

## Neighbourhood Plan Consultation June 2016. Responses to the various comments made.

Issue raised	Comment	Response
<b>Traffic and Transport</b>	1. Parking stables lane – not short term as intended. Speeding through village. Sign “no through road” at chemists isn’t visible from road.	The Parish Council (PC) made a request to introduce short term parking at Stables Lane but a number of objections were made by local traders and residents which resulted in the request being rejected. The PC has asked for improvements to signage. Plan for Stables Lane enhancement in preparation.
	2. Increase village size, increase traffic problem. Another village crossing required e.g. Deepdale. Traffic calming measures needed.	A working group has been formed by the PC to progress how a “people friendly village centre” (PFVC) can be created, this includes what can be done on several approaches to the centre, including around Deepdale.
	3. Is there any proposition to have a safe crossing for children and families near the park at Deepdale?	See above
	4. From the Village Hall to the end of the village dangerous amounts of vehicles try to squeeze past causing damage to cars and frequently mounting the pavements on both sides. My daughter was involved in a reported near fatal incident when a bus mounted the pavement and nearly knocked her over. Traffic travelling along the pavements is now a daily occurrence. The volume of traffic is only set to increase as the Paper Mills site is built. Short term traffic calming and crossing points need to be considered and longer term by-pass plans need to be sought. This end of the village is a problem! 2. Additional housing. I fully support the opposition of building on the field next to the hospice or any other large-scale development that will cause additional vehicles to use the roads in Boston Spa and put a strain on the existing infrastructure and facilities. Without investment in our schools, car parking and traffic management	The creation of a PFVC is looking at how engineering of roads by the introduction of built outs, different surfaces and mini roundabouts on the approaches could change driver behaviour. This approach is looking at deterring through traffic, reducing the speeds of traffic moving around the village and creating a pleasant area of meeting and socialising for residents and visitors.

	<p>Boston Spa cannot support further large scale developments</p>	
	<p>5. The 'pedestrianisation' of the high street is a welcomed idea as it would increase the feel of the area and hopefully slow down traffic. I think careful consideration of the design will be needed to make sure this area is safe for pedestrians whilst also allowing the heavy use of vehicles in peak times. Discussions have been made to allow more social space within the village centre however this should be limited as it will have a negative impact if too many coffee shops / bars are allowed. I note a number of empty units on the high street, which appear to be currently being refurbished. It is good to allow a variety of different use types within the village to maintain the character of the conservation area</p>	<p>Discussions are currently in progress between the PFVC working group and Leeds planners which are developing the ideas into workable solutions. Once these are complete extensive consultations are required with residents, local business and limited ability groups which will seek to develop a plan which has broad support. It would be good if the creation of a PFVC could encourage more people to visit the centre and thereby stimulate local businesses.</p>
	<p>6. I am very concerned with the state of the road surface on Grove Road. I have contacted Leeds City Council and placed my concerns and I have not had any response. The road is in terrible condition and the risk of an accident I think is very high. I hope you can help in this important matter.</p>	<p>As of June 2016 following the intervention of the Alec Shelbrooke MP, Leeds City Highways have been requested to instigate remedial action.</p>
	<p>7. Re: Boston Spa Neighbourhood Plan Congratulations on an excellent Plan, resulting from much hard work and commitment. Whilst my wife and I fully support the Plan and its proposals, we would like to emphasise that the sooner that two specific items are put in place the better: 1 traffic speed limit is reduced - relatively easy. 2 making the centre more pedestrian friendly - more difficult but not impossible Thank you and regards.</p>	<p>Thank you for your support.</p>
	<p>8. Secondly it would be great if we could treat the provision of more cycle ways as another priority area. Why can't we have a better link to Route 66 at Thorp Arch plus an extension of it to Newton Kyme across the viaduct?</p>	<p>Discussions have been held with neighbouring communities and issues such as this have been discussed. However, Newton Kyme is in North Yorkshire and Boston Spa is in West Yorkshire, which introduces further challenges. Again this is work in progress.</p>

	<p>9. More, not less parking is required in the village centre. We recently lost two spaces at Bridge Road as a result of the introduction of Stew &amp; Oyster; please do not remove any more so that they can expand their seating area which only benefits their patrons. With the builders working at the former Kier property, Stables Lane is always full, hence the dangerous double-parking outside the post office and chemist. 20mph speed limits should firmly be introduced and enforced outside all the primary schools and St John's (not just "welcomed", page 19), like at the high school. Is the traffic survey you quote using 2013 figures? If so, this data is out-of-date with the new housing at Church Fields and Newton Kyme since being completed and occupied.</p>	<p>Good to see the village centre becoming revived and residents enjoying the facilities in Millennium Garden. When building finished at Keir the car park will be available for visitors/residents and will have greatly increased the parking provision in the village.</p>
<b>Schools</b>	<p>1. Without investment in our schools, car parking and traffic management Boston Spa cannot support further large scale developments</p>	<p>This statement is at the heart of the concerns in the Neighbouring Planning Group and the Parish Council. Note shortage of land available for these uses.</p>
	<p>2. Being a new resident to Boston Spa on the Churchfields estate I welcome the proposals for new housing in the village, however, consideration needs to be given to the current over capacity at the local primary schools. I may struggle to get my children into the school despite it being one of the closest. I may then have to commute to another village. There is discussion in the plan that these schools add to the increase in traffic, surely local children should go to local schools so they can walk / bike and thus reduce traffic. If more and more housing stock is added (65% for families) there should be consideration for a new school to take up this demand. I still don't understand why they closed the school in Clifford</p>	<p>This issue is highlighted in the plan. Availability of local schools, cycling routes etc are part of sustainability, which is addressed throughout the plan (see pg4 for outline).</p>
	<p>3. Great plan, however I note St John's School for the deaf is omitted i.e. pg 19 and pg 20. Five schools mentioned but surely should say six schools. Again with the may pg 20. Please can St John's be included.</p>	<p>Point noted</p>
<b>Housing</b>	<p>1. Neighbourhood Plan looks and reads well. Just one observation ... The apartment block next to the GP Surgery, in front of the Methodist Church is an eyesore and in no way preserves the image of the village. I'm surprised to see a photograph of it in the summary document</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
	<p>2. Congratulations to the Steering Group who have produced such a</p>	<p>Agreed. Shortage of land for building affects</p>

	<p>comprehensive plan. It must have taken an enormous number of man-hours. I see the priority areas for the plan as ensuring well-managed development of additional housing. The local area does need more houses and the village should focus on getting quality housing across the price range plus improvements to infrastructure funded by the developers. In my view, despite all the opposition in the past, the Churchfields estate has turned out to be a good thing and an asset to the village. We should remember this when considering future planning applications.</p>	<p>all these worthy aspirations.</p>
	<p>3. This is by and large a fantastic document - well done! The overall vision and objectives are clear and achievable. One of the purposes of urban planning at the neighbourhood level is so communities can direct where development takes place. I can't see any proactive suggestions for housing sites and fear this opportunity has been missed, unless the steering group wants to knowingly maintain this NIMBY approach until 2030. Why not look to the future and allocate some new 'design and build' sites? Primrose Lane primary school was oversubscribed again for this coming year's intake. Instead of saying "no more housing", why not plan for the inevitable ongoing population growth over the next fifteen years and make an allowance for new school buildings while we have this chance? Do not defer the responsibility for infrastructure to developers in its entirety. For example, policy AF2 (which is poorly expressed) tries to pass the responsibility for a pedestrian crossing at Deepdale onto any future developer intervention - a safe crossing over the A659 needs to be provided now by Leeds City Council - if indeed you do support this then do not let them off the hook for another decade! Please re-word this policy (it shouldn't be linked to a future hypothetical situation).</p>	<p>Space allocated for further housing has to be balanced with urgent need for more green space if new dwellings are to be sustainable. The overall shortage of green space within the parish boundary is 12.7ha, roughly twice the area of Church Field.</p>
<p><b>Business</b></p>	<p>1. Please also select some up-to-date photos in the final version - the images on pages 3 and 4, with the 'to let' signs where the tapas restaurant is trading, are no longer reflective of the current look of the High Street. The vacancy rate is no longer as high as the 15% being quoted on page 17. The sustainability matrix is interesting. encouraged by the Parish Council at the</p>	<p>Photos are being reviewed before final publication.</p>

	application and consent phase too.	
<b>Environment</b>	1. I wholeheartedly support renewable energy production in the village and I hope that community energy schemes will genuinely be	Addressed in the Plan under policies and community actions.
	2. Stables Lane of course needs proper seating, ideally picnic benches and more bins. We are fed up of eating off the fitness equipment and the bins are always full.	Plan in production by Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan working group.

## Agencies and Land Owners

<b>Highways England</b>	Agreed plan is positively prepared inline with core strategy and supports policies to retain enhance cycle ways, footpaths, bridleways and public transport. Indicating a need for additional capacity at A1(M) Junc' 44 and 45 over the plan period. This didn't include discounted sites and if these are brought forward into the plan a reassessment will be needed. We welcome opportunity to work with neighbourhood planners and developers.	Points noted
<b>Natural England</b>	Has no specific comments on the draft plan but draws our attention to issues and opportunities that should be considered with the plan	Points noted. Issues and opportunities in Natural England Guidance are already covered in the Neighbourhood Plan policies.
<b>Leeds Diocese</b>	Policy DEV1 Type and tenure of new housing. Our response: We object to Policy DEV1 because it is unnecessary and overly prescriptive. The policy will have a significant adverse impact on the delivery of much needed new homes as it is unduly restrictive and fails to provide for open market housing as required which in turn supports provision of affordable housing.	The NP has a remit to qualify the Leeds CS and NPPF. We have done so with the necessary evidence to support our Policy Dev1 and do not regard it as unnecessary or overly prescriptive.

	<p>Additionally, the National Planning Policy Framework requires provision of a range and mix of house types and this national guidance is reflected in Leeds City Council Adopted Core Strategy policy, There is therefore no need or justification for this general requirement to be duplicated in this restrictive manner. Plan BSNP D1 Possible Development Sites Our response: The identification of Site 3132, Church Street and 1154 Church Street for residential development is supported</p>	
<b>Yorkshire Archeological</b>	<p>Thank you for consulting the West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service (WYAAS) with regard to the above. WYAAS strongly welcomes &amp; supports the prominence of Heritage within the proposed Neighbourhood Plan &amp; its proposed Policies (H1 – H3) inclusive. It may be helpful to signpost interested readers to where further details may be obtained on Boston Spa’s known heritage assets (including designated &amp; undesignated ones). This information is available via the West Yorkshire Historic Environment Record, held &amp; maintained by the West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service</p>	Points noted
<b>Bellway Homes</b>	<p>We act on behalf of Bellway Homes, who have an interest in land off Winnow Lane, which is shown edged red on the attached plan. As you know Bellway Homes are promoting the residential allocation of this land through the Leeds Site Allocations</p>	We have met to discuss their interest in this site.

	<p>Plan which, as a result of the withdrawal of the Hedley Hall proposal, will have to undergo a further round of public consultation to provide the public with the opportunity to comment upon the new housing allocations. Bellway Homes would very much like to come and meet you to discuss the Neighbourhood Plan, which we are reviewing with interest, and our site. We hope that this is acceptable. We look forward to hearing from you.</p>	
<p><b>Environmental Agency</b></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. The River Wharfe (Main River) runs to the east of the settlement Boston Spa and Fir Green Beck (main river) running approximately to the south, with associated areas of flood zones 2 and 3. Boston Spa also lies over a principal aquifer. We suggest that the following paragraph be added in relation to any development in the Boston Spa area. Development should be located within flood zone 1 (low risk). Where development is deemed necessary within flood zones 2 and 3 (following the application of the flood risk sequential and, where relevant, exception test), the proposals must demonstrate that they will be safe for their lifetime and will not increase flood risk to 3rd parties, with flood risk betterment provided where possible.' This will reduce the risk of</p>	<p>Points noted</p>

	<p>flooding to any future proposals for development and occupants.</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>	
Historic England	<p>Thank you for consulting Historic England in connection with the draft Neighbourhood Plan prepared for Boston Spa Parish Council.</p> <p>We do not wish to comment in detail, but welcome the clear commitments contained within the Plan to the conservation of the historic environment of the Parish and of designated and non-designated heritage assets within in. We look forward to being notified about the consultation on the full Boston Spa Neighbourhood Plan, following any revisions of the current draft Plan. We have copied this response to Leeds City Council for their information.</p>	Points noted
<b>Diocese of York</b>	Objection to policy GS1 and the designation of Oaks Lane site as Local Green Space	The arguments against this policy are appropriate in many ways but need to be balanced against the need for green space of which the deficiency in the village is 12.75. However, further consideration has been given and the site withdrawn from the list of designated spaces.
<b>St Mary's Respondents (overview)</b>	Issues raised around housing and protection of certain sites and prevention of urban sprawl. Protection of wildlife and extending Stables Lane recreation area will enhance this point. Proposed drop off zone in the vicinity of Church St will only	General agreement with the comments, which will be given careful consideration.



	<p>exacerbate traffic problems. Encourage parents walking children to school. Or provide car parking off Primrose Lane. Risks to cyclists along Church St and avoidance of risks to cyclists should be noted. Access to Stabled Lane for walkers from Church St should be welcomed. The argument that West Park PAS site 2137 would extend the village envelope is weak. It is well within the village boundary and preservation of the trees on this site and the riverside walk could be achieved. Impact of Grove Road development on the village infrastructure of the village should be addressed within the plan.</p>	
<p><b>Gilman/GMI (overview)</b></p>	<p>GMI are supportive of each policies in the sections relating to public transport, safe cycling paths and accessible footpaths and particularly Community Action PTCA1. In conclusion the Boston Spa NDP does not comply with the basic conditions set out in paragraph of the Town and Country Planning Act. Fundamental concerns associated with the approach to the identification and location of housing sites. Unfortunately these concerns originate with the Leeds Sites Allocations Plan, which the NP is based on. We believe that the policies within the Leeds Sites Allocation Plan will be amended prior to their adoption, which in turn necessitates amendments to the Boston Spa Neighbourhood Plan. Issue of urban sprawl caused by the development is</p>	<p>There is no specific housing requirement allotted to Boston Spa other than that shared on the Site Allocations Plan Development. The GMI proposals have many favourable features and their plans are to be commended. The over-riding issue with the Low Mills site is that it falls outside the village envelope and despite GMI's contentions the development would constitute urban sprawl. The site is 1Km from the village centre and is far from ideal for any residents especially the elderly. For these reasons the plan is strongly opposed in the Draft Plan. The plan justifies and gives evidence for maintaining 65% of new homes being 1-3 bedroom.</p>

	contested. The NP plan is inflexible in requiring 65% of homes being 1 and 3 bedrooms.	
--	--	--

In addition, written letters were also sent to the Parish Council Office and have been acknowledged and points have been noted and discussed at the Steering Committee Meeting.

<b>Other Comments</b>	Wholehearted agreement with proposals presented in the NP. The sooner the better!	Thank you
	Opportunity to reduce streetlight operating times and light pollution.	Point noted. Helps with sustainability.