

`Consultation Statement – Appendix 1`

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

RESIDENTS AND BUSINESS

POLICY AREA	Comments	Response of the Steering Group	Proposed Action
BE 1: Design and development in the conservation area	I believe there should be some scope for more modern design and construction (including window materials) which would not adversely impact on the overall atmosphere of the village.	Noted, Policy reflects examples of opportunities for enhancement of the conservation area set out in the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP) for Thorp Arch	None required
	Maintain unique character THROUGHOUT the village, not just in selected areas / types, and keep traffic low.	Noted and refer to response above	None.
	Not sure that we need to be prescriptive about wood frame Windows in this modern era.	Noted, but, the difference in character when timber windows are used is well reflected in the alterations recently undertaken to 7 The Village	None proposed
	Pressure should not be applied on the choice of window materials.	Noted, but timber windows are encouraged in CAAMP.	None required

	<p>Replacement of uPVC windows is a big `ask` and possibly not realistic.</p> <p>The encouragement to prefer timber wood rather than uPVC may be irrelevant as the quality of the latter continues to improve and is cheaper.</p> <p>The plan is well thought out and considers development whilst retaining the character of the local area.</p> <p>Who / How will you "encourage" residents to replace PVC windows with timber frames?</p> <p>Yes although I do not understand I seek opportunities to enhance the public area in the vicinity of the station' and I live there!</p> <p>I accept the need to preserve the village, but it seems this will be given priority over other areas of the parish.</p> <p>I don't agree with the uniform palette of building materials nor use of timber windows or doors, some modern materials are better</p>	<p>Noted, but again it is encouraged.</p> <p>Agreed but the appearance of uPVC at present remains lacking in detail to match timber windows and remains a key way to retain character within the village</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>CAAMP is approved as a material consideration in the determination of planning decisions</p> <p>Noted, but such is noted in CAAMP Character Area 3 – railway station as a key way to retain character</p> <p>Policy is for the Conservation Area, Policy BE2 refers to areas outside the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Noted, but this is one of the key way's listed in the CAAMP to retain the historic character of the village.</p>	<p>None proposed</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>Review justification and amend wording of Policy BE1: 3Cb if considered to be relevant.</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>None proposed</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>performing, eg aluminium / steel windows.</p> <p>I think the chimneys and arched windows at the side of the cottages are very important</p> <p>Refuse development of gardens on Church Causeway for housing</p>	<p>Noted and included in CAAMP</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>None proposed</p> <p>None required</p>
<p>BE2: Design and development outside the conservation area</p>	<p>Add to policy CNE1 ; "Seeking to protect key views along the riverside"</p> <p>Although bearing in mind the problems that generating extra traffic will bring</p> <p>Any new development must not adversely affect the existing infrastructure or its residents 1 Development `must` be restricted to the absolute minimum.</p> <p>Ensure development is of a scale that retains village feel.</p> <p>Sadly this was not the view of LCC when they allowed the Persimmon</p>	<p>Noted and agree, but comment refers to Policy CNE1 and assume entered in the incorrect column.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted and covered in section 3.4 Housing Development sub-clause 3.4.1 i Issues.</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed, Section 3.2.2 i, Issues confirms the preferred style for</p>	<p>Policy CNE1 a -to be extended to include - and riverside.</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>None required</p>

	<p>development to go ahead in its present form. The houses are not in keeping with the immediate street scene or in keeping with the height of the existing houses. Local buildings such as the lending library were sited and I think many would agree that the result is inappropriate for its setting. The car-parking is not as was detailed on the proposals as most homes have 2 cars and most residents will in fact commute to their work, not work on TAE as was suggested.</p> <p>The ideals are the same as for BE1 which is good as it provides a cohesive plan for the whole area.</p> <p>This supports the opposition to a large development on TATE.</p> <p>I think in development we need to look forwards and not backwards- new development should complement rather than just reflect local styles</p>	<p>future developments and BE2 c, provision for off road parking. Regrettably the current application for housing on TAE16/05226 still implies the 'live and work on site' scenario which is clearly misguided.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>It does</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>None proposed</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None required</p> <p>Review Policy BE2 a, suggest alter to read after neighbouring buildings : , reflects and compliments local style in neighbouring buildings.</p>
<p>BE3: Local Green Spaces</p>	<p>Apart from K, should not be developed even in special circumstances.</p>	<p>Noted but the survey indicates a 97.4% support for the Policy and the areas identified</p>	<p>None proposed</p>

	<p>Circumstances would have to be VERY special to impact on these areas.</p>	Agreed	None required
	<p>In particular the cricket pitch</p>	Agreed	None required
	<p>Is it possible to have a preservation order on the cricket club pitch to prevent development?</p>	Noted but a legal opinion would be required and not part of the NPSG remit.	None proposed
	<p>Re cricket pitch. Adequate parking should be considered away from the Village main street, due to large size of TABS cricket club.</p>	Noted and subject to agreement the school car park is available to be used at weekends and parking on Dowkell Lane is more suitable than The Village.	TABS to action.
	<p>There are too few green spaces, with general public access.</p>	Most are accessible, Project P1 and P3 would also increase public access	None proposed
	<p>Currently nearly all those included are owned privately (including Woodlands Drive) and can be closed off at the will of the land owner.</p>	Noted but cannot be avoided and re Woodland Drive park this is owned by the residents.	None proposed
	<p>These areas enhance the village and local area and should be protected. There is actually limited space for play and leisure in the village, if these were removed outdoor leisure activities would require</p>	Agreed, the aim of the plan is to improve and retain local facilities	None proposed

	greater travel		
BE4: Protecting non designated heritage features	<p>ADD PEAR TREE FARMHOUSE & WALLED GARDEN? - WAS THE FARMYARD</p> <p>I think that the former ROFF munitions factory should have some protection</p> <p>Nevertheless I believe that the old railway bridge should not simply be preserved but be adapted to provide an additional road access to the industrial estate. This would reduce the traffic on the existing bridge and enable other development options for the Trading Estate.</p> <p>Not so sure about the `Protection & Enhancement` of Thorp Arch Mill weir ? Environmental Dept would</p>	<p>Noted and to be investigated</p> <p>Noted. A similar representation has been submitted by Historic England (HE) in respect of Rocksprings outline planning application for housing on TATE. Application Nr 16/05226/OT refers.</p> <p>Noted, but would require cross boundary consultation and not sure such would be viable together with highway and ownership implication. The cycleway Route 665 has also been extended over the bridge as part of the consent granted for housing in the adjacent Ward.</p> <p>Noted, but the Policy aims to protect the weir and any development proposals should demonstrate how they would</p>	<p>Reviewed and included, Policy BE4 item `h`.</p> <p>HE considers a policy requiring that a design code and design parameters should be drawn up and agreed with all parties. Due to cross boundary implication, it is considered that this should if agreed be implemented by LCC.</p> <p>None proposed</p>

	<p>need consulting, also owners of the weir- the residents of the Mill</p> <p>Protect the nature and design of street lighting.</p> <p>TABS Cricket Ground and the surrounding perimeter wall should be included on this list</p>	<p>contribute to its conservation and enhancement</p> <p>Noted, but already undertaken and the responsibility of LCC.</p> <p>Noted and protected by Green Space allocation</p>	<p>None required</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None proposed</p>
CNE1: Protecting countryside character	<p>It is unique, we can't afford to lose it</p> <p>It may be difficult where the former Wetherby / Tadcaster rail was will falls within private property</p> <p>Publish what are defined as protected views.</p> <p>The area is rural/semi rural and we should fight to maintain that-we don` t want to become part of Leeds urban sprawl !</p> <p>Yes - however more protection could be included.</p>	<p>The NPSG agree.</p> <p>Noted, however the railway bed / line is classed as amenity greenspace in the Site Allocation Plan.</p> <p>Identified on Key Views – Map 2 page 24 of the Plan.</p> <p>Agreed and that is the aim of the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Noted and would be provided by the adoption of the Plan</p>	<p>None required</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None proposed</p>
CNE2: Green corridors	<p>VITAL</p> <p>Yes - however there could be more</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Noted but would be outside the</p>	<p>None required</p>

	emphasis on development of new & additional corridors and the linking of existing ones.	neighbourhood area	None proposed
CNE3: Public rights of way	<p>Could do with some seating on public footpaths especially regarding older people out for a walk</p> <p>Cycle routes should not take priority over pedestrian access or inconvenience walkers</p> <p>Thoughts needs to be given to landowners, not just connectivity to suit development.</p> <p>VITAL</p> <p>Yes - however there could be many improvements and better linking of the existing rights of way.</p> <p>Yes although diverting rights of way can have commercial consequences</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Noted and they do not.</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Noted, but this would require agreement between the council and land owners or by compulsory order, but is supported by the Plan.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>Discuss provision with the Parish Council</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None, is supported in Policy c.</p> <p>None proposed</p>
CNE4: Enhancing biodiversity	Change is inevitable but protecting and being sensible about what we do have / can do will ensure an overall balance.	Agreed	None proposed

	<p>Don't think greenfield sites should be developed at all.</p> <p>If biodiversity is that important it should not be affected by development. Unfair to put new biodiversity onto someone else to suit planning.</p> <p>Publish the bio diversity of the river and its banks</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>It is important and that is the aim of the Plan. It is not the intention of the Plan to `just suit planning` but ensure that any new development provides positive benefits.</p> <p>Noted, but considered not necessary for the plan.</p>	<p>None proposed</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>Review text and amend if considered necessary.</p>
H1 : Site allocations	<p>A little concerned regarding the site allocation for a suggested minimum build of 25 new homes on the former Social Club on Walton Road. We understand there could be consent for as many as 194 homes applied for. Again at the Walton end of the village, this creates traffic issues, assuming each house has 2 vehicles. Noise during the building would also impact on the local residents. It took 2 years to complete the Persimmon development and the mud noise and mess was felt by the local residents who moved here for a more tranquil lifestyle.</p> <p>I also think that any small infill or windfall sites should be considered</p>	<p>Noted, but the site of the old prison social club for a small scale housing development was well supported.</p> <p>Regarding the consent for 194 homes applied for, the Site Allocation Plan Revised Publication Draft Area Proposals for the Outer North East has identified land to the north of HMP Wealstun Prison for 142 houses, Site Reference HG2-227.</p> <p>This area of land includes the curtilage of the old prison social club and is not supported by the Plan.</p> <p>Noted, the Core Strategy does make ref to `Windfall Sites`, review if</p>	<p>None proposed</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>Review if policy should be extended to include similar reference.</p>

	<p>as they maybe become available</p> <p>Possibly- it is a sustainable number of houses but I`m not really familiar with the site. Happy to let the Parish Council decide.</p> <p>TOO MANY DWELLINGS FOR THE SIZE OF LAND & GRANGE AVENUE WOULD BECOME TOO BUSY WITH EXTRA TRAFFIC AS A RESULT</p> <p>The policy says a minimum of 25 homes - should there be a maximum specified too? I realise that it may not be possible but I would have liked to see some housing allocated on Church Causeway to connect the village to the church and to produce a traffic calming effect.</p> <p>There are several opportunities for infill housing in the parish, these should be explored.</p> <p>Consideration made to future allocations to preserve village community.</p> <p>The figure of 25 Houses `MINIMUM` should be the absolute MAXIMUM -</p>	<p>policy should be extended to include similar reference.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Noted, but disagree and if this concern was supported by LCC, then highway mitigation measures would be sought by the Council.</p> <p>The Housing Market Needs Assessment prepared for Thorp Arch identified some 20-30 dwellings within the parish.</p> <p>Comment made re housing on Church Causeway noted but not supported by the evidence.</p> <p>Noted, but this not supported by surveys undertaken by the SG.</p> <p>See above.</p> <p>Noted but not supported by evidence</p>	<p>(Reviewed and not required)</p> <p>None</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>None required</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>LESS IF POSSIBLE !!</p> <p>what is the maximum number of new homes. Shoudn`t be too many.</p> <p>would have liked it to be a maxim of 25 new homes of affordable Housing</p>	<p>The Housing Needs Assessment undertaken by Ruralis identified some 20 – 30 dwellings.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None required</p> <p>None proposed</p>
H2: Housing type and mix	<p>A PITY SITES NOT IDENTIFIED TO ENABLE PEOPLE TO DOWNSIZE IN THE OLD VILLAGE</p> <p>Definitely</p> <p>Definitely need smaller housing</p> <p>Hopefully not cheap looking properties but of character and varied in appearance.</p> <p>I think an emphasis on starter and homes for elderly people should be a priority</p> <p>If the development goes ahead. It is important to allow only housing development which does not significantly impact on the road</p>	<p>Noted, but considered this to be included in the Policy.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted and hopefully covered by Policy BE1 and BE2</p> <p>Noted and the Policy does call for proposals for new homes should ensure that they reflect the demand from within the parish first.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and covered in the plan.</p>	<p>None proposed</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>None required</p>

	<p>infrastructure.</p> <p>The two sizes of houses mentioned I think are vital.</p> <p>We don't need any more large properties. smaller family units and downsize properties for older residents are exactly what is needed.</p> <p>We need to encourage the older residents to downsize but stay which will allow younger families in to support the village both financially and also by getting involved in community activities.</p> <p>Yes - except there seems little opportunity to improve housing for locals (offspring & aging) to stay in the area.</p> <p>Yes, but on the understanding that these should also reflect their setting, ie a rural development and not an inner city style complex as has already been allowed at Walton end of the village. Sadly this may have already set a precedent for future development and would never have been allowed within the</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, and part of the plan.</p> <p>Noted, but considered difficult to encourage downsizing as part of the plan.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted and hopefully adequately covered in the plan.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>All property owners have the right to alter and improve dwellings to suit their needs, subject to obtaining the relevant consents.</p> <p>None proposed</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>confines of the conservation area.</p> <p>Yes, but we need starter homes and smaller detached houses for older people</p>	<p>Noted, and considered to be included in the plan.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>CF1: Retention and provision of community facilities</p>	<p>A playground might be nice if a suitable site could be found.</p> <p>A village hall is aspirational, but would significantly add to village facilities.</p> <p>I don't think development should be permitted on key community facilities.</p> <p>The village lacks a community meeting space. LEH currently offers some opportunity, this could be increased by encouraging a more community focused support system for the LEH staff out of hours (key holders, caretaking responsibilities etc)</p> <p>Yes - But currently too limited.</p> <p>I do think a little park for children would be lovely</p>	<p>Noted, Covered in Projects P1 – Children's play area and equipment.</p> <p>Noted, but this was assessed as a project unlikely to be fulfilled and cost prohibitive.</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Noted, but not considered to be within the SG remit.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed and aim of project P1.</p>	<p>None required</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>None required</p>

LE1: TATE	Absolutely.	Thank you	None
	BUT INCREASE IN TRAFFIC NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED	Noted and is only supported in the plan where these do not result in a significant rise in traffic.	None
	Build new roads that link TATE to A1 / A64 without going through Thorp Arch or Boston Spa	Noted, but considered to be outside the SG remit	None
	However I believe that opening up the old railway bridge as an additional access route would enable consideration of limited housing development in addition to industrial use.	Noted, see response to same suggestion made in BE4	None
	In addition I would suggest that no other access into the trading estate are created	Noted	None
	It is important that the retail park is kept	Noted	Wording of the policy to be reviewed and altered id considered necessary..
	Must remain an employment site only.	Noted	None
	NO HOUSING ON THIS SITE	Noted	None

	<p>The entire area is far too contaminated for housing – ever</p> <p>What about development of houses on the estate? I agree that if land is to be built on then this `Brownfield` site should be used, but not the quantity of houses that have been proposed.</p> <p>Yes - but a few (100 - 200) houses would probably not over impact on the area.</p> <p>I have concerns over the new developments going on which in turn will increase road activities through Boston Spa and especially over the bridge</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, but view not supported by representations received. Also the site is not 100% `Brownfield` LCC SAP indicate Mix 50:50 Green/Brown</p> <p>Comment noted but not supported by the plan and representations received.</p> <p>Noted, but new development only supported where they do not result in a significant increase in traffic.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>None</p>
LE2: Supporting small scale business growth	<p>....and do not impact On other measures in plan ig views, biodiversity, etc - ie avoid `development creep` on farms etc.</p> <p>Thorp Arch Trading Estate offers ample opportunity for this</p>	<p>Agreed, review wording of the plan</p> <p>Noted, but can also apply to other areas within the Parish</p>	<p>Review wording of the Plan</p> <p>None</p>
LE3: Farm diversification	<p>Agree in part but surely some vehicle movement increase will happen with diversification so</p>	<p>The aim of the Policy is to support farming, ensure that they remain viable and that any diversification</p>	<p>None proposed</p>

	<p>statement is contradictory.</p> <p>Although there is obviously a very important engagement that for us needs to ensure to support local employment.</p> <p>Definitely agree that it should not result in additional vehicle movements particularly by fast, flash car drivers.</p> <p>Ref point made in comment of LE2</p>	<p>does not result in negative impact upon residential areas.</p> <p>Agreed and this is the aim of the Policy</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Noted and responded to in LE2</p>	<p>None required</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None</p>
--	---	---	---

<p>Please feel free to add further comments here on any matter arising from the draft plan.</p>	<p>(1) Priority given to traffic control and road surfacing maintenance through the village (not speed bumps)</p> <p>(2) Provision of lighting on the Thorp Arch - Boston Spa road bridge.</p> <p>A good piece of work !</p> <p>As remarked before, need more seating outside the village on public</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, however the bridge is Grade II listed and within the conservation area.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None proposed</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>None</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>footpaths.</p> <p>Excellent work</p> <p>First class plan which fully reflects the immense hard work of The Steering Group.</p> <p>Future consideration should be given to infilling between the Church & the village (Dowkell Lane and Church Causeway) for housing /parkland etc.</p> <p>I RANK THE FOLLOWING OF THE SAME / EQUAL IMPORTANCE : P4 - 1 P5 - 4 P7 - 5 P8 - 1</p> <p>I am concerned that the large residential development proposed by Rockspring appears to be dealt with by LCC outside the neighbourhood planning process which is undemocratic</p> <p>I consider Projects P2,4,5 and 6 to be equally least important and score each 8.</p> <p>I consider the following projects of equal importance: P1, P2, P4 & P8 Nr 2 P3 & P5 Nr 4 P6 & P7 Nr 6</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Comment noted but this is not supported by the plan and representations received</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Concern noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None proposed</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>I consider the following projects of equal importance: P4 & P5 Nr 2 P3 & P8 Nr 4</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>I rank P2, P7 and P8 of same importance, number 7.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>Just to express gratitude to the team and in particular its key members for the hard work they have put into the plan</p>	<p>Thank you</p>	
	<p>Most current initiatives to protect Thorp Arch are `reactive`. What about a 30 year transport plan to Protect Thorp Arch by proposing a road network, with at least one extra river bridge, that keeps traffic out of Thorp Arch and Boston Spa - in old fashioned terms `a by-pass`, which would go east of TATE and link up with the A1 (N) and A64 (S).</p>	<p>Noted, but considered to be outside and beyond the remit of the SG</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>P4. - Please see comments on BE3</p>	<p>Noted and responded</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>PROJECTS, I consider some of the projects listed to be of equal importance and would rank ; P1, P5 and P7 all 1. P2 and P3, all 2. P4, P6 and P8 all 3.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>
	<p>Projects, P1, P4 and P8 I consider equally important and rank each 2.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>

	<p>For P3 and P7 again rank each 3. Well done KEEP IT UP.</p> <p>Providing facilities for the children in the old part of the village as well as the children at Woodlands will be appreciated, there are now many more families with young children in the village and the traffic / lack of safe space to play is an issue. A deal with TABS to provide better access for those without a gate into the grounds from their gardens would meet this need. Can the Ebor way footpath be made multi use so bikes can use it too?</p> <p>THE WALLED GEEN SPACE WITH MATURE TREES ACCESSED FROM THE CEMETERY- IS OWNED BY THE HATFEILD ESTATE NOT THE CHURCH.</p> <p>The roads in this area should be properly resurfaced for longevity as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>Urgent attention is required to upgrade the local roads and keep this maintenance of the road system</p>	<p>Noted, review SAP Green Spaces re Childrens Play allocation at the school.</p> <p>Noted, but considered to be a matter that should be raised by the residents with the land owners /TABS, not the SG Ebor Way is defined as a Walking Route, but extends over roads and tracks.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted but the responsibility of LCC.</p> <p>Noted and agree, but remains the responsibility of LCC.</p>	<p>None proposed</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>Reviewed and ownership Map Ref H corrected.</p> <p>None proposed</p> <p>None proposed</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>ongoing. Obviously the road usage has a great effect which I cannot see reducing !</p> <p>We consider TANPSG is doing a good job in maintaining our beautiful village environment , resident of 40+ years. Thank You.</p> <p>We feel that road safety ie our choice 1 + 2 are of paramount importance as at some point a fatal accident will be the result of inaction.</p> <p>We strongley feel there should not be any development on the current TABS cricket pitch.</p> <p>We would welcome footpaths/cycle ways that link the north of the village to the rest of Thorp Arch. Particularly as Walton Road /church causeway often has speeding traffic which makes walking to the village feel unsafe.</p> <p>Well done for the work on this draft plan</p> <p>preservation of the visual appearance of the riverside</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted and is designated Local Green space in the plan</p> <p>Noted and included in Section 4 of the plan `Projects and aspirations`, P2. This provision was also ranked the most important.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None required</p> <p>Riverside included in Policy CNE1/a</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>environment is important for protecting the pleasant character of the boarder with Boston Spa</p> <p>would like to see Grange Avenue / Northfield / Rudgate and all housing from Prison to Walton Road to be classed and included as Thorp Arch not just an appendix. The only bits of these plans that include these areas are the H1 which is already ongoing and the saga of TATE</p>	<p>Noted, but a) the said locations are clearly identified within the neighbourhood boundary and b) referred to in Section 3.2.2 `Design and development outside the conservation area`, part ii Evidence refers.</p>	<p>None required</p>
<p>Please rank the projects you would like to see deliver the plan's policie</p>	<p>1 P2. New cycle track. 386</p> <p>2 P4. Thorp Arch and Boston Spa Cricket ground and facilities. 371</p> <p>3 P1. Children's play area and equipment. 357</p> <p>4 P3. New sports facilities including a new playing field and new allotments. 322</p> <p>5 P8. New footpath for a section of Ebor Way. 312</p> <p>6 P7. Realign the pathway and</p>		

	<p>road into All Saints Church. 264</p> <p>7 P5. Improvements to the facilities, infrastructure and visitor information in Thorp Arch Village. 242</p> <p>8 P6. Rudgate Park – Improve screening of TATE entrance road and the British Library. 182</p>		
--	---	--	--

Residents & business