <p>d. ensure that established facilities are able to develop and modernise and are retained for the benefit of the community; and</p> <p>e. Ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services.'</p> <p>The draft Policy does not acknowledge Garforth Cricket Club's aspirations to relocate from their site due to the poor quality of the sporting facilities available and the requirement to provide a better quality and larger facility in a suitable location.</p>	Please see response to 568.	
p	579	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>In this regard, the existing cricket club site extends to 0.9 hectares in total, incorporating the cricket pitch, clubhouse, storage for practice nets and car parking. As such, the cricket ground is currently 73% of the size the ECB require for village cricket.</p>	The Plan does not object to Garforth cricket club's aspirations to improve its facilities. Please see 568.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>There are no ball-stop nets preventing ball strikes into the surrounding area, which is now primarily residential. Not only this but the clubhouse is rundown and has sub-standard changing rooms and there is no adjacent land which the Club might be able to expand into, to improve the quality of the cricket pitch which has deteriorated with overuse. It is therefore clear that the existing facilities at Church Lane are not at an acceptable in terms of quality or quantity, which has been confirmed by the ECB (see Appendix C). Despite the substantial evidence to support the club's conclusions that the current facilities do not meet the standards required, the GNDP does not include the club within the identified sites which fall below the acceptability score.</p> <p>At Paragraph 92(a), the NPPF states that planning policies should plan positively for sports venues, to enhance the sustainability of communities. Draft Policy GSRE4 does therefore not conform to the policies contained within the NPPF and instead would jeopardise the future significant material benefits associated with the club's relocation to Selby Road. It is important that the unacceptable quality of the existing cricket club facilities is acknowledged within the GNDP, and that its relocation to a suitable site, still within Garforth's settlement, is identified and supported.</p>		
p	580	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>Summary and Conclusions</p> <p>Morbaine Limited is working with McCarthy Stone to deliver the proposed redevelopment of the existing Garforth Cricket Club to create a retirement living scheme (application reference 19/02248/FU), along with the relocation of the cricket club to the site at Selby Road, on the edge of the settlement of Garforth (application reference 19/02404/FU).</p> <p>It is our client's view that the Draft GNDP would have direct implications on the delivery of the redevelopment and relocation of the Garforth Cricket Club site, and that the policies of relevance are drafted in such a way as to not be in conformity with either local or national planning policy, and therefore do not meet the Basic Conditions as set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.</p> <p>In light of the above, our recommendations are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy GSRE1 of the GNDP should be redrafted to differentiate between open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, and Local Green Space, as set out by paragraphs 97 and 99 of the NPPF respectively. • In defining the designations, the GNDP must be supported by a robust evidence base which assesses the open space and recreation land within Garforth, having regard to the definitions within the NPPF. 	Please see all of above points.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				The Green Space Analysis Report should be further updated to include the Club's proposed site at Selby Road within the outdoor sports provision.		
p	581	Developer	gsre1+4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy GSRE1 should be re-worded to conform with both local and national planning policy guidance, and remove the requirement to have to demonstrate 'very special circumstances' when seeking to redevelop open space, sports and recreational buildings and land. In particular, the policy should be reworded to reflect the wording of paragraph 97 of the NPPF and only apply the more stringent policy guidance provided at paragraph 101 of the NPPF to the designated Local Green Spaces within Garforth, the list of which requires defining through the preparation of a robust evidence base. • In any event, Garforth Cricket Club's site at Church Lane should be removed from the list of Local Green Spaces, to take into account the Club's commitment to relocate to a better quality and larger site, and the current planning application for a retirement scheme on the existing cricket club site. • The GNPF should recognise that the site at Church Road is unsuitable for a cricket ground and does not meet current playing standards. The current cricket club facilities are hindering its future success and ability to attract new players, along with restricting the types of events that can be held at the clubhouse for both the club and the local community. In addition, the site at Selby Road should be designated in the Local Plan for Garforth Cricket Club's expansion by Policy GSRE4 'Improvements to Green Space'. <p>We trust these representations will be taken into account in the preparation of the next stage of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>In the meantime, we would be willing to meet to discuss the above representations and an appropriate way forward.</p>	The decision regarding development at the cricket club site remains with the LCC planning officers.	
p	584	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>My client wishes to respond with some reservations to Draft NP policy GSRE1 Local Green Spaces. This policy affects the proposed redevelopment of Garforth Cricket Club which my client, McCarthy Stone has an interest in (undetermined planning application Ref No.19/02248/FU).</p> <p>By way of background Garforth Cricket Club is currently located on Church Lane within Garforth and is a popular and important sporting facility serving the Garforth community. The Club has been looking for a new facility for some time and has recently managed to identify a potential new home nearby at Selby Road. The Selby Road site provides sufficient space to enable the club to accommodate a cricket pitch that meets Sport England and ECB standards, along with supporting facilities including a clubhouse, practice nets and car parking provision. Therefore, the relocation of Garforth Cricket Club to the chosen application site (Council Planning Reference 19/02404/FU)</p>	Please see response to 581.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				provides the added benefit of a modern, fit for purpose sports facility that will be of significant benefit to the local community in Garforth. To facilitate the purchase and investment in the new site and facilities at Selby Road, the club's existing site is proposed to be redeveloped for a retirement care village (including both apartments and bungalows). The cricket club is working in partnership with Morbaine and McCarthy Stone to achieve its relocation to the Selby Road site.		
p	585	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>My client, McCarthy Stone submitted an application in May 2019 to redevelop the existing Garforth Cricket Club site in Church Lane. This application sought to provide accommodation for the frail elderly within a 'Retirement Care village', typically over 80 years of age, with the aim of maintaining their independence via a wide range of communal facilities and care packages tailored to their individual needs as frailty increases through later life. This is a very specialised form of accommodation, in particular with the linked care bungalow offer, that is currently limited within Leeds. It is a sustainable location close to the amenities of Garforth Centre and would contribute towards an identified need for specialised older persons housing in the town and the wider Leeds area. The need for such accommodation is reiterated in Policy HBE4, which my client supports.</p> <p>The proposed replacement facility will provide a larger, level and better-quality playing field that meets current guidance. This separate application is also yet to be determined. Once constructed, the intention is for Garforth Cricket Club to relocate to the replacement facility and vacate the Church Lane site. It is then proposed that the Church Lane site will be redeveloped for 'Extra Care' retirement living apartments and bungalows, this comprising the second element of the overall relocation scheme.</p> <p>My client is disappointed that the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group has not engaged with them to date as the proposals in Draft NP policy GSRE1 directly affect the proposed development of Garforth Cricket Club. We note that the NP makes reference to the planning application and the site's inclusion within the Leeds City Council Site Allocations Plan (SAP).</p>	Please see responses to 581, 535 and 569.	
p	586	Developer	gsre1+4	<p>Constraints of Existing Site</p> <p>The size of the club's existing ground and facilities at Church Lane are inadequate for the current level of participation of this highly active and successful cricket club. The existing cricket club consists of a sports clubhouse facility with limited social space and changing rooms located in metal containers with no showers. Pitch preparation and equipment technology have improved significantly since the club was first established on the site over 85 years ago; modern cricket requires a larger pitch than in the past and the existing ground is too small for today's improved game. Whilst there are no standard dimensions for a cricket playing field, Sports England</p>	Please see 581	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>has published guidance[1] on the area requirements for a range of outdoor sports including cricket. It recommends an overall space requirement for a 12 No. pitch senior cricket playing field of 112m x 128m, equating to a rectangular area of approximately 1.2 hectares. This relates to the overall playing area only, which includes space for teams and match officials, but does not include a space allowance for any associated facilities such as a clubhouse and car parking.</p> <p>In comparison, the entire Garforth Cricket Club's existing site extends to only 0.9 hectare, around 75% of the current recommended size for the cricket field alone. The small and constrained nature of the club site causes a range of issues for the club. They include:</p>		
p	587	Developer	gsre1+4 HBE4 CL3	<p>The size of the cricket 'square' is constrained by the size of the ground and suffers from overuse. The club are unable to increase the size of the cricket square as play would be too close the boundary of the cricket field. With use of the club's pitches already above ECB guidance and adversely affecting the quality of the pitch, the limited size of the ground constrains the use of the ground, with the club unable to further expand its participation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balls hit beyond the limits of the cricket ground represent a significant health and safety issue for the club and neighbouring residents. Historically, the area surrounding the cricket ground was predominantly agricultural land. However, the ground was largely enclosed by residential properties in the 1960s and on match days, these houses and their residents are at risk of damage and injury from cricket balls. Some balls go beyond the adjacent properties. • The existing clubhouse is arguably already beyond its expected life span. Changing accommodation is extremely poor. Changing in metal containers with no vanity and no showers. This is contrary to all adopted design criteria and is not conducive to development of women's and girl's sport. • Furthermore, space for supporting facilities such as the clubhouse, practice nets and car parking provision is limited and is insufficient to meet the current and future needs of the club. <p>Garforth Cricket Club therefore wishes to relocate to a larger and more suitable site that is able to meet its current and future needs and has been actively looking to do so for a number of years.</p>	Please see 581	
p	588	Developer	gsre1+4 HBE4 CL3	<p>Benefits of the Proposed Relocation</p> <p>The proposed relocation of the club to the Selby Road site would provide the club with a much larger site. The relocation site offers sufficient space to provide the club with a bigger and better facility, accommodating a larger cricket playing field along with a bigger modern clubhouse, more practice</p>	Please see 581	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>nets and sufficient car parking provision. In short, the proposal will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significantly improve the quantity and quality of greenspace for Garforth • Provide the club with a larger and level playing field that meets the ECB guidance and represents best practice. • The proposed new larger and level ground and modern facilities would not only improve the playing and practice provision for current members, but enable the club to better attract new members of all ages, helping to increase participation and secure the future of the club. As well as an increase in player membership, the club also expects an increase in non-playing members wishing to socialise at the club. • The new pavilion building will be fully accessible for wheelchair users. • The increased provision of practice nets will also help to increase participation and realise the full potential of the club's ECB qualified coaches. Practice nets enable the club to help improve the bowling and batting skills of players of all ages and abilities and play - an essential role in the club's coaching programme. 		
p	589	Developer	gsre1+4 HBE4 CL3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With a larger improved facility, the club will be able to continue increasing access for the local community. Currently, the capacity to accommodate community access to the club facilities is limited. In particular, the club can continue to increase and develop its links with all the local primary and secondary schools through coaching, organising tournaments and other activities. • The proposed new clubhouse will provide the club and the wider community with a larger modern function facility, enabling the club to hold and host fundraising and other events and providing a further source of income generation through private hire. • Relocation to a proposed larger site would not only give them a bigger and better facility but will also avert any future adverse impacts on neighbouring properties and residents caused by cricket balls batted off site and overspill parking on to residential streets. The larger size of the cricket field, overall site and more compatible nature of the surrounding land uses will minimise the potential for the cricket balls to be batted off the new site and cause any damage or injury. • The relocation will therefore facilitate increasing revenues through increased membership and use of the club facilities by both club members and the local community. The modern new pavilion will also substantially reduce running and maintenance costs, as well as the costs of repairing damage to neighbouring properties and potentially legal action from neighbours, which will all help to ensure the future sustainability of the club. 	Please see 581	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition, the relocation of the club is fully supported by the England and Wales Cricket Board and Sport England. 		
p	590	Developer	gsre1+4 HBE4 CL3	<p>I have attached a letter with this representation (Please see Appendix 1) dated 4th February 2021 from Sue Redfern MBE, who is the Regional Facilities Planning Manager of the England and Wales Cricket Board. You'll note that the letter confirms the inadequacies of the existing cricket pitch and facilities and that the plans for relocation are only a reality financially if the existing site is redeveloped and is not designated as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Paragraph 73 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recognises that access to high quality open space and opportunities for sport and recreation are important to the health and wellbeing of communities. Policies should be based on up to date assessments of the need for open space, sports and recreation facilities, which identify the deficit or surplus of open space and recreational facilities in an area to determine what is required.</p> <p>Paragraph 97 of the NPPF 2019 sets out that existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless one of three criteria is complied with. The scheme is in compliance with paragraph 97 of the NPPF as the benefits of a new and improved cricket facility (outlined previously) far outweigh the loss of the current cricket pitch at Church Lane.</p>	Please see 581	
p	591	Developer	gsre1+4 HBE4 CL3	<p>Policy G6 of the Leeds Core Strategy outlines the Local Authority's position on the 'Protection and Redevelopment of Existing Green Space' the policy states that: 'Green space (including open space and pedestrian corridors in the City Centre) will be protected from development unless one of the following criteria is met:</p> <p>(i) There is an adequate supply of accessible green space/open space within the analysis area and the development site offers no potential for use as an alternative deficient open space type, as illustrated in the Leeds Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment, or,</p> <p>(ii) The green space/open space is replaced by an area of at least equal size, accessibility and quality in the same locality; or</p> <p>(iii) Where supported by evidence and in the delivery of wider planning benefits, redevelopment proposals demonstrate a clear relationship to improvements of existing green space quality in the same locality.</p> <p>My Client and Morbaine's proposals clearly meet the advocated policy tests within parts ii and iii of the above policy. Moreover, the proposal would help to meet the current shortfall of outdoor recreation space in Garforth with larger, improved facilities which would allow both the cricket and the football club to expand. The draft consultation document is somewhat misleading in this regard - it designates the Garforth Cricket Ground as Local Green Space, but it is not included within Map 17 of the Draft NP. While page 84 of the Draft</p>	This is a reiteration of comments made earlier and responded to above.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				NP references a shortfall of 3.66 of outdoor space, it is unclear if this includes Garforth Cricket Club, which we believe is a private facility. The proposed development at Selby Road would meet this shortfall yet the draft NP does not include reference to this within policy GSRE4 Improvements to Green Spaces. This policy, or potentially Policy CL3 'New Community Facilities', should reference the new facilities proposed at Selby Road which would meet this identified greenspace shortfall, whilst also providing an excellent new facility for sports users of all ages.		
p	592	Developer	gsre1+4 HBE4 CL3	<p>Whilst we agree with the general aspirations of the draft NP, in supporting specialist accommodation for older people, we respectfully submit that the plan currently misses a great opportunity to support the redevelopment of the Church Lane site for much needed high-quality extra care apartments and bungalows, which would be available for rent and sale, as well as the proposed enhanced provision of sports and open space proposed at Selby Road.</p> <p>Page 25 of the NP reinforces the 'The question of "right-sizing"' in Garforth. The text states: 'Many older people are living in accommodation which is too large for them; they need to find smaller suitable properties such as bungalows, but do not want to leave Garforth, where bungalows are at a premium.' The proposal for the redevelopment of the Church Lane site meets the objective of providing bungalows and apartments for older people to downsize. Most homeowners entering a McCarthy Stone development move from within the local area, move from within a five-mile radius (the average is 5.2 miles), thereby releasing much-needed family homes back into the local market thus freeing up accommodation locally for younger families.</p>	Please see 581	
p	593	Developer	gsre1+4 HBE4 CL3	<p>If the recommendations of this representation are included within the Draft NP the redevelopment of these two sites would meet three main aims of the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft NP Policy GSRE1 to Green Spaces – my client's proposal meets the tests within the NPPF, Leeds City Core Strategy and this policy by allowing the loss of some green space if enhanced facilities are provided within the locale. • Draft NP Policy GSRE4 Improvements to Green Spaces – the proposal at Selby Road also meets the aspiration of this policy and this policy could be amended to support the facilities proposed at Selby Road. • Draft NP Policy HBE4 – my client's proposal meets the needs of the older population of Garforth by proposing the delivery of extra care accommodation including bungalows. <p>Recommendations: That (a) Reference to site G1226 Garforth Cricket Club as a 'green space'</p>	Please see response to 568 The cricket ground is already a designated greenspace and the neighbourhood plan cannot delete this from the SAP.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>be deleted.</p> <p>(b) The Garforth Cricket Club (Church Lane) be allocated for development under Policy HBE4 or a new policy.</p> <p>(c) The Selby Road site for the new cricket club be supported within the Neighbourhood Plan and included within Policy CL3 'New Community Facilities'.</p> <p>We would welcome an opportunity to meet with the steering group if this would be of help to members.</p> <p>Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the Pre-Submission Draft Garforth Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p>		
p	594	Developer	gsre1+4 HBE4 CL3	<p>Attachment 1</p> <p>FAO Garforth Cricket Club</p> <p>Church Lane</p> <p>Leeds</p> <p>LS25 1HB</p> <p>4 February 2021</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>ECB continue to fully support the advanced plans of Garforth Cricket Club to relocate from Church Lane to a more suitably sized new location off Selby Road.</p> <p>As the National Governing Body for Cricket it is our role to provide advice and technical guidance that gives cricket clubs the opportunity to safeguard their sustainability, so future generations can enjoy sport and the social benefits that come with being part of a community sports club.</p> <p>ECB have previously worked with representatives of Garforth Cricket Club and the community in identifying some of the challenges the club face. Their current ground doesn't meet the recommended minimum size which is needed for a cricket ground and the present associated ancillary facilities aren't conducive in creating a strong viable platform for the club to develop and survive longer term</p>	Please see above comments.	
p	595	Developer	gsre1+4 HBE4 CL3	<p>The plans for relocation are only a reality financially if the existing site is redeveloped and is not designated green space. The club are the current landowners of this existing site and it is not presently public green space. The relocation, will in our opinion, support the club and the community of Garforth in ensuring sports provision is retained for the enjoyment of all in the community for many generations to come. It will provide an inclusive and welcoming space that will increase community cohesion and will ensure cricket can be played safely in an environment which is more suited to modern day cricket.</p> <p>We will continue to work with the club and Yorkshire Cricket to support them</p>	Please see above comments.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				in their journey to create welcoming and inclusive facilities for the community of Garforth. Yours sincerely, Sue Redfern MBE Regional Facilities Planning Manager, England and Wales Cricket Board		
p	157	Resident	gsre10	I totally agree.	Thank you	
p	158	Resident	gsre10	How can there be a net gain in biodiversity from new development on green field sites?	Biodiversity Net Gain has been clarified through LCC guidance. The Neighbourhood Plan can not resolve the details of "how" but does identify some potential improvement sites in the Projects following Policy GSRE14	
p	306	Resident	gsre10	Great detail, love it	Thank you	
p	307	Resident	gsre10	The positive contribution should reflect the locale. It should not be grass and whatever are the cheapest trees and bushes at the time.	Leeds has a policy of net gain of 10% minimum to biodiversity.	
p	516	LCC	GSRE10	GSRE10 Biodiversity and the Leeds Habitat Network: OK in principle. Criteria d) should be better separated out as a distinct paragraph within the policy.	We agree	Alter the policy to create d) as a separate paragraph
p	12	Resident	gsre11	Policy GSRE11 contains a typographical error – I don't think point (d) in the list is supposed to be part of that list.	We agree	Alter the policy to create d) as a separate paragraph
p	159	Resident	gsre11	As regards (b) the phrase "try to use areas of poorer quality land" should be altered "must use areas of poorer quality land".	Thank you. We will strengthen the wording of the policy	Alter the policy and refer to NPPF paragraph 171, note 53.
p	160	Resident	gsre11	How can this land be protected from development when 'local preference' had decided that these sites would be developed?	If this policy is accepted, then monitoring should ensure that this land is protected from development	
p	308	Resident	gsre11	I don't know much about this but if there is any space for permaculture I'd be glad to see some land go in that direction.	This could be investigated as an interesting concept.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	309	Resident	gsre11	What is the difference between grade 2 and grade 3 agricultural land please? Would be good if a description was included in the text.	Notes on grades of agricultural land will be added to the Glossary	Add details to the Glossary
p	310	Resident	gsre11	There are plenty of acres of land that would be improved by developing them. Converting productive farmland to building sites is not one of them. Start with the land that has been damaged by mining and other brownfield land	NPPF advises this approach	
p	517	LCC	gsre11	GSRE11 Preservation of Grade 2 and 3 Agricultural Land: The title of the policy should be amended to reflect that Grade 3 is split into Grade 3a and Grade 3b, and national policy only classifies Grade 3a as best and most versatile. Criteria c) noise is not necessarily relevant to protecting agricultural land (though it may be of relevance to nature conservation aspirations). Criteria d) is not necessary and should be deleted. Instead, suggest the policy starts with "In line with Natural England Guidance on assessing development proposals on agricultural land (as shown on Map 35)..."	Thank you. We will make the necessary changes.	Change the policy to reflect these points. Amend the map 35 to show the classifications.
p	13	Resident	gsre12	Policy GSRE12 also contains a minor typographical error – only a missing full stop. Policy GSRE12 could perhaps do with splitting into two, with a more ambitious target for houses and bungalows, but a less ambitious targets for flats.	Thanks The plan seeks to improve habitat in and around all buildings	Add a full stop
p	161	Resident	gsre12	Must include special hedgehog fencing as some developers are using.	This is covered in the policy	Add 'wildlife' before 'corridors'
p	162	Resident	gsre12	The integrated wildlife features must ideally be in the highest possible % of dwellings - at least 80% if not 90% or ideally 100%. The developer behind any new developments should consider consulting local environmental and nature organisations to ensure that the integrated wildlife features are the best suited to Garforth and compliment any developments by the aforementioned organisations. Light pollution - in any existing or new developments - must be kept to an absolute minimum if not eliminated altogether.	The nature team and landscape team are mandatory consultees on all planning applications. Policy wording is consistent with what is currently determined by the Local Authority – this may be reviewed by Local Plan Update	
p	163	Resident	gsre12	Who in the local authority would specify which specific wildlife features to be integrated ?	The nature team at LCC could advise.	
p	518	LCC	gsre12	GSRE12 Wildlife Features: This policy should be clarified to apply to new residential development only. It would be disproportionate for the policy to apply to all new development.	This may change in accordance with the local plan update. GNPF considers that this policy should apply to all developments.	Add 'including all Greenfield sites' between 'new development'

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
						and 'must integrate'. Change 'dwellings' to 'buildings'.
p	164	Resident	gsre13	Should be replaced by mature trees and hedging plants not ones that take years to be useful to wildlife.	This should be covered by the revised LCC Land Planning policy	Add 'trees' where appropriate. Text will be revised if new LCC policy produced in time.
p	165	Resident	gsre13	What does 'respect key views' mean in practice?	Thanks for your suggestion. We will look again at the wording,	Alter GSRE 13 (b) to read " Must not significantly alter or harm Key Views"
p	312	Resident	gsre13	Oh yes the more the better. As the grass cutting technology advances it makes it less of an issue to cut around trees and bushes so there's less excuse not to do this. Do it, do it lots.	Thank you.	
p	313	Resident	gsre13	Briarlands as well.	Thank you.	
p	370	Resident	gsre13	I love the lines of trees I can see in Garforth, they are really important to me	Thank you.	
p	519	LCC	gsre13	GSRE13 Landscape Character: Criteria a)ii) is not workable in practice in terms of the reference to 'consistent with the planning approval granted by LCC' as the removal of hedgerow would be part of the assessment of the application. Suggest that this is deleted. Criteria a)iii) again may not be practicable in terms of being able to agree an appropriate location with the Greening Garforth group (who may not exist in Garforth in 10+ years' time). Criteria c) better to just say "will be supported".	Thanks for your suggestions most of which we will implement.	Remove (a) ii (a) iii Remove Greening Garforth from and put full stop after Garforth. Then add "Trees should be replaced in accordance with LCC tree policy and in conjunction with..."

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
						(c) Remove "encouraged and"
p	166	Resident	gsre14	Partly agree. Planting trees elsewhere in the Neighbourhood Area is doing nothing to help wildlife (and that includes diverse insect life) in the area that's been decimated.	Will be influenced by Land Policy in LCC's Local Plan update	
p	167	Resident	gsre14	This list should not be expanded to include more areas. How can local people become involved in decision making? LCC has plans to promote tree planting (6 million trees)but who will decide where they / if any will be planted in Garforth?	LCC are working on their tree planting strategy.	
p	311	Resident	gsre14	Yes as much as possible please	Thank you	
p	416	Resident	gsre14	Extra care must be taken when planting trees near houses to preserve the amount of natural light entering those houses.	LCC have existing guidelines on this for developers.	
p	520	LCC	gsre14	GSRE14 Planting Opportunities: This policy makes reference to Policy LAND2 and the 3 for 1 replacement requirement. However, tree planting is being considered as part of the Local Plan Update and this requirement may be increased, therefore it may be more practical (to avoid the NP having a 'weaker' requirement than the Local Plan) to include the wording 'at least 3 for 1 basis, and in accordance with the latest Local Plan Policy). The last part of the policy is more of a statement than policy, suggest that it says something along the lines of 'should be avoided and must be robustly justified' so that it provides a clear expectation. For clarity, sites identified in a) to g) should start with LGS1, LGS3, etc.	Thank you for this advice. The NP will follow any recommendations in the Local Plan update if it is feasible to do so in the available timescale.	Amend the policy wording as suggested. Will do.
p	314	Resident	gsre14fincom	Great ideas here!	Thank you.	
p	371	Resident	gsre14fincom	. I would like to see the conservation of all the green areas and make significant improvements to our biodiversity. Stop building roads and houses and plant more trees. Create and enhance our green areas for families to enjoy.	Thank you. This is the aim of policy GSRE 14.	
p	135	Resident	gsre2	How can development generate new green space when the developer will be building on the little green space that is left. Green space is finite. It cannot be manufactured.	Development on Brownfield land where a green area has been created would be classed as new green space by LCC. However, new green areas created by the developer on a Greenfield site is an overall loss of green space.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	136	Resident	gsre2	"The substitution of commuted sum payments in lieu of an on-site provision will only be supported if it is demonstrated on-site provision is not practical" and there is no resulting environmental damage. The preceding part sentence after the quoted section should be considered.	Thank you for your comment. After consideration, GNPF are happy to leave the wording as it is.	
p	137	Resident	gsre2	All of the new green space proposed are probably too small to be developed. However, Core strategy G4 has reduced the new green space provision for any new developments. What would be the criteria to demonstrate that on site provision would not be practical?	This would be determined on a site-by-site basis – impossible to list all justifications as part of the Neighbourhood Plan	
p	286	Resident	gsre2	Oh yes we are desperately short of woodland and parks and HS2 will remove our ancient woodland. We only seem to have playing fields, the only thing close to a park is millennium gardens at about 15 square metres!	Thank you for your comments. Policy GSRE 4 seeks to improve this.	
p	287	Resident	gsre2	trees and blossom trees would be lovely	Thank you.	
p	288	Resident	gsre2	There needs to be a policy that ensures that the existing shortfall is made up in subsequent developments i.e. they don't just provide the statutory minimum. Failing that the CIL generated from the development should be dedicated to acquisition of additional greenspace in the area that can be opened up to the public	This would be ideal but it isn't local or national policy. New developments are only required to address issues that they cause	
p	508	LCC	gsre2	GSRE2 Provision of New Green Space: Suggest that the second part of the policy directs off-site contributions to priorities for natural space, followed by parks and gardens, etc. It is worth considering how this policy relates to the following two policies on new play spaces and quality improvements for existing green space. One option would be for this policy to support off-site contributions towards the opportunities identified in GSRE3 or GSRE4.	The purpose of policy GSRE 2 is to provide new green space. It is considered that new children's play facilities are included within the amenity green space typology. Policy GSRE2 is not considered appropriate to Policy GSRE4.	Will amend policy to include suggestions for improving the green space.
p	138	Resident	gsre3	More children's play spaces, for under 12s, with good access needed. Doesn't need to be full of the traditional metal (expensive) equipment but could be recycled tyres and wooden structures, swings and little hills or banks. The North Yorkshire Moors centre at Danby has good ideas.	Thank you for your comments.	
p	139	Resident	gsre3	A children's play area on East Garforth field would be very close to the play area at Firthfields.	There is a lack of children's play facilities within Garforth. These are potential sites.	
p	140	Resident	gsre3	The children's play facility that was behind the fire station should reopened if possible.	There is no obvious indication that there was a play area on this public green space.	GSRE 3 Remove bullet 5 as this green space is

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					However, Policy GSRE 3 does list this location as a potential site for new children's play facilities.	not publicly accessible.
p	289	Resident	gsre3	More variety as well please, my little one would probably like a large wooden ship if there's an ideas pot :)	This is not within the direct control of the Plan. However, it is to be hoped, as with the skate park on Glebelands, that local people would be consulted about any new facilities.	
p	360	Resident	gsre3	More play areas and investment in existing ones	Please see above comment.	
p	361	Resident	gsre3	I support the development of additional plays areas, but consideration needs to be given about how the different play areas compliment each other and don't just replicate/duplicate. There's an opportunity to provide 'natural' play areas that encourage children to use their imagination. There's also an opportunity to combine combine play areas with growing or children's nature gardens.	Agree with your aspirations. Please see above comments.	
p	362	Resident	gsre3	The development of the playgrounds should be supported. I would like to see the areas become more social places for families. This would include the introduction of picnic tables. I would also like to see sandpits and more modern play equipment. (Pudney's Park is a lovely example) Also the basketball area on Barley hill park is not accessible anymore. Why? Barley hill park should also be included in the list for improvement.	Policy GSRE 3 lists potential sites for new play facilities that the Plan would support. Barleyhill Park is included in GSRE 4 as a site to be improved. In addition, in Appendix 9 under Area 1 West Garforth, potential improvements to Barleyhill Park are listed under "Opportunities".	GSRE 4 Change "Barleyhill Rd" to "Barleyhill Park" under "Neighbourhood Park"
p	363	Resident	gsre3	Would be good to have tennis courts in the area near to Ninelands Lane.	This is not within the direct control of the Plan. However, it is to be hoped, as with the skate park on Glebelands, that local people would be consulted about any new facilities.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	509	LCC	gsre3	GSRE3 Children's Play: The identification of potential sites for additional children's play facilities is supported. Suggest the second sentence reads "The new facility should be within..."	Thank you	Change sentence 2 in GSRE 3 to read, "Any new facility..."
p	141	Resident	gsre4	Definitely need improved provision for children under 12.	Any improvements to children's play provision would be welcome.	
p	142	Resident	gsre4	I have a part allotment at Firthfield Allotments and I am left wondering what the problem is that they fall below standard. Also the same with the playing fields at Garforth Academy. Brierlands pitches totally agree. No official games are played at Firthfields kids just play there with their friends.	The scoring is carried out by Leeds City Council.	
p	143	Resident	gsre4	I am surprised that "5. Small area under the road bridge on the A63 where it crosses the Linesway" meets the required standard. Any improvements should look at improving access by walking & cycling and/or public transport - the provision of seating should also be looked at.	This area has not yet been assessed by LCC as it is only now being proposed as a local green space. Please see Policy T2 on active travel and connectivity.	
p	144	Resident	gsre4	presumably any finances would have to be sourced from new development. How do we ensure that it will be spent on improving any green spaces and who would be consulted ?	Any available finance from new developments is currently allocated to the Leeds City Council Outer East Community Committee where decisions are taken by local councillors.	
p	290	Resident	gsre4	Yes!	Thank you!	
p	291	Resident	gsre4	We should try to get more out of our current green assets. For example the sports fields at Briarlands, Glebelands, Goosefields and Barley Road, plus the land at the back of the fire station could be enhanced with footpaths to turn them from muddy fields into all weather parks. These footpaths could link up to MUGAs, ponds, garden and wooded areas and childrens playgrounds to provide even more facilities.	Thank you for your suggestions. This is not within the direct control of the Plan. However, it is to be hoped, as with the skate park on Glebelands, that local people would be consulted about any new facilities. However, under GSRE 4 there are a number of aspirational projects.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	364	Resident	gsre4	Safe access for children needs to be considered. Ash lane pitch is currently not accessible at all.	Clearly safe access for children is an important issue. Unfortunately, this is not within the scope of the Plan. It might be worth addressing concerns to LCC Highways Dept and possibly enlist the help of local councillors.	
p	365	Resident	gsre4	The green spaces in Garforth mainly caters for children's play and people playing sport, there is no provision for people/families to meet in a green space for a leisure walk around the green space. The lack of circular accessible path in any of the green spaces means the vast majority of green spaces will not be used by the average resident from October to April when the ground is likely to be wet and muddy. Parkrun is a great initiative to bring the community together, those who like exercise and those who like/want social contact, the lack of greenspace with a circular accessible path restricts our opportunity to run such an initiative.	Welcome suggestions. Please see Appendix 9 Area 2 Church Garforth where we describe the opportunities for an all weather peripheral path around Glebelands.	
p	414	Resident	gsre4	I support it as long as it doesn't mean the potential loss of 'below acceptable quality' green spaces (eg if a developer can say that because they don't meet the standard, they can be developed and lost as green space)!	The developer can not use this as an argument. Please see Policy G6 of LCC's Core Strategy.	
p	510	LCC	gsre4	GSRE4 Improvements to Green Spaces: Any greenspace improvements undertaken that will be managed and maintained by the Parks and Countryside service should be realistic in terms of staffing and the level of committed sum provided for maintenance. In addition, guidance should be provided in the supporting text to the policy as to what standards should be used to assess quality, this could be linked to the scoring criteria used in the greenspace assessments.	Surely LCC would be pivotal in deciding how/ if any proposals were carried out. Happy to put in criteria if LCC indicate where to find them.	
p	544	Developer	gsre4	NPPF para 92. The policy does not acknowledge the club's aspirations to improve facilities	The inclusion of any site on this list is intended to reflect the fact that it scored low on LCC's criteria (CS Policy G3). The intention is to improve the existing sites and the policy does not comment on any proposals to move facilities to a new site.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	545	Developer	gsre4	Para 92a states that policies should plan positively for sports etc.	The policies in the Plan do, in the view of the Forum, plan positively for sport.	
p	553	Developer	gsre4	GSRE4 should include the proposed new site as improvements.	GSRE4 refers exclusively to the existing sites, based on LCC evidence	
p	145	Resident	gsre5	Totally agree	Thank you	
p	146	Resident	gsre5	These green corridors should be useable within all but the most extreme of weathers, water permable hard surfacing should be considered to make this possible - even if it is just a narrow part of the overall green corridor.	This is an interesting idea but potentially very expensive. It would be a question of working out who would be responsible for the finance and for carrying out the work It is possibly something that could be considered in the future, money allowing.	
p	147	Resident	gsre5	Developers are allowed to re route public footpaths which are then invariably hard surfaced and no longer green corridors. it would be preferable if developers had to build around established public footpaths.	Although the policy states a preference for “ soft” surfacing, in itself hard surfacing does not prevent a green corridor remaining, provided there is sufficient greenery next to it.	
p	292	Resident	gsre5	Good to see this is being looked at	Thank you.	
p	293	Resident	gsre5	The footpath to the north of Main Street no longer crosses the railway near the allotments - it has been closed by Network Rail.	Thank you for this information. GNPF has been informed by LCC that this is a temporary closure by Network Rail for safety reasons.	
p	294	Resident	gsre5	This is really important. Please make this a priority	Thank you.	
p	295	Resident	gsre5	We probably need a warden to ensure that these paths remain open and the concerns of the land owners adjacent are understand and acted upon.	This is within the remit of the Public Rights of Way team at LCC.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	366	Resident	gsre5	Is it possible to plant wildflower seeds in grass verges, to assist with insect habitat and bees	Perhaps this is something that one of the local voluntary groups could do.	
p	367	Resident	gsre5	Consideration of wildlife is very important	Thank you, GNPF agree with this.	
p	511	LCC	gsre5	GSRE5 Protecting Local Green Corridors: This policy could be more positively worded and seek/require proposals to demonstrate how they relate to the identified green corridors or for them to actively promote enhancement. Currently the wording is negative regarding stopping harm, rather than aiming to secure benefits. The last line of the policy is about improvement, but does not set a requirement for developers to do anything that they weren't already proposing. In addition, the Local Green Corridors would benefit from being numbered/identified in some way to help with referencing.	Thank you for your comments.	In GSRE5, at line 2, replace "must not harm or sever" with "should seek to enhance"
p	148	Resident	gsre6	Again we have the phrase "new green space" as if it can be manufactured. It is not new green space it is the small percentage Garforth is left with after developers have wreaked havoc.	Thank you for your comment. The reference here to greenspace will be clarified as it refers to green space which has been designated as such by LCC and is thereby afforded a degree of protection.	Add "designated and protected " after " new" in Policy
p	149	Resident	gsre6	It is unclear how this policy would be implemented	As the NP will become part of the Development Plan for Leeds, legislation states that development proposals should be "determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise" – the plan will have statutory weight in the same way that the Core Strategy and other planning policy documents do	
p	296	Resident	gsre6	Again, wonderful to see someone is doing something about this! With lack of a parish council the local councillors seem to struggle to even have these important issues on their radar.	Thank you .	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	297	Resident	gsre6	This is not very clear to me. Does it mean that building will be allowed as long as it is in keeping with the area?	It is not about permitting or not permitting the building but rather requiring the inclusion of green infrastructure appropriate to the scale of the development.	
p	298	Resident	gsre6	The obvious opportunities to me are extending Linesway upto Green Lane. This brings it into the heart of the community rather than it being a link to Kippax as it seems to be at the moment and making more use of our existing green assets by making them all weather	Please see Policy GSRE 8	
p	368	Resident	gsre6	Definitely more cycle routes	This policy aims to encourage the provision of more cycling and walking routes.	
p	512	LCC	gsre6	GSRE6 Green Infrastructure Opportunities: OK in principle. The Council is supportive of the aspirations of this policy to improve green infrastructure connectivity within and around Garforth, though at present the policy wording is unclear and could be tidied up.	Thank you. We will reconsider the wording.	In GSRE6 , after “network” add, “through measures such as:” Then bullet point the 5 suggestions. Final sentence to read “Opportunities to achieve this are set out in The Character...”
p	150	Resident	gsre7	A first step would be for old footpaths that have been closed down by private individuals to be reinstated eg the footpath across Whitkirk Haulage Yard at the beginning of the Fly Line. A petition signed by 97 people who regularly used the footpath was presented to the relevant dept at LCC. They were told they only reviewed 4 a year and there was already a waiting list of about 40. Not very proactive.	GNPF are keen for all PROWs to be maintained and improved where possible. The specific case you mention is clearly being dealt with by LCC.	
p	151	Resident	gsre7	The PROWs should be useable within all but the most extreme of weathers, water permeable hard surfacing should be considered to make this possible - even if it is just a narrow part of the overall green corridor. New PROWs and connections to existing PROWs should be developed to	Please see response to p 146.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				make it as easy as possible to walk and cycle within Garforth and the wider district.	This connectivity is the intention in both GSRE 6 and 7.	
p	152	Resident	gsre7	Should we be seeking that are PROWs are retained as wildlife corridors and no re routed ?	Wherever possible, yes. However, where a PROW has to be moved the Plan's policies aim to ensure no net loss in terms of wildlife provision.	
p	299	Resident	gsre7	Useful maps too, thankyou	Thank you.	
p	300	Resident	gsre7	Not sure about the new major housing comment. What would be construed as major please? I am not averse to additional housing completely but would not support any more major housing in Garforth. I would be very disappointed if new major housing was approved but if it is I agree that they should make sure that footpaths are accessible throughout and improvements should be incorporated into the plan.	Major is a term defined in the Glossary as "10 or more homes". However, to avoid confusion we will rephrase the policy. Thank you for your comment.	Remove "major" before housing and replace with "more than 10". Leave "major" before employment but add " see glossary".
p	301	Resident	gsre7	Agree we shouldn't lose access when a housing estate is dropped on top of a right of way. Perhaps there should be local development rules that say that a right of way in the middle of a development should have a 5 metre strip of greenspace either side of it. and that should be on the developers plan from day 1	Interesting idea. Perhaps one that needs to be taken up with LCC planners.	
p	513	LCC	gsre7	GSRE7 Accessibility and Connectivity (Including PROW): This policy could emphasise that new routes should be of good quality with additional amenity value and should provide a sense of security for users (including additional tree planting). In addition, as with other policies, it may not be possible for every major housing or employment development to connect to the existing PROW network, so this policy should apply where it is feasible to do so.		Add to 2 nd para of GSRE7 "Any new routes should be of good quality with additional amenity value and should provide a sense of security for users (including

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
						additional tree planting).” Add at the start of the 1 st sentence, “Where it is feasible to do so...”

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	636	Resident	gsre7 EH	<p>mirror those for the M1 at locations like Ash Lane and the ridge path west from Barrowby Lane, but in one location they are totally inadequate -the route just east of Barwick Road where their proposal fails to mirror that for the same path under the M1, indeed are legalistic, fail to recognise the integrity of the route and show a failure to appreciate what paths are for.</p> <p>More generally, as Garforth is becoming surrounded by three traffic routes, there is a need to provide safe, (controlled or grade separated) crossings of all three. Being motorway, this was obligatory for the M1 but is equally necessary for the present A656 and the future A63. Apart from the Linesway, which being a railway path has a proper under bridge, all the other three crossing points over the present A63 are at grade, -at the Gaping Goose, Ninelands Lane and Green Lane. Visibility is good at all these, and Ninelands Lane benefits from traffic signals. It is to be hoped that since traffic on the new road will no doubt move faster, proper provision - ideally grade separation, pedestrian signals if not, will be included at all these three locations.</p> <p>Although the “Roman Ridge” road (A656) is the lesser of the three, in many ways it is the most dangerous to pedestrians, being a single carriageway, dead straight for some distance, but undulating, so visibility is poor, yet it carries quite a bit of traffic. There is (fortunately) only one crossing point that matters. That is where the several paths across Sturton Grange (Meakin’s land) converge before crossing the road at a point just south of its junction with Church Lane Micklefield, then continuing to that village. Visibility here is further limited by close tree cover on both sides of the road, and as both paths are hidden in the respective trees, (even from walkers!) motorists get no warning whatever of likely pedestrian presence. At the very least adequate warning signs for drivers are required, and improved visibility at least in the immediate vicinity would help too. (With the development of an industrial area south of the railway, a secondary crossing point is beginning to develop at the railway bridge, but visibility is rather better here. Absurdly this area along with the rest of Micklefield including the quarry and much of Kippax, is designated “Strategic Green Infrastructure“ on Map 7.) [For discussion of pedestrian / cycling issues, pavement cycling etc see 3.3 Transport above.]</p> <p>3.6.1 Education. (As a non-parent I start at a disadvantage here!) The distribution of Primary schools seems to reflect reasonably the present shape of the town. Any new provision would need locating so as best to serve substantial new development. I was under the impression that the NET site in Dover St was a school of some sort, presumably nursery / pre-school?</p> <p>As regards the Secondary school (a.k.a. Academy, Comp, Community College etc according to age and political persuasion!) if it is close to capacity now, then it was surely unwise to have sold off the land for Scholars’ Gate some time back. Were they under financial or political pressure? There still <i>seems</i> to be plenty of space. What I would <i>NOT</i> do is move it out to some edge-of-town site, presumably in the east, remote from regular public transport and from half the town catchment. The present site is ideally located, with good access and transport services, central to the catchment and well place to serve other community functions being near the centre. What I am not clear about is how much catchment there is (if any) <i>outside</i> Garforth. Because if there is, or if neighbouring villages expand (eg Micklefield?) then the long term solution is another school, initially satellite later freestanding, to serve that</p>	Thank you for your detailed comments. Whilst there are clearly issues around safely crossing major roads, which you rightly raise here, these are unfortunately not within the scope of the Plan. These issues are, to the best of our understanding, the responsibility of the Highways Dept at LCC.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	153	Resident	gsre8	Agree	Thank you	
p	154	Resident	gsre8	How can we ensure that an extended Lines way would be protected as a wildlife corridor given past applications to develop Kennet lane Meadows?	As the NP will become part of the Development Plan for Leeds, legislation states that development proposals should be “determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise” – the plan will have statutory weight in the same way that the Core Strategy and other planning policy documents do	
p	302	Resident	gsre8	Very interesting and informative	Thank you	
p	303	Resident	gsre8	Fully support. It brings linesway into the heart of the community, almost back to the railway line. Should try to preserve the trees that currently occupy the space as well as inserting a footpath.	Thank you.	
p	369	Resident	gsre8	This is our best green resource and must be protected	Thank you	
p	514	LCC	gsre8	<p>GSRE8 The Lines Way: The policy refers to Map 20, but Map 18 is included within the policy?</p> <p>In addition, the dotted line on the map appears to show a proposed extension to the Lines Way rather than the existing Lines Way as it falls within Garforth (as shown by the pink line on Map 20). Suggest that this map is clarified before submission and that the policy explicitly refers to the existing Lines Way and the proposed extension.</p>	<p>Thanks for your comments.</p> <p>We will alter the numbering and remove the map from within the Policy box.</p> <p>We will also clarify the Map 18</p>	<p>Renumber Map 20 as Map 18.</p> <p>Remove Map from Policy box.</p> <p>Clarify key on Map 18 to highlight proposed extension Linesway and green corridor/ Linesway.</p> <p>Add in “existing “ prior to “ Linesway” in 2nd sentence of policy.</p>

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	155	Resident	gsre9	Problem with developers planting trees is that when they reach something like maturity and are at last relatively useful the residents cut them down as the leaves are messy.	GNPF are not in a position to prevent this if the trees are the property of the resident. It is the responsibility of the developers to put the right trees in the right location.	
p	156	Resident	gsre9	How would this be implemented in practice?	As the NP will become part of the Development Plan for Leeds, legislation states that development proposals should be “determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise” – the plan will have statutory weight in the same way that the Core Strategy and other planning policy documents do.	
p	304	Resident	gsre9	That last point is very specific	Yes, it is intended to be, as part of an effort to sequester more CO2.	
p	305	Resident	gsre9	Perhaps the greenspace that should come with every new development should be more than just grass. And it should be bigger than the statutory requirement. This additional space could be funded by the CIL money, so we can claw back the shortfall in greenspace over time.	The Draft plan supports improvements to green infrastructure. This policy refers to broadleaf trees being provided in new developments, where feasible. Currently, the available CIL money does not come directly to Garforth but goes to the Outer East Community Committee who make decisions on spending.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	415	Resident	gsre9	Extra care must be taken when planting trees near houses to preserve the amount of natural light entering those houses.	Agreed. It is about the right kind of trees in the right location.	
p	515	LCC	gsre9	GSRE9 The Rural Environment: This policy should focus on development on the edge or around the built up area of Garforth. As currently worded ('within') it would apply to all schemes, including those in the town centre (where the policy isn't relevant). Criteria d) does not relate to the rural environment and may be better in a design policy.	Thank you for your comments. We will alter the wording in the first sentence.	Alter wording in sentence 1 to read, "Development proposals on the edge of, and around the built up area of, Garforth."
p	4	Resident	HBE	<p>Section 3 – Issues, Evidence and Policies</p> <p>Page 20 notes a significant deficit of Green Space. An implication of this (which is not drawn out in the Plan so far as I can see, and in my view should be) is that new developments would need to over-provide accessible green space in order to make up for the existing deficit.</p> <p>Page 21 states that "houses built now need to address the issue of global warming for 2/3 generations". This is not sufficiently ambitious in my view – we would expect housing to last for much longer than this and needs to meet the needs over the much longer term.</p> <p>Page 21 also states that "carbon neutral houses should be our aim". I disagree, and believe this should say that carbon negative houses should be our aim. It would not be possible to achieve the net zero vision outlined in section 2.1 with development being only carbon neutral, and not carbon negative.</p> <p>I am sorry to say that from the middle of page 22 until the end of page 28, the content isn't as well written as most of the rest of the document, to the extent that it is difficult to provide any substantive comments.</p> <p>I support the policies outlined on page 29.</p> <p>While I appreciate its overall message is about pedestrians and cyclists, page 34 still includes a sentence which attenuates to "Designing a streetscape that ... allows access for car drivers ... is vital in the creation of a healthy and vibrant local community". I doubt this was intended – the sentence would make more sense if it read "Designing a streetscape that leaves space for people to use the streets for walking, cycling, socialising and playing is something that is vital in the creation of a healthy and vibrant local community". I am not aware of any evidence which says that access for car</p>	<p>Developers only have to provide the statutory amount of green space as outlined in LCC's Core Strategy.</p> <p>Agree with your ambition, but current constraints are government legislation.</p> <p>Thank you for your comment. Carbon neutrality will be a step along the way. National legislation will be needed to effect the necessary changes. Much of pages 22-28 will end up being moved to a different document.</p> <p>The sentence is intended to improve provision for pedestrians and cyclists whilst , at the same time, recognising the need to provide some</p>	<p>P.21 Alter penultimate bullet to read "Houses built now need to be future proofed in a way that takes into account global warming so that they will perform well for at least a century."</p> <p>P.34 final paragraph after "use the streets "</p>

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>drivers is vital in the creation of a healthy and vibrant community, whereas there is ample evidence that the other items included contribute.</p> <p>The first point on page 37 is unclear to me. It just says, “people mentioned ribbon type infill developments”. Elsewhere in the document it would say what the arguments in favour or against were, whereas I am not clear what the argument was from this point alone.</p> <p>The write-up of the Green Lane workshop on page 51 is unclear to me. It could be improved by adding an introductory sentence.</p> <p>I can’t read the key on several of the maps as they have been uploaded with insufficient image quality.</p>	<p>access for car drivers. The sentence has been split to stress this.</p> <p>There are larger versions of all the maps in the complete set which is at the end of the document.</p>	<p>add “ is important”. Begin next sentence “However,...”</p>
p	5	Resident	HBE	<p>With particular reference to map 20, I would appreciate it if you could provide any information on what the paths marked in green denote. I have been unable to follow the path marked in green which passes Barrowby Hall as the landowner appears to be restricting access.</p> <p>It appears strange that on page 111 Covid-19 is referenced under a heading about a survey carried out in 2018.</p> <p>Throughout the document, I think that ‘Greening Garforth’ should be referred to as the Garforth Community Greening Group.</p> <p>I believe there are some words missing from the top of page 133.</p> <p>I really appreciate the time and effort that volunteers have put in to develop such a comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>My preference would be for there to be a Plan which would succeed at the referendum stage. However, I think that the Plan, as currently drafted, is not sufficiently tightly worded. I give several examples of this below. My concern is that if the Plan passes as drafted, it could be used as evidence to suggest that the local population supports measures beyond the scope of what is actually intended. I have tried to identify the main areas affected by this and given suggestions below of how they could be tightened.</p> <p>In my view the document is far too long – by around 250 pages. The length of the document will no doubt mean that some people who do have an interest in the future of Garforth, but who are either busy or are just not used to reading such long documents may be put off of reading, commenting, contributing or voting. I would anticipate that this will mean that the respondents to the consultation are not representative of the demographic mix of Garforth as a whole. I think the aim should be for a 10- to 20-page document which puts almost all of the detail currently within the Plan into separate documents which can be cross-referred from the main body. Further advantages of this approach would be:</p> <p>It would allow for a more dynamic approach; whereby other documents could be updated without needing to amend the whole Plan.</p>	<p>LCC informed GNPF that this “footpath is designated as “claim review” and the owners of the land can keep it closed until the outcome of the review is known.</p> <p>The reference to Covid is a supporting statement. For clarity, we will bracket it.</p> <p>References to Greening Garforth will be removed from any Projects.</p> <p>There are no words missing on P.133.</p> <p>The final Plan will be shorter as several sections relating to evidence and conformity to local and national policies will appear in separate documents.</p> <p>We will also be producing an executive summary of the main points.</p>	<p>Bracket “Covid “ statement on P.111 under 2018 Survey</p> <p>Remove Greening Garforth from Projects.</p> <p>Produce executive summary</p>

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>Currently, the Plan could do with proof-reading and copy-editing (unfortunately I don't think it's yet cohesively written enough). This would be an easier task if the document was condensed.</p> <p>I have provided specific comments below. I have commented by exception - where I have not commented, I am generally supportive.</p>	Thank you for all your comments.	
p	16	Resident	HBE	<p>Survey Evidence</p> <p>The Housing Needs Survey 2018 shouldn't be used to draw any conclusions or recommendations from and does not represent the population of Garforth due to the low number of respondents, the lack of statistical significance and the lack of a cross-representative sample of the community.</p> <p>The lack of a representative sample also applies to the Policy Intention Survey 2019 with a response rate of 115 people. If this mirrored the same profile as above then only 46 people under the age of 60 will be representing what is in effect 60% of Garforth's entire population. Again, this is wholly inadequate and the lack of engagement or representation is something the GNPF needs to address urgently.</p>	<p>The survey was delivered to every household in Garforth. It is not possible to insist that people respond. We made use of the information that came back to the Forum.</p> <p>The Policy Intentions Survey was used to gain a snapshot of views from a small number of people at random to see whether the emerging policies were broadly on the right lines.</p>	
p	425	GI	HBE	<p>It is fair to say that following many years of extremely hard work and massive community engagement, the elected ward members working in conjunction with residents have been able to satisfy the examiner at a public enquiry that volume housebuilding is not required at these locations and, better still, the site allocation process has now been settled, which takes volume housebuilding at both locations out of the equation until 2028.</p> <p>One could argue, therefore, if the plan is actually now needed in a reality that has changed so dramatically over the last six years?</p>	<p>It is agreed that circumstances around housebuilding have changed significantly in recent years but that does not mean that there are no other issues for a neighbourhood plan to seek to influence. It was clear from the consultation undertaken on the pre-sub plan that the need for a neighbourhood plan is appreciated by many local residents.</p>	
p	426	GI	HBE	<p>It is now six years since designation. In that time the landscape around housing delivery has changed considerably with the site allocation process now been settled and an understanding that our area will not be exposed to rampant, unsustainable mass housing development until the matter is reviewed in 2028 at the earliest.</p>	As above.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	427	GI	HBE	Therefore we are of the opinion that much of how the current plan is scoped, with the strong emphasis on volume housebuilding is now, broadly redundant in a plan that runs to 2033.	The section on housebuilding has been altered significantly to take account of the changing circumstances.	
p	428	GI	HBE	Clearly, unsustainable volume housebuilding is a massive concern but, as stated previously, a neighbourhood plan that gives tacit approval to housing, no matter how oblique in the wording, will be seized upon by avaricious developers and planners, and in our opinion used incorrectly as a tool with which to try and bypass the site allocation process.	As previous.	
p	429	GI	HBE	It would therefore be our submission that the plan is significantly truncated. We think the focus of the plan should be on green space, small pockets of developable property being protected and environmental and wildlife protection and preservation.	The Submission neighbourhood plan will reflect the issues of interest and concern expressed by the local community at pre-sub consultation.	
p	448	GI	HBE	<p>"The plan does not allocate any sites for development rather seeks to shape development up to 2033 as and when it comes forward."</p> <p>This is concerning because the forum have already put land forward for development prior to a plan even being settled. Selby Road.</p> <p>In addition, the statement that they wish to shape development up to 2033 is worrying because development has affectively been halted until 2028 and, as elected representatives, we would be then making the case that no further volume housebuilding should take place in the locality, so we find this statement both contradictory and unhelpful.</p> <p>It must also be remembered that despite the site allocation process being fixed, this does not mean developers cannot put in speculative planning applications on any site that they wish. Whilst the council would likely refuse the application in accordance with the SAP, avaricious developers will often take these matters to appeal. As we have found out from experience, on appeal, barristers will use the development of a Neighbourhood Plan to create the argument that, either through adoption following referendum or through recommendations of a planning forum, that the community supports volume housebuilding.</p>	<p>The forum have not put land forward for development as suggested.</p> <p>The plan will be revised to ensure that references to housing development are carefully worded and considered, in line with the concerns expressed.</p>	
p	468	LCC	HBE	Housing and the Built Environment (HBE) The locally specific nature of this topic area is a particular strength and demonstrates a high level of understanding. However, suggest the wording is cut down significantly for the submission plan and a review is undertaken of the evidence presented and its relevance to the circumstances in Garforth today. It is suggested that the housing chapter is generally reviewed to ensure that wording either in the policies or in the supporting text are unlikely to be misinterpreted by local	We understand the need to remove statements around volume housebuilding. At the same time we need to make it clear that policies are there to shape any development which	Revisit ARC Survey and criticisms of the evidence and how used in the Plan.

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				residents at Referendum or by any others who will be using the Plan. Given that the Council has not allocated a major housing site in Garforth and that the neighbourhood plan does not allocate a housing site this section should be explicit about that and why the policies that are there are needed, in the absence of allocations.	might occur in line with our objectives.	See comments p18,19,20 on PP 131. Also , wherever possible clarify meaning of "major developments."
p	+61 4	Resident	HBE	<p>Page 22-table at the bottom of the page I quite possibly may have misinterpreted the table, but why do older people require 5-bedroom properties? This seems at odds with the statement regarding older people wishing to downsize without having to move out of Garforth.</p> <p>Page 24-towards the bottom of page Given the definite lack of 2-bedroom accommodation and the significant shortfall of 1-bedroom accommodation in Garforth, How on earth did Redrow get planning consent for the abomination taking shape on Ninelands Lane? How did Charles Church manage to wangle consent for the even bigger new build travesty off Selby Road? Given that Charles Church is the premium range of properties belonging to the Persimmon group, who never build 1-bedroom properties; never build bungalows and, having looked at the plans on Leeds City Council website, there are no flats at all in any of the phases, I am at a loss to see how this sprawling site will help to address any of the issues facing Garforth.</p> <p>Page 25-the table shows 1 new bus shelter and footpath improvements. If both "improvements" relate to the Redrow development on Ninelands Lane, then they are both woefully inadequate given the size of the development. Indeed the footpath is not actually fit for purpose, as the pavement opposite Glebelands already has a section where the kerbstones have cracked away from the pavement. For just 129 out of 1474 to be "affordable" is just an appalling statistic.</p> <p>Page 26-relating to the section in which you mention the need for "right size" homes and affordable accommodation for 1st time buyers. This really did hit home about the importance of your Forum, since none of current developments, and certainly not the Charles Church plan for Selby Road will actually address these key issues, nor will they do anything but add to the pressure on transport/lack of greenspace/car parking/ education and health provision.</p>	<p>The majority of older people wanted 1 bed houses.</p> <p>These are planning decisions taken by LCC and the Neighbourhood Plan is not taken into account as it is yet to be passed at Referendum.</p> <p>Thank you for your supportive comments.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	663	Resident	HBE	<p>HOUSING AND INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>"To encourage the successful integration of new homes into the town in a way that does not put excessive pressure on the existing physical infrastructure." - GNP</p> <p>As anybody who actually lives here will tell you that the infrastrucure of Garforth needed serious attention BEFORE the recent major housing settlements at Garforth Cliff, Ninelands Lane and Lidgett Lane. And not to mention the 300 houses to be built off the George roundabout.</p> <p>Every housing development puts hundreds of extra cars on the town's roads, and especially affecting the exits out of Garforth. There aren't enough ways out of town now, never mind when extra housing is planned.</p> <p>The more green land is tarmaced over means more flooding. The town's drains are struggling to cope as it is; more houses means more schools, doctors, dentists, more car parks etc. The present gridlocked junctions will need radical improvements to cope with the extra traffic</p>	<p>The points you make are some of the reasons why a Neighbourhood Plan is necessary. Although each development may not have been huge, the collective impact on the Town is considerable. The Forum is hoping that the Plan will be able to have some impact on this.</p>	
p	676	Resident	HBE	<p>Encourage and support the need for monitoring of energy performance of new builds to inform future design improvements.</p> <p>Encourage modern methods of construction to support zero carbon homes.</p> <p>Climate emergency: Electric vehicle sharing schemes What is the vision for green energy - Pro wind turbines/pro solar panels? Can we have an explicit mention of community based composting? How can Garforth support small businesses and local employment? How do they see CIL money being used to support climate emergency?</p> <p>Food sustainability: Public edible beds in 'pocket' green spaces."</p>	<p>These are good ideas. They would need legislation to be enforced.</p> <p>Our Policies HBE 15 – 18 are intended to promote energy efficiency in new buildings based on a fabric first approach.</p> <p>The recently formed Eco Friendly Garforth is one of 4 neighbourhood hubs set up recently with Lottery funding to promote action on combatting climate change. This is an avenue for action over the coming years. Incredible Edible are doing this in the Town.</p>	
p	677	Resident	HBE	<p>Community ownership of public buildings - opportunity for community groups to take these on.</p>	<p>The Locality Act of 2011 offers this opportunity</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	679	Resident	HBE	I agree totally that Garforth is becoming increasingly overdeveloped with houses being built on every available piece of land with no extra provision being made for green space, education and medical facilities. No account seems to be taken of existing residents or the need for affordable housing for young people who were born here but can't afford to live here. The development at the former Stocks site is typical - mostly very large and expensive houses - the 3 storey townhouses look like a prison block and are unsightly. There is very limited affordable housing provision on this site (and none at other sites recently built) and I have been asking Redrow since they started building as to when the affordable housing will be available and who will be administering the sale and allocation of those properties, without any success. To allow the existing cricket field to be developed will add further congestion to Church Lane, which is already a nightmare to negotiate at any time of the day. It is time that a new approach to planning and building was considered. Why not do as they did in the 1960s and build complete new towns, with all the amenities communities need, rather than continuing to expand and swamp existing communities without providing additional amenities for those new residents, thus impacting negatively on existing residents and facilities.	Thank you very much for your supportive comments. There are clearly issues around affordable housing and, in general, 15% of houses on developments of 10 houses or more are meant to be affordable. More information is available from LCC Housing Dept.	
p	730	J Justice	HBE	Retrofitting will be key to get to net zero. Can it be included in the Plan?	Retrofitting is mentioned in Policy HBE 15 Energy Efficiency	
p	731	J Justice	HBE	How likely is it that the policies on energy efficiency can be enforced?	This will depend on national legislation regarding Building Regulations but hopefully these regulations will be tightened to reflect the Climate emergency	
p	711	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	HBE & GSRE	We feel that many of the aspirations set out within the local plan could be strengthened through the development of clear design aims of a site. For instance, we would strongly recommend the incorporation of the wish to see development designed in line with Building with Nature standards.	Thank you for your comment. We will incorporate a reference to the Standard in Policy GSRE 10	Add sentence to preamble in GSRE 10- "Proposals which seek accreditation under Building with Nature Standards will be supported."

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	712	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	HBE & GSRE	Building with Nature sets out standards to provide a benchmark in order to provide a qualitative assessment of a proposed development site. The Building with Nature (BwN) key themes are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core – Distinguishing green infrastructure from a more conventional approach to provision of open and green space. • Wildlife – to protect and enhance wildlife, creating networks where nature can thrive, and supporting the creation of development which more effectively delivers a net gain for wildlife. • Water – a commitment to improving water quality, on site and in the wider area: reducing the risk of flooding and managing water naturally for maximum benefit. • Wellbeing – to deliver health and wellbeing benefits through the green features on site, making sure they can be easily accessed by people close to where they live. 	Please see above	
p	714	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	HBE & GSRE	Aspirations for the enhancement of biodiversity, as reiterated throughout the plan, could again be further supported by a strong commitment for development to deliver a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain, as is expected to be mandated by the Environment Bill later in 2021. Inclusion of such a policy will ensure clarity for any developments in the locality to deliver such schemes and provide a mechanism by which it can be secured. The plan could then go further to demonstrate land which would be preferential to receive enhancements as a result of such a scheme.	Thank you for your comment. We will include the minimum percentage.	GSRE 10 . Add “of a minimum of 10%” in (a) after the words “net gain”
p	738	Resident	HBE & GSRE	Interested in the idea of Leeds as an age friendly city. Issues surrounding older people – housing provision and green space/ accessibility are crucial. Saw much in the Plan about these issues . Wondered if there was more we could do.	Agreed that there is always more that can be done but GNPF hope this is a good start.	
p	732	J Justice	HBE and GSRE	Can HS2 be opposed? Can anything be done about Hawks Nest Wood?	It is not possible to oppose strategic national infrastructure works. Having said that, it now looks as if HS2 will not come to Leeds.	
p	682	Resident	HBE Section 3.1.1	This piece of work may have taken sometime to produce.I was concerned to read that people are making decisions on the housing accommodation they feel fit for the over 60’ s . I have liked in Garforth for many years and choose to like in a 3 bedroomed house ,who gives this group the right to suggest over 60’s are holding onto houses and should down size. It is my decision and how dare some unelected group suggest otherwise. Also the comment	An individual reply was sent at the time. Briefly it outlined the following. There is no suggestion that anyone would be forced to downsize. The Plan is addressing the issue of a lack of suitable properties	Remove comments in Town Centre P.55 and 57 which suggest an over representation of

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				about "To many takeaways" . How many are actually in this group and what is the ratio to the population of Garforth.	for those people who want to downsize. Thank you for your comment on takeaways- the relevant sentence is to be removed.	certain types of shops.
p	18	Resident	HBE1	<p>Conclusions drawn from the Garforth Housing Mix Analysis 1974-2020 don't make sense</p> <p>Whilst an interesting piece of analysis, its unclear what the usefulness of the section titled Garforth Housing Mix Analysis 1974-2020 on Page 23 is or what conclusion should be drawn from it.</p> <p>Whilst the plan acknowledges the figures are not representative, as clearly the data does not take into account the large swathe of houses in Garforth that were built in the 50s, 60s and early 70s.</p> <p>See Page 2 – "There was a large surge in house building in the 1960s and 1970s" and Page 26 "There was a significant amount of Council housing in the town e.g. The Oak Estate and around Goosefield. Much of this was built in the 1940s and 1950s"</p> <p>The table also only considers approved developments which may or may not have been actually been implemented.</p> <p>The Arc Survey states that "at nearly 53%, there is a higher proportion of 3 bed dwellings compared to both Leeds and England". Within the Housing Mix table, the number of 3 bed dwellings is 21.7%, which is 50% less than the actual.</p> <p>The data presented in this table is therefore redundant in the context of a representative view of the real housing mix in Garforth as the figures are highly skewed. Its therefore questionable if this table should be used to draw any conclusions from, which unfortunately it is.</p> <p>Page 24 and 25: "Looking at this data and combining it with the findings in the Household Survey conducted by the Forum and the ARC4 Housing Needs Assessment it seems clear that there is a definite lack of 2 bedroomed accommodation, especially for newly formed households. There is also a significant shortfall in 1 bedroomed accommodation both affordable and market housing. This would be for younger people and those wishing to downsize but remain in Garforth. In fact in the Forum survey 79% of respondents talked of the need for affordable homes for the young."</p>	<p>Thank you very much for your detailed comments. You have clearly spent much time analysing the information presented, conclusions drawn and recommendations in the Plan. GNPF are very grateful for the time and attention you have given to this. The above sentiments apply to different comments you made (p18-20, p24,26,27,29 and 30)</p> <p>With regard to your comment on the Housing Mix analysis, you correctly draw attention to the fact that the figures are for applications approved and that they may not in all cases have gone ahead.</p> <p>The fact that 21.7% were for 3 bedroomed units is not quoted in an attempt to portray the current housing mix but rather indicate a trend in terms of the type of housing being planned during the period in question.</p>	Re-examine the conclusions reached from the Garforth Housing Mix Analysis.

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				According to the Housing Mix table, 2 bedroom properties make up the second biggest number of properties in Garforth that are approved. The table presented doesn't backup the recommendation that more are needed. Arguably there is a lower number of 1 bedroom properties at 8.5%, but this is not a defining characteristic of the housing mix or the demand for property in Garforth.	You are also right that the prevalence of 2 bedroom properties in the survey should be given more weight in the final conclusions.	
p	19	Resident	HBE1	<p>The Housing Survey (see Page 8 Housing Type Most Required) stated that 49% of respondents think Garforth needs more 1 or 2 bedroom properties. However, around 47% of respondents think that Garforth needs more properties with 3 or more bedrooms. The decision to ignore this 47% is hard to understand and with such a small difference is hardly conclusive evidence to recommend building more 2-bedroom houses. Consideration should have been made for the large volume of empty nesters responding to the survey. The Leeds ARC survey is pretty clear in its recommendation.</p> <p>Page 15 – Table 7: The gross additional market housing states 0% requirement for 1 or 2 bedroom properties.</p> <p>Page 16 – Table 8: There is a requirement for newly forming household requiring 2 bedroom properties, however this is dwarfed by the need for larger 3+ homes required for social renters by almost double.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 14 – Table 6 - There is a high need for 1 bedroom properties (58) in comparison to 2 bedroom properties (16) for younger people requiring affordable i.e. social housing <p>The overall findings of the ARC report state</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garforth and Swillington forms a self-contained residential area but more 3-bedroom or larger market homes need to be provided to diversify the housing stock in order to retain residents. • Additional affordable 1-bedroom homes are also needed mostly for younger households unable to afford local market prices. <p>The conclusion on Page 24 which recommend the building of more two bedroom properties is simply not backed up by the data in the surveys or reports referenced.</p> <p>“.....it seems clear that there is a definite lack of 2 bedroomed accommodation” – this is incorrect in isolation, there is equal if not more data to justify the building of properties of 3 or more bedrooms.</p>	<p>You rightly highlight the 47% in The Housing Survey who replied that more properties with 3 bedrooms are required. In addition, some of the conclusions from The GNPF Housing Survey contradict some of the conclusions from the ARC survey. This point is made in Appendix 1 of the Plan.</p> <p>Given these contradictions, it is important that GNPF look again at the conclusions drawn from the different sources of data to ensure the best possible match between all the available data and the conclusions and eventual Policies.</p>	Re examine conclusions reached from ARC survey and Household Survey

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				"especially for newly formed households." – This may be somewhat true but again the demand is higher for people seeking properties with 3 or more bedrooms based on the data referenced.		
p	20	Resident	HBE1	<p>There is also a significant shortfall in 1 bedroomed accommodation both affordable and market housing. – There is no shortfall for 1 bedroom properties in the market demand table. There is a small shortfall in the affordable housing table of 58 one bedroom properties. Although the number is dwarfed by the market housing demand of 238 properties and the social housing demand for over 3 bedrooms!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q17 - What evidence actually supports the recommendation to only support the building of 2 bedroom properties? • Q18 – Why has the clear need for building of larger properties been completely ignored from the report and on what basis has this been made? 	You are right to point out that an error has been made with regard to 1 bedroom houses in the market demand table. It is also clear that the expressed need for market housing of larger proportions should be acknowledged.	<p>Reassess conclusions drawn.</p> <p>Re consider wording in Policy HBE1</p>
p	65	Resident	hbe1	We need to grow all aspects of a community, not just housing stock. The people of the community are best placed to understand it's needs. This applies to all age groups even if they are not as active in local issues at this time.	Agreed that local people need to be involved in assessing the needs of the local community.	
p	66	Resident	hbe1	Not enough starter homes	The policy aims to ensure identified housing need is met.	
p	67	Resident	hbe1	This policy would also give the older people who wished to downsize some options especially is 2 bedroomed terraced bungalows were included in any development thus releasing more 3/4/5 properties onto the market for families.	Thank you for your comment.	
p	68	Resident	hbe1	Smaller affordable properties for retired people to downsize is important, however this needs to be within easy walking distance of Main Street. Despite suggestions to redevelop the clinic site for such properties the planning officer gave permission for 2 sets of 3 bed semis on 3 floors and 2 6 bed houses. Core strategy policy H4 does not have a minimum target for 1 bed properties so no obligation for developers to provide any despite a Leeds forecast of an additional 45,800 single households by 2026.	It would be good if there were a minimum target for 1 bedroom properties in LCC's Core Strategy.	
p	229	Resident	hbe1	And ideally support services plots for self builds.	The Plan does not oppose self-build. Any new builds should meet all the policies set out within the Plan.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	230	Resident	hbe1	Smaller houses should have gardens that enable enlargement of the property. It's the Garforth way	Thank you for your opinion. There is no requirement , as far as GNPF is aware, for minimum garden sizes.	
p	355	Resident	hbe1	Cheaper houses as part of the mix is essential	Thank you for your comment.	
p	389	Resident	hbe1	Many first time buyers would like a 3 bed property to potentially start a family in, so I would prefer the 'majority of 3+ bedroom' to read 'majority of 4+ bedroom', and also a stipulation that the rooms & bedrooms be a minimum size - too many modern homes have tiny rooms, especially 3rd 'bed'rooms incapable of taking a single bed! UK room sizes are generally too small in modern affordable housing.	Thank you for your comment. The policy aim is to provide the housing required to meet identified need .	
p	390	Resident	hbe1	If these can be built on suitable brownfield land, this would be acceptable. However, to consistently build on green belt is destroying garforth	Building on suitable brownfield land is clearly a good idea. . However, as we are not putting forward any sites we are not including it in any policies.	
p	475	LCC	HBE1	<p>HBE1 Housing Mix: The ambition of this policy is welcomed, and would support the Council's objectives in terms of Core Strategy Policy H4, which seeks a 60/40 split between 1&2 bed dwellings and 3+ dwellings. At present, Core Strategy H4 only requires there to be a housing needs assessment submitted in support of applications for 250 dwellings in major settlement such as Garforth, therefore a more proportionate approach to the first sentence of the policy may be needed, currently it requires that all new housing development (including proposals for 1 dwelling) would need to be justified by up-to-date evidence of local need.</p> <p>The wording of the policy could be strengthened by rephrasing the second sentence so it sets a requirement for the majority of units to be 1 or 2-bed homes, rather than just saying that this would be supported, which continues with the last sentence that says that developments providing a majority of 3+ homes will not be supported – though proportionality is needed here (it may be difficult to justify a refusal for a proposal for 2 dwellings that are 3 or 4 bed as this would not materially harm neighbourhood composition). Additionally, it is unclear what is meant by 'smaller house types' – is this just a reference to 1 and 2 bed homes (in which case it can be deleted) or is it a reference to flats / bungalows (which is covered by HBE2)?</p> <p>Care is needed regarding the evidence base to this policy, in particular the Arc4 Housing Market Assessment, which suggests that the demand for market homes comes from 3+ dwellings (which would undermine the ambition of the policy) and that the need for 1 and 2 bed homes is only in</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. It is clear, on reflection, that the wording of the policy will need to be tightened up to avoid unintended consequences. Certainly the reference to "smaller house types" is probably unhelpful, particularly given the wording in HBE2.</p> <p>It is clear that the evidence base from ARC4 does not support 1 and 2 bedroom houses for market housing. However, rather than focus, as you suggest, on historic delivery (The Garforth</p>	<p>Rewrite Policy HBE 1 to remove references to "smaller house types".</p> <p>Ensure no unintended consequences in revised wording and use all available data to ensure policy matches up to date evidence.</p>

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				affordable dwellings. It may be that it would be more beneficial to focus on the historic delivery of housing and the need to diversify the housing stock (including the benefits of this) to justify the requirement of the policy for the majority of new homes to be 1 & 2 bed.	Housing Mix Analysis suggests incidentally that 1and 2 bed planning approvals totalled 39%) it is proposed to rewrite the Policy to fit all the available evidence, including the SMHA which has not so far been included in the evidence base.	
p	24	Resident	HBE1+2	<p>Assumed demand for one-bedroom properties</p> <p>On page 27 under the heading Local Estate Agents Survey 2017 the report claims that 59% of respondents are looking for 1 to 3 bedroom properties, but fails to state that of this 59% only 3% are looking for 1 bedroom properties. The demand for one bedroom housing is simply not evident in the data and not backed up by the analysis of Leeds City Council. The Arc survey states that only 13% of the total demand is for one-bedroom properties for older people which means 87% of demand is for properties greater than one bedroom.</p> <p>There is a real danger here that an influx of smaller housing units leads to properties becoming inadequate in size, areas becoming overcrowded and people becoming stuck due to the lack of availability of larger homes. Occupants will then be facing even higher prices due to the increased demand created and ultimately are forced to move away from Garforth. The recommendations made could also result in property developers using this plan as leverage to build inadequately spaced or small homes which bring associated social issues such as noise, overcrowding and further parking problems. Care must be taken in ensuring that smaller developments do not adversely impact Garforth.</p> <p>• Q24 – How does the Garforth plan justify its support for the building of one-bedroom properties in Garforth when there is little demand?</p>	<p>Your comments are to the point. On re-reading the ARC and Estate Agents’ surveys the demand for 1 bedroom housing is not as high as the Plan implies in some of the wording.</p> <p>At the same time, there is a need for some properties with fewer than 3 bedrooms, both for older people and younger buyers / renters. The key for the Plan will be to more accurately reflect the demand.</p>	<p>Re examine the wording in 3.1.1 relating to 1 bedroom housing to ensure it more accurately reflects the data. Alter the wording in HBE1 to reflect the data more accurately.</p>
p	26	Resident	HBE1+2	<p>Housing in Garforth offering “too much space and too expensive”</p> <p>Page 26 “For younger people and first-time buyers, the ubiquitous 3-bedroomed semis in Garforth are not the right size, offering too much space and being too expensive”</p> <p>• Q25 - Is this statement backed up by any actual data or is this an opinion?</p> <p>• Q26 - What evidence is there to justify the “size of houses being too big” for both first time buyers and younger people?</p> <p>• Q27 - How is ‘too expensive’ defined and who for?</p> <p>This isn’t backed up by the statement made in the CASS Report on page 28 “it is uncontentious to say that typical young families need three (or more)</p>	<p>The phrase “too much space” is clearly an opinion and should not have been used. Thank you for pointing this out.</p> <p>The question of these houses being too expensive for</p>	<p>Remove the phrase “not the right size, offering too much space” from paragraph 3 P.26</p>

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>bedrooms”, apparently however, in Garforth, this is a contentious view. Defining what is meant by the term “younger people” and an actual appreciation of who “first time buyers” are in the modern world is important to avoid sweeping statements or assumptions about their needs. Neither of which is defined in this report or the Housing Needs Survey.</p> <p>Garforth is a suburb of Leeds and a popular location for couples, first-time buyers and families.</p> <p>On pages 21 and 22 the following statement was made in reference to Garforth “There was a significant amount of housing development during the 1960s and 1970s, with the construction of a number of new private estates, which has largely shaped the Garforth we see today. The majority of homes were occupied by young couples and families, many of them moving out of the city”.</p> <p>In the 60s and 70s Garforth was a sought-after location for both young couples and families (presumably including those who bought homes for the first time) who moved into the “ubiquitous 3 bed semi”. At what point were the young couples in the 60s and 70s, who it could be assumed were younger people who have also arguably remained in their homes for many years, informed that the house they were buying were not the right size for them and that they offered too much space?</p>	<p>younger people and first time buyers is backed up by some data from the ARC 4 survey, sections 3.15-3.18.</p> <p>Younger people is open to interpretation but GNPF are considering those between the ages of 18 and 35.</p> <p>Those people buying houses in Garforth in the 60s and 70s may as you presume have been buying homes for the first time. They may also already have had children and so were seeking, perhaps, larger accommodation with a garden i.e. the 3 bed semi.</p> <p>There is a degree of speculation here.</p>	<p>Add definition of younger people to Glossary</p>
p	27	Resident	HBE1+2	<p>The Government published the English Housing survey in 2019 which states that in 2018-19,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the average age of first-time buyers was 33 years. • 72% of first time buyer households were couples with or without dependent children, while only 23% were one person households. • Based on ONS data <p>https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/livebirths/bulletins/birthcharacteristicsinenglandandwales/ 2019#age-of-parents the average age of parents having children is now 30 years for the mother and 33 years for the father with the average age of a woman at first birth being 29</p> <p>https://www.parliament.uk/contentassets/3a84308e4ab4433f814406b9934bf6ae/olympicbritain.pdf#page=23</p> <p>The actual conclusion that should be drawn from the facts, is that first-time buyers, predominantly couples with or without children, aged on average 33, who are within the right age of potentially starting families are likely to be looking for 2, 3 or 4 bedroom houses in Garforth. This is arguably no different from the characteristics of those who moved to Garforth in the 1960s, 70 and 80s. What’s clear is that young couples and families are a defining</p>	<p>The information you provide is interesting. Most first time buyers are in their early 30s and in couples.</p> <p>They probably are looking for 2/3/4 bedroom houses, though it is hard to be sure what proportion are looking for each house type. Potential differences between now and the 60s /70s are the number of couples who already had children and the number of 2 and 4 bedroom houses then available on the new estates.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				characteristic of Garforth and have been for well over 60 years. The needs of the first-time buyers, couples and families that make up the demographic in Garforth have largely been overlooked, both through the skewed survey and the inconsistency in defining these groups and the misguided belief that a high proportion of older people in Garforth will downsize and more “young” people move in.	The evidence from the GNPF Household Survey suggests demand for starter homes and family homes. This may well need to be made more explicit in the text and reflected in the policies.	Reconsider text in 3.1.1 to more accurately reflect conclusions drawn from data sources. Re draft Policy HBE1
p	29	Resident	HBE1+2	<p>Lack of support for Larger Homes</p> <p>Arc Survey Page 18 “Garforth and Swillington forms a self-contained residential area but more 3-bedroom or larger market homes need to be provided to diversify the housing stock in order to retain residents”</p> <p>This appears to have been completely ignored by the Garforth Plan in favour of smaller builds.</p> <p>The Arc Survey also highlighted the demand for larger homes, Arc Survey Page 12 “We were told that the local gap was for 4-bedroom homes, both detached and semi-detached. Most of the dwelling stock was 3-bedroom semi-detached homes and there was little supply of 4-bedroom homes for households that need an extra bedroom or aspired to a detached house.”</p> <p>The cost of larger homes is in the 75th percentile and the lack of supply ultimately leads to families moving away from Garforth due to lack of availability or affordability. The lack of larger homes increases the demand for 3 bedroom properties and makes Garforth unaffordable for many. Building more smaller homes in the hope people may downsize from 2 and 3 bedroom properties appears to make little sense. As much as Garforth logically may require smaller homes, there is more demand for larger accommodation as seen in the Arc report tables.</p> <p>There is scant evidence that building smaller homes will encourage people to actually downsize and the recommendations in the plan could lead to large scale development of small properties, increasing the population to a point where infrastructure is put under so much strain that Garforth stops becoming a desirable location.</p>	<p>You correctly quote from the end of the ARC report and this is not adequately reflected in the current wording and policies.</p> <p>There is clearly a need for larger housing to retain those who want to move into larger homes from the 3 bedroomed properties which currently form 53% of the accommodation available.</p> <p>There is also an issue around right sizing and the need for some smaller homes – this is also referenced in the ARC report.</p> <p>The issue for the Plan will be to recommend the right balance.</p>	<p>Review current wording of Plan to ensure a proportionate view is taken of the need for larger house types.</p> <p>Reconsider HBE 1 and 2</p>
p	30	Resident	HBE1+2	<p>There is nothing inherently wrong with housing developments with larger houses, and it can be argued that larger homes will ultimately lead to a greater contribution to the local economy as larger households are likely to have higher incomes and therefore spend more locally.</p> <p>The justification not to even consider housing developments over 3 bedrooms appears to be short-sighted and it appears this may driven by flawed understanding of the realities of downsizing and a lack of definition of what</p>	The first point in the Plan’s objectives with regard to housing (2.2) is " to support the provision of an inclusive range of different types of homes and a greater range of	Actions required already outlined in responses immediately above.

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>the appropriate housing mix should be for Garforth. Building more larger homes would have a more positive impact on Garforth in freeing up 2 and 3 bedroom properties as people are more likely to upsize than downsize. The actual evidence and clear demand for larger homes in Garforth in comparison to the hope and possibility that people may downsize, provides more certainty of freeing up properties to address those unable to stay or move to Garforth and could make existing 2 and 3 bedroom properties more affordable.</p> <p>Housing in Garforth needs to be of an appropriate mix and the report fails to state how many houses of each type Garforth should have or aim for. This is a major problem as the recommendations fall short of providing a suitable target mix of houses which can be used to ensure the plan delivers on its intent. It is clear however that larger homes are needed.</p> <p>The lack of support for large houses is not backed up by the data which states Garforth does need more larger properties of 3+ bedrooms and its unclear why some developments of larger houses should not be supported, no reason is provided as to why the GPNF has decided to ignore the supporting data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q30 – Why do none of the recommendations in the Garforth Plan address the need for larger homes in Garforth? • Q31 – Why are 3+ bedroom homes not being supported when its clearly an area of demand and would address the problem of freeing up stock? • Q32 – Why have the clear recommendations from Leeds City Council that Garforth requires more larger properties been ignored? • Q33 – Why has the report failed to provide an explicit recommendation of the percentages for an appropriate housing mix in Garforth? 	<p>affordable housing to meet the needs of all residents.”</p> <p>GNPF agree, as already stated in responses above, that a fresh look at the data will result in changes to some of the text to more accurately reflect the balance of house types suggested.</p> <p>The issue of rightsizing is still one that needs to be considered and, as you rightly point out, freeing up , particularly 3 bedroom properties, would be a positive outcome of this.</p> <p>With regard to specifying exact percentages, the Plan is aiming to provide guiding principles. It has to be in broad conformity with LCC’s Core Strategy which does provide parameters (though fairly broad ones) for a city wide housing mix. Moreover, the Plan talks in Policy HBE1 of considering “ up-to-date local evidence”. While this wording may change and it might be unreasonable to expect smaller developments to offer a range of house types, the underlying assumption that what is being built in Garforth</p>	<p>Comment added to reflect the possible impact of Covid on desire for extra space for home working and gardens.</p>

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					needs to take into account local need remains true. It also allows, given that the Plan runs until 2033, for changes in supply and demand.	
p	6	Resident	HBE10	I don't agree with policy HBE10, in that it suggests that the list of "key guiding principles" aren't really principles at all, so much as a list of descriptions of the status quo. I also note that character area 6 is labelled differently on the map to in the Character Area list below.	Thank you for your points. GNPF will rewrite HBE10 to make it clearer. The title of Character Assessment area 6 will be changed to match the Map. Thank you for pointing this out	Restructure HBE 10 – just insert guiding development principles. Change Title of Character Area 6 on P.40 and P.209 to match Map 9
p	100	Resident	hbe10	Walkways & sympathetic planting adds to outdoor enjoyment	Agreed	
p	101	Resident	hbe10	In my opinion Garforth has very little character. There is part of Wakefield Road and Aberford Road, Kensington Terrace and the right hand side of Main Street in parts when looking from Town End which also have some character.	Thank you for your comment.	
p	253	Resident	hbe10	A lot of work has gone into defining the seven areas and thinking about the best policy for each area and congratulations to the people who did the survey and the those who wrote the policies. . I can't see anything I disagree with, certainly not for Character Area 1 where I live.	Thank you for your supportive comment.	
p	254	Resident	hbe10	Character area 4 is devoid of local shops. also needs disabled parking spaces by station entrance	Agreed that there are no shops in this area. There are some disabled spaces just beyond the buildings at Garforth Station. It would be a good idea , in principle, to have a couple of spaces near	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					East Garforth Station. However, this is not something that can be included in a Policy in the Plan. It is possibly something to be taken up with LCC.	
p	404	Resident	hbe10	Also Victorian character of parts of Lidgett Lane and roads off it, historic features Methodist Chapel frontage (SLP), Coach House.	Please see list of Non Designated Heritage assets Policy HBE12 which includes many of these features.	
p	484	LCC	HBE10	HBE10 Character Areas: The identification of character areas and specific guidance for each area is welcomed, reflecting the work put into the character assessment and analysis. References to permeable surfaces and reducing flood risk may be better as a distinct policy in the physical infrastructure and flood prevention section. When the guidance relates to 'landscaping features' it would be beneficial for this to say specifically what it refers to, is this boundary treatments, etc.? 6 It would also be beneficial to identify where the informal greenspaces are (even if these are not necessarily proposed LGS). Character Area 3, criteria a) should be 'roofs', criteria c)ii) – should this reference LGS15 Fairburn Drive? Character Area 4, criteria c) – should this reference Local Green Corridor Map 18	We will treat this as proposed in response to P6 above P.140. We intend to remove the references to landscaping.	Correct typos. Other Green Spaces will be included in Greenspace section.
p	102	Resident	hbe11	Yes but ease of access through jargon needs addressing.	Thank you for your comment.	
p	103	Resident	hbe11	Beck needs to have capacity for additional influx of water. Maybe an investigation needs to be carried out if not already done so. The connection to the lines would provide an additional egress point.	Please see Point of the Policy with regard to flooding issues.	
p	104	Resident	hbe11	There should be some regulation for the standard of exterior care of the affordable housing as in some instances after a period of time these properties look extremely shabby	This is not within the scope of the Plan.	
p	105	Resident	hbe11	The footpaths have already been re routed and there does not appear to be any proposal to link up/ provide additional footpaths/ PROWs to the LInes Way	According to information obtained from LCC there is a plan in Phase 2 of the development to extend the footpaths towards the east of the site. It is still uncertain , depending on ownership of	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					the land, whether it will be possible to link the final stretch to The Linesway.	
p	255	Resident	hbe11	Sounds OK.	Thank you.	
p	256	Resident	hbe11	I have to say that I am concerned about further building along Selby Road towards the garden centre. Traffic is likely to increase considerably with any large building scheme and the countryside nature of the area would be changed forever.	GNPF is not aware of any plans to build near the Garden Centre. The current plans for Phase 3 of the development stop just past Lidgett Lane.	
p	257	Resident	hbe11	Needs thought on access to Selby Road	This is a Highways issue and is currently being worked on	
p	258	Resident	hbe11	"Development proposals should enable ease of travel by walking and cycling both within and to and from the development. Travel to and from the development should be easy as possible by public transport - the proposals should look at how the public transport network could/should be enhanced to enable this. Development proposals should be as environmentally friendly as possible. Development proposals should be as children/older people/disabled people friendly as possible. All efforts should be made to reduce flood risks as much as possible e.g. large rainwater/grey water tanks at homes to reduce the amount of water going into the drainage / sewage system by as much as possible. Creating a green corridor / walking / cycling access to the development from the Linesway should happen. Spreading the affordable housing units and / or any olderpeople housing units is important to enhance community cohesion as well a having a space for residents to come together."	Please see Policies T1 and T2 on active travel and connectivity. Please see Policy HBE15 on Energy Efficiency. Please see the statements made regarding children and those with mobility issues in Streetscape Design on PP34-35. Please see Policies HBE 5-7 regarding reducing flood risk. Please see response to P.105 above re The Linesway. Please see HBE 11 criterion (b) regarding community cohesion.	
p	405	Resident	hbe11	Having worked in construction and for one of the companies which has secured land off selby road on which to build properties, I don't trust them one bit to follow through with this or prioritise this	Thank you for your comment.	
p	406	Resident	hbe11	Unhappy about ANY developments here that do not fully address a) infrastructure issues such as school and health services provisions, b) flooding issues not only locally in Garforth but further down the Lin Dyke catchment areas.	Thank you for your comment. The Plan is not allocating any sites for development however, school and health	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					provision are addressed in the Plan as well as flooding issues.	
p	485	Resident	HBE11	<p>HBE11 SAP Site HG3-18 Selby Road: This site is a safeguarded land site (HG3-18) rather than an identified housing site. As the Forum will be aware, permission has been granted on part of this site through the Outline approval (17/05759/OT) and there is a current application for the Reserved Matters (20/06036/RM), therefore the scope for the NP to influence the development here may be limited.</p> <p>References to affordable housing in criteria a) should be a separate policy criteria to flooding, as these are unrelated and are separate principles in themselves.</p> <p>Criteria c) perhaps better to reference opportunities rather than measures and include a reference to Core Strategy Policy G9.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We will sub divide point a, as you suggest.</p> <p>We will use the word "opportunities"</p>	<p>Split point (a) after "water from the site" and make rest (b), " In order to promote.."</p> <p>In former point (c) change "measures" to "opportunities" and add " in accordance with LCC Core Strategy Policy G9"</p> <p>Remove the words "key guiding principles" from heading and opening paragraph.</p>
p	615	Resident	HBE11	<p>Page 35/36 Selby Road site that was, supposedly, "safeguarded"</p> <p>As I have already written above, that has been very conveniently over-ridden by Leeds City Council. This new build plan will not address the need for "right size" housing stock in Garforth. In the most recent amended plan on the LCC planning portal, Charles Church have actually reduced the number of 2-bedroom properties, thereby rendering even fewer properties "affordable" to younger people and older Garforth residents wanting to downsize are certainly not going to be tempted to buy a 2-bedroom house with rooms only slightly bigger than a shoebox.</p> <p>probably exacerbate flooding issues around the Old George roundabout.</p> <p>put yet more pressure on local schools and healthcare services. Once</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The site on Selby Road is a PAS site (Protected Area of Search) meaning it was removed from the Green belt by LCC in 2006 specifically for future housing development.</p> <p>GNPF agree with the need for right sizing in Garforth, as our</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>phases 1-4 are complete, that will be an additional 270 properties, the occupants of which will need to visit a doctor/optician/dentist etc. Thanks to limiting the number of properties to less than 300, there is no need for an additional bus route to be offered, so yet more pressure will be added to existing public transport services. The proliferation on EV charging points on their most recent phasing plan would certainly suggest that there is scant thought at Charles Church/Persimmon for encouraging people to engage in active travel.</p> <p>Page 70-Main Street will not attract new residents if parking provision isn't improved or cycling routes are not developed: too many cyclists who lack the confidence or skills to ride on the roads are using pavements to get around Garforth without considering the impact on pedestrians.</p> <p>Page 72-Enforcing times limits in existing car parks around Main Street is an excellent idea.</p>	<p>Plan suggests and the policies in HBE 1 – 4 will hopefully help ensure this happens if the Plan succeeds at referendum.</p> <p>There are a variety views on the best way to ensure Main Street remains attractive and the Plan tries to address this issue positively.</p>	
p	7	Resident	HBE12	I disagree with policy HBE12. In particular, I think that the commitment it makes is too strong – “development proposals involving any heritage asset will be supported in principle where they...” should in my view be weakened to “development proposals involving any heritage asset may be supported in principle where they...”. I believe this change would allow more flexibility down the line, and could help to address concerns raised by the Garforth & Swillington Independents about the possibility of the Plan tying their hands in discussions relating to future developments.	GNPF feels it is appropriate to support such development proposals on the understanding they will protect the heritage asset. The inclusion of the words “ in principle” give a degree of flexibility. The inclusion of the words “ in principle” give a degree of flexibility.	
p	106	Resident	hbe12	All historic remnants should be protected.	Thank you. The list seeks to do this.	
p	259	Resident	hbe12	Should this also say development proposals involving destruction of any heritage asset will not be supported?	This is already implicit in the wording of the policy.	
p	486	LCC	HBE12	HBE12 General Heritage Assets: As with the general design policy, this policy does not extend beyond the provisions of Core Strategy Policy P11 and therefore may be deleted by an examiner. Suggest that ‘in principle’ is deleted.	Thank you. Having considered comment p7 above and reflected further we have decided to retain “ in principle”.	
p	685	Resident	HBE12, 13 Replied	Augustus Walker House - Thank you for your note regarding the Garforth Neighbourhood plan. This was the first we had heard of our inclusion in the plan.	A response was sent at the time. The main points made were as follows.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>We have located our property in the online document and are trying to understand what it means to be owners of a non-designated heritage site. Can you inform us, in simple language, what responsibilities, restrictions, benefits? etc are involved with this inclusion (or point us to a source of such information).</p> <p>We are currently trying to sell our house and are nervous that this listing may make a sale more difficult in these troubled times</p> <p>If we decided it was not in our best interests, could we elect for our property not to be included in the plan?</p> <p>Thanks in advance for any information</p>	<p>An explanation of the two main types of heritage assets.</p> <p>An explanation of the intention of the Policies i.e. to protect buildings designated from harmful development proposals.</p> <p>The fact that designation as an NDHA would not show up on searches until the Plan passed at referendum.</p> <p>A statement that GNPF would happily remove the building from the list if the owners requested this to be done.</p>	
p	616	Resident	HBE12+13	Page 45- the list of heritage buildings is a really good idea.	Thank you.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	632	Resident	HBE12+13 HBE15 BETC	<p>could persuade our neighbours in Saxton Court to stop trying to cut down our <i>existing</i> trees!</p> <p>The central area (pp211-14) is inevitably a mixed bag. As I only go back to 1984 in the area I cannot comment except to say I broadly agree with your comments (although restricting delivery times will be problematic). Inclusion of Barrowby Lane is incongruous but there is no obvious alternative. If one side of Aberford Road is included, surely both sides should be, as far as St.Benedicts? There are a couple of places in Barrowby Lane that, to judge from appearance, names, and size of grounds, are considerably older than the rest, and in time may offer opportunities for more redevelopments along the lines of Barrowby Close. Seen from the railway, there are several undesirable backland uses such as a scrap yard, and several other properties are in a messy condition.</p> <p>3.1.4 Heritage. It is gratifying to note how much heritage, especially non-designated, there is to be found in the town, which does not immediately strike the visitor as a place as well endowed as other small towns in West Yorkshire: Haworth, Hebden Bridge, Holmfirth, Ilkley, Otley, Wetherby to name the more obvious. A benefit is that Garforth does not suffer the consequent traffic problems that they do. However there always has to be a balance between preserving every last bit of "heritage" however rundown or unsuited to present needs, and the demands of the present day. I'm not surprised for example, that the pit building on the Stocks site could not be retained. (How many had seen it? Or even knew it was there?) It would have been out of place in the middle of the residential development and devalued the nearby properties, so the developers would have insisted on it. And the photo of the NISA premises (page 45) illustrates how an unsympathetic fascia treatment can wreck the appearance of such places. In passing, did none of the other pubs merit inclusion -Bird-in-hand, Crusader, Podger?</p> <p>A more serious conflict is likely to arise over the railway bridges, all of them, especially if & when electrification ever arrives. All three are unsatisfactory in one way or another even now, and would normally have been replaced, but other solutions are possible such as lowering the track below overbridges (although the recent flooding incident may deter that idea). The footbridge is actually in poor condition especially the wooden treads, and the excess of steps makes it unusable by some and unpleasant for all. There was a promise of lifts, -but only platform-to-platform (and likely to overlook our flats!) but we understood the footbridge would stay -for now. Normally such items would be offered to heritage railways. As for Barwick Road, a pedestrian tunnel alongside would be the best answer, although frankly I cannot see that there is much about that bridge that really merits heritage status. At least nobody is suggesting that Bar Lane bridge has any heritage value! I'll return to this in 3.3.</p> <p>3.1.5 and Appendix 2. Environment and Energy. Requiring low carbon in new build is the easy bit. Retrofitting the existing stock is altogether a different proposition, which will need state subsidy and eclipse North Sea Gas conversion.</p> <p>3.2. Business & Employment. I think we have to recognise that the days when most people who lived in Garforth worked in Garforth are long gone and unlikely to return, even with home working although that will</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. It is a difficult balance between preserving heritage and the needs of the present day. In the end the list was drawn up following consultation and represents a cross section of views on the importance to Garforth of the structures/ buildings included.</p> <p>3 of the railway bridges are listed structures and appear in the list in Appendix 3.</p> <p>Agreed. It will be a challenge to retrofit the existing housing stock. It is hard to predict the future but increasing the number of those living locally who also work locally seems a worthwhile aspiration given the climate and obesity crises.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	8	Resident	HBE13	I disagree with policy HBE13. In particular, I think the list of non-designated heritage assets is too broad, and appears to be seeking to protect some sites based more on their age than on any particular other merits. I believe each of these assets should be assessed on their merits and supported by rationale which extends beyond their age.	Thank you. In Appendix 4 there is a list, with photographs, of all the assets. The accompanying text gives information, beyond just their age, to explain their inclusion.	
p	108	Resident	hbe13	Most of the original buildings in Garforth named. All remedial works should be akin to the national trust grading system.	Thank you for your comment.	
p	109	Resident	hbe13	41 and 43a, the brick built, semi detached mine managers cottages Church Lane are probably the oldest houses in Garforth and aren't on your list.	Thank you. We will investigate further.	Include 41 and 43a Church Lane if they satisfy the NDHA criteria which are to be included around HBE 13.
p	110	Resident	hbe13	I think all of Kensington Terrace should be included not just the entrance. It is the only terrace in Garforth not spoilt by inappropriate windows being inserted ruining the whole terrace.	All of the Terrace is included; Policy HBE13 item 9.	
p	261	Resident	hbe13	Brilliant, good to hear what our heritage assets are	Thank you	
p	262	Resident	hbe13	What a lot of them!. I look forward to inspecting most of them in due course. Is there a collection of Heritage Assets as well?	See Appendix 3 for list of Heritage Assets	
p	263	Resident	hbe13	St Mary's church doesn't appear to be in this list, is there a particular reason for this please?	It is a listed building and appears in Appendix 3.	
p	264	Resident	hbe13	"Any development proposals should have involved/consulted any relevant local organisations - e.g. the Garforth Historical Society - from the start to ensure that heritage is not an after thought and that the proposals could be used to help foster a sense of history and community within Garforth. Practical everyday use that supports the heritage quality of a heritage asset should be supported so that the asset and our heritage remains in our everyday thoughts and so is not forgotten and left to decay. Garforth Railway Station should include the road bridge and the steps from the northern side of the road as well - the road bridge is said to be the first bridge to cross a railway at an angle. The Fly Line path should be included as well - it's a key part of our heritage St Mary's Church & grounds and St Benedicts Church & grounds should be included. Any mile stones that are with in Garforth should be included e.g. the one at the T junction of Selby Road and Ninelands Lane.	The list of heritage assets was drawn up following consultation with Forum members and a notice in the Library also invited comments from the public. The bridge is listed in Appendix 3 Heritage Assets The Fly Line begins outside the Neighbourhood Plan boundary.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>The original buildings of Garforth Academy - e.g. the 3 blocks and the staff room should be included as they are a good example of the 20th Century Brutalist Style of public buildings.</p> <p>I'm pleased that the Water Tower, the Fire Station, the Railway Station and the Linesway have been included.</p> <p>The old cross of the school that sat at the junction of Main Street, Church Lane and Lidgett Lane should be considered for inclusion."</p>	<p>St Mary's Church is a listed building ; see Appendix 3.</p> <p>The grounds of both St. Mary's and St. Benedict's are designated green spaces by LCC.</p> <p>The milestones are listed in Appendix 3.</p> <p>We will investigate the cross you mention.</p>	<p>Include cross if deemed appropriate. See p109</p>
p	407	Resident	hbe13	<p>The primitive Methodist church off main st has been all but wiped out as it is, would be nice to see further development in this and other areas take into consideration, the historical value of the area.</p>	<p>The façade has been largely retained in its original state. It is item 23 in Appendix 4.</p>	
p	408	Resident	hbe13	<p>Not sure if these should also be included: Upper floors of southern end of Main Street! Other Victorian Terraces & houses? (eg Beech Groves, Moorland; Lowther, Springfield, Churchfield houses on Lowther Avenue, 9-19 terrace on Aberford Rd, Potty Cottage terrace).</p>		
p	487	LCC	HBE13	<p>HBE13 Non-Designated Heritage Assets: This policy is supported in principle, however a number of the proposed NDHAs are not considered to have heritage value (e.g. the Library and One Stop Centre, the Fire Station, St Armand's Court). The inclusion of such assets in the list may compromise the integrity of the list as a whole, so it is important that the assessment process (Appendix 4) provides a robust justification for all of the identified NDHA.</p> <p>The NDHA assessment at Appendix 4 should provide additional details as to the justification for inclusion in the neighbourhood plan as a NDHA in line with Historic England guidance. The assessment does this to an extent but there remain some gaps. The way that Appendix 4 is set out does not make it clear which selection criteria have been used as a justification for the identification of the NDHA. It is therefore recommended that this assessment is revisited, using Historic England's Local Heritage Listing Advice Note 7 (available from: https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/local-heritage-listing-advice-note7/heag301-local-heritage-listing/).</p> <p>The assessment should clearly show the justification for the selection criteria that have been used in Garforth, and whether there has been any threshold test for inclusion as a NDHA within the Garforth NP. This may include locally specific criteria, for example the importance of a NDHA to the mining history of Garforth. Setting this out within Appendix 4 will ensure that the identification process is open and transparent.</p>	<p>We will reconsider Appendix 4 following the suggestions made and provide a clearer and more robust justification for inclusion.</p>	<p>Reconsider NDHA list with clearer assessment process.</p> <p>Redo map as required</p>

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				As a suggested format, Appendix 4 could introduce the assessment process for NDHA in Garforth, why it was decided to include NDHA within the NP (e.g. there is no Conservation Area but there are a number of locally important heritage sites), then introduce the relevant selection criteria for Garforth. This will help to frame the assessment. For each of the proposed NDHA, there should be a reasoned justification (with supporting evidence) for identification under the terms of the selection criteria. The Conservation Team can help you develop the assessment further after the close of the consultation. The assessment should also reflect 7 consultation responses, including dialogue with asset owners, and any requests not to identify the NDHA within the NP.		
p	488	LCC	HBE13	It would also be helpful for the policy and introductory text to the policy to have a clear statement that the identified NDHA within the policy is not a definitive list of all NDHA within the Garforth Neighbourhood Area, and represents those identified at a point in time. This will help in future if further NDHA are identified, for example through a planning application process or through the Council's work on the Local List.	Thank you for your comment.	Include sentence to this effect in text at start of Policy HBE13
p	611	Resident	HBE13	I would add in addition some historical buildings missed off your list. 1. Garforth HouseTudor House on Barleyhill Road the property now the home of Spectronic Components. I met a lady in 1994 who was born there and her father built it in the early 1900s. She was born there before the Great War. It was the home of Garforth coal merchants in 1935 and the post-war years. It is a substantial building and I wonder what features are retained inside. 2. Barleyhill House on Barleyhill Road has some fine Edwardian glass features. 3. The Victorian house on Lowther Avenue. There are two but one is lost in the Springfield Nursing Home. The other has still many original features and some interesting original outbuildings, sadly a Victorian greenhouse was restored with modern materials a few years back as was the outbuilding and this original solid iron guttering was replaced with modern guttering. Even so the building is a good example of a late Victorian villa.	Thank you for your suggestions. Following advice from Leeds City Council to re-examine the criteria, all existing NDHAs and any new suggested ones will be considered.	Consider any new suggested NDHAS against tightened criteria.
p	643	Resident	HBE13	As the owner of one of the non-designated heritage assets in Garforth i can confirm my support for the Garforth plan in any referendum held.	Thank you for your supportive comment.	
p	665	Residents	HBE13	We have been forwarded a letter and details of the Garforth plan as home owners of... Thank you for submitting details of the proposals for the Garforth area. We have a question regarding the following statement: The land/buildings are proposed to be identified as a non-designated heritage asset within the Plan under Policy HBE13 which means that development proposals affecting the site will need to have regard to the effect of the proposal on the significance of the site.	A response was sent at the time. A synopsis of the main points follows. A link was sent to a Gov.uk website giving advice on planning issues around NDHAS.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>As we are not familiar with a “non-designated heritage asset” we would like further clarification as to what this would mean for us as home owners please.</p> <p>Please can you advise if the “non-designated heritage asset” status would affect existing or future plans to update the property. For example – we expect we will need to repaint the exterior of the property in the next couple of years. We may also wish to change the windows and perhaps within 5 years have a loft conversion to add an additional bedroom in the attic. Would the “non-designated heritage asset” status affect planning permission in any way or restrict use of materials we can use (for example the restrictions that are enforced on renovations of a listed building?) We would very much like further clarification on this if possible please?</p> <p>In addition, we currently let the house and would assume that this would not be affected by the proposed status of the building? Again, would someone be able to clarify this for us please?</p> <p>Whilst we are very much in favour of looking after the heritage of Garforth and preserving historic landmarks, we would need to be assured that this proposal would not affect our use or development of the property in the future.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing from you</p>	<p>It was also pointed out that the policy was intended to protect NDHAs in a proportionate way and that they do not have the same status, and therefore protection, as listed buildings. Specifically, permissions would not preclude changing the widows or renting the property.</p> <p>Other potential changes would be considered by planning on an ad hoc basis.</p> <p>The respondent thanked GNPF for the response.</p>	
p	112	Resident	hbe14	Totally agree.		
p	113	Resident	hbe14	How will we source information about unsympathetic proposals particularly when they do not involve planning permission ? eg window frames, boundary walls.	As far as GNPF is aware only buildings that are listed as designated heritage assets will require permission for alterations. For other buildings it may not be possible to source this information.	
p	266	Resident	hbe14	"Any development proposals should have involved/consulted any relevant local organisations - e.g. the Garforth Historical Society - from the start to ensure that heritage is not an after thought and that the proposals could be used to help foster a sense of history and community within Garforth. Practical everyday use that supports the heritage quality of a heritage asset should be supported so that the asset and our heritage remains in our everyday thoughts and so is not forgotten and left to decay."	Thank you for your suggestion. GNPF feels that the existing wording in HBE 12 +13 is sufficient to help ensure these assets are not lost.	
p	489	LCC	HBE14	HBE14 Heritage at Risk: OK in principle, however it would be beneficial for this policy to identify the heritage assets it applies to, with consideration given to whether it adds any further policy detail beyond Policies HBE12 and HBE13 (or Core Strategy P11). There are no heritage assets on the Council's	Thank you for your suggestion which we will follow.	Delete Policy HBE14

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				Heritage at Risk Register within the Garforth Neighbourhood Area. It may not necessarily be possible to make historic assets significantly sustainable.		
p	32	Resident	HBE1-4	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>It is difficult to support the recommendations made by the GNPF in relation to Housing in Garforth and a number of flaws with the data, interpretation of the data and the conclusions made based on the data are present in the plan.</p> <p>A broader understanding of the variables involved in downsizing and a more demographically representative assessment of Garforth's needs is required and should be reflected in the report.</p> <p>In addition, data supporting larger home developments should not be ignored and the overemphasis on smaller properties should be urgently reviewed.</p>	Please see response to comments made above in p26-30	
p	9	Resident	HBE15	<p>I disagree with policy HBE15 to the extent that it says that gas-fired heating systems will be supported. In my view this commitment is too strong. It would be more appropriate to say that gas-fired heating systems may be supported (based on their merits and the available alternatives).</p> <p>I believe policy HBE15 could be improved by adding support for pre-installed water butts as part of new housing developments.</p>	<p>GNPF agree that gas fired central heating should not be actively supported alongside other energy efficiency measures. It will be deleted from the list.</p> <p>The water butts is a good idea. An extra bullet will be added to the list. Thank you for your suggestions.</p>	<p>Delete penultimate bullet from HBE15 re gas fired central heating.</p> <p>Add, "Provision of water butts where feasible"</p>
p	114	Resident	hbe15	Green policies are of utmost importance.	Thank you	
p	115	Resident	hbe15	All new housing development should have solar panels ect. It should not be an optional extra.	GNPF agree but this will depend on national government policy. Please see list in HBE 15 where photovoltaic panels are included as an aspiration.	
p	116	Resident	hbe15	However LCC core strategy policies need updating to ensure support these policies otherwise developers do not have to comply.	The Local Plan is being updated and a major focus is climate change.	
p	267	Resident	hbe15	We should all support all these and more. Shame on those that vote against this plan	Thank you for your support	
p	268	Resident	hbe15	A brilliant great collection of proposals which need support to the extent to which that they can be funded. They may need greater Government support than is currently the case.	Thank you. GNPF agree that more government support may be required.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	269	Resident	hbe15	The different measures listed should each carry a score and a new development should have an energy efficiency target that must be achieved through a combination of efficiency measure scores	This seems like a good idea and perhaps something you could take up with Leeds City Council as they re-write the Local Plan. There are currently targets set by LCC in its Core Strategy Policy EN1 – Climate Change which you can find online.	
p	270	Resident	hbe15	not all new houses are built with solar panels and those without the roof design isn't built to then take the weight of solar panels. Houses that aren't built with solar panels, the roof should be built to support the homeowner adding solar panels at a later date	The Policy supports the installation of solar panels and it is clearly better to install them at the construction stage.	
p	409	Resident	hbe15	BUT - who fits steel and aluminium windows anymore? Modern A rated uPVC windows and frames have higher thermal efficiency than older uPVC/metal frames. Wood is not necessarily the best option (needs maintenance, can warp, hard to get a really good seal). Not sure why low light transmittance in windows is required, certainly not in winter when good light transmittance in southern windows actually helps heat rooms if solar glass, which keeps heat in, is used!	Thank you for your comments. GNPF will seek further advice on the points regarding wooden frames and light transmittance.	Following advice from LCC, delete references in policy HBE15 to wooden frames and low light transmittance
p	490	LCC	HBE15	HBE15 Energy Efficiency: OK in principle, though “should” would be more appropriate here. The upcoming Local Plan Update seeks to ensure that Local Plan policies are in line with Climate Emergency priorities so these issues may be captured as part of future Local Plan policy. Some of the measures listed may need planning permission, and sometimes may be on Listed Buildings which may not be appropriate so it is important to note that all of the measures may not be supported all of the time. The second paragraph has the line ‘subject to local design and amenity considerations’ so it is recommended that this is added to the first paragraph, so it reads ‘The use of the following measures will be supported, subject to local design and amenity considerations.’	Thanks for your comments. Suggestions will be accepted.	Alter wording in HBE 15 first sentence replacing “must” with “should”. Add “conversions” after “New housing” in first sentence. Move “subject to local design...” to end of first sentence.

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
						Add bullet "retrofitting of existing buildings"
p	603	Development Worker	HBE15	<p>Please note that I am writing not as a resident, but as someone interested in climate and sustainability through personal interest and because of my role as development worker in Garforth in the climate emergency climate action project (CECAP)</p> <p>I fully support the bid for all new developments to be zero carbon. You refer to policies needed to make this happen. What do you think the role of the GNPF might be towards campaigning for this? Without such policies, in which ways do you imagine being able to influence such an outcome in Garforth? Does the GNPF and the neighbourhood plan have any influence on existing housing stock and potential retrofits? Do you imagine that there might be scope for a Garforth-wide approach to retrofitting, given that there is a common type of housing stock across the town? Can you imagine the GNPF having a role in this if so, or does your scope not extend beyond newbuilds? (See https://www.constructionleadershipcouncil.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/CLC-National-Retrofit-Strategy-final-for-consultation.pdf currently under consultation)</p>	<p>The Plan mainly focuses on new developments.</p> <p>The reference to retrofitting in HBE15 refers to existing buildings being retrofitted as development.</p> <p>A Garforth wide approach would be on the back of an LCC or national government push.</p>	
p	617	Resident	HBE15	<p>Page 51- adequate space on new builds between houses and the mandatory use of solar panels on new builds. This is very interesting, since Leeds City Council, forever keen to push and flaunt their "green" credentials, chose not to push for that in the Redrow development on Ninelands Lane. There's very little space between units; there are very few homes with solar panels and there is no cycle path either.</p>	<p>The developers will have met the guidelines set by LCC.</p> <p>Whether the guidelines are sufficient may be a matter of opinion. The Local Plan update is currently in progress and this may have an impact on such guidelines</p>	
p	649	Environment Agency	HBE15+16	<p>Sustainable construction</p> <p>You could also help your community save money through sustainable construction. Neighbourhood planning is an opportunity for communities to encouraging efficient water and waste management systems in new buildings, and use locally sourced wood fuel for heating. You could also help to promote the use of sustainable materials in construction, and encourage energy efficiency measures for new builds. These measures will reduce the cost of construction for developers and help to reduce utility bills for those</p>	<p>Policy HBE 15 lists a number of energy efficiency measures in order to reduce CO2 emissions and save money on utility bills. LCC are currently reviewing the Local Plan with climate change a major focus.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				using the building. This will also help the environment by reducing emissions and improving air quality.		
p	117	Resident	hbe16	Our green credentials will be scrutinised by others	Thank you for your comment.	
p	118	Resident	hbe16	These should be first choice in all situations	Thank you. We agree wherever it is feasible.	
p	119	Resident	hbe16	Yes but how can this be implemented /	As the NP will become part of the Development Plan for Leeds, legislation states that development proposals should be “determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise” – the plan will have statutory weight in the same way that the Core Strategy and other planning policy documents do.	
p	271	Resident	hbe16	National standardisation of recycled and recyclable materials please, like food packaging.	Thank you, but this is not within the scope of neighbourhood planning.	
p	273	Resident	hbe16	"The materials should ideally be already be in circulation. The materials should also be easily able to be repaired, reused or recycled. The use of materials should be not be excessive."		
p	491	LCC	HBE16	HBE16 Materials: OK in principle, though this policy may be better off being combined with Policy HBE15. Consideration should be given to how case officers would balance this against the need to preserve local character as required by the design policies of the plan. It may also be worthwhile giving some consideration to the re-use of materials, so at the end of life of a building the materials are re-used as far as possible, which will help to influence the choice of materials from the outset.	Thank you for your comments. They will be incorporated.	Delete HBE16 and add to bullets in HBE 15. Add bullet on reusing old building materials
p	120	Resident	hbe17	Need to discourage car usage.	The Plan promotes Active Travel – see Policies T1 and T2	Supplementary Planning Document instead of SPD. Add SPD to Glossary

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	121	Resident	hbe17	Where on the development? In my opinion very few people would use this facility on the grounds of security and inconvenience. Houses are being built without a garage or storage facility. Surely it would make better sense for houses to have a garage or storage incorporated?	GNPF is aiming to promote Active Travel by following LCC guidelines.	
p	274	Resident	hbe17	Not just cycle storage, should be more general, a space to accommodate bike/ mobility scooter / Priam with charging point	Thank you for your comment	
p	275	Resident	hbe17	E-bike charging points should be included.	This is something for LCC to consider in their guidelines as they review the Local Plan. Thank you.	
p	358	Resident	hbe17	Brilliant idea!	Thank you.	
p	492	LCC	HBE17	HBE17 Cycle Storage: OK in principle, the reference to SPD guidance is welcomed.	Thank you.	
p	583	Developer	HBE17	With regards to Draft NP Policy HBE17 'Cycle Storage' it is important to note that the policy should reference that where specialist accommodation for older people makes provision for mobility scooters, a lower level of discretionary cycle spaces should be considered. McCarthy Stone's independent research indicated that for residents living within 'Retirement Living' apartments, the cycle ownership rate is 0.0157 (approximately 1 cycle per 63 apartments). Each McCarthy Stone development contains a dedicated cycle and mobility scooter store where a number of cycles can be stored. As this policy does not allow for different forms of accommodation to install cycle parking in accordance with its likely use for a typical retirement housing scheme of 30-40 units this policy would dictate that 60 cycle spaces would need to be provided. This would mean that a large dedicated store of cycles, where they are rarely used would need to be provided at cost to the developer and take up valuable space which could be better utilised. Recommendation: That the policy is revised to reflect the differing requirements of retirement housing i.e. that proposals for such development are considered on a case by case basis	Thank you for pointing this out. We will amend the wording of the policy.	Add "and type" to HBE17 after "the scale..."
p	122	Resident	hbe18	Government grants would assist the purchase of electric cars	Thank you.	
p	123	Resident	hbe18	Who is going to decide that LCC have made a logical decision regarding the standard that should be set or will they be led by the developer?	Standard is in Policy EN 8 of LCC's Core Strategy.	
p	276	Resident	hbe18	Yes, including the supply cable size etc so all cars can be charged simultaneously	Thank you but such technical details are not within the scope of the Plan.	
p	277	Resident	hbe18	Charging points for commercial type vehicles - e.g. post vans - should be considered.	See above comment.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	278	Resident	hbe18	This is a must, there is no rational reason that any developers are still not installing these charge points into new developments.	Please see Policy EN8 of LCC's core strategy. As far GNPF is aware this means one EV charging point per parking space.	
p	493	LCC	HBE18	HBE18 Electric Vehicles: This policy does not go beyond Core Strategy Policy EN8 and therefore may be deleted by an examiner.	Thank you.	
p	124	Resident	hbe19	Dustbin & emergency vehicles need 24 hour access.	Agreed. This is always considered at the planning stage.	
p	125	Resident	hbe19	I support this but don't see how it could be implemented. Houses being built now don't have enough parking. In many instances modern housing developments have garages, if any, too small for a modern car and only one or maximum two parking spaces for even 4 bed houses which isn't realistic.	As the NP will become part of the Development Plan for Leeds, legislation states that development proposals should be "determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise" – the plan will have statutory weight in the same way that the Core Strategy and other planning policy documents do.	
p	126	Resident	hbe19	Given the increasing density of housing the only space provided for car parking is at the front of houses which always impacts on the street scene, so policy wording may need to be stronger	Thank you. GNPF feels the wording is sufficiently strong.	
p	279	Resident	hbe19	Car parking spaces to relate to size of home, more bedrooms more parking spaces. Minimum of 2 parking spaces	GNPF follows LCC guidelines on parking spaces. Active Travel and responding to the Climate emergency are also key aspects of the Plan.	
p	280	Resident	hbe19	"Parking on any part of the pavement / pathway should be banned if possible On-street parking should be carefully considered so that it does not have any adverse impact on safety and the use of road by other road users e.g. cyclists and buses."	Thank you for your comment. The policy aims to reduce the potential adverse impact of car parking.	
p	410	Resident	hbe19	See previous comment about congested claustrophobic new estates packed with cars.	See above	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	494	LCC	HBE19	<p>HBE19 Residential Parking: As mentioned in the comments regarding HBE9, there is an opportunity for schemes to actively discourage car use, which would contribute to the active travel aspirations that feature throughout the draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>The policy could be clarified in terms of what it is trying to achieve. Is it that car parking infrastructure within new housing developments should be designed to minimise the impact on the street scene to maximise space/opportunities for active travel, children's play and greenspace elsewhere in the development (rather than in the car parking infrastructure itself)?</p>	Thank you for your comments. We will adopt your suggestion.	Add to last sentence of HBE 19, "elsewhere in the development".
p	31	Resident	HBE2	<p>Over emphasis on rentals</p> <p>Page 22: There is a need for rented accommodation, especially for young people who are studying locally, e.g. at the performing arts college. Those who are returning from university, or leaving home for the first time, also require suitably priced rental accommodation, which is currently in short supply.</p> <p>Whilst there maybe some demand for rental accommodation for young professionals and a small group of students this unlikely to be large in comparison to the wider housing needs. In addition, both students and young professionals are arguably more likely to house share rather than purchase or rent smaller one-bedroom properties due to the obvious economics. There may be a need for rented accommodation, but its likely this will be for larger houses which puts these groups in competition with families also seeking the same. The short supply therefore is as a direct result of the overall shortage in suitable 3 and 4 bedroom houses rather than smaller accommodation.</p> <p>As the report itself highlights for Garforth, "The majority of homes [were] occupied by young couples and families, many of them moving out of the city". Garforth is defined by its location as a suitable commuting town, close to Leeds, with good schools and amenities. Its by definition characterised by families or those starting families and recommendations to build more rentals, flats or smaller properties appears to run counter to the defining characteristics of the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q34 - What data supports the statement that there is a high demand for rented accommodation from young people aged between 19 and 24? 	<p>GNPF agree with you that much of the demand from students will be for house sharing in larger properties however, the ARC survey states in 3.20, "Agents told us that whilst the private rented sector is relatively small, vacancies are much sought after especially from young professionals." and in 4.9, "In addition, newly forming households are mainly seeking 2-bedroom homes and they are a mixture of private rent and intermediate housing."</p> <p>The wording in this section will be re-examined to stress that the rental sector forms a small portion of the market. Nonetheless, there is data to support the claim.</p>	Reword comments on P.22 re renting to reflect the small proportion of the market this represents.
p	69	Resident	hbe2	<p>We need to grow all aspects of a community, not just housing stock. The people of the community are best placed to understand it's needs. This</p>	Thank you for your comment.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				applies to all age groups even if they are not as active in local issues at this time. I do not believe HBE1 and HBE2 contradict each other.		
p	70	Resident	hbe2	Not enough single units available	Thank you for your comment. The evidence suggests there is not a great demand for 1 bedroom units. Policy HBE1 will be altered to reflect this.	
p	71	Resident	hbe2	Houses, bungalows and flats should have green spaces/gardens and be set back from the public spaces or pavements.	Policies HBE 8 and 9 deal with design issues. Please see them for more detail.	
p	72	Resident	hbe2	What is right-sizing?	The phrase means moving from one's current accommodation into accommodation that is more suitable for the stage of life and family / individual circumstances one is now in.	Add definition to Glossary.
p	73	Resident	hbe2	up to date local evidence of needs will probably need additional updating in as a result of the Covid pandemic and the increase numbers of people working from home who will require additional space. It is well recognised that homes have become smaller, however there are daily applications from Garforth residents to enlarge their premises.	GNPF agree that up to date evidence (at the time) of local need will be required.	
p	231	Resident	hbe2	Garforth has some nice self builds and the opportunity for more people to do the same would be fantastic.	The household survey carried out by GNPF and the ARC4 survey did not demonstrate much call for self build. However, there are opportunities for people to build on land they already occupy and there are several examples of this in Garforth.	
p	232	Resident	hbe2	Very sensible	Thank you	
p	233	Resident	hbe2	Right sizing is as much about equity release as manageable homes. Therefore smaller homes must be cheaper homes. The housing proposed for the cricket field is not cheap. Might meet the manageable criteria but fails equity release criteria.	Right sizing is not only about downsizing. Please see definition in Glossary.	
p	391	Resident	hbe2	More bungalows are badly needed.	Thank you for your support.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	392	Resident	hbe2	It's pointless building homes when the infrastructure cannot support the housing already here. Surely more school places for all ages, more facilities and more public transport options should be provided	One of the key aspects of the Plan is to highlight any shortfall in infrastructure and point out the need for infrastructure commensurate with development.	
p	476	LCC	HBE2	HBE2 Housing Type: OK in principle, but the policy would have more teeth if it were more specific in terms of requiring a mix of house types to be provided (including an evidence-based justification), rather than simply supporting a mix of house types. Again, proportionality would be necessary here.	Thank you for your comment. Not sure that GNPF can insist on a particular mix but relying on most up-to-date data at the time of any application could provide more specifics of need.	Add the words "in particular" to HBE 2 at start of second sentence. Consider possibility of amalgamating HBE1 and HBE2.
p	21	Resident	HBE2+4	<p>Downsizing</p> <p>The Garforth Plan seems to have been built on a general assumption that more two-bedroom properties will encourage downsizing for older residents. However, this assumption is not supported by the data presented, which appears to have been selectively interpreted to justify this conclusion. The report highlights that "the issue for many of the older people is finding suitable accommodation to downsize into, as there is a lack of smaller homes and flats" whilst this might be logically correct the solution to this problem is far from simple and factors such as financial, emotional and health variables play an important role in a decision to downsize.</p> <p>The assumption that there will be a large enough proportion of the older generation wanting to downsize is the basic crux of the housing plan for Garforth. There is however questionable evidence to support the fact that simply building more 1 or 2 bedroom properties will see a corresponding increase in downsizers.</p> <p>The Garforth Plan makes the assumption that because of the larger volume of over 60s, Garforth would have to build a large volume of attractive and affordable 1 and 2 bedroom properties and bungalows. However, given the current housing market, business models and policies in play with little incentive for either developers or builders to provide suitable accommodation, the consequences of GNPF house building recommendations for Garforth may ultimately be detrimental for the entire community.</p> <p>Whilst one scenario assumes that a large number of retirees living locally downsize into newly built properties and free up the housing stock allowing</p>	<p>GNPF would not agree that the Plan is "built on the assumption that more 2 bedroom properties will encourage downsizing".</p> <p>The case for downsizing is based on a number of factors. The CASS article highlights the following, "There is increasing under-occupation of the existing housing stock. There is also a chronic shortage of suitable accommodation for older households to downsize into. This constricts the supply of homes, especially for families, with knock-on effects right through the housing ladder. The potential exists to release thousands of homes</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>more young families to get on the property ladder. Another scenario is that the newly built one and two bedroom homes become unaffordable for local residents due to high demand. The local residents have little incentive or wouldn't have downsized sized anyway and the new builds attract people downsizing from larger sized properties in the surrounding areas, which actually adds to the problem of an ageing population in Garforth.</p>	<p>each year for younger purchasers, releasing funds for older people and enabling them to move to more appropriate accommodation." The ARC survey states in Future Housing Requirements that, "16% of the requirement is for 3-bedroom bungalows which, if provided, would release larger homes to the market."</p> <p>The GNPF Household Survey found that the 2 main reasons for people moving were setting up home (25%) and downsizing (22%).</p>	
p	22	Resident	HBE2+4	<p>It would be reasonable to assume that based on the Housing Needs between 5.5% and 11% of people are considering downsizing over the next ten years. This is in line with the findings from the CASS report which reverences the 7% of people who do actually downsize.</p> <p>The over 60s make up 40% of the entire Garforth population which would be around 7,000 people. This results in around 350 to 700 people merely considering downsizing in the next ten years. Many of these will be couples seeking one property which reduces the numbers even further. Many will only ever 'consider' downsizing and never actually do it.</p> <p>Irrespective, over the next ten years an optimistic figure would be around 35 to 70 people per year actually downsizing, which could be accounted for through the natural attrition of the housing market and negate the need to build a large volume of 1- and 2-bedroom properties.</p> <p>Even with the over 60's the ARC survey highlights the fact that for Garforth, "The majority of residents who responded aged 65 and over, stated that they did not want to move within the next 5 years (85.0%), the rest (14.5%) stated that they would like to move but were unable to."</p> <p>These numbers are not significant enough to justify the recommendations in the report that more two-bedroom houses need to be built for older people.</p> <p>Q19 – Has the GPNF considered how it will incentivise under occupied home owners to actually downsize?</p>	<p>Although the figure of 7% you quote from the CASS report is accurate, the next sentence in the report states</p> <p>" The latest edition of Legal & General's Last Time Buyers Report argues that 26% of older households are amenable to downsizing, affecting 3.1m properties."</p> <p>The reasons given for not doing it are lack of suitable properties and price.</p> <p>GNPF hopes that the existence of a wider range of suitable options locally will enable older people who wish to downsize to do so. There is</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>Q20 – Has the GPNF considered a scenario of retirees moving from outside of Garforth and what would it recommend in dealing with this?</p> <p>A more worrying scenario is that property developers see the recommendations in this report as a justification to build a large volume of expensive smaller one or two bedroom properties which ultimately will do more damage to Garforth by putting a larger strain on infrastructure and lead to wider issues.</p> <p>Q21 – Has the GPNF considered the implications of a larger volume of people moving into smaller homes in Garforth?</p>	<p>clearly a contradiction between the data from the ARC report and the GNPF Household survey.</p> <p>The NP is not promoting housing development</p> <p>The intention of the Policies is to provide a range of homes of the right type in the right numbers to meet identified housing need in the event of development applications being submitted.</p>	
p	23	Resident	HBE2+4	<p>Low Actual Volume of Downsizers</p> <p>The Housing Survey 2018 looked at people considering moving out of their homes. Of the 41% stating they expect to move out within the next ten years, estimated at 144 respondents based on a survey size of 360 respondents, a subset of 22.5% explicitly stated they were considering “downsizing to a smaller home”. This is a sample size of 32 people out of 360 respondents in survey weighted towards over 60s which means its probably somewhat more significant in terms of its representation of this groups views.</p> <p>The more surprising conclusion that should be drawn here is that the number is so low, roughly 11% of the total survey population! If nearly 50% of those considering downsizing, are also considering a move away from Garforth the number looking to move in Garforth would be even lower at 5.5%.</p> <p>It would be reasonable to assume that based on the Housing Needs between 5.5% and 11% of people are considering downsizing over the next ten years. This is in line with the findings from the CASS report which reverences the 7% of people who do actually downsize.</p> <p>The over 60s make up 40% of the entire Garforth population which would be around 7,000 people. This results in around 350 to 700 people merely considering downsizing in the next ten years. Many of these will be couples seeking one property which reduces the numbers even further. Many will only ever ‘consider’ downsizing and never actually do it. Irrespective, over the next ten years an optimistic figure would be around 35 to 70 people per year actually downsizing, which could be accounted for through the natural attrition of the housing market and negate the need to build a large volume of 1- and 2-bedroom properties. Even with the over 60’s the ARC survey highlights the fact that for Garforth, “The majority of residents who responded aged 65 and</p>	<p>Your calculations are interesting and could lead to the conclusion that every year there will be between 35 and 70 people seeking to downsize within Garforth.</p> <p>The question , then, is are there currently sufficient existing properties of the right kind and price available for them? That is quite difficult to determine. The ARC survey states that 407 older person households wanted to move but could not – 50% stated affordability as the problem, 25% a lack of suitable accommodation.</p> <p>The CASS report states in its Conclusions that,”... far too few homes are being built that cater for older people. “</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>over, stated that they did not want to move within the next 5 years (85.0%), the rest (14.5%) stated that they would like to move but were unable to.”</p> <p>These numbers are not significant enough to justify the recommendations in the report that more two-bedroom houses need to be built for older people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q22 – Is there data that supports the recommendation that only 1 or 2 bedroom properties in Garforth should be supported? • Q23 – A report of this nature should address the number of homes required. How many 1 and 2 bedroom properties does the GNPF recommend are built or will be supported? 	<p>GNPF , as already stated, is looking again at the policy recommendation surrounding 1 bedroom properties.</p> <p>Precise numbers are not given as the Plan’s life time is 13 years and situations could alter; that is why ”up to date local evidence of need” is the phrase used in the policies.</p>	
p	659	Resident	HBE2+4	<p>Thank you for your reply Chris. Just one of the comments made around older people not everyone wants to downsize and this is personal choice not a requirement.</p> <p>Lots of positive in the plan though</p>	<p>The Plan does not suggest people should be pressurised into downsizing but rather there should be opportunities in Garforth for people to right size, if they wish.</p>	
p	658	Resident	HBE2+4 Replied already	<p>I have had a look at the Garforth plan and wonder why no consideration has been given to the needs of housing for the many elderly people in the local community.</p> <p>What happened to the proposed McCarthy and Stone development in Church Lane?</p> <p>There is very little over 60’s housing in the area and a large number of oldies are wanting to move down from large family homes but finding there is very little suitable accommodation.</p> <p>Please give this some consideration</p>	<p>Policy HBE 4 specifically looks at the needs of older people. The Church lane development is still at the planning stage as far as GNPF is aware.</p>	
p	602	Resident	HBE2+4 Written reply	<p>On the face of it I can understand the reason behind setting up of this group. The of the comments in your plan suggest people over 60 are hanging on to larger houses than needed. Considering I have lived in this house for many years I don’t think it is appropriate for others to comment on my living needs. I bought my property and will hopefully remain her for many years . Please could you advise how many are in this GNPF and if you were elected and by whom.</p>	<p>The reply sent at the time explained in detail how the Forum was set up and who is eligible to join. It also explained how the Plan is being drafted. Reassurance was given that no one is being forced to downsize, rather the policy is designed to offer</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					more suitable accommodation for older people.	
p	127	Resident	hbe20fincom	Again all policies are good however it is the ability of the planning officers to implement that is of concern.	As the NP will become part of the Development Plan for Leeds, legislation states that development proposals should be “determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise” – the plan will have statutory weight in the same way that the Core Strategy and other planning policy documents do.	
p	281	Resident	hbe20fincom	Excellent plan.	Thank you	
p	282	Resident	hbe20fincom	A lot of first class work has gone into the survey of current conditions and then converting those current conditions into a set of practical proposals for the future. They will need development and alteration as more appropriate technological innovations are developed and as climate change begins to alter our lives even more than is the case at present. Their implementation and funding will probably take many years but it is great to see the Neighbourhood Plan making a start.	Thank you for you support. The intention is to keep the Plan under review in the years ahead.	
p	411	Resident	hbe20fincom	Do we need any more housing estates in garforth?	There are no proposals in LCC’s current Site Allocation Plan for any more housing estates. The Neighbourhood Plan is not putting forward any sites for development.	
p	17	Resident	HBE3	Inconsistent use of the term ‘affordable’ home The term affordable homes is used somewhat inconsistently throughout the report and specifically within the Housing Survey in which respondents were asked their opinions. In the context of town planning an ‘affordable’ home has a very specific legal definition which differs from the general use of the term. Affordability, in general terms, can be defined as the ability for an individual to pay the rent or mortgage without being forced to cut back on essentials or falling into debt.	It is true that the term affordable housing was not clearly defined in the housing needs survey. It is likely that there was a level of ambiguity as you state, although the overall view that there needs	Add “young people” definition to Glossary.

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>The majority of affordable housing built today is classed as affordable rent housing and shared ownership housing. When seeking responses as part of the survey it needs to be stated very clearly in which context affordability is being used to avoid ambiguity.</p> <p>The Housing Needs Survey 2018 asked the following question “Is there a need for more age-related affordable housing for the young in Garforth?”. This question is a leading question as it neither defines what is meant by the term affordable or what age groups are categorised as young. The majority of respondents are aged over 60 so it can be safely assumed that young could be any age from 18-59. It's largely impossible to disagree that housing should be more affordable but as to which groups and the nature of affordability in terms of the income profile of Garforth is also left massively open to interpretation.</p> <p>Q14 – Was the term ‘affordable housing’ defined clearly in the Housing Needs Survey?</p> <p>Q15 – When ‘affordability’ or ‘affordable’ is referenced within the report can the GNPF confirm the term is being used consistently?</p> <p>Erroneous ‘affordable’ housing data</p> <p>Page 25: However, 129 affordable housing units out of a total of 1474 units falls way below what is needed to address the housing issues in the town.</p> <p>Q16 – It's not clear what the source of the 1474 unit requirements is, could you confirm the source for this?</p>	<p>to be more housing which younger people can buy/rent is still valid. It is improbable that respondents would see young people as anyone between 18 and 59. GNPF views young people as those between 18 and 35.</p> <p>Within the Plan the term affordable housing is defined in the Glossary and the use in the text and policies is the specific definition for planning purposes.</p> <p>The Housing Mix Analysis (1974-2020) states that 1474 houses and flats were given planning permission.</p>	
p	74	Resident	hbe3	Again not in direct opposition to 1,2	Thank you	
p	75	Resident	hbe3	Builders need to comply	This will depend on LCC planning decisions.	
p	76	Resident	hbe3	That's fine as long as the housing is made available to people already living in Garforth area. The present system has Garforth people being offered accommodation in Seacroft and vice versa.	This is not within the remit of the Plan.	
p	77	Resident	hbe3	However there is no obligation for developers and LCC probably cannot insist to build higher proportion of of 1 bed homes let alone more that 15% of affordable.	LCC's Core Strategy Policy H4 talks about housing mix and sets targets for that mix.	
p	234	Resident	hbe3	Just some concerns that too many smaller homes may adversely affect the family friendly nature of the area. I fully appreciate that smaller homes are needed to help young people get onto the property ladder but larger homes amongst the starter homes should not be prevented.	GNPF agree that a range of housing will be required for people at different stages of their lives. Policy HBE1 is to be reworded to more accurately reflect this.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	235	Resident	hbe3	The only truly affordable housing in Garforth for older residents is at Garforth Cliff park. Perhaps we need more of this type of housing, or the prefabs built after the war	A definition of affordable housing is given in the Glossary.	
p	393	Resident	hbe3	Home construction companies prefer to build larger homes which bring in more money, if they can persuaded to stick to supplying what they are asked, that would be great but I feel subsidies would be required to entice builders	This may well be true but LCC's Core Strategy Policy H4 talks about the housing mix they want to see.	
p	394	Resident	hbe3	The statement 'not feasible' is open to interpretation - this could be exploited by building companies who want to build 'luxury developments' - better that, say, where 1-3 houses are to be built should this be applicable.	Please refer to LCC Core Strategy policy H5 which talks about affordable housing numbers required on "major developments" i.e. developments of 10 or more dwellings.,	
p	477	LCC	HBE3	HBE3 Affordable Housing: OK in principle, the reference to local affordable housing needs is welcomed. There is a risk in seeking to ring-fence Affordable Housing contributions for spend within the neighbourhood area, as Section 106 Agreements typically have a 'claw-back' option if the funds are not spent. It would not be beneficial for the Council to have to return AH monies that could be spent elsewhere in the city because Garforth doesn't have a specific project that the monies could be spent on.	Thank you we will adapt the wording	In HBE 3 sentence 2, after "housing" add "ideally" and "Plan" after "Neighbourhood"
p	78	Resident	hbe4	Older support will be provided by increased suitable housing stock. Sheltered housing could be addressed separately.	Thank you for your comment.	
p	79	Resident	hbe4	Needs change year to year	It is not possible to pre-empt all needs bit the policy offers a range of housing types to suit different needs in the event that any development were to take place.	
p	80	Resident	hbe4	But please don't build on the green spaces.	There are currently ne plans to build on green spaces. GNPF, in its Plan, is attempting to safeguard as many as possible.	
p	81	Resident	hbe4	Where is all this going to go if it happens? We have no space left in Garforth.	The ideal would be for any new building that is approved	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					to be on suitable brown field sites.	
p	82	Resident	hbe4	How do we define sheltered, retirement or extra care housing ? A retirement application has been proposed which is very unpopular in Garforth. We have opposed its development. Will this policy mean that we should now support it?	Thank you for this comment. We will provide definitions in the Glossary. GNPF does not support development on designated green spaces, such as the cricket field.	Add definitions of “sheltered, retirement living and extra care housing” to Glossary
p	236	Resident	hbe4	Ideally without building on the only small patches of open space left in the town (cricket club church lane)	Please see above comment.	
p	237	Resident	hbe4	Plus well designed low cost lodges" in communities, like Garforth Cliff, with facilities	Retirement living includes this type of accommodation.	
p	238	Resident	hbe4	There should also be support for new homes that meet the needs of people with the wildest range of disabilities and health conditions - ranging from physical to learning to "hidden" to people with a combination of different conditions. Also all homes should be able to be easily adapted for different life stages / events so that remaining in their existing home is an option for as many people as possible if they chose to do so. All new developments/homes should aim to be as easy to access/live in as possible to enable as wide a range of people to live in them/visit them - eg. older / disabled people.	Whilst this is a worthy aspiration, GNPF is constrained by current legislation. In its Core Strategy Leeds City Council has expressed broad support for the idea of “ lifetime homes” in (5.2.39) and the idea of new housing being built to the latest accessible housing design standards. The GNPF Plan is in broad conformity with LCC’s Core Strategy. See Core Strategy Policy H10.	
p	356	Resident	hbe4	Bungalows are really not an efficient use of space. Otherwise ok	Thank you.	
p	395	Resident	hbe4	More bungalows are badly needed.	Thank you.	
p	396	Resident	hbe4	Where in garforth will these be built? Surely they'd need to be near shops & other facilities such as medical etc - in which case, where could they be built? The cricket field on church lane has been put forward but this would increase traffic on an already busy and narrow road.	If any were built , ideally it would be on a suitable brown filed site.	
p	478	LCC	HBE4	HBE4 Homes for Older People: OK in principle. Level access is a requirement for all new build homes under Part M4(1) of the Building Regulations but the reiteration of the requirement here is welcomed.	Thank you.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	582	Developer	HBE4	<p>This is a representation made on behalf of my client McCarthy Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the consultation papers for the aforementioned document. As the market leader in the provision of retirement housing for sale and rent to the elderly, McCarthy Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd considers that with its extensive experience in providing development of this nature it is well placed to provide informed comments on the aforementioned consultation, insofar as it affects or relates to housing for the elderly.</p> <p>In particular, we would like to express our support, in general terms, for Draft Neighbourhood Plan (Draft NP) Policy HBE4 'Homes for Older People' which incorporates support for various forms of accommodation for older people including bungalows and level access flats; Sheltered housing; Retirement living; or Extra care housing. The inclusion of such a policy is suitable given the need for this type of accommodation in the town.</p>	Thank you for your comments. A full and detailed response has already been provided above.	
p	642	Berkeley Leisure Group	HBE4	<p>I am providing comments on the draft Neighbourhood Plan as Planning Advisor for the Berkeley Leisure Group Ltd who own the Cliff Top mobile park and adjoining open land. It is noted in the Plan that proposals for the development of new homes across a range of types and tenures to meet the needs of older people will be supported. The Plan then lists a range of accommodation types but no mention is made of the contribution that mobile homes can make to meeting the needs of older people. The Company own 51 mobile home parks specialising in providing affordable accommodation for older people. This enables older people to downsize thus freeing up houses for younger age groups. The mobile homes are single storey, low maintenance with manageable gardens and provide a sense of community and safety for older people. I would ask therefore that you lend your support in the Plan to this form of accommodation in the Plan area.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The accommodation type you offer is included in our definition of "retirement homes" given in the Glossary	Mobile homes included in definition of retirement living in Glossary.
p	83	Resident	hbe5	<p>New developments to "drip-feed" surface water to water system, meaning large tanks to be installed.</p>	Please see policy HBE6 regarding attenuation tanks. Also LCC Core Strategy policy EN5 , Managing Flood Risk	
p	84	Resident	hbe5	<p>Definitely support reduction of surface water causing flooding.</p>	Thank you	
p	85	Resident	hbe5	<p>I think "where feasible" should be omitted and substituted with "mandatory" or developers will avoid doing it.</p>	It may not be possible in every case to insist on this e.g. flats with communal drainage.	
p	239	Resident	hbe5	<p>Ongoing flooding issues have not been resolved</p>	The Plan is seeking to minimise the problems caused by rainfall. Garforth Flood	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					Group is still active and looking into these issues.	
p	240	Resident	hbe5	New developments should also include the largest water storage system that is possible so that as much rainwater and/or grey water can be used/reused thus saving mains drinking water and reducing the amount of water that goes into the drainage/sewage system. This will help in future extreme weather events that could cause droughts or floods.	Thank you for your comments. Recycling water is clearly important in helping to mitigate climate change. GNPF hope that, as systems for this purpose are improved and become more widespread, they will eventually be a feature of all new builds.	
p	397	Resident	hbe5	All new houses should incorporate water butt systems from roofs.	Thank you, GNPF will adapt the Policy to include this.	ADD to HBE5 2 nd sentence, "Integrated water butts recommended , where feasible"
p	479	LCC	HBE5	HBE5 Use of Water: The justification for separate water systems is understood however this is not appropriate in every case, therefore the inclusion of 'where feasible' is supported.	Thank you. GNPF will change the Policy accordingly.	Add "where feasible" after end of HBE5
p	645	Environment Agency	HBE5-7	<p>Flood Risk</p> <p>I note that the area has a risk of flooding.</p> <p>We would like to see flood risk policies and that minimising the impact of flooding referred to in an 'Environmental' section. This is a key sustainability issue and will be exacerbated in the future due to climate change.</p> <p>In terms of both policy and site selection, flood risk should be a major consideration in your plan. In drafting your flood risk policy, you should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasise that inappropriate development will not be considered acceptable in areas of high flood risk. • Highlight, where necessary, the need to undertake the sequential and exception tests. • Promote a sequential approach to development layout, to ensure the highest vulnerability development is located in areas at lowest flood risk. • Address the potential impacts of climate change on flood risk. • Describe what is expected of developers in terms of surface water run-off rates (for both brownfield and Greenfield sites) and sustainable drainage systems. • Where possible, expect development to result in a betterment to the existing 	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The Plan refers to the issue of climate change as an existential threat and flooding as part of this.</p> <p>Although Garforth is not a high risk flood area we have included policies regarding attenuation tanks and slowing down run offs. We also</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>flood risk situation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that new development does not increase flood risk to others <p>A sequential approach to flood risk will also need to be taken when allocating sites.</p> <p>New development proposals should be encouraged to contribute either financially or through physical works to reduce the flood risk to the wider village. This would require a clear understanding of what the flood risk reduction strategy is. This should be reflected in this section/policy.</p>	<p>recommend the inclusion of blue / green SUDS.</p> <p>In addition, the run off rates from developments in the Lyn Dyke catchment area are prescribed.</p>	
p	646	Environment Agency	HBE5-7	<p>Surface Water</p> <p>The Lead Local Flood Authority is now the responsible authority for commenting on the surface water drainage arrangements. We therefore recommend you consult your LLFA regarding the proposed management of surface water within the Plan.</p> <p>Water quality</p> <p>Proper management is important to protect water quality, both for groundwater and surface water resources.</p> <p>Drainage misconnections can occur in new developments, redevelopments, extensions or through refurbishment. Developers must ensure that they do not connect any foul drainage (including sinks, showers, washing machine/dishwasher outlets and toilets) to a surface water sewer, as this can send polluted water into watercourses. Similarly, developers should ensure that they do not connect surface water drainage (e.g. roof gutter downpipes) into foul sewers as this can cause overloading of the foul sewer during heavy rainfall.</p> <p>Polluted surface water flows from areas like car parks or service yards should always have sufficient pollution prevention measures in place to ensure the protection of groundwater and watercourses from specific pollutants like petrol (hydrocarbons) and suspended solids. Developers should follow appropriate pollution prevention guidance when designing formal drainage for large areas of hardstanding.</p> <p>Ideally, applicants should introduce more 'surface' or 'green' drainage solutions to aid improvements in water quality, such as swales along hardstanding boundaries, or a more advanced reed bed system for larger sites. These solutions are easier to access and maintain than engineered solutions like petrol/oil interceptors, which require regular maintenance to ensure they operate correctly.</p> <p>We would welcome a policy which requires a net gain in biodiversity through all development,</p>	<p>Policy HBE 5 requests separate surface water and sewage systems in any new development.</p> <p>Policy HBE6 asks that development proposals include filtration systems and natural features to break down pollutants wherever possible. Moreover, hardstanding should be permeable wherever possible.</p>	
p	647	Environment Agency	HBE5-7	<p>River restoration</p> <p>We would welcome the inclusion of a specific river policy, addressing the</p>		

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				<p>following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum of 8 metre (m) buffer zones for all watercourses measured from bank top to provide an effective and valuable river corridor and improve habitat connectivity. A 5m buffer zone for ponds would also help to protect their wildlife value and ensure that the value of the adjacent terrestrial habitat is protected. • Development proposals to help achieve and deliver WFD objectives. Examples of the types of improvements that we may expect developers to make are: removal of obstructions (e.g. weirs), de-culverting, regrading banks to a more natural profile, improving in-channel habitat, reduce levels of shade (e.g. tree thinning) to allow aquatic vegetation to establish, etc. Proposals which fail to take opportunities to restore and improve rivers should be refused. If this is not possible, then financial or land contributions towards the restoration of rivers should be required. • River corridors are very sensitive to lighting and rivers and their 8m buffer zones (as a minimum) should remain/be designed to be intrinsically dark i.e. Lux levels of 0-2. <p>It may be useful to include ownership information details for landowners, applicants or developers who have a watercourse running through or adjacent to their site. Many people believe that the Environment Agency own 'main rivers' which is not the case. Whilst we hold permissive powers to carry out maintenance on main rivers, the site owner is the 'riparian owner' of the stretch of watercourse running through their site (whole channel) or adjacent to their site (up to the centre line of the channel) – and this includes culverted watercourses. Our 'Living on the Edge' publication provides important guidance for riverside owners.</p>		
p	648	Environment Agency	HBE5-7	<p>Applicants should remove watercourses from existing culverts where this is feasible. This will help to reduce flood risk from blocked or collapsed culverts, and open channels are significantly easier for the landowner to maintain. Culverts that cause blockages of the watercourse are the responsibility of the owner to repair. Additionally, we will usually object to planning applications that propose new culverts.</p> <p>Your plan policy should also provide details of 'buffer zones' that are left adjacent to watercourses. We will always ask developers to maintain an undeveloped, Naturalised, 8 metre buffer zone adjacent to main rivers. We ask that applicants do not include any structures such as fencing or footpaths within the buffer zone as this could increase flood risk - through the inclusion of close-board fencing for example. Any works or structures that applicants intend within 8m of a main river will require a flood defence consent from us, which is separate from and in addition to any planning permission granted.</p>		

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	86	Resident	hbe6	Also safeguard vital water stocks	Thank you.	
p	87	Resident	hbe6	Should be ponds in wildlife areas.	This aspiration is included within the overall remit of GSRE 10.	
p	88	Resident	hbe6	Application reports all suggest that the site is not within flood risk zones, however Garforth continues to experience surface water flooding.	That concern is why the Plan includes policies around water management.	
p	241	Resident	hbe6	Natural water filtration features -such as reed beds - should be used as much as possible. This will also provide benefits for flora and fauna, and space for people to spend time in nature. All areas of hard standing should be fully permeable if possible. There should also be as much natural surfaces as possible eg. grass."	Thank you for your comment. We are altering HBE 6 to insert a preference for natural methods such as ponds and swales. GNPF also agree with your comment on permeable surfaces and will add wording accordingly.	ADD to HBE6 "In addition hard standing should be permeable, wherever possible."
p	357	Resident	hbe6	People should be prevented from concreting over their gardens	Thank you	
p	398	Resident	hbe6	Essential in Garforth which suffers from surface water (pluvial) flooding. Applications must be double checked for accuracy as many applications currently ignore culverted waterways (and even open streams!) and seem to get away with denying localised flooding!	Thank you.	
p	480	LCC	HBE6	HBE6 Drainage Systems: Suggest the reference to attenuation tanks/areas is changed to reflect a preference for open water attenuation such as ponds and swales which have a biodiversity value and can have an amenity value, unlike tanks which can sterilise the land above. It should be clarified that this policy applies to new housing/employment development rather than all development proposals (e.g. a change of use, extension, etc.)	Thank you, we will adopt your suggested wording.	HBE 6 insert ""open water attenuation, such as ponds and swales" instead of "attenuation tanks" After "natural features" add "e.g. reedbeds" "New employment / housing development"

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
						proposal” at start of HBE6.
p	89	Resident	hbe7	It is in the interests of all parties to consider this.	Thank you	
p	92	Resident	hbe7	Page 31 quotes ' The frequency of once in a lifetime weather events is increasing' so is the flow rate described above sufficient ?		No change needed other than simplifying policy wording
p	243	Resident	hbe7	This policy needs to be explained with maps/diagrams/graphs to make it easier to understand.		Simplify policy wording following advice from Garforth Flood Group
p	399	Resident	hbe7	In theory, yes I support this. How will it be implemented properly and who will monitor it?	As the NP will become part of the Development Plan for Leeds, legislation states that development proposals should be “determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise” – the plan will have statutory weight in the same way that the Core Strategy and other planning policy documents do.	
p	400	Resident	hbe7	It is essential that applications acknowledge and respect the impact of surface water discharge into eg the Lin Dyke further downstream which affects flooding in other villages/towns.	Thank you.	
p	481	LCC	HBE7	HBE7 Lin Dyke Catchment: It is acknowledged that previous informal comments from flood risk management have been taken into account and therefore we have no further comment to make on this policy.	Thank you	
p	93	Resident	hbe8	Public services as well, schools, medical.	Thank you for your comment. Major developments are for 10 houses or more.	
p	94	Resident	hbe8	Aim to minimise traffic pollution. Increase amenities & green alternatives	Thank you.	
p	95	Resident	hbe8	Houses are already small that's why people are converting garages and parking on the street. Parking for 2 cars per household no longer works.	Major developments are those with more than 10 houses.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
				Where are the recreation areas going to be if all this development takes place? What is "public realm?"	Developers will decide on house sizes in line with government legislation. Designated green spaces are intended to safeguard green spaces from development. See GSRE1. Public realm is defined in the glossary but broadly relates to all spaces between buildings to which the public has access.	
p	96	Resident	hbe8	How are these principles to be implemented in Garforth ? Greater densities may not minimise distances to nor proximity for recreation . Does the mixed land use just refer to amenities or could it be interpreted as employment/ offices etc?	As the NP will become part of the Development Plan for Leeds, legislation states that development proposals should be “determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise” – the plan will have statutory weight in the same way that the Core Strategy and other planning policy documents do. Greater densities would, however, increase the number of people within close proximity. Yes it could be interpreted in that way.	
p	244	Resident	hbe8	Strongly agree with this, all points should always be promoted	Thank you	
p	245	Resident	hbe8	Yes I like this policy.	Thank you	
p	246	Resident	hbe8	And every development within 20 minutes walk of Main Street otherwise it's back into the car isn't it.	The Plan is in favour of active travel and promotes the idea of 20 minute neighbourhoods.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	247	Resident	hbe8	"There should be provision for cycling and scooting around neighbourhoods - especially for children, older people and disabled people. All homes should have access to some kind of outside space and nature. There should be spaces for the neighbourhood to come together for a broad range of activities eg. kids playing football, older people chatting, a street party etc. etc. Regular street closures to take over the streets from cars to enable some activities - such as those above - should also be an option."	The Plan aligns with your aspirations.	
p	401	Resident	hbe8	If this would be adhered to, I'd be amazed.	As the NP will become part of the Development Plan for Leeds, legislation states that development proposals should be "determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise" – the plan will have statutory weight in the same way that the Core Strategy and other planning policy documents do.	
p	482	LCC	HBE8	HBE8 Healthy Planning Principles: These principles are supported, though it may not be possible to integrate them all into all new major housing developments, so the use of 'have regard to' is welcomed. For example, it may not be appropriate for smaller housing developments to include a mix of uses. Perhaps this could be clarified that there should be a mix of uses at the neighbourhood scale?	Thank you.	Alter wording of HBE8. Add, "as appropriate" after 1b
p	97	Resident	hbe9	Materials should be sympathetic to local environment	Thank you.	
p	98	Resident	hbe9	If police HBE8 is followed there will be no spaces between buildings or green space. Developers in their proposals offer a small amount of green area as if they are giving Garforth a bonus when what they are actually doing is taking away over 90% of the green space that is already there by building on it..	The Plan seeks to protect green spaces by having them designated, see GSRE1. Brown filed development is preferred whenever possible.	
p	99	Resident	hbe9	How will the character of the locality interpreted by planning officers?	GNPF can not determine how planning officers will interpret policies but the intention of the Plan is to safeguard the	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					nature and character of the town.	
p	248	Resident	hbe9	Yes- assuming these criteria agree with best practice in the new housing industry.	Thank you.	
p	249	Resident	hbe9	Spaces between buildings listed twice	Thank you for your helpful comment. We will amend.	Delete(c) in HBE9
p	250	Resident	hbe9	Should have garden space to extend the property. This is a feature of Garforth homes	This is not within the scope of the Plan.	
p	251	Resident	hbe9	should be garages big enough to fit cars and driveways too. a front garden. wider pavements to support tree lined streets or small patches of lawn included in designs would be wonderful	GNPF agree.	
p	252	Resident	hbe9	The environment should always be a key consideration.	GNPF agree, it is a major feature of the Plan	
p	403	Resident	hbe9	Pack them in' housing estates cause car-packed, claustrophobic roads, causing parking and access issues. Decent-sized gardens and green spaces are needed for mentally & physically healthy residents.	Compact does not imply crowded, rather the idea is to make places more accessible and reduce car usage by facilitating active travel.	
p	483	LCC	HBE9	HBE9 Design: Page 34 'Streetscape design' could go further, such as encouraging schemes to actively deter car ownership (e.g. car clubs, parking on periphery of development instead of outside front doors to encourage walking). Active travel should be emphasised in the general design policy and cross referenced to Transport section where the case for reduction in car usage is so well made (page 76). Whilst a general design policy is welcome as it sets the context for the subsequent Character Area policy (HBE10), the policy does not go beyond existing Core Strategy Policy P10, and therefore may be deleted by an examiner. Criteria c) 'spaces between buildings' is repeated from criteria a).	Thanks for your comment . We will add something to that section. Thanks for the comment on criterion (c). We have deleted.	Add to text on P.34 Add to HBE9 at (e) "Opportunities for active travel"

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	631	Resident	HBE9 Appendix x 9	<p>But regarding PROWs, it seems to me that the one that matters (apart from the Linesway) is the one starting opposite the Gaping Goose and heading south towards Brecks Farm (although the new link alongside the stream to the Linesway on map 19 would be nice!) The north-south path is shown on Geoff's plans, in one case forming the eastern boundary of the development site. But it is a pity that the sections of street with treatment designed to deter through traffic are not located where the footpath crosses the proposed streets. Were they to be so placed, they would offer an added reassurance to users of the PROW. Hopefully the same path will be favoured with a footbridge or underpass where it crosses the new Selby Road. (c.f. footpaths crossing the M1.) These points need clarifying.</p> <p>3.1.3 and Appendix 9. Character areas etc.</p> <p>I would divide areas 1 and 2 down Lidgett Lane placing the Lowther enclave in 2, maybe included the Academy site in area 7, and split areas 4 and 6 along Bar Lane, -or the railway.</p> <p>In the Appendix, Goosefield is described on p 198 as off Goosefield Rise (wrong) and on the next page as off Westbourne Avenue (right). The description of the old Kippax railway as Leeds-Pontefract (p202) is bizarre and confusing, as are some of the descriptions. Where, for example, are the Bluebell or Wimpey estates? I have no idea! East Garforth station was <i>never intended</i> to have parking (pp202./6) -hence the expansion at Garforth station. Apart from the informal parking along Woodlands Drive, there is simply no space, -unless you want to take over the bus turning loop and send the buses round Ludlow Avenue! Cut this bit! And Lockdowns aside, East Garforth has always had, and still has, 2 trains/hour each way .</p> <p>I have yet to find this mini Eden of Isabella Road (it's not in the street atlas)! Also on p208, my impression is that the traffic problems in Aberford Road are more due to the pre-existing junctions: Parkinson App/Lotherton Way and especially Bar Lane, whereas the new junction for Lidl/Home Bargains etc is signalled and generously laid out. And Ash Lane does not become the Fly Line until it is through the industrial area. And the suggestion (same page) under opportunities worries me! Yes, if HS2 follows the proposed route there is bound to be some dead land between it and the motorway, and while <i>new</i> paths are always welcome, they <i>cannot</i> be offered as replacements for existing paths simply because HS2 have some spare land they had to buy. Safeguarding the existing route across the line and motorway must come first (see 3.4.2 below) ! The strip of dead land would best be given over to wild life.</p> <p>Like everyone you have fallen into the trap (p209-10) of confusing us -Station COURT (flats, built, yes, c 1988) with Station CLOSE (houses, over the railway off Station FIELDS, near the junction with Station APPROACH, facing the station entrance. According to my records, <i>SaxTon</i> Court (houses) was built in the period 2005-7 by Wild Bennett Homes, and I feel sure that Station <i>Close</i>, as well as Meadow Rd, Montague Cres, and White Rose Way are all much earlier, although James Close may well be more recent. Leeds Planning would have records - if you want them. (Would that the Council could come up with more original names!)</p> <p>Garforth station certainly did (and may still, when life resumes) have a parking problem, but just now the expanded and resurfaced car park is typically about one third full! Pick-up/drop-off traffic is still a nuisance in our entrance. As for a nature reserve, not sure where you want to put it. We are trying to do our bit on our <i>private</i> property, but it would help if someone</p>	<p>GNPF is unable to influence these footpath issues.</p> <p>This is clearly a matter of judgment.</p> <p>Goosefield is an area of greenspace bounded by several different streets. Thank you for your observation re the station car parking.</p> <p>IT looks increasingly unlikely that HS2 will be going ahead as far as Leeds.</p> <p>Apologies for any confusion caused.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	470	LCC	T	Transport The locally specific nature of this topic area is a particular strength and demonstrates a high level of understanding. However, suggest the wording is cut down significantly for the submission plan and a review is undertaken of the evidence presented and its relevance to the circumstances in Garforth today. The Council is supportive of the overall aspirations of the NP to improve pedestrian and cycle accessibility throughout Garforth and the championing of active travel measures. However, the policies in this section may not be wholly deliverable, in line with national policy, and should be edited to make them more proportionate to development that is proposed.	We will address the issues raised and alter the policy wording.	Insert at start of T1 and at the end of T2, "where feasible."
p	563	Resident	T	GNDP Transport Policies. My response: 1. I wish you to consider including the expansion of 'Real Time Passenger Information' (RTPI) within the Settlement. 2. After many years of successfully campaigning for RTPI at East Garforth Rail Station it finally arrived in the form of the changing electronic display boards. 3. I mounted a similar campaign for bus stops, but this was very poorly promoted by Metro again over many years. My response: 1. All bus stops in the settlement to be upgraded to include full RTPI electronic boards except if there are any circumstances, they cannot be reasonably be provided. 2. Expanded RTPI boards giving more information including bus/rail links/transport hub interchanges etc to be provided and located in key locations such as our local and larger supermarket shopping centres and rail stations. Reason: Giving good and reliable information as to 'when the next bus is actually coming' is an essential part of encouraging the use of public transport by bus and train, and transport interchangeability. I trust that you will seriously consider incorporating my response into the revision of the GNDP proposals.	Thank you for your comments. Whilst we agree RTPI is desirable, it is not within the scope of the Plan. There has been an expansion of RTPI, certainly at bus stops, over the last few years.	
p	733	Development Worker	T	comment on Leeds Transport Strategy promoting new mobility schemes such as car sharing and car clubs. Could spaces be available in the future for car club cars, for example? She offered to send us details of a car club scheme.	Thank you for your suggestion. GNPF will mention car clubs in the revised Plan.	
p	734	Resident	T	asked for a stronger commitment to cycling in the Plan. Using S106 contributions to link up existing cycle routes. Cycling numbers won't increase unless there is a stronger commitment to infrastructure.	AS far as GNPF is aware, the spending of S106 money is determined on behalf of	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					Garforth by The Outer East Community Committee.	
p	128	Resident	T1	I find it difficult to visualise how cycle paths can be incorporated due to lack of space. There needs to be cycle lanes on Selby Road, Ninelands Lane, Wakefield Road and Aberford Road	The key is to think about cycle paths and roads at the design stage as Policy T1 suggests	
p	219	Resident	T1	Existing walking and cycling infrastructure should be enhanced through improving the infrastructure and / or providing new connections.	Policy T2 is about the new connections. It is beyond the scope of the Plan to insist on existing infrastructure being enhanced.	
p	220	Resident	T1	There should be a 20 minute rule. If it is more than 20 minutes walk to the town centre and the station from the propped development then they shouldn't be buiding there	20 minute neighbourhoods are an aspiration.	
p	353	Resident	T1	More cycle infrastucture and footpaths cleaned of waste and with a good service for walking and cycling	Cleaning cycle routes and footpaths is an LCC responsibility and is not within the scope of the Plan	
p	505	LCC	T1	T1 Active Travel: The objectives of this policy may not be feasible for all new housing or employment development (e.g. single dwellings / units), therefore it may be appropriate to introduce proportionality and refer to major housing and major employment development. In addition, it may be more appropriate for developments which adjoin existing walking and cycling infrastructure to provide connections, rather than all developments creating connections themselves (which may not be feasible).	Please see response to comment p470.	Add "where feasible" to end of T1

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	633	Resident	T1+2	<p>help. Proximity to Leeds, the dominant city in what was the West Riding, plus the excellent rail and road links (to Leeds and elsewhere) make it inevitable that Garforth will remain primarily a commuter / dormitory town within Leeds' orbit. (That's why I moved here!)</p> <p>Main Street is beginning to look decidedly run down. Recently we have lost two computer/IT shops and an excellent bookshop. Electrical shops are long gone (the Factory Shop apart). Even the Estate Agents are leaving. It will soon be all cosmetic salons, hair-&-beauty, coffee bars and charity shops! There are still a few traditional shops, and some new arrivals, but most of the convenience & food stores have moved to Aberford Road (except the Coop, a couple of other smaller places and a greengrocer), and everything else except Peases has gone "on line". Other nearby out-of town centres also seem to be struggling. Colton has not benefited much from Thorpe Park development, and even the rebuilt Seacroft disappoints (despite the mega-Tesco). Only Crossgates seems to muddle on as before.</p> <p>It is true that as a centre Main Street lacks a focal point, (3.2.2), although the area set back midway is beginning to develop into one (photo, page 56, left) and the new pub may help. But the clinic and Library are at one end, while at the other end Townhead is a nightmare for pedestrians to cross anywhere near the junction despite the signals. Ironically the main pull at this end is Peases DIY emporium (without which we <i>would</i> be lost!), which also seems to be the only establishment with substantial customer parking of its own.</p> <p>Parking (3.2.3) is clearly part of the problem. The few car parks are invariably full, and too many drivers seem unwilling to put more than about 10 yards between themselves and their vehicle, so resort to kerbside or pavement parking despite the restrictions (which go largely unenforced anyway), creating hazards for pedestrians. By contrast the out-of-town centres including those on Aberford Road (and Peases) have ample parking, which increases their attraction. A new car park on the vacant land at Townhead is certainly worth considering. Expansion of the station car park (opened just before Lockdown one!) should have dealt with commuter parking, if not the pick up / drop off problem, in neighbouring streets. This latter still infests streets such as ours north of the railway, because the tight corner on the entrance to Station Approach, plus the daily congestion on the bridge, combine to deter commuters from the Aberford direction and beyond, from using the parking provided.</p> <p>3.3 and Appendix 6. Transport. (A very short section for such a key topic!) Also 1.1, 1.5. Whilst I broadly agree with the text, I am concerned that the relation between cycling and other modes, both vehicular <i>and pedestrian</i> has not been addressed. I raised the prevalence of pavement cycling in my response to the Visions & Objectives consultation, and the problem has not gone away since. It was interesting to observe during the first lockdown that for about 2 or 3 weeks when vehicular traffic virtually disappeared, that the cyclists had the run of the streets and for once made proper use of them. But it didn't last, and in no time at all as traffic returned they were back on the pavements. Cyclists need to understand that bad behaviour on their part is just as intimidation to pedestrians (especially the elderly) as bad behaviour on the part of motorists is to them. To this mix is likely shortly to be added various forms of scooters (e and non-e) which will of course also be banned from pavements -but so is cycling.</p>	<p>The section of the Plan entitled BETC, Section 3.2 seeks to maintain and wherever possible enhance the quality of Main Street. The future of Garforth is inevitably linked to a thriving Main Street.</p> <p>Parking is clearly an issue. GNPF hope that the proposal for a new car park (see BETC 9) at the end of Main Street will be realised and help solve some of these problems.</p> <p>It is not right in general that cyclists use pavements, with the exception of shared use footpaths. There are clearly potential conflicts here.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					<p>At the same time, the majority of cyclists do respect the Highway Code and use the road.</p> <p>An improved cycling infrastructure would undoubtedly help reduce conflict and encourage more cycling which would be beneficial for health, reduce pollution and help tackle obesity.</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	634	Resident	T1+2	<p>This highlights some contributory factors. First, the total absence of education or training of young cyclists. I gather that there is no longer any cycling proficiency test, which explains the appalling ignorance of most youngsters about even basic rules of the highway code, - indeed many have not even heard of it! That became clear to me when I tried to challenge young cyclists using the Church Lane - Lindsey Road path (used by many old folk) which has a No Cycling sign at both ends (black cycle silhouette in red roundel). Most of them think it means Cycleway! Even those who do know treat it with contempt. Just another rule to be ignored or got round, like those on littering or dog mess (as you mention in 1.1). Sadly the same attitude by the young is clearly now being applied to covid lockdown rules, as the number of parties and raves being broken up by police demonstrates. Passing admirable laws but omitting to enforce them merely cultivates that attitude, so when a law is actually enforced, they all think they are being victimised, picked on, getting a poor deal, etc.</p> <p>To bring it down to the local level, in my experience local hotspots are first: blind corners at Aberford Rd / Bar Lane and Aberford Rd / Main St. I have often encountered young oafs on two wheels come round these corners at speed with no thought for anyone round the corner. Sooner or later someone (possibly me) will be knocked over and hurt by these idiots, which makes it as much a Health & Wellbeing issue as anything, -potentially as lethal as any virus. Second group: the railway bridges -all three of them in different ways. That in Aberford Road has heaviest traffic, is on an S bend with poor visibility and only one (narrow) footpath. Understandably with self preservation in mind, the cyclists take to the footpath if they can get away with it, at the expense of pedestrians' safety. (I once saw one use the station footbridge!) Likewise at Bar Lane, despite the massive barrier, impatient cyclists take to the footway rather than wait their turn. The third, Barwick Road, being an under bridge, is different, being already unpleasant for everybody, with a minimal footway and a tidal traffic flow, making it an inadequate replacement for the adjacent footpath crossing at Dale Croft - allotments, which seems to have been permanently closed by Network Rail despite being allegedly temporary. All three, as so often, are inadequate for today's needs despite being historic etc.</p> <p>Elsewhere, you mention the Church Lane - Lindsey Rd path as tending to get overgrown. The longer section Lindsey Rd - Selby Rd is worse, -unsurfaced, equally narrow & overgrown, and also favoured by cyclists (who always expect walkers to get out of their way). Moving out of town, the Ridge path from Barrowby Lane end, recently upgraded by the Council to cycleway, <i>ought</i> to be adequate if only cyclists would behave with more thought for walkers (clearer warnings if approaching from behind etc). In recent months this path has become much busier with both groups (and horse riders, from the Riding school nearby) but there is no clear separation. A narrower unsurfaced path runs alongside, which is walkable in dry weather, which used to be cycle-free, but of late they have taken to using it on the grounds that they have had too many disputes with walkers on the main path! The side path sports a sign at one end (by the motorway bridge) which reads "alternative horse route". Well, I've not met any alternative horses on either path (indeed few horses at all) so seriously, there is perhaps scope for rationalisation and some more helpful signing by the council. Walkers are entitled to expect <i>some</i> paths free of cyclists and the like. The Fly Line path through Parlington Woods is another one that is narrow, often overgrown, and not suitable for cyclists, whose steeds dig yet further into the poor surface, making it unpleasant for walkers.</p>		

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
p	604	Development Worker	T1+T2	<p>Please note that I am writing not as a resident, but as someone interested in climate and sustainability through personal interest and because of my role as development worker in Garforth in the climate emergency climate action project (CECAP)</p> <p>Transport and cycling infrastructure The plan promotes active travel and has produced what seems like a comprehensive review of existing walking and cycling infrastructure, including pointing out the shortfalls. In which ways can you imagine influencing improvements to this existing infrastructure (aside from requesting new developments to connect up to existing infrastructure)? Are there aspects of the Connecting Leeds transport strategy consultation that you see as relevant to Garforth?</p>	<p>Whilst GNPF would be happy to see existing infrastructure improved, the remit of the Plan does not go beyond new developments.</p>	<p>Determine whether consultation is ongoing. Consultation has closed.</p>
p	129	Resident	T2	<p>Not sure what is meant by non motorised accessibility. Does it mean pavements and/ or cycle paths? What is the definition of 'within walking distance'? And how does T1 differ from T2?</p>	<p>Yes, you are right on the meaning of non-motorised. The 20 minute neighbourhood idea suggests housing should be within around a 20 minute walk from many of the key destinations in an area, such as transport links, schools and shops. Clearly, this will vary with age and level of fitness, but it is intended as a broad guide. Policy T2 builds on and strengthens the requirements in T1.</p>	
p	130	Resident	T2	<p>This again would need cycle lanes on Selby Road, Ninelands Lane, Aberford Road, Wakefield Road.</p>	<p>The key is to think about cycle paths and roads at the design stage as Policy T1 suggests</p>	
p	131	Resident	T2	<p>How would this be demonstrated, given that decisions are taken by an individual planning officer interpreting these policies. Would GNPF have a voice?</p>	<p>As the NP will become part of the Development Plan for Leeds, legislation states that development proposals should be “determined in accordance with the development plan</p>	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					unless material considerations indicate otherwise” – the plan will have statutory weight in the same way that the Core Strategy and other planning policy documents do.	
p	221	Resident	T2	Great, yes, plan in advance	Thank you	
p	222	Resident	T2	The plans support residents who wish to take exercise and leave the car at home.	Thank you.	
p	223	Resident	T2	East Garforth railway station to remain	Thank you, it will as far as GNPF is currently aware.	
p	224	Resident	T2	<p>Public transport must be integrated with any new developments.</p> <p>Public transport must enhanced to provide full integration between different public transport modes and active travel modes.</p> <p>The 2 railway stations must be of the best possible standard, be easily accessed by everyone, be integrated with bus services and have safe & secure cycle parking.</p> <p>Bus stops must be of the best possible standard - e.g. real time information, seating, shelter, timetable information, protection from passing traffic etc. etc.</p> <p>They could also include cycle parking at key bus stops to improve ease of access.</p> <p>Bus services should enable people who cannot drive to lead a full life - especially disabled people, elderly people and children & young people. They should along with the trains also enable people not to have a car if they do not want one.</p> <p>A internal "shopper" Garforth bus service between the key areas of the town should be looked into - this could enhance connections to the railway stations and help turn Main Street into the vibrant heart of the town.</p> <p>Public transport should be easily useable in the early morning, evening, night-time and weekends.</p> <p>A community / neighbourhood electric car sharing scheme should be set up so that if a Garforth resident does need a car on the odd occasion they can easily access one without the hassle of owning one.</p>	<p>GNPF agree with your aspiration to have a fully integrated public transport system.</p> <p>The policies in the Plan aim to integrate new developments with existing transport infrastructure using active travel wherever possible.</p> <p>The idea of a shopper bus is a good one, but not within the scope of the Plan. Perhaps this is something that could be followed up with LCC.</p> <p>There is now an Enterprise Car Club car in Garforth available for club members.</p>	
p	225	Resident	T2	Motor vehicles will continue to play an important part in residents lives Perhaps every new build should have 2 parking spaces. Every new build must include a street that is 3 vehicles wide so that roads are never blocked.	It is true that cars continue to play an important role. However, it is important that	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
					new builds take into account the needs of all not just car drivers. The Plan seeks to promote active travel wherever possible.	
p	354	Resident	T2	Remove on street parking in busy areas to be enable flow of vehicles including bikes and buses	A good aspiration but not within the remit of the Plan.	
p	506	LCC	T2	T2 Active Travel and Connectivity: Again, it may not be possible for all new housing or employment development to provide accessibility to PROW, public transport hubs, the town centre and local green infrastructure, therefore it is suggested that the policy uses the word "should" rather than "must" and again includes an element of proportionality, perhaps by using the words "where feasible". Support cannot be conditional on something that a scheme cannot reasonably achieve and may have nothing to do with the proposed development.	Agree with your suggestions.	Alter "must" to "should" in T2 and add, " where feasible".
p	226	Resident	T3fincom	Astoundingly good plan, the time taken is appreciated.	Thank you	
p	227	Resident	T3fincom	Two good policies and hopefully non controversial.	Thank you	
p	228	Resident	T3fincom	Sorry if any of my comments on the six forms are not revelent or go on a bit too long - I wanted the comments to be as constructive and as wide ranging as possible so that any future developments enhance Garforth as much as possible. Garforth is a good place to live - and with the right support & development - it could be a great place to live with a strong, inclusive sense of community. This plan is a good first step to achieving it.	Thank you for your support.	

G	seq	who by	Section	Comment	GNPF Response	Action Change
z	637	Resident	Appendix 11	<p>place. Kippax surely already has its own, although I have no idea where it is! Failing that, perhaps now is the time to rectify the Scholars' Gate mistake and grab some land between the old and new Selby Road, to decant some peripheral activities. The area just west of the old railway bridge would be ideal as the Linesway path could serve as a safe direct route between the main site and the extension. Plan ahead!</p> <p>3.6.2 Health facilities.</p> <p>Here I have more relevant experience. I've been a client at Moorfield House since I moved here 30 years ago, and was well satisfied until two of their GPs chose to retire just as the problems of age began to catch up with me. (I presume their Aberford offshoot still operates on certain days.) They have now merged with a practice in Rothwell (New Cross) which has led to some Admin problems, but I still get good care from the practice nurses, and Tesco pharmacy serves me well. I am slightly alarmed to note that one of the surgeries operates as a satellite of Kippax Health Centre (on Gibson Lane presumably) -which would that be? I note you say "the clinic" closed 5 years ago. I thought "that's odd, wasn't it replaced by a new one just up the road?" until I realised that you call it the Medical Centre. Is there a difference? Everyone calls it as the clinic. Kippax seems to be doing better than Garforth in health,-the reverse of education. Is that why Moorfield House recently offered me a covid vaccination <i>at Gibson Lane</i>. I declined. Hopefully they will get to <i>Garforth Clinic/Medical Centre</i> one day.</p> <p>Other medical services in Garforth, such as dentists, are a mixed bag. Genix on Main St has had so many rebuilds, buyouts and staff changes since the original (sole practitioner) retired that I have given up on them. They now seem to be part of some mega chain, which I don't like. I do attend Moorhouse Opticians, who seem excellent, indeed I've not found any other. For a period I was referred to an osteopath in Headingley, but covid has put an end to that. I see one has set up shop at Townhead, but I know nothing about them. So I get around a bit. My biggest pre-covid problem was the lack of direct bus service to St. James' for outpatient appointments. For a while Square Peg route 22 to Seacroft solved the problem, but that seems to have died of the virus! If only Metro would open a railway station at Marsh Lane!</p> <p>Appendix 11 (pages 217-222) is an interesting collection of pictures, but in my view there are only three worthwhile viewpoints from within the town, and two more close by. This is based on 30 years of local walking. The three in town are (starting with much the best):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1:From Garforth Cliff, close to the water tower, west towards Thorpe Park and East Leeds. 2:From the top of Goosefield, to the north & NW towards Barrowby Park and the ridge. 3:From the footpath alongside East Garforth School parallel to Sturton Lane, looking west towards Barwick, Scholes and East Leeds. <p>Out of town, two in particular:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4: From two points along the Barrowby Ridge (cycle route & Countryway) i, from near the Garforth end south across Garforth towards the remaining (Ferrybridge) cooling towers, and ii, from near the M1 bridge south over Barrowby Park and its lake, towards Swillington. 5. From the Kippax Hills (not far from Garforth Cliff) south and SW over Kippax. <p>With some new links, one could connect all these together in a pleasant circular walk.</p>	<p>Garforth Clinic, adjacent to the Police Station closed around 5 years ago. There is now a small development of new houses on the site.</p> <p>Thank you very much for your considered views on this. They represent a decision taken by members of GNPF's Steering Group. There will always be differences of opinion with a subject such as this.</p>	