

# THORP ARCH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

## Consultation Statement

28<sup>th</sup> March 2017

### Contents

Section 1 - Consultation Evidence List

Section 2 - Introduction

Section 3- Aims of the Consultation

Section 4 - Background to the Consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan

Section 5 - The Consultation Stages

Section 6 – Links between consultation responses and the Neighbourhood Plan themes and policies.

Section 7 – Conclusions

Appendix - Tables of all comments, responses and actions that resulted from Regulation 14 Consultation August / September 2016

### **Section 1 - Consultation Evidence and where it can be located.**

1. 2012 Village Survey.

- Report containing questions and analysis of the feedback is on the website.
- Records of individual responses are held by the Chairman of the NDP Steering Group.

2. 2012 Business Survey.

- List of businesses who were contacted is on the website.
- List of survey questions is on the website.
- An example covering letter is held by the Chairman of the NDP Steering Group.
- The analysis of the feedback is on the website.

3. 2013 Presentation by Carter Jonas of proposals for relocating TABS Cricket Ground.

- The Carter Jonas presentation is on the website.
- Village survey held in July 2013 and relating to the presentation. Questions and analysis of responses are on the website.
- Village survey held in July 2013. Records of individual responses are held by the Chairman of the NDP Steering Group.

4. Presentations to annual Parish Meetings.

- Minutes of Parish Meetings held in 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016 are on the website. The references to the NDP are within the minutes.

5. Presentation of draft NDP at public exhibitions held in December 2014 and March 2015.

- The draft NDP is on the website.
- The flyers, exhibition panels and questionnaire are on the website.
- The analysis of the responses to the questionnaire is on the website.
- Records of individual responses are held by the Chairman of the NDP Steering Group.

6. 2015 Consultation of landowners and main businesses.

- List of consultees is on the website.
- The two responses received are on the website.

7. 2012 and 2015 Consultation with HMP Wealstun.

- The responses are in NDP Steering Group minutes dated 22/08/12 and 18/11/15 and are on the website under minutes.

8. Articles in the local magazine 'Causeway'.

- The articles have been copied from the magazines and are held by the Chairman of the NDP Steering Group.

## 9. 2016 Regulation 14 Consultation.

- Under Regulation 14 Consultation a letter from the Parish Council, draft plan summary and questionnaire was sent to all residents and businesses. All statutory consultees were also informed about the NDP status. All those contacted were told how they could obtain a full copy of the NDP and how they could contact the Steering Group for assistance. All consultees were invited to comment on the plan during the six week consultation period which runs from August 20<sup>th</sup> to October 1<sup>st</sup>.
- The tabulated comments from consultees and the responses and actions from TANPSG are in an appendix at the end of this document and are also on the website.
- The original comments from consultees are held by the Chairman of TANPSG.
- Notes from the meetings/communication with Carter Jonas, Pegasus Group and HCA are on the website under Minutes.

## **Section 2 - Introduction**

The Thorp Arch Neighbourhood Plan is the result of an extensive and ongoing process of community consultation, involving research, contributions from external agencies (particularly Leeds CC), surveys of residents and other stakeholders, public presentation and debate over a five year period.

The process was started by the Parish Council in late 2011 when they resolved to apply for Thorp Arch Parish to be designated as a Neighbourhood for the purposes of the incoming Neighbourhood Planning Regulations and to create a Steering Group for that purpose. The Steering Group was subsequently formed in February 2012, to include members of the Parish Council and residents from within the Parish willing to contribute their time and skills to the project.

This Consultation Statement sets out what was undertaken, how the information was analysed and how it was publicised.

The Thorp Arch Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement:-

- Sets out the aims of the Consultation process,
- Summarises all the statutory and non-statutory consultation that has been undertaken with the community and other relevant statutory bodies and stakeholders;
- Describes how concerns have been addressed and what changes have been made to the Draft Thorp Arch Neighbourhood Plan as a result of the pre-submission consultation.

The Evidence list in Section 1 provides an index of the records of all consultation exercises, comments and feedback and shows where they can be located.

### **Section 3 - Aims of the Consultation**

*The aims of the Thorp Arch Neighbourhood Plan consultation process were:*

- *To involve the community throughout the evolution of the Plan so that the Plan was informed by, and took account of, the views of local people and other stakeholders from the start of the Neighbourhood Planning process;*
- *To engage with as wide a range of people as possible, using a variety of consultation and engagement techniques; and*
- *To build partnerships within the community to ensure that the Plan policies and programmes could be delivered.*

### **Section 4 - Background to the Consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan**

In 2011, Thorp Arch Parish Council resolved to form a Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group under the auspices of the Parish Council. It was recognised that the Steering Group needed to be truly representative of the community and a meeting was held at The Pax Inn (and previously advertised in Causeway, the community magazine) to explain the function of the new legislation, the potential benefits to the community, and to recruit volunteers to a Steering Group.

### **Section 5 - The Consultation Stages**

#### Initial Publicity

In January 2012 under Regulation 5 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Thorp Arch Parish Council submitted an application to Leeds City Council (LCC) for the designation of the entire parish as a Neighbourhood Area. LCC publicised this application in accordance with Regulation 6 and no objections were received to the proposed boundary or the appropriateness of the area being designated a Neighbourhood Plan area.

#### Raising Awareness, Information Gathering and issues and discussions with landowners

Awareness raising activities were undertaken by members of the Steering Group.

These included:-

2012 Village Survey

2012 Business survey

2012 Consultation with HMP Wealstun.

2013 Presentation by local landowner of proposals to relocate the TABS Cricket Ground.

2013 Village survey to gather opinions on the cricket ground proposals.

2013 Parish Meeting: presentation about the NDP status.

2014 Public exhibition held to explain the main elements and draft proposals for the emerging NDP.

2014 Parish Meeting: presentation about the NDP status.

2015 Repeat of the 2014 exhibition to ensure maximum number of local residents had been given an opportunity to see the draft NDP.

2015 Consultation with landowners and businesses to ensure they were aware of the emerging NDP and had sight of the draft document.

2015 Consultation with HMP Wealstun.

2015 Parish Meeting: presentation about the NDP status.

Various editions of the local magazine Causeway carried articles about the status of the NDP.

2016 Regulation 14 Consultation on the NDP. Pre-submission consultation on the Draft Thorp Arch Neighbourhood Plan

The pre-submission Consultation and Publicity stage of the Draft Thorp Arch Neighbourhood Plan was undertaken in accordance with Regulation 14 between 20<sup>th</sup> August and 1<sup>st</sup> October 2016. The regulations require that all local residents and businesses are made aware of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan and how to comment on it. Also, in line with the regulations, all statutory consultees were invited to comment appropriately within that period. The TANPSG responses and actions indicate where the draft NP published for Regulation 14 consultation has been changed to reflect the comments made or where no change was felt necessary.

The comments from stakeholders together with responses and actions from TANPSG are appended to this document in Appendix 1.

They are under the following headings:

- a) Residents and businesses.
- b) The Coal Authority, Historic England and The Environment Agency.
- c) Homes and Communities Agency.
- d) Carter Jonas on behalf of The Elizabeth Hastings Estate Charity, Foxlow Ltd. and The Hatfeild Estate

e) Pegasus Group on behalf of Rockspring Hannover Property Trust.

Note: Communication was made in March 2017 by TANPSG to explain the changes in the NP between the draft version at Regulation 14 consultation and the Submission version in April 2017. The communication was made with Carter Jonas, Pegasus Group and the Homes and Communities Agency.

## **Section 6**

### **Links between issues raised at consultation events and NP themes and policies.**

Please note that only those questions that relate to Neighbourhood Planning issues are listed in the tables.

#### A. 2012 Village Survey.

[thorparchnp.org.uk/sites/default/files/TANDP EVIDENCE – Residents Survey 2012 Results.pdf](http://thorparchnp.org.uk/sites/default/files/TANDP_EVIDENCE_-_Residents_Survey_2012_Results.pdf)

Issues Raised	Link to themes/policies
Key assets and areas that should be protected: The bridge: 96.6% The countryside: 89.4% The Conservation Area: 89.4% All Saints Church: 85.1% The Pax Inn: 75.5%	Theme: Built Environment. Policy: BE1 Design and Development in the Conservation Area & BE4 Protecting non-designated heritage features. Theme: Community and recreational facilities. Policy: CRF1 Retention and provision of community and recreational facilities.
How important are the countryside views? Important or very important 96.8%	Theme: Countryside and the natural environment. Policy: CNE1 Protecting countryside character - identifies key views.
Do you agree TA should minimise its carbon footprint? Yes: 74.1%	Theme: countryside and the natural environment. Policy: CNE3 Public rights of way – supports new cycle routes and footpaths.
Would TA benefit from an alternative route for traffic away from the bridge? Yes: 79.3%	Themes: Housing development and supporting the local economy. Policies H1 Residential development – mentions traffic management issues & LE1 Thorp Arch Trading Estate – mentions issues of the impact of traffic from additional development on residential areas.
What do you think about the number of houses that have been built in TA over the past 10 years? About right: 70.7% Too many: 18.5% Too few: 5.4%	Theme: Housing development. Policy H1: Residential development – mentions the 2012 survey as evidence to support the need for housing.
What do you think about the size of houses that have been built in the last 10 years? About right: 69.2% Too big: 5.5% Too small: 3.3%	Theme: Housing development. Policy H1: Residential development – mentions the 2012 survey as evidence to support the need for housing.
How many dwellings should be built over the next 15 years? 1-10: 34.8% 11-25: 22.5% 26-50: 24.7% 51-75: 3.4%	Theme: Housing development. Policy H1: Residential development – mentions the 2012 survey as evidence to support the need for housing numbers.

76-100: 4.1% 100+: 5.6%	
What kind of houses do you think TA needs most? 3 to 4 bed family homes: 32.2% Affordable: 28.9% Townhouses: 6.7% Executive detached: 5.6% Flats: 1.1% Rented: 1.1%	Theme: Housing development. Policy H2: Housing type and mix – mentions the 2012 survey as evidence to support the need for housing.
Where should houses be built? On the trading estate: 37% Opposite the prison: 15.7% Fields along Dowkell Lane: 7.6% The Village: 3.3% Others various: 37%	Theme: Housing development. Policy H1: Residential development – supports the potential location of the number of houses needed on the former prison social club site which is both opposite the prison and on trading estate land.
Does TA need any of the following facilities? Village Hall: 60.6% Children's play area: 54.5% Improved cricket pavilion: 28.8% Bowling green: 4.5%	Theme: retention and provision of community and recreational facilities. Policy CRF1 Retention and provision of community and recreational facilities. The questionnaire is used as a basis to propose a children's playground and football pitch while retaining the existing facilities. A village hall is considered but not proposed at this time.
Rate the importance of the following facilities: Junior school: 96.6% Pub: 96.6% Tennis club: 89.6% Village cricket club: 86.0% Children's playground: 73.8% Village hall: 68.3% Football pitch: 50.6%	Theme: retention and provision of community and recreational facilities. Policy CRF1 Retention and provision of community and recreational facilities. The questionnaire is used as a basis to propose a children's playground and football pitch while retaining the existing facilities. A village hall is considered but not proposed at this time.
Where should new businesses/job creation be sited to benefit young people the most? Within 5 miles of TA: 100%	Theme: Supporting the local economy. Policy LE1 Thorp Arch Trading Estate and LE2 Supporting small scale business growth – both are within the 5 mile radius proposed in the 2012 survey.

### B. 2013 Village survey.

[thorparchnp.org.uk/sites/default/files/TANDP Survey 2013 Results.pdf](http://thorparchnp.org.uk/sites/default/files/TANDP%20Survey%202013%20Results.pdf)

Issues Raised	Link to themes/policies
Is it important to have a cricket club in the village? Important:49.5% Very Important: 37.4% Not important: 13.2%	Theme: Community and recreational facilities. Policy: CRF1 Retention and provision of community and recreational facilities – the survey result is reflected in this policy regarding the importance of having this facility.
If important or very important, would you prefer to: Retain the existing cricket pitch: 80.3% New pitch N side of Dowkell Lane: 16.1% New pitch elsewhere: 3.7%	Theme: Community and recreational facilities. Policy: CRF1 Retention and provision of community and recreational facilities – the survey result is referred to in issues forming the policy to retain this facility. Theme: Built environment.

	Policy BE3 Local Green Spaces. This includes a wish to designate the Cricket Pitch as a local green space.
Putting aside the TABS issues, would you support residential development: On the old cricket pitch: 27.9% N side of Dowkell Lane: 37.2% S side of Dowkell Lane: 48.8% Church Causeway: 51.2%	Theme: Housing development. Policy H1 Residential development. The policy acknowledges that the historic SHLAA and current SAP processes will dictate which land is allocated for housing. Policy H1 does not allocate land but supports the use of one site that would accommodate the number of dwellings determined as needed in the 2012 survey in A above and reinforced in this survey.
How many houses would be suitable: 92% said between 5 and 30 houses.	Theme: Housing development. Policy H1 Residential development. The policy reflects the number of dwellings determined as needed in the 2012 survey in A above and reinforced in this survey.
If TABS ceases to use the old cricket ground, what would you like to see the land used for? 94% would like it be a green space and for community use.	Theme: Built environment. Policy BE3 Local Green Spaces. This includes a wish to designate the Cricket Pitch as a local green space.

C. Results from two public exhibitions December 2014 and March 2015.

thorparchnp.org.uk TANDP EVIDENCE – SUMMARY REPORT  
EXHIBITIONS.doc

Issues Raised	Link to themes/policies
Do you agree with the vision in the draft NP? 40 responses. 100% agreed	The vision wording has been changed slightly between the draft NP and that put forward for Regulation 14 consultation. The purpose was to improve the flow of the vision and transfer any policy type statements into the policy section.
Do you think the proposed housing development is appropriate and adequate? (this referred to the houses being proposed on the former HMP social Club site) 40 responses. 90% Yes 10% No Comments: a) that there is scope for limited infill within the village. b) there is a need for houses for the elderly.	Theme: Housing development. Policy H1: Residential development. The policy wording has changed from allocating the site referred to in the draft NP, to one of supporting the site. Policy H2: Housing mix. This has been written to reflect the need for accommodation for the elderly.
Are you satisfied that the proposed additional recreational spaces are adequate and in the appropriate locations? (this referred to the football field and play area) 39 responses. Yes: 93% No or blank: 10% Comment: need an extra play area nearer the school.	Theme: Community and Recreational Facilities. Policy CRF1: Retention and provision of community and recreational facilities. The policy supports new facilities. Policy BE3: Local Green Spaces. The football field and children's play area are both mentioned in the proposed green spaces list. They are also listed in section 4 of the NP 'Projects and aspirations.'
Do you think we have correctly identified those areas to protect within the Parish?	Themes: Built environment and Countryside and the natural environment.

<p>39 responses.  Yes: 95%  No or blank: 5%  Comments: a) strongly agree to the importance of protecting the character and heritage of Thorp Arch. b) protection is needed for the woodland behind the prison, huge heronry nesting area and wild flowers.</p>	<p>A series of policies have been constructed to protect the areas that have been identified and supported as being worthy of protection. The policies are:  Policy BE1. Design and development in the Conservation Area.  Policy BE2. Design and development outside the Conservation Area. Policy BE3. Local Green Spaces, Policy BE4 Protecting non-designated heritage features. Policy CNE1. Protecting countryside character. Policy CNE2 Green corridors. Policy CNE3. public rights of way and Policy CNE 4. Enhancing biodiversity.</p>
<p>Do you feel the cycleway will be beneficial to improve the connectivity within the Parish? If so, which of the options would you prefer? (this referred to three different route options from the housing N and NW of the prison to Thorp Arch village.)  39 responses.  Route 3: 60%  Route 2: 18%  Route 1: 45%  Comments: a) Cycle path will improve access to the school but will not improve connectivity between the village. b) the proposal would be ideal to help bring the two districts together. c) paths 2 and 3 would be advantageous for the Woodlands area. d) consider linking with the footpath from the church to the tennis court. d) add a small section of path on Wood lane to join Ebor Way. e) proposed path along Wood lane for Ebor Way excellent idea.</p>	<p>Theme: Countryside and the natural environment.  Policy CNE3. Public rights of way. This policy supports proposals for new cycle routes and footpaths.  Section 4 Projects and aspirations, lists the route 3 project which was selected as the favourite route in the exhibitions. It also lists a project to install a footpath along Wood lane to link with Ebor Way as mentioned in the exhibition comment. Section 4 also lists an aspiration to support and link with Walton NP objectives to improve various cycle paths in their plan area.</p>

## **Section 7 - Conclusions**

The Steering Group believes that the NDP has been the subject of an ongoing and proportionate level of community engagement that meets the requirements of the regulations.

The Draft Neighbourhood Plan put forward at The Regulation 14 Consultation Stage received many comments from residents and stakeholders. Where comments were received, either appropriate changes have been made to the plan to address concerns or justification has been given where the Steering Group felt that no change was needed or that other suggested changes should not be made.

The Steering Group also believes that the policies and other details of the NDP at Submission Draft Stage reflect the issues and concerns raised during these multiple consultations that started in 2012 and concluded in March 2017.

28<sup>th</sup> March 2017

**Appendices – Regulation 14 Consultation.**

**Tables of comments from consultees with responses and actions from Thorp Arch Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.**

Appendix 1 - Residents and Businesses

Appendix 2 - Carter Jonas

Appendix 3 - Pegasus

Appendix 4 - Coal Authority, Historic England and Environment Agency.

Appendix 5 - Homes and Communities Agency

Appendix 6 – Leeds City Council