

Leeds City Council

Decision Statement – Horsforth Neighbourhood Development Plan

Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

Regulation 18 Decision Statement

1. Summary

- 1.1 Following an independent examination, Leeds City Council now confirms that it is making modifications to the Horsforth Neighbourhood Plan as set out in Table 1 below. The Plan will then proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning Referendum.
- 1.2 In accordance with the independent examiner's recommendations, the Horsforth Neighbourhood Plan will proceed to referendum based on the Horsforth Neighbourhood Area as designated by Leeds City Council on 16 July 2013.
- 1.3 This Decision Statement, the examiner's report and the draft Horsforth Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documentation are available on the Council's website:
<https://www.leeds.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/horsforth-neighbourhood-plan>
- 1.4 They are also on the Horsforth Town Council website
http://www.horsforthtowncouncil.gov.uk/Horsforth-TC/horsforth_neighbourhood_plan-17751.aspx
- 1.5 Hard copies of the Decision Statement and the examiner's report are available for inspection at:
 - Horsforth Town Council Offices, Mechanics Institute, Town Street, Horsforth, Leeds, LS18 5BL
 - Horsforth Library, Town Street, Horsforth, Leeds, LS8 5BL
 - City Centre One Stop Centre, Merrion House, 110 Merrion Centre, Leeds, LS2 8BB

2. Decisions and Reasons

- 2.1 The examiner has concluded that subject to the specified modifications being made to the Plan, the Horsforth Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions stated and other relevant legal requirements.

- 2.2 The Council accepts all of the modifications and the reasons put forward by the examiner for them. The examiner’s reasons and Recommendations are set out in Table 1, followed by the Council’s decisions.
- 2.3 The Council is satisfied that subject to the modifications specified in Table 1 below the Plan meets the relevant Basic Conditions mentioned in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, is compatible with the Convention Rights and complies with the provision made by or under s38A and s.38B of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 2.4 To meet the requirements of the Localism Act 2011, a referendum which poses the question “Do you want Leeds City Council to use the Neighbourhood Plan for Horsforth to help it decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area?” will be held in the Horsforth Neighbourhood Area. It is anticipated that the referendum will take place in spring 2020.

TABLE 1 Schedule of Modifications Recommended in the Examiner’s Report

Modification Number¹	Page/Part of the Plan	Examiner’s recommended changes	Examiner’s reason	Leeds City Council’s decision
Introductory Sections and Supporting Documents				
OM1	Statement of Community Consultation, page 2	Correct the date of designation of the neighbourhood area to July 2013 in the Statement of Community Consultation	The Statement of Community Consultation erroneously states that the neighbourhood area was designated in February 2013 – this was the date of application.	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations.
OM2	Map 1	Provide a link to the Policy Proposals Map in relation to Map 1	A map of the neighbourhood area is included in the Plan. This is not of sufficient quality that the location of the boundary can be determined. The Policy Proposals Map provides an appropriately detailed mapping base for the neighbourhood area.	Agree to add link as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations.
OM3	Statement of Community Consultation, page 1 and Sustainability Assessment, page 1	Correct the plan period in the Statement of Community Consultation and the Sustainability Assessment to 2019 – 2028	The Statement of Community Consultation and the Sustainability Assessment both erroneously refer to a period of 2019 – 2018.	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations.
M1	Maps (throughout the plan)	Use high definition map images at an appropriate scale throughout the Plan and provide a link to the Policy Proposals Map	The Plan includes a number of maps and these are of varying quality. A high quality Policy Proposals Map is provided, including online, and this should be referenced alongside other relevant maps. Specific issues of clarity are addressed in the comments below on specific policies.	Agree to modify the maps as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations.

¹ Please note that the examiner has included Optional Modifications in his report, which are marked in the report and in this decision statement as “OM”.

OM4 and OM5	Section 4.3, pages 27 - 31 Contents section, page 2	Amend the hierarchy of headings in Section 4.3 addressing individual sites Amend the second subsection of Section 4.6 in the Contents to read “Improved Cycling, Walking and Equestrian Provision”	The Plan is well structured and presented with a comprehensive Contents and an appropriate hierarchy of headings except in Section 4.3 where the individual sites (commencing with “ <i>Brownberrie Lane</i> ”) should be subservient to the section heading “ <i>Housing Sites – Development Requirements and Aspirations</i> ”. The second subsection in Section 4.6 should also be corrected in the Contents to reference equestrian provision.	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations.
OM6	Policy criteria, throughout the plan	Be consistent in the presentation of policy considerations	The presentation of separate considerations within a number of policies is inconsistent and makes various use of letters (c)), dashes (-) and bullets ().	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations.
4.1 Green Environment				
POLICY GE1: WOODHALL/CALVERLEY/CRAGG WOOD/HUNGER HILLS SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREA (WITHIN HORSFORTH)				
M2	Policy GE1, page 12	Amend Policy GE1 to replace “ <i>will be acceptable, provided it would</i> ” with “ <i>should</i> ”	Policy GE1 is restrictively worded in defining what will make development “ <i>acceptable</i> ”. National planning policy requires neighbourhood plans to be positive in approach and for planning policies to avoid being inflexible.	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
M3	Map 2, page 12	Provide a link to a high definition map depicting the boundary of the Special Landscape Area associated with Map 2	The Policy is supported by Map 2 which defines the boundaries of the Special Landscape Area. This is at too small a scale and the boundaries are too vaguely represented to provide the clarity necessary. The Special Landscape Area is clearly defined on the Policy Proposals Map and online and these sources should be referenced.	Agree to add link as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations.

POLICY GE3: PROTECTION OF LOCAL GREEN SPACE				
M4, M5 and OM7	Policy GE3, page 15 Policy Proposals Map Appendix 2	insert "Inappropriate" before "development" in the second sentence delete "Land at West End/The Avenue (19)" Make consequential changes including to the Policy Proposals Map and Appendix 2 to exclude those areas of Local Green Space not designated Renummer the Local Green Spaces so they are sequential	The policy approach for Local Green Space should align with that of Green Belt. This applies the "very special circumstances" test to "inappropriate" development and not to all development. The evidence supporting designation of land at West End/The Avenue as Local Green Space (reference 19) is heavily caveated. It "may be" accessible, "may be" used, is "very likely" to be wildlife rich, is "probably" associated with wildlife significance, "may also" have recreational significance, is "likely" to be demonstrably special and is of benefit only to a "limited" community. The site is entirely bounded by private dwellings and has no physical and limited visual access from public land. Although there is no requirement for Local Green Space to be publicly accessible, there is a need for its benefits to be evidenced and demonstrable.	Agree to modify the text and maps as indicated to comply with the examiner's recommendations
POLICY GE4: GREEN SPACE ENHANCEMENT				
OM8	Policy GE4, page	Delete ", and which complies with other policies in this Neighbourhood Plan or the Local Plan"	The reference to development which complies with other plan policies is superfluous as all planning applications are considered in the light of all development plan policies.	Agree to modify text as indicated to comply with the examiner's recommendations
4.2 The Built Environment				
POLICY BE1: HORSFORTH CHARACTER AREAS – DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN				
M6, OM9 and M7	Policy BE1, pages 18 - 20	Delete "where permission is required" in Area 4c) Delete the bracketed text at the end of Area 6	For Area 4 the reference to circumstances "where permission is required" is superfluous as planning policies only apply when a planning application is required. For Area 6 examples, such as "keyhole-shaped recessed porches", need to be evidenced in the supporting text. For Areas 7, 9 and 10 the cross-	Agree to modify text and maps as indicated to comply with the examiner's recommendations

		<p>Delete the first bullet of Area 7 and Area 10 and the first two bullets of Area 9</p> <p>Correct the name of Character Area 9 “Green Belt” in Map 4</p> <p>Provide a link to a high definition map depicting the boundary of the Character Areas associated with Map 4</p>	<p>referencing of other Plan policies is superfluous as planning applications must be considered against all development plan policies. The reference to “Policy BE2” in Area 7 should in any case be to Policy BE3.</p> <p>The Policy is supported by Map 4 which defines the boundaries of the Character Areas. This is at too small a scale and the boundaries are too vaguely represented to provide the necessary clarity. The Character Areas are clearly defined on the Policy Proposals Map and online and these sources should be referenced. There is an error in the name of Character Area 9 in Map 4.</p>	
POLICY BE2: SHOP LIGHTING				
OM10	Policy BE2, page 21	Amend Policy BE2 to add “; and” at end of the third bullet]	The Policy does not make it clear whether all of the criteria apply to each application.	Agree to modify text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
POLICY BE3: UPPER WEST END LANE/SOUTHWAY ESTATE DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS				
M8, M9, M10, M11	Policy BE3, page 23 Policy Proposals Map	<p>Delete Policy BE3 and make consequential amendments to the numbering of the Plan</p> <p>Insert the wording of Policy BE3 into the considerations for Area 7 in Policy BE1 after “in the area” and replace the “-” for each consideration with letters “a) to i)”</p> <p>Amend the Policy Proposals Map to align the boundary of the Upper West End Lane/Southway Estate with that of</p>	<p>The area defined in Policy BE3 is almost all in Character Area 7 and there is no substantive evidence provided for the small variations south of Lee Lane West or for the inclusion of Lee Lane Farm. My own assessment on visiting the area is that the Horsforth Design Statement provides a stronger evidence base for defining the character area boundaries and I did not find reason to justify the addition of an overlapping character area. I conclude that the intent of Policy BE3 can best be achieved through an amendment to Policy BE2 which integrates it into the considerations for Area 7.</p>	Agree to modify text and map as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations

		the boundary between Area 7 and Area 9 along Lee Lane West, including the deletion of Lee Lane Farm Make consequential changes to the supporting text and Policy Proposals Map Key		
POLICY BE4: LOCAL HERITAGE AREAS				
OM11	Policy BE4 supporting text, page 23	Replace “ <i>similar protection</i> ” with “local protection as a non-designated heritage asset” in the supporting text in last paragraph of page 23	It is important that the two Local Heritage Areas are not confused with being Conservation Areas. The merits for whether they are “ <i>worthy of similar protection</i> ” is not a matter for a neighbourhood plan and Conservation Area designations are made by Leeds City Council.	Agree to modify text and maps as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
POLICY BE5: NORTH ROAD / SCOTLAND LANE LOCAL HERITAGE AREA				
OM12	Policy BE5, pages 24 - 25	Add “; and” to the end of the penultimate bullet point and end all except the last bullet point with a semi-colon.	Policy BE5 is supported by the same evidence base as Policy BE4. It is non-prescriptive and positively worded. It is unclear whether all of the policy considerations apply to each planning application.	Agree to modify text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
POLICY BE6: THE BROWNBERRIES LOCAL HERITAGE AREA				
OM13	Policy BE6, page 25	Add “; and” to the end of the penultimate bullet point and end all except the last bullet point with a semi-colon.	Policy BE6 is supported by the same evidence base as Policy BE4. It is non-prescriptive and positively worded. It is unclear whether all of the policy considerations apply to each planning application.	Agree to modify text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
POLICY BE7: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS				
M12 and OM14	Policy BE7, page 26	Amend Policy BE7 to replace “ <i>Poplar</i> ” with “ <i>Lime</i> ” and make the same correction to the Policy Proposals Map	The Policy is supported by an assessment of the four proposed non-designated assets in Appendix 7 and there is evidence of strong public support for the approach. My own visual assessment of the four proposed non-designated assets accords with the	Agree to modify text and map as indicated to comply with the

	Policy Proposals Map	Amend Policy BE7 to add “Local Heritage Areas (Policy BE4)” as an additional bullet	<p>evidence presented. There is an error in the Policy wording and on the Policy Proposals Map which describe Stanhope Drive “<i>Poplar</i>” Tree Avenue and not “<i>Lime</i>”.</p> <p>For consistency Policy BE7 should also address the non-designated assets represented by the two Local Heritage Areas in Policy BE4.</p>	examiner’s recommendations
4.3 Housing				
Policies H1 to H6				
M13, OM15/ M14, OM16 and OM17	<p>Policies H1 to H6, pages 27 – 31</p> <p>Policy Proposals Map</p>	<p>Amend Policies H1, H2, H3, H4, H5 and H6 to replace “<i>will</i>” with “<i>should</i>” after “<i>Map</i>”</p> <p>Delete Policy H5 and make consequential changes to the supporting text and Policy Proposals Map / Delete the last bullet of Policy H5 (if retained)</p> <p>Amend the supporting text in the penultimate paragraph of page 27 to recognise the Site Allocations Plan is now adopted and includes the six sites identified in the neighbourhood plan</p> <p>Correct the reference number (from “<i>HG2</i>” to “<i>HG1</i>” in the supporting text for Policy H3 relating to the area of recently granted planning permission.</p>	<p>I note the concerns expressed by WYG on behalf of Leeds City College that Policy H3 is not consistent with Leeds City Council’s recently adopted Site Allocations Plan. It considers this to be a breach of the Basic Conditions because the site allocation is a strategic policy, the effect of Policy H3 will be to “<i>constrain the delivery</i>”, and there has not been sufficient consultation. I also note that Leeds City Council believes the Plan has regard to its strategic planning policies and that these are provided by the Core Strategy. While it would have been preferable to see wider and earlier consultation with landowners on Policy H3, I do not consider the policy considerations in Policy H3 are either in conflict with the Site Allocations Plan or are unreasonable. With regard to the specific representations on vehicle access I note that Policy H3 presents a flexible approach with options and that the Site Allocation Plan also states that “<i>Horsforth roundabout will require alteration</i>”. I also make recommendations below to increase the flexibility of all of Policies H1 to H6 so that these are consistent with national Planning Practice Guidance and do not “<i>constrain the delivery</i>”. The considerations of Policy H3</p>	Agree to modify text and map as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations

			<p>are not binding. WYG acting on behalf of Leeds City College correctly identifies an error in the Site Allocations Plan reference number used for the site adjacent to that in Policy H3.</p> <p>The drafting of Policies H1 to H6 is too prescriptive in stating what “will” be required of planning applications on each of the sites. Policies H1, H2, H3, H5 and H6 also include unnecessary references to compliance with other policies in the Plan. All planning applications are considered against all policies in the development plan. Since the content of Policy H5 relates only to other Plan policies it does not serve a “clear purpose” (NPPF, paragraph 16) and should be deleted although I do not consider this is a breach of the Basic Conditions. I also agreed with WYG’s representations on behalf of Leeds Trinity University that Policy ES2 is not relevant to Policy H5 as the site will not functionally be part of Leeds Trinity University.</p>	
POLICY H8: HOUSING FOR INDEPENDENT LIVING				
M15 and M16	Policy H8, page 32	<p>Delete Policy H8 and make consequential changes to the supporting text</p> <p>Add “Housing for independent living” as an additional bullet in Policy H7</p>	<p>The Policy is intended to secure the supply of houses for independent living on sites smaller than the 50 dwelling threshold in the Local Plan. There is evidence of public support for the approach. The Policy lacks an evidence base as to the scale and nature of the need for housing for independent living and the Policy is prescriptive in setting a threshold for its delivery on development sites as small as five dwellings. This is not consistent with national planning policy (NPPF, paragraph 61) and there is an insufficient evidence base to justify the approach. I</p>	<p>Agree to modify text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations</p>

			recommend the issue is addressed less prescriptively as part of an amended Policy H7.	
4.4 Employment and Shopping				
POLICY ES1: CONTROL OF A5 HOT FOOD TAKEAWAYS IN HORSFORTH TOWN STREET TOWN CENTRE AND HORSFORTH NEW ROAD SIDE HIGHER ORDER LOCAL CENTRE				
M17, M18 and M19	Policy ES1, page 34	<p>Replace Policy ES1 with “Proposals for the change of use to A5 hot food takeaway should demonstrate that they will not:</p> <p>a) Undermine the vitality and viability of existing retail uses to meet day to day local needs;</p> <p>b) Increase the need to travel; and</p> <p>c) Lead to a concentration of A5 uses which will detrimentally impact on the community, including consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - cumulative impact, particularly upon the amenity of the area and traffic generation, especially where concentrations of A5 uses already exist; and - the impact of any proposal involving evening opening in relation to the proximity of the premises (and associated parking requirements) to residential accommodation, the nature 	<p>On request I was provided with a breakdown of the quantum and percentage of different uses for each of the recognised centres. This also resulted in clarification of the figures which showed that the proportion of A5 uses is significantly higher than shown in the Plan (38 units, 13%). A5 uses comprise 11% of units in Town Street and 15% in New Road Side.</p> <p>Policy ES1 is negatively worded in stating that proposals for A5 uses “<i>will be resisted</i>” and the evidence base is insufficient to justify such a restrictive approach. The Policy also lacks clarity in determining what constitutes “<i>concentrations of A5 uses</i>” and the policy considerations are relevant to all changes of use to A5 not only those from other A use classes.</p>	Agree to modify text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations

		<p>and character of the neighbourhood and existing noise levels.”</p> <p>Add the following to the supporting text “In assessing concentrations of A5 uses regard will be had to the guidance on clustering provide in Leeds City Council’s Supplementary Planning Document <i>Hot Food Takeaways</i> (April 2019).”</p> <p>Update the supporting text and evidence with the revised information on the breakdown of different uses across the neighbourhood area</p>		
POLICY ES2: LEEDS TRINITY UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA				
M20	Policy ES2, pages 35 and 36	<p>Amend Policy ES2 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ replace the third bullet with “The benefits for the surrounding area of reducing parking pressure on local roads.” ○ add “and” to the end of the penultimate bullet 	<p>There is a tension between the desirability of maintaining existing car parking capacity and of increasing it which is not resolved by the Policy and which is a potential source of confusion. Horsforth Town Council has clarified that the principle concern relates to parking on local roads outside the campus and this also corresponds with WYG’s representations on behalf of Leeds Trinity University. This parking pressure can be addressed in a number of ways not just through increased parking provision on-campus.</p> <p>It is unclear that all the criteria in Policy ES2 apply to relevant planning applications.</p>	Agree to modify text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations

4.5 Community Facilities and Services

POLICY CFS1: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES

<p>M21 and M22</p>	<p>Policy CFS1, pages 37 and 38</p>	<p>Amend Policy CFS1 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Delete <i>“requiring planning permission”</i> in the first line ○ Delete the second paragraph beginning <i>“Commercially provided facilities”</i> ○ Delete <i>“acceptable in principle”</i> in the last paragraph <p>Add <i>“(including the student community)”</i> after <i>“community”</i> in the second line of the last paragraph before the Policy Box on page 37</p>	<p>WYG on behalf of Leeds Trinity University has made representations that provision of the Leeds Trinity University Sports Centre facilities for the community is a management decision and not one which should be fettered by planning policy. My assessment of Policy CFS1 is that it takes a wider view of what constitutes <i>“community need”</i> than this and it would include the use of the Sports Centre facilities by students who are a part of the Horsforth community.</p> <p>Policy CFS1 contains superfluous references to development <i>“requiring planning permission”</i> and that which is <i>“acceptable in principle”</i>. In response to my request Horsforth Town Council has confirmed that the reference to <i>“commercially provided facilities”</i> relates to any facility listing <i>“charges for its use or hire”</i>. It then identifies four different ways in which charges are made. The term is confusing and does not provide the clarity necessary for an effective policy. Those cases where a facility may need to close on commercial grounds are addressed by the requirement that a <i>“continuing community need is identified”</i>.</p>	<p>Agree to modify text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations</p>
--------------------	-------------------------------------	---	---	--

POLICY CFS3: SCHOOLS DEVELOPMENT – KEY GUIDING PRINCIPLES

OM18	Policy CFS3, page	Amend Policy CFS3 to add “and” at the end of the second bullet	The Policy is supported by evidence that schools development will take place during the lifetime of the Plan. The drafting is such that it is unclear whether all the considerations apply.	Agree to modify text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
4.6 Traffic and Transport				
POLICY TT1: PUBLIC CAR PARKING IN HORSFORTH’S CENTRES				
M23, OM19 and OM20	Policy TT1, page 41	Amend Policy TT1 to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Delete “in Horsforth’s centres” in the first sentence ○ Replace “which would result in the loss of car parking capacity will be resisted” with “should not result in the loss of car parking capacity” in the first sentence ○ Add “which results in the loss of existing car parking capacity” after “permitted” in the second sentence ○ Replace “will be expected” with “should be provided” in the second sentence ○ Delete “or greater” in the second sentence ○ Replace “identified centres” with “nearest Town or Local Centre” in the second sentence 	<p>Policies TT1 and TT2 refer to “Horsforth’s centres”, “existing centres” and “identified centres” and indicate that they are shown on the Policy Proposals Map. The Policy Proposals Map has three blue hatched “Town and Local Centres”. This is a potential source of confusion and a single description is recommended.</p> <p>The Policy identifies two locations “in Horsforth’s centres” where loss of car parking capacity to development “will be resisted”. These are shown on the Policy Proposals Map. Fink Hill Car Park is located within the designated Centre. The former Adult Care Services Car Park is not located in the designated Centre and it is therefore unclear which Town or Local centre should be providing compensatory parking. It is unclear from the numbering on the Policy Proposals Map which car park is which and the red diagonal shading is also unclear. The Policy is negatively worded.</p> <p>The evidence base shows that the two locations are only sometimes at full capacity, there are significant periods when they are well below capacity and there is capacity elsewhere in the designated centre.</p>	Agree to modify text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Replace “existing centres” with “Town or Local Centre” in the second paragraph ○ Replace “, in excess of recommended parking standards”, and which complies with other policies in this Neighbourhood Plan or in the Local Plan, will be encouraged” with “will be supported.” in the second paragraph ○ Replace “is particularly encouraged” with “will be supported” in the third paragraph <p>Add numbers relating to those on the Policy Proposals Map after each of the named car parks (e.g. (1) and (2))</p> <p>Add “Recommended parking standards for Horsforth are provided in Leeds City Council’s Supplementary Planning Document <i>Parking (2016)</i>” to the supporting text.</p>	<p>The Policy encourages development which provides capacity in designated centres or at the railway station that exceeds recommended parking standards. There is no information provided on the source of these parking standards and the reference to compatibility with other Plan policies is superfluous. It also encourages additional capacity at Fink Hill car park.</p> <p>I do not find the evidence base supports such an encouraging approach to increasing parking capacity in Horsforth’s centres. It shows a degree of parking stress and the Policy does not consider alternatives to reducing demand. Three of the car parks are not pay and display and the car park with the most capacity is pay and display. My visit confirmed there is also significant additional short stay parking available which is not included in the study, including a major supermarket and an additional private car park off Fink Hill. The evidence base is not sufficient to justify exceeding recommended parking standards established by Leeds City Council.</p>	
POLICY TT2: PRIVATE CAR PARKING IN HORSFORTH’S CENTRES				
M24, OM21	Policy TT2, page 41	<p>Amend Policy TT2 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Replace “Horsforth’s” with “Town or Local” in the first sentence ○ Replace “will not be supported unless: - It can be clearly demonstrated” 	<p>The evidence base shows that the two of the three locations are only sometimes at full capacity, there are significant periods when they are well below capacity and there is capacity elsewhere in the designated centre. One of the car parks – the only one to be pay and display – is never more than half full.</p>	<p>Agree to modify text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations</p>

		<p>with “should demonstrate” in the first sentence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Delete “<i>Maverick’s Car Park (off Feast Field)</i>” and make consequential changes to the Policy Proposals Map ○ Replace “<i>in excess of recommended parking standards</i>”, and which complies with other policies in this <i>Neighbourhood Plan or in the Local Plan, will be encouraged</i>” with “will be supported.” in the second paragraph ○ Replace “<i>is particularly encouraged</i>” with “will be supported” in the third paragraph <p>Add numbers relating to those on the Policy Proposals Map after each of the named car parks (e.g. (1) and (2))</p>	<p>The Policy encourages development which provides capacity in designated centres or at the railway station that exceeds recommended parking standards. There is no information provided on the source of these parking standards and the reference to compatibility with other Plan policies is superfluous. It also encourages additional capacity at the “Crabtree” Site car park.</p> <p>As with Policy TT1 I do not find the evidence base supports such an encouraging approach to increasing parking capacity in Horsforth’s centres. It shows a degree of parking stress and the Policy does not consider alternatives to reducing demand, including use of pay and display. There is evidence that Maverick’s Car Park is under and not over used. My visit confirmed there is also significant additional short stay parking available which is not included in the study, including a major supermarket and an additional private car park off Fink Hill. The evidence base is not sufficient to justify exceeding recommended parking standards established by Leeds City Council.</p>	
Policy TT3: IMPROVED CYCLING, WALKING AND EQUESTRIAN PROVISION				

M25, M26	Policy TT3, page Map 7	<p>Amend Policy TT3 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Add “significantly” after “likely to” in the second paragraph ○ Delete “and which comply with other policies in this Neighbourhood Plan or in the Local Plan” in the third paragraph ○ Replace “must” with “should” in the fourth paragraph ○ Delete “, subject to compliance with other policies in this Neighbourhood Plan or in the Local Plan” in the fifth paragraph <p>Replace Map 7 with a higher quality definition and delete the Map 6 - Cycleways and Footpath Network” title</p>	<p>The Policy is supported by Map 7 depicting the existing footpath, cycleway and bridleway network and evidence of strong public support. Map 7 is poorly reproduced although the detail of the network is also provided on the Policy Proposals Map. Map 7 is also labelled as Map 6.</p> <p>Policy TT3 requires all development likely to increase usage of the network to provide connections or contribute to new provision. This would affect development with only a marginal impact on the network and is both too onerous and not justified by the evidence.</p> <p>The Policy is too prescriptive in stating what development “must” ensure and includes superfluous references to the need for compliance with other Plan policies.</p>	Agree to modify text and map as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
Further Modification				
Policies H1 – H4 and Policy H6				
FM1	Policies H1 – H4 and Policy H6, pages 27 - 31	In Policies H1 – H4 and Policy H5, delete policy clauses that refer to “compliance” with other neighbourhood plan policies	<p>The examiner has recommended that Policy H5 be deleted on the basis “<i>that all planning applications are considered against all policies in the development plan. Since the content of Policy H5 relates only to other Plan policies it does not serve a “clear purpose” (NPPF, paragraph 16) and should be deleted.</i>”</p> <p>In order to provide consistency with the examiner’s recommended modifications and to ensure that each policy within the neighbourhood plan serves a clear</p>	Modify the text as indicated.

			purpose, the references within these policies to “compliance” with other NP policies should be deleted.	
--	--	--	---	--