

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
<b>Background</b>	JohnsonMowat – P2/Para 2: we note...the NP was commenced in 2013 on the back of concerns over the threat of new housing which might not deliver the wider infrastructure needs of the settlement. This appears to be a common theme throughout the draft NP and is something our clients are fully aware of. However, the matter of infrastructure is one partially addressed by the District Council by way of the CIL that is extracted from almost every element of new development. It would therefore be appropriate to reference the CIL in the NP and how any CIL receipts from this process can be obtained to assist any local projects in need of financial support.	NOTED – The role of CIL is extensively referenced in the ‘Implementation’ section (P15). This will be carried through into the Pre-Submission NP.	NO ACTION
<b>Vision</b>	<p>NFU - given that the area is largely farmed, it is clear that any form of Neighbourhood Plan must adequately address the issues and opportunities of farming. Our vision for the area is:</p> <p>A sustainable rural community that is underpinned by an innovative rural economy and a thriving farming and food industry which is profitable and supports viable livelihoods, underpins sustainable and healthier communities and enhances the environmental assets that are vital to the counties prosperity.</p> <p>We all need to be aware of the future.</p> <p>Increased traffic on Old Pool Bank and through village a particular concern.</p>	<p>NOTED – the vision statement references the retention of the fundamentally rural character of the Wharfe Valley, the need to minimise environmental damage and sustainability. The vision needs to be community-led not outside agency led. It is however recognised that PIW’s farming community have a key role to play in this and all efforts will be made to engage this community in future NP development.</p> <p>AGREE – the vision aims to capture the community’s future aspirations for PIW.</p> <p>AGREE – the vision specifically references longstanding traffic-related problems, which are then followed</p>	<p><b>ACTION – specific targeting of farming community in future consultations.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Perfect in an ideal world.</p> <p>Pool has been asking for these things for 20 years.</p> <p>The majority of the vision I agree with.</p> <p>It is important that Pool-in-Wharfedale maintains its own identity.</p> <p>Clear and visionary.</p>	<p>through in objectives, policies and actions/projects. Specific Old Pool Bank issues already in process of being addressed.</p> <p>NOTED – the vision statement is aspirational. It paints a picture of how the PC and the community would wish the parish to be 11 years from now. There is no guarantee that this will happen but it nonetheless constitutes an achievable, if challenging, ambition for all involved in the life of PIW, which the NP’s objectives, policies and projects/actions will be designed to try to bring about.</p> <p>AGREE – the NP represents the first ever opportunity for the PC to ‘ask for some of these things’ (where planning-related and in conformity with planning requirements) via what will be statutory planning policies once the NP is ‘made’, ie adopted.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE – the vision clearly states that PIW will have been maintained as a distinct community.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>I think we ought to designate areas of land for these functions even if occupied by housing/commercial premises at the moment. Then at the appropriate time. e.e. when garage is sold, these areas can be developed as amenities.</p> <p>Traffic is the main problem of which there appears to be no solution.</p> <p>Bypass only solution.</p> <p>New development should only proceed when all the objectives below have been addressed.</p> <p>Protect the village, improve services and tackle congestion problem.</p> <p>No bypass mentioned?</p> <p>Footpaths on Old Pool Bank would be appreciated in the absence of proper traffic restrictions x2</p>	<p>NOTED – not clear how this relates to the vision. Not clear either what is meant by ‘these functions’ or what ‘housing/commercial premises’ (apart from the garage) are being referred to. But principle of identifying future ‘opportunity sites’ may be worthy of consideration.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP will seek to set out objectives, planning policies and non-planning actions/projects designed to address the traffic problem and to achieve the vision’s traffic-related aspirations.</p> <p>NOTED – beyond the scope of the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – it is not in the NP’s gift to prevent or condition new development in this way.</p> <p>AGREE – the vision reflects all 3 of these points.</p> <p>NOTED – beyond the scope of the NP.</p> <p>AGREE – it is already proposed that this be provided for in ‘Transport &amp; Traffic’ – ‘Non-Planning Actions/ Projects’.</p> <p>NOTED – the Leeds Core Strategy already provides for 35% of all new</p>	<p>ACTION – develop list of ‘opportunity sites’, such as the Half Moon Garage, to be covered by NP policy/policies setting out desired future land uses/development requirements.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>On the whole. I think the vision should contain a positive statement concerning the provision of more affordable housing.</p> <p>If it would be advantageous to join with any adjacent village, I would not object.</p> <p>Public transport good idea. Traffic issues good.</p> <p>Pool is Pool and I would love it to remain as it is and not be swallowed up by traffic or more building.</p> <p>Lovely site.</p> <p>Very wide-ranging - good.</p> <p>I'm glad it's recognised the need for people to travel to towns and cities and longstanding problems of traffic.</p> <p>Most of it - some areas a little vague.</p>	<p>homes in PIW to be affordable. In the absence of any evidence that PIW has a requirement over and above this level and that, as such, the NP needs to provide for such a higher level, there is no reason for affordable housing to figure in the NP vision.</p> <p>DISAGREE – it is not considered in any way desirable for PIW to physically merge with any adjacent village.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE – NP aims to achieve this.</p> <p>NOTED – although the focus of the comment is unclear.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – by its nature, a vision is necessarily couched in general terms. The NP's objectives, policies, actions/projects provide the specifics and the detail.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>You don't mention how the traffic is going to be controlled by a new road? From Otley perhaps. They have a bypass.</p>	<p>NOTED – beyond the scope of the NP.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Yes &amp; No - whilst I agree with protecting rural interests and green land and countryside, the vision indicates there will be building and development. This approach will bring new people into the area unnecessarily and cause problems.</p>	<p>NOTED – new building/development is almost inevitable – in the form of infill/windfall - and probably eventually at Old Pool Bank as provided for in the higher level LCC Local Plan, neither of which the NP can contradict/prevent. The best the NP can do is to control/shape any new development – its various policy intentions are designed to achieve this.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Traffic is the main issue - not just in the main village, but Old Pool Bank area.</p>	<p>AGREE - the vision specifically references longstanding traffic-related problems, which are then followed through in objectives, policies and actions/projects. Specific Old Pool Bank issues already in process of being addressed.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>It is comprehensive in its aspirations.</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Longwinded</p>	<p>DISAGREE – the vision statement is short and concise when compared those of many other NPs. It needs to be of sufficient length to cover the many and varied issues that the NP goes on to address.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>I am a little wary about any long-term plan that essentially says; things should remain the same but without the</p>	<p>NOTED – the vision reflects community consultation to date, together with</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>traffic problems. However agreeable I am to this, life is not like like as change is inevitable. There seems to a distinct lack of anything genuinely innovative - but perhaps that is intentional.</p> <p>You haven't told us what the plan is, you have just listed objectives and intentions. As well-meaning as these are, what will be done, by when, at what cost, met from what budget?</p> <p>I think the bad traffic and the narrow footpaths are the main problems the town has. We love living here otherwise and think the plan's vision is ambitious and excellent.</p> <p>I don't think the entire demographic of Pool has been considered.</p>	<p>likely, programmed change imposed from outside. There is scope for innovation if the community wishes to put forward innovative ideas.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP is still at an early stage of development. It is important initially to test out and ensure agreement with general objectives and intentions before embarking on more detailed, technical work. The core of the actual plan will be its planning policies (because the main raison d’etre of a NP is its planning content) – these are applied as required throughout the NP’s 10 year life with no direct cost/budget implication. The NP’s non-planning actions/projects will be worked up in more detail in the Pre-Submission Draft Plan which will include a ‘project delivery plan’, identifying priorities, partners and likely budgets and funding sources.</p> <p>AGREE/NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – all households (encompassing young/old by definition) have been engaged in the NP’s development thus far, including a</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>I do not agree that the proposed design of the Shell garage "retains the fundamentally rural character of the Wharfe Valley". This design could have been much more sympathetic and incorporated more trees/planting.</p> <p>See my comment on "vision". Housing should be stated under that heading too.</p>	<p>special school's project. It is unclear what demographic is felt not to have been considered.</p> <p>NOTED – approval of plans for the Shell garage pre-date the preparation of the NP Policy Intentions Document (PID). Even had the PID been available, it would not have carried any weight in the decision-making process as it would not have passed through its public consultation phase. The PC commented on the planning application.</p> <p>NOTED – housing, while not explicitly referenced in the vision, is implicit in references to 'any new development' and 'people's basic needs...will be largely catered for'. Housing is picked up as a specific thread in the follow-on objectives and policies.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<b>Objective 1</b>	<p>Need to sort traffic problems immediately.</p> <p>I think that in Objective 1 it is slightly over-stating the case to say that traffic makes much of the Parish UNSAFE for pedestrians but it certainly makes it UNHEALTHY.</p> <p>Agree with them particularly traffic control and infrastructure.</p>	<p>NOTED/AGREE – NP is not an 'immediate' project – it is unlikely to be adopted until late 2019. More urgent action to address problems is desirable.</p> <p>NOTED – it is probably true to say that much of the parish is both unsafe and unhealthy.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p><b>ACTION – PC to consider implementing NP non-planning actions/projects as a matter of urgency.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION – add 'unhealthy' to objective.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	Agree with all points, especially 1, 2, 3 and 9.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	We agree with all the objectives, particularly the issue of traffic problems and healthcare provision.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Whilst accepting statement 8, it needs to be able to fit in with statements 1,5 and 9.	AGREE – objectives 1 and 8 are considered to be compatible. NP planning policies and non-planning actions/projects will work to try to ensure that any new housing development does not exacerbate, and ideally addresses, PIW's existing traffic problems.	NO ACTION
	Laudable but, for No 1, probably not achievable. The very worst of the traffic is caused by heavy commercial vehicles. Until there is a "Pool bypass" nothing will change.	NOTED – 'Transport & Traffic' – 'Non-Planning Actions/Projects' includes actions designed to address the heavy commercial vehicles issue. Bypass considered beyond the scope of the NP.	NO ACTION
	I agree with all the objectives. Above all else, objective 1 needs to be sorted to improve the quality of life for all of Pool's residents.	NOTED/AGREE	NO ACTION
	Agree with all but particularly the first two.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I would like to see the actual word "bypass" appear as an objective to the solution of traffic problems.	NOTED – beyond the scope of the NP.	NO ACTION
	Particularly important are items 1,2 &12 - in that order of importance.	NOTED	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
<b>Objective 2</b>	<p>However, if objective 2 was successful, objective 12 would not be necessary, bearing in mind the shortage of surgeries overall.</p> <p>Agree with all points, especially 1, 2, 3 and 9.</p> <p>Agree with all but particularly the first two.</p> <p>Particularly important are items 1,2 &amp;12 - in that order of importance.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – objectives 2 and 12 are not co-dependent. The meeting of 2 would not necessarily remove the need for some people to access medical care within the parish, eg older people.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<b>Objective 3</b>	<p>Agree with all points, especially 1, 2, 3 and 9.</p> <p>I agree with them all, especially providing safe walkways. - Bar House corner which has no pavement. - Crossing over Leeds Road, old Pool Bank, between bus stops.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – matters already in hand to address issues raised.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<b>Objective 4</b>	<p>What is the Wharfedale Greenway project?</p> <p>I would like to see the track of the original train track made into a bicycle track or footpath and a car park.</p>	<p>NOTED - the Wharfedale Greenway is a cycleway/walkway link project along extant sections of the former Arthington to Burley-in-Wharfedale railway line, providing a route linking PIW, Otley and Menston with potential for extension through the Wharfedale valley to Ilkley and beyond. The Pre-Submission Plan will provide this further information.</p> <p>NOTED/DISAGREE– 1) the Wharfedale Greenway project, as promoted via NP policies and actions, will provide the cycle/footpath route suggested. 2) An</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>I would like to see the Arthington Railway station opened to Leeds.</p> <p>Do not want the area flooded with cyclists all over the place they can go to the gym. Agree with other points within objective 4.</p> <p>4/8/9/10/11/12 please don't waste monies studying new schemes when we need a new bridge and by-pass because of road and noise pollution (our road bridge was never built to carry the volume of traffic it does today).</p>	<p>associated car park is not considered desirable as do not want to encourage cars into the village to then access the Greenway.</p> <p>NOTED – any new railway station at Arthington would be outside the Neighbourhood Area and so cannot be specifically advanced via NP planning policy. However, this aspiration is implicit in the ‘improved travel’ and ‘traffic problem-solving’ statements within the vision, in objectives 1 and 2 and in NP ‘Traffic and Travel’ policies and actions/projects. NP policy will provide explicitly for the protection of an east-west rail link route through the parish.</p> <p>DISAGREE – objective is to provide for cycling provision off-road rather than attract more cyclists onto PIW’s roads – net effect should be to reduce numbers of on-road cyclists.</p> <p>DISAGREE – Wharfedale Greenway scheme already largely planned and agreed. Other measures referred to will be at minimal cost in relation to the amounts required for bridge/bypass projects and would be in no way related to the implementation or not of such</p>	<p><b>ACTION – add action/project re rail reinstatement, including stations at Arthington and Otley, to ‘Traffic &amp; Travel’ non-planning actions/projects.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	4. - should make specific reference to cycle lanes to key commuter locations such as Leeds, airport, Bradford rather than sedentary green cycle lanes that are no use for commuting.	projects. Bridge/by-pass considered to be beyond the scope of the NP.  DISAGREE – on-road cycle lanes to such destinations are not considered to be feasible, eg for reasons of topography. There are already objections to the cycle lane on Pool Bank New Road. They are also considered unhealthy due to pollution levels. There are no feasible off-road commuter routes.	NO ACTION
<b>Objective 5</b>	Would not wish to see Pool and Old Pool Bank consumed within other creeping communities such as Adel/Bramhope x2  Whilst accepting statement 8, it needs to be able to fit in with statements 1,5 and 9.	AGREE - it is not considered in any way desirable for PIW to physically merge with any adjacent village, as explicitly stated in the vision.  AGREE – objectives 5 and 8 are considered to be compatible. NP planning policies will work to try to ensure that any new housing development does not encroach on PIW's countryside hinterland. This however can only be within the context of higher level LCC planning policies re for eg safeguarded housing land at Old Pool Bank, which the NP cannot oppose.	NO ACTION  NO ACTION
<b>Objective 6</b>	All appropriate - particularly 6, 9 (school provision) and 11.  I don't agree with the provision of green spaces - we are very blessed already. Exception in case of a SMALL space in a larger housing area.	NOTED  NOTED – only new green spaces meeting clearly evidenced need, such as the example suggested, are envisaged.	NO ACTION  NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>6- why new space? why not ask people to choose greatest/least priorities?</p> <p>6- Don't put multiple items in one objective, e.g. #6.</p> <p>6 - Agree with most of this but the burial ground objective seems over-specific for this sort of plan. But if it does form a core part, I would wish it to be a non-denominational ground, acceptable to all beliefs and atheists alike.</p> <p>Agree with all objectives, but point 6 needs to take into account that new burial sites need to be considered very carefully.</p> <p>Disagree. Burial is declining, majority consider cremation preferable. This trend increases with each survey. Burial sites can reduce scope for other more beneficial uses.</p> <p>I am in agreement to protect, enhance and provide new green space, but not in favour of a new burial ground. I</p>	<p>NOTED - only new green spaces meeting clearly evidenced need are envisaged. Only one green space project is referenced in 'Green Environment' non-planning actions/ projects. In planning policy terms, through which this objective will be implemented, it is not a question of competing priorities.</p> <p>AGREE – the objective contains too many potentially conflicting elements.</p> <p>1) NOTED – re agreement. 2) DISAGREE – NPs are able to put forward site-specific proposals and aspirations. 3) AGREE – re non-denominational ground</p> <p>1) NOTED – re agreement. 2) NOTED – Unclear what exactly needs to be carefully considered.</p> <p>DISAGREE – there is good support for new burial ground.</p> <p>1) NOTED – re agreement. 2) DISAGREE – there is good support for new burial ground.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – separate out new burial ground issue, and possibly new green space issue, into individual objectives.</b></p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) ACTION – specify non-denominational in objective</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>think new and existing open spaces are better for the living and not the dead. Cremation should be encouraged.</p> <p>New green space -----YEs But new burial ground ----NO Waste of good land that can be used by the living The deceased should be cremated.</p>	<p>1) NOTED – re new green space. 2) DISAGREE – there is good support for new burial ground.</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p>
<b>Objective 7</b>	<p>7. Is preservation enough. Improvements can be secured by restoring original design features. Total excellence should be the target.</p>	<p>AGREE – ‘preservation’ can suggest an ‘in aspic’ mentality. Improvement or enhancement is likely to benefit the original historic or architectural character.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – amend objective to include improvement or enhancement.</b></p>
<b>Objective 8</b>	<p>Re 8 and 9 - feel there are difficulties supporting any more housing due to traffic problem, size of school, etc.</p> <p>I see no link between efficient energy and enabling children to remain in the community. (objective 8). To allow children to remain = more cheap housing and jobs.</p> <p>Whilst accepting statement 8, it needs to be able to fit in with statements 1,5 and 9.</p>	<p>NOTED – rather than supporting new housing, the NP is accepting (as it must be) of the new housing that will come its way as a result of LCC policy/ decisions and seeking to positively influence the nature of that housing.</p> <p>AGREE – encouragement of energy efficient new housing is unlikely to enable children/grandchildren to remain in the community.</p> <p>AGREE – objective 8 is considered to be compatible with 1,5 and 9. NP planning policies will work to try to ensure that any new housing development meets local need and in doing so, does not exacerbate, and ideally addresses, PIW’s existing traffic problems; does not encroach on PIW’s countryside hinterland (in context of LCC decisions already made to the contrary which the</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – separate out the energy efficiency dimension into a new objective.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>8/9/10/11/12/13/14 - Think these relate to going ahead and building and developing the area. The area does not require any of this. People wishing to access services immediately or within close distance can do this by living in cities.</p> <p>Objective 8. I agree with this but it is currently unfeasible given the price of building plots and the fact that developers/builders are still required to make a profit.</p> <p>4/8/9/10/11/12 please don't waste monies studying new schemes when we need a new bridge and by-pass because of road and noise pollution.(our road bridge was never built to carry the volume of traffic it does today).</p>	<p>NP cannot reverse); and comes with mitigating infrastructure.</p> <p>DISAGREE - rather than supporting new housing, the objective is accepting (as it must be) of the new housing that will come its way as a result of LCC policy/ decisions and seeking to positively influence the nature of that housing for the benefit of the community.</p> <p>NOTED/DISAGREE – a percentage of affordable housing will be delivered in PIW as a result of LCC planning policy. NP policy can push for smaller/cheaper houses to meet evidenced local need as part of any new housing scheme with reasonable hope of success. Actions under the NP umbrella can encourage energy efficiency but not require it over and above national standards.</p> <p>DISAGREE – NP policies/actions to deliver on this objective will be at minimal/no cost in relation to the amounts required for bridge/bypass projects and would be in no way related to the implementation or not of such projects. Bridge/by-pass considered beyond the scope of the NP.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<b>Objective 9</b>	Objective 9 may actually require disproportionately higher investment in infrastructure due to "step-up" costs.	NOTED	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	Re 8 and 9 - feel there are difficulties supporting any more housing due to traffic problem, size of school, etc.	NOTED – rather than supporting new housing, the NP is accepting (as it must be) of the new housing that will come its way as a result of LCC policy/ decisions and seeking to positively influence the nature of that housing.	NO ACTION
	All appropriate - particularly 6, 9 (school provision) and 11.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I especially agree with objective number 9.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Agree with them particularly traffic control and infrastructure.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	The village is growing but current infrastructure is poor.	AGREE – hence NP objectives, policies and actions/projects designed to improve infrastructure.	NO ACTION
	Agree with all points, especially 1, 2, 3 and 9.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Housing? Where would this be located. Will it reduce the appeals of the area? i.e. Lose house price for other houses.	NOTED – the only currently identified housing site is the safeguarded land at Old Pool Bank (as referenced in PI H1). Other new housing is possible over the plan period as a result of infill/windfall development and planning decisions by LCC/Government inspectors contrary to policy on other non-identified land. New housing unlikely to reduce appeal or deflate house prices.	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Whilst accepting statement 8, it needs to be able to fit in with statements 1,5 and 9.</p> <p>8/9/10/11/12/13/14 - Think these relate to going ahead and building and developing the area. The area does not require any of this. People wishing to access services immediately or within close distance can do this by living in cities.</p> <p>4/8/9/10/11/12 please don't waste monies studying new schemes when we need a new bridge and by-pass because of road and noise pollution.(our road bridge was never built to carry the volume of traffic it does today).</p>	<p>AGREE – objective 8 is considered to be compatible with 1,5 and 9. NP planning policies will work to try to ensure that any new housing development meets local need and in doing so, does not exacerbate, and ideally addresses, PIW's existing traffic problems; does not encroach on PIW's countryside hinterland (in context of LCC decisions already made to the contrary which the NP cannot reverse); and comes with mitigating infrastructure.</p> <p>DISAGREE - rather than supporting new housing, the objective is accepting (as it must be) of the new housing that will come its way as a result of LCC policy/decisions and seeking to positively influence the nature of that housing for the benefit of the community.</p> <p>DISAGREE – NP policies/actions to deliver on this objective will be at minimal/no study cost in relation to the amounts required for bridge/bypass projects and would be in no way related to the implementation or not of such projects. Any costs would be borne largely by developers/LCC. Bridge/by-pass considered beyond the scope of the NP.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>9 - would benefit from being more specific about 'proportionate'. In reality, we need disproportionate investment to sort infrastructure such as schools, roads and a railway line.</p>	<p>NOTED – impossible for the NP to be more specific. Use of phrase ‘at least proportionate’ indicates that disproportionate investment may well be necessary. The infrastructure referred to is only that required to mitigate the direct effects of any new housing and not that required/desired generally by PIW. NP PI H1 will set out such requirements for the one likely new major housing scheme in PIW at Old Pool Bank. No evidence of any school-related need. NP will seek to address road/rail issues in so far as it can.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
<p><b>Objective 10</b></p>	<p>8/9/10/11/12/13/14 - Think these relate to going ahead and building and developing the area. The area does not require any of this. People wishing to access services immediately or within close distance can do this by living in cities.</p> <p>10. Pool is a mixture of designs, developers pattern-book solutions predominate. Traditional materials may not be the solution for new housing and we should be open to modern buildings not contemporary styles.</p>	<p>DISAGREE - rather than supporting new housing, the objective is accepting (as it must be) of the new housing that will come its way as a result of LCC policy/ decisions and seeking to positively influence the nature of that housing for the benefit of the community. More generally, small scale development is inevitable anywhere over a 10 year period – this objective seeks to bring about good, appropriate design.</p> <p>NOTED – national planning policy requires that NPs are not overly prescriptive re design and are open to more modern styles.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>I don't disagree with above point but would not want the village to lose its character and charm with lots of new housing estates.</p> <p>Objective 10. I have trouble with this as it seems to say all new buildings should be a pastiche of what has gone before - even if what has gone before isn't very good. I am sure that is not its intention, but may well be interpreted that way in the future.</p> <p>4/8/9/10/11/12 please don't waste monies studying new schemes when we need a new bridge and by-pass because of road and noise pollution.(our road bridge was never built to carry the volume of traffic it does today).</p>	<p>NOTED – NP policies will work to conserve the best of PIW's historical and architectural character and to encourage new development that is mindful of existing character but also contemporary as appropriate.</p> <p>NOTED – NP policies will work to conserve the best of PIW's historical and architectural character and to encourage new development that is mindful of existing character but also contemporary as appropriate.</p> <p>DISAGREE – NP policies/actions to deliver on this objective will be at no study cost and would be in no way related to the implementation or not of any bridge/bypass projects. Bridge/by-pass considered beyond the scope of the NP.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<b>Objective 11</b>	<p>All appropriate - particularly 6, 9 (school provision) and 11.</p> <p>Just a bit worried about Number 11. Where would these be situated and what impact on quality of life if living near a small shopping area?</p> <p>Very positive although Objective 11 needs more clarification as to what and where and will this have an impact on more traffic.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – possibly objective is too firm/definite.</p> <p>NOTED – possibly objective is too firm/definite.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – reword objective to read:- “to encourage the provision of more facilities for shopping, eating and meeting, as necessary and appropriate, and subject to location.”</p> <p>ACTION – reword objective to read:- “to encourage the provision of more facilities for shopping, eating and</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>11. We have several meeting places: hall at Methodist chapel, room at Parish Church, Village Hall, Wharfedale Court, Sports Club. Eating: one pub has closed down and attempts to run a cafe at the Sports &amp; Social Club have proved unsuccessful.</p> <p>In order for objective 11 to be materialised, the village would need to grow considerably.</p> <p>11 - Pool already has a very well used centre for meeting and eating, and a very well stocked shop/PO.</p> <p>Not sure about 11 as we don't seem able to support existing facilities like Half Moon pub.</p> <p>8/9/10/11/12/13/14 - Think these relate to going ahead and building and developing the area. The area does not require any of this. People wishing to access services immediately or within close distance can do this by living in cities.</p>	<p>NOTED – possibly objective is too firm/definite.</p> <p>NOTED - possibly objective is too firm/definite.</p> <p>NOTED - possibly objective is too firm/definite.</p> <p>NOTED - possibly objective is too firm/definite.</p> <p>DISAGREE – this objective relates to encouraging more meeting/eating/shopping facilities to meet needs of current and likely future expanded community. It is likely that any required development will relate to existing rather than new properties.</p>	<p>meeting, as necessary and appropriate, and subject to location.”</p> <p>ACTION – reword objective to read:- “to encourage the provision of more facilities for shopping, eating and meeting, as necessary and appropriate, and subject to location.”</p> <p>ACTION – reword objective to read:- “to encourage the provision of more facilities for shopping, eating and meeting, as necessary and appropriate, and subject to location.”</p> <p>ACTION – reword objective to read:- “to encourage the provision of more facilities for shopping, eating and meeting, as necessary and appropriate, and subject to location.”</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Pool village has already a deep sense of community, with the Sports and Social Club and village hall forming a natural centre to the village, closely connected to the riverside park, sporting facilities and school. Our concern with Objective 11 are: 'to create a village centre' - we already have one, 'by encouraging the provision of more facilities for meeting, eating and shopping' - this could lead to a substantial increase in commercial developments within the village, leading to an increase in traffic, which is already a problem. We are a village, and by nature, villages depend on local towns (i.e. Otley, but also Harrogate and Leeds) for a wider choice of eating and shopping. The issue here is making sure we have adequate public transport to get to these shopping/eating centres, not to bring them to the village. The Post Office and White Hart are adequate.</p> <p>4/8/9/10/11/12 please don't waste monies studying new schemes when we need a new bridge and by-pass because of road and noise pollution.(our road bridge was never built to carry the volume of traffic it does today).</p>	<p>NOTED - possibly objective is too firm/definite. It is really about encouraging more meeting/eating/shopping facilities to meet needs of current and likely future expanded community? The need for improved public transport is addressed in 'Transport &amp; Traffic'.</p> <p>DISAGREE – NP policies/actions to deliver on this objective will be at no study cost and would be in no way related to the implementation or not of any bridge/bypass projects. Bridge/by-pass considered beyond the scope of the NP.</p>	<p>ACTION – reword objective to read:- “to encourage the provision of more facilities for shopping, eating and meeting, as necessary and appropriate, and subject to location.”</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<p><b>Objective 12</b></p>	<p>Medical facility may be over- ambitious. I see an expanded pharmacy (in a new location) with consulting room(s) that may be used by other peripatetic health practitioners.</p> <p>12 is unnecessary as there is plenty of medical care in Otley and Bramhope.</p>	<p>NOTED – the term ‘medical facility’ could cover this or any other suitable enhanced provision.</p> <p>DISAGREE – it is considered that a facility within the parish would benefit the community, particularly older people/those without private transport.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>However, if objective 2 was successful, objective 12 would not be necessary, bearing in mind the shortage of surgeries overall.</p> <p>12 is not realistic with current pressures on nhs. Aspirational.</p> <p>12 - I don't object to this aspiration as such, but I don't have a problem with using the Bramhope Medical centre, so am not sure it should form part of the fundamental objectives.</p> <p>We agree with all the objectives, particularly the issue of traffic problems and healthcare provision.</p> <p>Medical facility should include dentist.</p> <p>8/9/10/11/12/13/14 - Think these relate to going ahead and building and developing the area. The area does not require any of this. People wishing to access services immediately or within close distance can do this by living in cities.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – the provision of good public transport would not remove the benefit of a local facility for those who find it difficult to travel far.</p> <p>NOTED – hence the use of ‘to encourage...’ ie the objective is aspirational, as are the related NP ‘Community Facilities &amp; Services’ policies.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP includes a large number and wide range of objectives ranging from the very general and aspirational to the very specific and definite. This objective is not out of place in that context.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the term ‘medical facility’ could cover this or any other suitable enhanced provision.</p> <p>DISAGREE – this objective relates to encouraging a medical facility to meet needs of current and likely future expanded community. It is likely that any required development will relate to existing rather than new properties.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>4/8/9/10/11/12 please don't waste monies studying new schemes when we need a new bridge and by-pass because of road and noise pollution.(our road bridge was never built to carry the volume of traffic it does today).</p> <p>Particularly important are items 1,2 &amp;12 - in that order of importance.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – NP policies to deliver on this objective will be at no study cost and would be in no way related to the implementation or not of any bridge/bypass projects. Bridge/by-pass beyond the scope of the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – it is not necessary to rank the objectives in any priority order, although non-planning actions/projects will be prioritised in a 'project delivery plan' in the 'Implementation' chapter of the Pre-Submission NP.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<p><b>Objective 13</b></p>	<p>8/9/10/11/12/13/14 - Think these relate to going ahead and building and developing the area. The area does not require any of this. People wishing to access services immediately or within close distance can do this by living in cities.</p> <p>Reservations over visual and noise pollution of wind generators.</p> <p>13/ no to renewables ugly, noisy windmills or turbines in river which don't work.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – this objective is intended to relate only to encouraging a hydro-electric scheme on the River Wharfe to meet power needs of current and likely future expanded community. Any required development would be confined to the chosen Rover Wharfe location.</p> <p>DISAGREE – this objective is intended to relate only to encouraging a hydro-electric scheme on the River Wharfe.</p> <p>1) NOTED – this objective does not relate to wind power schemes only to a hydro-electric scheme on the River Wharfe.</p>	<p>ACTION – amend objective to specify River Wharfe based hydro-electric scheme.</p> <p>ACTION – amend objective to specify River Wharfe based hydro-electric scheme.</p> <p>1) ACTION – amend objective to specify River Wharfe based hydro-electric scheme.</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
		2) DISAGREE – there is no evidence presented to show that river turbines do not work.	2) NO ACTION
<b>Objective 14</b>	<p>No 14 may lead to more traffic, therefore this must be limited.</p> <p>8/9/10/11/12/13/14 - Think these relate to going ahead and building and developing the area. The area does not require any of this. People wishing to access services immediately or within close distance can do this by living in cities.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – the objective relates to PIW’s existing employment base/locations rather than to the encouragement of further economic development/employment uses in new locations.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the objective relates to PIW’s existing employment base/ locations rather than to the encouragement of further economic development/employment uses in new locations.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<b>Objectives - General</b>	<p>NFU - For the farming community this vision (nb see ‘Vision’ above) is to be achieved by the following themes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Strengthening our farming businesses to help them build profitability and respond to new opportunities;</li> <li>2. To create thriving localities which meet the needs of their communities, businesses and their environment;</li> <li>3. Realising the value of the region’s environmental assets.</li> </ol> <p>In addition we would see some of the key priorities for farms to include (not in order of priority):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.The ability for the next generation to take on management of farms and to support this through the provision of affordable housing to allow succession;</li> <li>2.Develop farming enterprises that can meet the challenges of food security through modernising and becoming more efficient;</li> <li>3.Diversifying farming enterprises to meet new opportunities such as, inter alia, business units or tourism;</li> </ol>	<p>NOTED – the objectives are designed to secure a thriving and more sustainable PIW, to protect PIW’s environmental assets and to safeguard its economic/ employment base. They also specifically reference renewable energy. The NP is set within the context of the Leeds local Plan which support rural/farm diversification. The objectives need to be community-led not outside agency led. It is however recognised that PIW’s farming community have a key role to play in this and all efforts will be made to engage this community in future NP development.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – specific targeting of farming community in future consultations.</b></p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>4.Developing renewable energy which meets the needs of the farm and are appropriate to the location and renewable resources available;</p> <p>5.Access to high-speed broadband.</p> <p>To help guide any work we have developed some principles which we believe will help to shape any activity in the area. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Food security is a crucial issue for now and the future and any actions must ensure that we do not compromise our ability to feed ourselves;</li> <li>•We should look to increase farm productivity and decrease impact on the environment;</li> <li>•The achievement of sustainable development in rural areas through the integration of environmental, social and economic objectives;</li> <li>•Meet the needs of a diverse rural population and ensure equality of opportunity;</li> <li>•Maintain and enhance the areas natural asset base;</li> <li>•Farmers and landowners should always be consulted and listened to with regard to developing the area;</li> <li>•Support sustainable growth in the rural economy;</li> <li>•Sustainable farming will support the wider community;</li> <li>•Not one system of farming is the answer and all should be supported for maximum benefit to society and the environment;</li> <li>•Encourage links between rural areas and urban centres.</li> </ul>		
	Very clear. Agree.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Agree with all objectives.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	All appropriate - particularly 6, 9 (school provision) and 11.	NOTED	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	Excellent. Ambitious but reflect what we'd like to achieve.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I agree with the objectives.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Agree with all objectives.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Very pleased with those proposed.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Very positive.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I fully agree with all the objectives listed.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Agree all.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	We agree with all the objectives.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Agree with them particularly traffic control and infrastructure.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Good.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Agree with all objectives.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Mostly admirable.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Fully agree with all objectives.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Overall, the objectives are commendable.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Agree with all points, especially 1, 2, 3 and 9.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	All objectives listed on Page 3 are very admirable - what's not to like? Realistically - Pie in the Sky!	NOTED – it is considered that the NP's planning policies and non-planning	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
		actions/projects represent an efficient and effective approach to addressing PIW's issues and attempting to deliver on the plan's objectives.	
	Good - to preserve Pool as it is as much as possible - though I know there will be changes!!	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Really good.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Excellent ! Covering the needs of Pool.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I agree with all the objectives. Maybe think of some measures and timescales against the objectives?	NOTED – this type of 'measures/ timescale' approach will be applied to the plan's non-community actions/ projects in a 'project delivery plan' to be included in the 'Implementation' chapter of the Pre-Submission NP. The planning policies will be applied on an ongoing basis.	NO ACTION
	Ok.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I agree.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	We agree with all the objectives, particularly the issue of traffic problems and healthcare provision.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Laudable.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I agree with the principles of these.	NOTED	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	I agree with them all, especially providing safe walkways. - Bar House corner which has no pavement. - Crossing over Leeds Road, old Pool Bank, between bus stops. Agree with all objectives, but point 6 needs to take into account that new burial sites need to be considered very carefully.	NOTED – specific points re objectives 3 and 6 addressed above under those headings.	NO ACTION
	All fine.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Very good if they happen.	NOTED – the NP will be prepared in such a way as to give the best possible chance of meeting the objectives.	NO ACTION
	Happy with all.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I agree with all the objectives. Above all else, objective 1 needs to be sorted to improve the quality of life for all of Pool's residents.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Agree with all but particularly the first two.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I agree with them all.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Agree with all the objectives.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	As per my previous comment.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I think the objectives as set out are very good. It is hoped that all of them will be implemented to make Pool a better place to live and work for our children and grandchildren.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Broadly agree as long as they do not interfere with the integration of modern technology into the community.	NOTED – the NP's objectives and follow-on provisions are compatible	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Younger people want different facilities to enhance their quality of life compared with other resident age groups - perhaps?</p> <p>Why is there no mention of key infrastructure improvements to the internet?? e.g. no acknowledgement that the internet / fibre optics cables play any kind of role in modern life. Perhaps some kind of planning provision ensuring all new housing can get direct fibre optics to the home would go some way towards allowing people to work from home (helping with traffic, providing more customers to local shops, attracting small business).</p> <p>More important things to deal with than these.</p> <p>Paragraph to finish as follows: - The necessary infrastructure to be in place before any new build begins.</p>	<p>with the integration of modern technology eg broadband into the community.</p> <p>NOTED – while it is considered that the ‘facilities’, ie the physical spaces to accommodate young people’s needs are already present, the activities/ opportunities within those facilities are currently lacking.</p> <p>DISAGREE – there is not considered to be an internet issue within PIW. Provision of direct fibre optics to the home is not a planning issue.</p> <p>NOTED – without knowing what these ‘more important things’ are however, the NP cannot address them. It is considered that the NP already addresses the most important things as raised by the community in initial consultations.</p> <p>NOTED – not clear which paragraph this relates to – possibly Objective 9? If so, this is an unrealistic requirement to impose and in any case not one which the NP could require.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – include a reference to the need for more young people’s activities, such as a youth club, within the plan as/ where appropriate.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>There is also no mention of general parking problems within Pool.</p> <p>The document needs to support Pool as an evolving community and ensure its sustainability. We need to be open to business ideas with forward thinking, whilst being mindful of inhabitants/residents and environmental impact. We need to support business and community.</p> <p>Please concentrate on road noise and pollution instead of wasting time and monies on other things.</p> <p>Growing traffic at speed through the village is a key concern.</p>	<p>NOTED – while the objectives make no specific reference to general parking problems, they are encompassed within objectives 1 and 2 and then specifically addressed in ‘Transport &amp; Traffic’ through PI TT4 ‘New Village Car Parking’.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that the NP is already set to do these things.</p> <p>NOTED – in terms of NP policy, it is not a matter of concentrating on one thing or another or of expenditure of time/money – it is a matter of putting in place a comprehensive suite of policies to be applied on an ongoing basis by LCC planners in the determination of planning applications. In terms of any non-planning actions/projects relating to noise/pollution, these can be prioritised by the PC in the Pre-Submission NP’s ‘project delivery plan’.</p> <p>AGREE – implicit in objective 1 and explicitly addressed under ‘Traffic &amp; Travel’ non-planning actions/projects.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – prioritise actions/projects re traffic noise/pollution in project delivery plan?</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Unsure about the provision of more parking. Where would it be? Would it be better to discourage cars in the village?</p> <p>The River Wharfe flowing through Pool is a real asset - is there an opportunity to address enhancing riverside leisure facilities/activities? (flooding permitting !).</p> <p>I think the environment/air pollution issue will become more pressing in future.</p> <p>The green environment should be protected and left as it is for those who want to live in a green, rural environment.</p> <p>Its never a bad thing to aim for perfection but some of these will be unattainable without support and funding from Central Government. This seems unlikely unless there is a significant change in policy and the economy.</p>	<p>NOTED – not explicitly referenced in the objectives but addressed in NP policy. Policy is left deliberately open-ended re location enabling any development-related proposals to be assessed on their individual merits. Objectives 2 and 4 specifically reference the discouragement of cars, while the ‘Traffic &amp; Travel’ section is clearly based on a ‘cars last’ approach.</p> <p>AGREE – neither the vision nor objectives address the Wharfe as a positive asset of which more could potentially be made.</p> <p>AGREE – vision and (implicitly) objective 1 highlight this and it is carried through into PI GE5.</p> <p>AGREE – the NP aims to do just this in so far as it is possible within the context of overriding national and LCC planning policies.</p> <p>AGREE – the NP is in some ways aspirational. It is recognised that some of its actions/projects will require significant outside funding in order to come to fruition and this will be made more explicit in the Pre-Submission NP.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include new text as/where appropriate re making more of the potential opportunities offered by the Wharfe, eg permissive paths to Otley and Arthington</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI GE1	LCC - Ok in principle.	NOTED	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	Visitors love to look at this beautiful, pretty, dramatic countryside.	AGREE	NO ACTION
	Even though I don't want this to be given the green light for any developers.	NOTED – PI does not give green light to developers. NP cannot prevent development coming forward but can set out a policy to control and shape any such development.	NO ACTION
	Although I don't want to see this as a blank cheque for development.	NOTED – PI does not present a blank cheque to developers. NP cannot prevent development coming forward but can set out a policy to control and shape any such development.	NO ACTION
	It is appropriate to add mention to the value of this area as an important "corridor" for wildlife in the wider landscape.	NOTED – this is covered under PI GE2.	NO ACTION
	Absolutely agree. We need to retain our scenery and open spaces.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Taking into account my comment in "Objectives".	NOTED	NO ACTION
	All good objectives.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Part of Chevin Forest Park and I hope will remain so for the long term future.	AGREE	NO ACTION
	Pool Mill chimney is a special feature in the landscape of Lower Wharfedale and should be retained.	AGREE – this will be addressed in the 'Built Heritage' section.	NO ACTION
	I agree with all the planning policy intentions.	NOTED	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>I don't think any level of development will have suitable regard. Any change will affect the character and appearance.</p> <p>Unless the drainage is improved no building should be allowed. The fields act on southern slope as a catchment area of water off the Chevin by springs.</p> <p>Although clarity and specificity may be enhanced by a reassessment of the language used.</p> <p>We cannot agree with policy intention that already states there will be vast building in a rural, green area surrounding a small, historic village.</p> <p>Not an inclusive intention.</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP cannot prevent development/change but policy can work to control and shape it.</p> <p>NOTED – matters of flood risk/ development are largely governed by national planning policy and a suite of higher level Leeds Local Plan policies. The NP cannot easily add to/strengthen these.</p> <p>NOTED – the final policy wording will differ from that of the PI, but will of necessity be somewhat technical/ legalistic in nature, as it must be fit for purpose for use by LCC planners in determining planning applications.</p> <p>DISAGREE – policy intention nowhere states that there will be 'vast building'. Rather the policy intention is accepting of the fact that there may well be some (probably minor) development which the NP is powerless to prevent and anticipates this by seeking to control/ shape any such development in so far as is possible.</p> <p>NOTED – the meaning of this comment is unclear and cannot therefore be properly responded to.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<b>PI GE2</b>	NYCC - we welcome the consideration of green infrastructure policies.	NOTED	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	LCC - ok in principle, subject to evidence, the clarity of the policy and the extent to which there are requirements.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	The new cycle/walking Greenway needs car parking areas around its start point.	DISAGREE – it is considered undesirable to encourage cars into the village in order to access the Greenway from there.	NO ACTION
	Need to know exact passageway.	NOTED – Pre-Submission NP will identify all Local Green Infrastructure and show it on the NP Map.	NO ACTION
	Don't understand what is to happen.	NOTED – Pre-Submission NP will make it clear what the policy means in practice and which areas of land the policy will relate to.	NO ACTION
	Protecting our green space is the best way for our village and quality of life here.	AGREE – NP policy seeks to protect green space and the quality of life it contributes to.	NO ACTION
	Maintaining and protecting green space is fundamental to the character of the village and quality of life.	AGREE – NP policy seeks to maintain and protect the green space resource.	NO ACTION
	Yes cycle paths to Otley, Harrogate and Harewood.	NOTED – Local Green Infrastructure will seek to embody cycle paths within multi-functional corridors, but can only do so within the Neighbourhood Area (although actual/potential links beyond can be indicated). Policy GE2 will be backed up/supplemented by Policy TT1 ('Traffic & Travel').	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Any development MUST fit with the green objectives and be in an appropriate material preferably natural stone.</p> <p>With the provision of green infrastructure within the Parish, it would be useful to ensure that new building on the outskirts of the Parish has porous boundaries to enable wildlife to move in (and out) from the countryside.</p> <p>But we also need to consider how others (non-residents) may be attracted to the area and how we will deal with parking vehicles and safe access.</p> <p>Strongly agree.</p> <p>Definitely.</p> <p>the sooner the better.</p> <p>Not the highest priority.</p>	<p>AGREE – NP policies re development in green areas flow directly from the plan’s objectives. The use of appropriate building materials is covered under ‘Built Heritage’.</p> <p>AGREE – attention will be paid to this in the mapping of Local Green Infrastructure (LGI).</p> <p>NOTED – comment seems to relate to the Wharfedale Greenway. GI TT4 (‘Traffic &amp; Travel’) would address any such for car parking if/when they come forward, although it is considered undesirable to encourage cars into the village in order to access the Greenway from there. Safe cycle access would be addressed via the identification of access routes under TT1.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – NP unlikely to be adopted until late 2019, although its provisions will become material post-exam (after February 2019?).</p> <p>NOTED – with NP policies the issue of priorities is irrelevant. It is a matter of</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – ensure in the mapping of LGI that any planned developments have open space permeability.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Fully in agreement with Wharfedale Greenway.</p> <p>We both wholly support this and would use and enjoy.</p> <p>This is high priority for me.</p> <p>Keep as it is.</p> <p>Wharfedale Green would be excellent for the village.</p> <p>As a cyclist, I am very enthusiastic about improving green links, off the main road network, and creating the Wharfedale Greenway as soon as possible. BUT, not at the expense of reducing the present road capacity.</p>	<p>putting in place a comprehensive suite of policies to be applied on an ongoing basis, as appropriate, by LCC planners in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – although with NP policies the issue of priority is irrelevant. It is a matter of putting in place a comprehensive suite of policies to be applied on an ongoing basis, as appropriate, by LCC planners in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>DISAGREE – it is simply not enough to just ‘protect’. There is a need also to enhance and extend as opportunities arise in order to strengthen the robustness of the network.</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>AGREE – Local Green Infrastructure policy has no implications for the reduction of present road capacity.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	Aside from cycle lanes - look what this did to Pool Bank. Very quickly aborted!	AGREE - Local Green Infrastructure policy has no implications for the creation of on-road cycle lanes.	NO ACTION
	The extension of the Greenway would, we feel, be very beneficial to Pool.	AGREE	NO ACTION
	We cannot agree with development and interference with natural environment.	NOTED – Local Green Infrastructure (LGI) policy generally is about protecting and enhancing the natural environment – the wildlife corridor function is a key criterion for the identification of LGI. The Wharfedale Greenway project will introduce greater formality (eg surfacing) to the former track bed but will be done with sensitivity to the natural environment. The greenway route is already well-used by people and the heightened profile is unlikely to cause unacceptable increases in such use.	NO ACTION
	Essential!	AGREE	NO ACTION
	Been looking forward to the Wharfedale Greenway for years!	AGREE	NO ACTION
	as per previous comments.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I would love to see improvement to stiles on existing footpaths.	NOTED – this can be encompassed within ‘Traffic & Travel’ non-planning actions/projects.	ACTION – add this issue to action point.

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>I would support the Wharfedale Greenway which could encourage safer cycling and walking. This idea has been discussed for years and yet seems to be as far away as ever for Pool.</p> <p>I think green infrastructure needs to be more focussed on commuters - and should learn lessons from the terrible Leeds/Bradford cycle super highway which places cyclists into junctions and is a bonkers design.</p> <p>As before.</p>	<p>NOTED – the project is now much closer to initial implementation.</p> <p>NOTED – PIW’s Local Green Infrastructure (LGI) can play a role for commuters where identified LGI encompasses corridors that can perform a cycle route function in relation to key commuter destinations.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<b>PI GE3</b>	<p>LCC - recommend the policy simply designates. A separate policy (or project) can be included for improvements.</p> <p>More than less to maintain village status as opposed to sub area of Leeds.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>Really need to know what is "agreed" when decided.</p> <p>No development of green belt land.</p>	<p>AGREE – it is intended that Pre-Submission NP has separate ‘designation’ and ‘enhancement’ policies.</p> <p>AGREE – although this is not the function of this particular policy. National and LCC Green Belt policy and PI GE1 and GE2 address this issue.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – there will be an informal sites consultation early in 2018 which will include candidate Local Green Space sites.</p> <p>NOTED – Green Belt policy/review/removal/addition is a function of national planning policy and LCC Local</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>As above.</p> <p>It will be necessary to overcome to NIMBY contingent.</p> <p>A good idea to have local green spaces.</p> <p>To an extent, but this very much depends on exactly where those sites are - you can't really agree or disagree without further info.</p> <p>We cannot agree with the proposal of welcoming and encouraging enhancement which in other words means building and developing.</p> <p>However, I'm reluctant to see any green space disappear.</p>	<p>Plan policy and lies outside the remit of NPs.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the meaning of the comment is unclear in relation to the PI.</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>NOTED – there will be an informal sites consultation early in 2018 which will include candidate Local Green Space sites.</p> <p>DISAGREE – enhancement in this context means improving the site in order to increase the open green space benefits it provides. Local Green Space status affords such sites the equivalent of Green Belt protection which rules out any built development except in exceptional circumstances, ie the highest level of protection against development possible.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP's combination of GE, BH and TT policy intentions does the best possible to protect PIW's green space, within the context of higher level national and Leeds planning policies that the NP must be prepared.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>But what's in the list?</p> <p>Depends on the list!</p>	<p>NOTED – there will be an informal sites consultation early in 2018 which will include candidate Local Green Space sites.</p> <p>NOTED – there will be an informal sites consultation early in 2018 which will include candidate Local Green Space sites.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<p><b>PI GE4</b></p>	<p>LCC – Ok.</p> <p>Wary re green space development.</p> <p>Would like to identify any "new green space"?</p> <p>Not sure what the word "otherwise" means - otherwise what?!</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – PI does not say 'green space development', rather it says 'development that delivers new green space', ie built development that would be allowable/in line with other policies that also result in the creation of new green space for PIW.</p> <p>DISAGREE – it was not considered possible to identify any land where new green space could be created. Instead, the PI allows for proposals for creating new green space to come forward and be assessed on their individual merits.</p> <p>AGREE – wording is imprecise and unclear.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – wording to be replaced with 'Development that is acceptable in principle.....' ie that is in line with other applicable planning policies. Eg housing development on an allocated site that creates new green space would be welcomed.</b></p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Depends on the "acceptable" development!</p> <p>Eh? What's an 'otherwise acceptable development'?</p> <p>Don't really understand this. Does it mean encouraging building on green field sites, provided that some unspecified other area is rendered "green space" which previously wasn't? Not sure how that can be done. And it doesn't sound a good idea. Or, does it mean taking current agricultural land and changing it into specific green-ish facilities? I'm uneasy about this too.</p> <p>May be better to protect the green spaces we have rather than developing some.</p>	<p>AGREE – wording is imprecise and unclear.</p> <p>AGREE – wording is imprecise and unclear.</p> <p>NOTED – it means welcoming the creation of new green space in situations where other development that is already acceptable in principle (eg housing development on an already allocated site) is going to take place.</p> <p>AGREE – PI GE3 already provides for this. GE4 relates to the provision of new green space 'on the back of' new development that is going to happen anyway (eg an identified housing site) and where it meets an evidenced local green space need.</p>	<p>ACTION – wording to be replaced with 'Development that is acceptable in principle.....' ie that is in line with other applicable planning policies. Eg housing development on an allocated site that creates new green space would be welcomed.</p> <p>ACTION – wording to be replaced with 'Development that is acceptable in principle.....' ie that is in line with other applicable planning policies. Eg housing development on an allocated site that creates new green space would be welcomed.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>We already have green space that must be protected, not policies that state the area is being built up to the extent we need to create what can only be described as small, artificial green spaces. We do not welcome development at all.</p> <p>Yes - I would welcome the development of new and different categories of green spaces.</p> <p>One of the more important intentions.</p> <p>I am encouraged by the description boards and glad to see the local school was involved with the designs Please note that the board that has nothing on it spoils the look of the area as a whole.</p> <p>Not sure about a new burial ground ..... though a better use of land than more housing.</p> <p>Agree re burial ground.</p> <p>New burial ground not a priority.</p>	<p>NOTED – PI GE3 already provides for the protection of eligible green space sites. GE4 relates to the provision of new green space ‘on the back of’ new development that is going to happen anyway (eg an identified housing site) and where it meets an evidenced local green space need. The NP cannot prevent new development identified in the Leeds Local Plan or infill/windfall development that is in line with higher level planning policies, although its policies are designed to control/shape such development as far as is possible.</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – although it is unclear to what the comment relates.</p> <p>NOTED – there is good community support for a new burial ground.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is not considered a priority, but there is good community support for such a facility.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	Burial grounds for residents or past long standing residents.	DISAGREE – it is not considered appropriate to restrict use in this way, although any new burial ground will be non-denominational.	<b>ACTION – specify non-denominational in policy/action point.</b>
	Reservation: only for provision of new burial ground which should have an area for sitting.	NOTED – suggestion is too detailed for inclusion in policy.	NO ACTION
	We feel burial is an outdated need due to over population. Where would the land come from? Churchyard already has some anti-social activity re dog mess, litter etc.	DISAGREE – there is good community support for such a facility. Location would be subject to opportunity arising. Referenced nuisances are not a reason for abandoning project and can be addressed.	NO ACTION
	Burial grounds take up too much space. An area outside the village would be more sense. Other green spaces are acceptable.	1) DISAGREE – there is good community support for such a facility. Location would be subject to opportunity arising. 2) NOTED – re other green spaces.	1)NO ACTION 2)NO ACTION
	If space can be made in the village this will be an asset for everyone	AGREE	NO ACTION
	A one acre area at the top of Church Lane would be ideal as it is close to both churches and easily accessible via Church Lane.	NOTED – location would be subject to opportunity arising.	NO ACTION
	No - to additional burial ground.	DISAGREE – there is good community support for the new ground.	NO ACTION
	Previous comments on burial grounds.	NOTED	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Not for a burial ground.</p> <p>Not being religious I personally don't see the need for elaborate funeral rites.</p> <p>No new burial ground.</p> <p>Good that a new green space is being designated for a burial ground.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – there is good community support for the new ground.</p> <p>NOTED - there is good community support for the new ground.</p> <p>DISAGREE – there is good community support for the new ground.</p> <p>AGREE</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<b>PI GE5</b>	<p>LCC - opportunity to explore.</p> <p>Why could not the Shell Petrol Station triangle be changed into a round-a-bout? This would slow traffic outside of the main street and may help to prevent as much queuing.</p> <p>Increased traffic and difficulty/danger for all pedestrians including school children is a particular concern.</p> <p>This should have been done years ago. I have asthma made worse by waiting for buses and walking to the shop in these air conditions.</p> <p>We need to identify the unacceptable amount of traffic in the vision to reduce pollution.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – this idea was considered and rejected as part of the determination of the recent planning application but could still have merit.</p> <p>NOTED – non-pollution aspects also addressed/tackled in 'Traffic &amp; Travel' section.</p> <p>NOTED – LCC have only recently brought the AQMA into force. The new proposed NP policy flows from this.</p> <p>NOTED –The vision already identifies the 'longstanding problem of traffic blight' which encompasses pollution.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – add action point re 'highway improvements' under 'Community Actions' in 'Traffic &amp; Travel' section, to include reference to roundabout idea.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Absolutely imperative that the unacceptable amount of traffic is identified in the vision.</p> <p>Need a strategic solution - flyover/tunnel to fit with landscape. The volume of traffic is unsustainable given airport expansion plans.</p> <p>Also air quality on Arthington Lane.</p> <p>Very important.</p> <p>Push hard to ban HGV traffic, except local farm vehicles, from coming into the village from any route.</p> <p>Volume of traffic on Main Street and Arthington Lane.</p> <p>This should be the No 1 priority.</p>	<p>NOTED - The vision already identifies the 'longstanding problem of traffic blight' which encompasses pollution.</p> <p>NOTED – strategic solutions of this nature lie outside the scope of the NP's planning powers. The 'Traffic &amp; Travel' section's non-planning actions/projects includes actions to attempt to address these issues.</p> <p>NOTED – not included in the AQMA so no evidential basis for also applying the policy here. PC working with LCC on ongoing basis re air quality monitoring and action in the village. Results produced annually.</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>AGREE – this is an action point under 'non-planning actions/projects' in 'Traffic and Travel'.</p> <p>AGREE – policy seeks to address in respect of new development/air quality. 'Traffic &amp; Travel' section also seeks to address in other ways.</p> <p>NOTED - with NP policies the issue of priority is irrelevant. It is a matter of putting in place a comprehensive suite of policies to be applied on an ongoing</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – prioritise traffic actions as suggested.</b></p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Very high priority.</p> <p>I wish we could reduce the traffic in Pool. It has grown so much in the 42 years my wife and I have lived here.</p> <p>Really important and a solid argument for change in traffic, i.e. HGV ban or bypass (pie in the sky).</p> <p>Needs something about heavy goods vehicles coming through the village.</p>	<p>basis, as appropriate, by LCC planners in the determination of planning applications. Relevant non-planning actions/projects in 'Traffic &amp; Travel' section can be prioritised in the 'project delivery plan' of the 'Monitoring &amp; Implementation' chapter which will feature in the Pre-Submission NP.</p> <p>NOTED - with NP policies the issue of priority is irrelevant. It is a matter of putting in place a comprehensive suite of policies to be applied on an ongoing basis, as appropriate, by LCC planners in the determination of planning applications. Relevant non-planning actions/projects in 'Traffic &amp; Travel' section can be prioritised in the 'project delivery plan' of the 'Monitoring &amp; Implementation' chapter which will feature in the Pre-Submission NP.</p> <p>AGREE – NP is seeking to do this in so far as its powers allow.</p> <p>AGREE – 'Traffic &amp; Travel' non-planning actions address HGFV issue. By-pass considered beyond the scope of the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – addressed in 'Traffic &amp; Travel' non-planning actions.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – prioritise traffic actions as suggested.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Yes, control needed to control impacts of any new developments.</p> <p>Although if any development occurs, I can't imagine how this would be done. Good luck.</p> <p>Ideally we believe that this particular intention should be a priority.</p> <p>Not just AQMA but also the safety factors of transport on Main Street and Arthington Lane.</p> <p>But this should be a "will" not a "may".</p> <p>Do not agree because this implies development is going ahead and could quite easily mean the proposal to build motorway/bypass. We do not agree for this to happen.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – requires discussion and research to determine what is possible in planning policy terms.</p> <p>NOTED - with NP policies the issue of priority is irrelevant. It is a matter of putting in place a comprehensive suite of policies to be applied on an ongoing basis, as appropriate, by LCC planners in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>AGREE – non-pollution aspects addressed in 'Traffic &amp; Travel' section.</p> <p>AGREE – it is now clearer that planning policy should be able to address the air quality issue.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the NP/policy is accepting of the fact that development of some sort is almost inevitable over the NP's lifetime – whether infill/windfall, Old Pool Bank or as a result of speculative development outside of NP control – and seeking to control such development in that eventuality. There is no question of a motorway. By-pass is considered beyond the scope of the NP.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – policy will be drafted to seek to control impacts of new development on Main Street air quality.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Don't forget the impact on Old Pool Bank's main road = Leeds Road.</p> <p>Not just Main Street affected. Old Pool Bank severely traffic polluted. "Rat running" issue needs addressing.</p> <p>This is vital and urgent.</p> <p>I would prefer "Policy will..." rather than "Policy may..."</p> <p>To include New Pool Bank Road, which takes the same volume of traffic, many vehicles being heavy goods and includes standing traffic.</p> <p>1) Any development will affect volume of traffic which is already at saturation point. 2) Any development needs to include infrastructure which diverts traffic away from the main street through Pool.</p>	<p>NOTED - not included in the AQMA so no evidential basis for also applying the policy here.</p> <p>1) NOTED – not included in the AQMA so no evidential basis for also applying the policy here. PC working with LCC on ongoing basis re air quality monitoring and action in the village. Results produced annually. 2) NOTED - rat-running issue in process of being addressed.</p> <p>AGREE – the NP is being progressed as quickly as possible in order to get the policy adopted.</p> <p>AGREE – it is now clearer that planning policy should be able to address the air quality issue.</p> <p>NOTED – not included in the AQMA so no evidential basis for also applying the policy here. PC working with LCC on ongoing basis re air quality monitoring and action in the village. Results produced annually.</p> <p>1) AGREE 2) NOTED –major infrastructure such as by-pass/bridge considered beyond scope of the NP.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2)NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – policy will be drafted to seek to control impacts of new development on Main Street air quality.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>This must be backed up with viable proposals.</p> <p>No new housing until by-pass is made.</p> <p>Possibly the most important intention.</p> <p>This must be one of the top policy intentions/objectives ..... consideration to make this "will" rather than "may".</p>	<p>AGREE - it is now clearer that planning policy should be able to address the air quality issue.</p> <p>NOTED – by-pass considered beyond the scope of the NP.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED 2) AGREE – it is now clearer that planning policy should be able to address the air quality issue.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – policy will be drafted to seek to control impacts of new development on Main Street air quality.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) <b>ACTION – policy will be drafted to seek to control impacts of new development on Main Street air quality.</b></p>
<b>PI GE6</b>	<p>NFU - In the NPPF the government makes a number of very important statements related to this the development of renewable energy. Paragraphs 95 to 98 make a number key points including: ‘local planning authorities should recognise the responsibility on all communities to contribute to energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources’ (para 97); ‘have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources’ which ‘maximise renewable and low carbon energy sources’. Renewable energy represents an important opportunity for farms to reduce their energy bills and also to create revenue that can help support farming activity. We understand that this can be a contentious issue within communities and are aware that early consultation with those that are either impacted or likely to gain is crucial.</p> <p>NYCC - the proposals to develop a River Wharfe Local Energy Scheme could give rise to crossboundary issues relating to flood management, biodiversity and landscape</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP seeks to contribute in the way encouraged by the NPPF in respect of a potential scheme on the River Wharfe.</p> <p>AGREE</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>matters. Consideration of these matters should be addressed within the feasibility study and the County Council should be consulted on any proposals as they emerge.</p> <p>LCC – ok.</p> <p>Brilliant idea. BUT who would benefit from the power produced?</p> <p>Don't know too much about this policy intention.</p> <p>Don't know full facts.</p> <p>In principle this sounds good but it would be good to understand more about how this works and impact on residents.</p> <p>Not necessary.</p> <p>However would like further information.</p> <p>What does this look like?</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – details would be subject to the feasibility study.</p> <p>NOTED – more information will be forthcoming as the NP progresses.</p> <p>NOTED – more information will be forthcoming as the NP progresses.</p> <p>NOTED - details would be subject to the feasibility study.</p> <p>DISAGREE – it is considered that anything which is feasible which can improve PIW's sustainability is worth investigating.</p> <p>NOTED – more information will be forthcoming as the NP progresses.</p> <p>NOTED - more information will be forthcoming as the NP progresses. In the meantime, the newly implemented scheme at Otley weir would give some idea.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Great.</p> <p>Who is paying for it? Who will benefit? Only those who benefit from it should pay.</p> <p>Although I would expect the full implications to flooding and wildlife (specifically otter) to be understood beforehand.</p> <p>No proliferation of wind turbines or other large visual structures.</p> <p>Provided its development is in keeping with the local environment and does not adversely affect local wildlife habitats.</p> <p>This would be fantastic.</p> <p>Damage banks/fish/others for what - an ugly contraption that doesn't work!</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED – initial feasibility study to investigate all issues, including project funding, would itself be funded by a private sector company as yet to be identified.</p> <p>2) NOTED – details would be subject to the feasibility study.</p> <p>NOTED – details would be subject to the feasibility study.</p> <p>NOTED – the PI relates to a possible hydro-electric scheme on the River Wharfe not to wind turbines. Such a local scheme would not involve a proliferation of large visual structures.</p> <p>NOTED – this would be the aim. Details would be subject to the feasibility study.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – no evidence to support this view. Although some damage would be inevitable it is considered that this would be limited and outweighed by the benefits. The ugliness or otherwise of such schemes is a matter of opinion.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	Subject to an appropriate funding plan. x2	Details would be subject to the feasibility study. AGREE	NO ACTION
	Increasing traffic is a key concern not just for pollution but safety due to speed of vehicles.	AGREE – comment seems to relate to GE5 rather than GE6. Issue is addressed in ‘Traffic & Travel’ non-planning actions/projects.	NO ACTION
	Definitely.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Would need more information regarding the environmental impact on the River Wharfe.	NOTED – more information will be forthcoming as the NP progresses. Details will be subject to the feasibility study.	NO ACTION
	Water needs to be harnessed more as a way of sourcing energy.	AGREE	NO ACTION
	Depends on where and how this affects the community ... i.e. not want an industrial area.	NOTED - Details will be subject to the feasibility study. The Otley weir scheme is a reasonable guide to the likely scale, impact, appearance.	NO ACTION
	This would be superb - like at Otley Mills (former site) and the renewable energy scheme at the water mill on the Wharfe at Grassington.	AGREE	NO ACTION
	Interesting idea !	AGREE	NO ACTION
	As long as it is discreet. No big windmills for example along the river.	NOTED - the PI relates to a possible hydro-electric scheme on the River	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Excellent idea.</p> <p>The River Wharfe should be maintained only as a natural habitat and not used for purpose of new housing/building project.</p> <p>Depends on what the scheme is.</p> <p>See answer in "vision" section at start.</p> <p>Reservations concerning noise and visual pollution. The windmill located off Old Land can be heard whooshing hundreds of yards into Danefield.</p>	<p>Wharfe not to wind turbines/windmills. Details will be subject to the feasibility study.</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>NOTED – the PI is not proposing new housing. The only ‘building project’ would relate to whatever development would be necessary for implementing a local hydro-electric power scheme, along the lines of the new Otley weir scheme. Details/more information subject to a feasibility study. The NP is committed to protecting the Wharfe as a natural asset but also to utilising it sustainably.</p> <p>NOTED - more information will be forthcoming as the NP progresses. Details will be subject to the feasibility study.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - the PI relates to a possible hydro-electric scheme on the River Wharfe not to wind turbines/windmills. Feasibility study will examine noise and visual pollution implications of such a scheme.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Will this benefit the village and where will it be sited.</p> <p>It is encouraging that the River Wharfe will be considered in schemes of local renewable energy as it already has in the new development in Otley.</p> <p>Kills fish and disturbs the otter environment.</p>	<p>NOTED – it is considered that the scheme would be of community benefit. Details subject to the feasibility study.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – no evidence to support this view. Feasibility study would look at these implications.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<p><b>Green Environment – Non-Planning Actions/Projects</b></p>	<p>NFU - In the NPPF the government makes a number of very important statements related to this the development of renewable energy. Paragraphs 95 to 98 make a number key points including: ‘local planning authorities should recognise the responsibility on all communities to contribute to energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources’ (para 97); ‘have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources’ which ‘maximise renewable and low carbon energy sources’. Renewable energy represents an important opportunity for farms to reduce their energy bills and also to create revenue that can help support farming activity. We understand that this can be a contentious issue within communities and are aware that early consultation with those that are either impacted or likely to gain is crucial.</p> <p>NYCC - the proposals to develop a River Wharfe Local Energy Scheme could give rise to crossboundary issues relating to flood management, biodiversity and landscape matters. Consideration of these matters should be</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP seeks to contribute in the way encouraged by the NPPF in respect of a potential scheme on the River Wharfe.</p> <p>AGREE</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>addressed within the feasibility study and the County Council should be consulted on any proposals as they emerge.</p> <p>Not sure if these are a priority. Pool is well placed for travel to work in Otley/Bradford/Harrogate and Leeds, however publicising of any local job opportunities would be useful.</p> <p>Definite need for conservation areas, park area with seating but not for recreational use.</p> <p>Ideal in an ideal world. Should not be developed at the expense of some of the previously listed aims. This was a clear well-expressed, easy to follow document. Hope the results are encouraging.</p> <p>Very comprehensive - only criticism is need to concentrate on infrastructure requirements before plans agreed e.g. school enlargement, better health services.</p>	<p>NOTED – all finally agreed non-planning actions/projects will be prioritised in a ‘project delivery plan’ to feature in the ‘Monitoring &amp; Implementation’ chapter of the Pre-Submission NP.</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>1) NOTED - all finally agreed non-planning actions/projects will be prioritised in a ‘project delivery plan’ to feature in the ‘Monitoring &amp; Implementation’ chapter of the Pre-Submission NP. 2) NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – unclear how comment relates to ‘Green Environment’ non-planning actions/projects. There is no current evidence re the need for school enlargement. Any required enlargement would be welcomed under terms of PI CFS2 and could be accommodated at current location. Better health services are addressed in general terms under ‘Community Facilities &amp; Services’. The NP cannot require that the infrastructure</p>	<p>ACTION – priorities of agreed actions to be determined.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) ACTION – priorities of agreed actions to be determined. 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Well thought out and it would be wonderful if they could be implemented. When development is proposed, funding should be sought to progress these from developers. The village has missed opportunities in the past by simply opposing development rather than using it to seek improvements to the village overall.</p> <p>I think all projects will enhance the village and should be pursued.</p> <p>Admirable.</p> <p>Loads of houses in the village already.</p> <p>I like all that.</p> <p>All points raised are ok with me.</p> <p>Is this pie in the sky or has Walter Mitty taken over the Parish Council? Well we can dream but where is the money coming from?</p>	<p>improvements suggested be provided in advance of any plans for new housing development (nb on the assumption that this is what the comment relates to).</p> <p>NOTED – this may be possible in some cases, eg public garden space project. CIL from new development could also be used to fund projects.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the NP is not proposing more housing in the village.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the NP is a 10 year plan and will include a 10 year project programme/delivery plan, subject to annual review and change – it will not be set in stone. The Pre-Submission NP will indicate potential sources of funding for each agreed project,</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>The establishment of an electric vehicle charging point at Shell Garage needs to be supplemented possibly by others if a car park is established.</p> <p>To be encouraged.</p> <p>The principle seems ok.</p> <p>We definitely do not agree with the non-planning actions and projects. The problem has been caused by building houses in a rural area, bringing too many people into the area and people who want city living in a countryside location. If you want city life, then live in a city.</p> <p>Can we make sure reduction of heavy traffic and speeding including Old Pool Bank hamlet please, so we are not forgotten. There is a move to assert our identity as we often feel excluding from main village activity.</p>	<p>building on the information contained in the PID 'Implementation' section.</p> <p>AGREE – unclear how this comment relates to 'Green Environment' non-planning actions/projects. Relevant however to 'Traffic &amp; Travel' – unfortunately a charging point is not being provided as part of the current Shell development. Such points are required, particularly in context of AQMA.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – the historical reasons for any problems which PIW currently experiences are now irrelevant. The non-planning actions/projects are designed to improve the lot of those who now live in PIW. There is no logic re opposing projects/actions which address problems on the basis of the alleged historical source of those problems.</p> <p>NOTED – unclear how this relates to 'Green Environment' non-planning actions. Relevant however to 'Traffic &amp; Travel' – matters are already in hand re</p>	<p><b>ACTION – include references to charging points in housing policies as appropriate and in non-planning action point under 'Traffic &amp; Travel'.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Just be aware of the traffic implications for the proposals and the effect of this on the environment (e.g. your reference to the airport expansion). Reduction of speeding to 20mph should cover the whole village, including Old Pool Bank area.</p> <p>It would be helpful to add web links into the document to enable better decision making and gain more information. From what has been put in the plan so far, it looks a reasonable proposal.</p> <p>Generally very good.</p> <p>Happy, thanks.</p> <p>These would be desirable.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the impact of any work undertaken on Old Pool Bank. The likely flooding effect due to extended build must be dealt with effectively.</p> <p>Agree with all the suggested projects. We need to be more sustainable. A local recycling point would also be useful - particularly for glass, which is not currently covered by the local authority.</p> <p>None.</p>	<p>addressing Old Pool Bank hamlet's issues.</p> <p>1) NOTED – NP will take this into account in all ways possible. 2) NOTED – matters already in hand to address Old Pool Bank speeding issues. Already advised by LCC Highways that 20mph limit not feasible for either 'upper' or 'lower' Old Pool Bank.</p> <p>NOTED – more information/links to information will be provided on the NP website once the Pre-Submission NP has been produced.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – unclear how the comment relates to 'Green Environment' non-planning actions/projects. Relevant however to 'Housing' PI H1.</p> <p>NOTED – in hand. Site options currently being considered.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – build into final policy requirements/aspirations.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Good.</p> <p>New Public Garden Space Project - hopefully this will be made accessible for ALL, including people with disabilities and special needs.</p> <p>I think renewable green energy and projects are of the utmost importance. Carbon neutral public transport could cut down air pollution and traffic congestion.</p> <p>I'd like to see a focus on cycle routes to commuting destinations, allowing high-speed cycle commuting.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>AGREED – new X85 service generally utilises carbon neutral buses. Could encourage such use by other bus companies providing PIW services.</p> <p>DISAGREE – on-road cycle lanes to such destinations are not considered to be feasible, eg for reasons of topography. There are already objections to the cycle lane on Pool Bank New Road. They are also considered unhealthy due to pollution levels. There are no feasible high speed, off-road commuter routes.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – specify access for all in action point.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION – add new action point re encouraging all bus companies providing PIW services to use carbon neutral buses, where they have them, on PIW routes. And where they don't have them to consider investing in them.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<b>Green Environment - General</b>	<p>Natural England - Neighbourhood plans and orders present significant opportunities, but also potential risks, for the natural environment. Proposals should be in line with the National Planning Policy Framework. The key principles are set out in paragraph 109: The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: ☐ protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils; ☐ recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services; ☐ minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible,</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP is and will continue to be in general conformity with NPPOF and Local Plan policies.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>contributing to the Government’s commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;</p> <p>The neighbourhood planning body should also consider the natural environment policies in the area’s Local Plan. The neighbourhood plan or order should be consistent with these, and the neighbourhood planning body may decide that the emerging Neighbourhood Plan should provide more detail as to how some of these policies apply or are interpreted locally.</p>		
<b>B: Built Heritage – Supporting Text</b>	<p>Historic England – the Neighbourhood Area “contains 8 grade II listed buildings and the Pool in Wharfedale Conservation Area. Pool in Wharfedale will also include buildings, sites and areas which are of local historic interest.</p>	<p>AGREE – current NP text is inaccurate with regard to numbers of listed buildings.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – amend text re listed buildings as indicated in comment.</b></p>
<b>PI BH1</b>	<p>Historic England – we welcome and support the suite of Built Environment policies set out in the draft PID, especially those relating to Local Heritage Areas (LHAs) and Non-Statutory Heritage Assets (NSHAs).</p> <p>Historic England – we would also suggest that you consider including policies which relate to the nature and form of new development within Pool in Wharfedale, whether within or remote from the Conservation Area; this will help ensure that any new development in P in W is complementary to and reinforces or enhances the distinctive character of the parish. These policies could consider the following:-</p> <p>-Scale of new buildings and extensions: ensuring that new development is of generally similar height to existing development.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE - issues re the nature and form of development outside of the conservation area (and any local heritage areas) are already addressed by Core Strategy Policy P10 (Design) . In order to try to address those issues at a more local level elsewhere in the NA, there would be a need for character assessment work to be carried out. Even then, the resultant policies may fall foul of national planning policy at examination. National policy (NPPF para</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>-Materials to be used: matching materials to be used to complement existing character.</p> <p>-Detailing of building elements: stone or brickwork constructions and windows and door proportions being similar to existing buildings.</p> <p>-Density of development: similar numbers of dwellings being built per hectare/acre as already exists.</p> <p>-Patterns of development: layouts of new development being complementary to existing development.</p> <p>-Plot ratios and site layouts: ensuring that individual sites are laid out in a similar way to existing sites.</p> <p>LCC - ok and supported but policies that repeat existing are often recommended for deletion by examiners.</p> <p>Brownfields may provide employment if allowed to sympathetically develop.</p> <p>Definitely. Pool is an ancient village with much history.</p> <p>Critical that this is clearly identified and adhered to.</p> <p>Not enough information to base a judgement x2.</p>	<p>60) cautions strongly against prescriptive design requirements, except where these can be properly substantiated, ie in a CA or LHA or through evidence in a proper character assessment.</p> <p>NOTED – policy will not repeat existing national or adopted Local Plan policy. Rather, it will seek to give greater statutory weight to the non-statutory provisions of the Pool CAAMP.</p> <p>NOTED – this may well be true but is not specific enough a comment to understand how it is meant to relate to PIW or be translated into NP policy or non-planning actions/projects.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – full policy will be included in Pre-Submission NP together with reference to Pool Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Conservation is good. Preservation is not necessarily.</p> <p>Yes most certainly to have a conservation area to check on development and design.</p> <p>Most key view are now blocked by overgrown trees. These should be maintained to restore most views.</p> <p>Village should be preserved and kept to original features.</p> <p>Unless you build an ancient church, how can any new development be sympathetic to existing structures?</p>	<p>(CAAMP) on which policy will be largely based.</p> <p>AGREE – policy will and must admit of the possibility of development that goes beyond an ‘in aspic’ approach.</p> <p>NOTED – comment implies that a conservation area does not currently exist. Supporting text makes it clear that it already does.</p> <p>NOTED – Pre-Submission NP will include detail on all key views in support of the policy. Any maintenance issues revealed through this work can be reflected in new action points under ‘non-planning actions/projects’.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the approach needs to be one of conservation not preservation if the NP is to be (as it must be) in conformity with national and Local Plan planning policies.</p> <p>DISAGREE – new development will take place in the conservation area (CA) whether the community likes it or not. The PI seeks to ensure that any such development is, as far as possible, in keeping with the character of existing development in the CA. CAs up and down the country are full of eggs of</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – add new action points re need for any tree maintenance in the CA in order to maintain key views.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>How are you going to ensure that the same type of buildings? Cheaper Housing !!</p>	<p>sympathetic new developments – it does not require the building of an ancient church to achieve this.</p> <p>1) NOTED – the PI does not require ‘the same type of building’ but rather building that is in keeping with existing in the CA.  2) NOTED – cheaper housing is not a ‘Built Heritage’ issue. It is however relevant to ‘Housing’ and will be addressed via a ‘housing mix’ policy which will specify the need for smaller and therefore cheaper housing to meet local needs. The ‘Affordable housing’ needs of PIW are already addressed in the LCC Core Strategy.</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION  2) NO ACTION</p>
	<p>We should preserve our village and history, countryside, animals.</p>	<p>AGREE – PI BH1 addresses village and historical conservation, as do BH2 and BH3. ‘Countryside and animal’ conservation are addressed in ‘Green Environment’.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Who dictates these features - that's the critical thing.</p>	<p>NOTED – the Pre-Submission NP policy will be based on LCC’s CAAMP, it being the most up-to-date and authoritative assessment of the CA’s features.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Further conservation area must be considered carefully.</p>	<p>AGREE – proposals for such will be based on thorough assessments carried out by local experts in line with Historic England guidance on such matters.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>The draft BH1 may give rise to measures that will have a commercial impact and employment opportunities.</p> <p>"including key views" this needs to be defined better, or it will be used by everybody to stop any kind of development.</p> <p>Conservation Area large enough.</p>	<p>NOTED – unclear re the exact meaning/import of the comment and whether meant positively or negatively or a mix. Comment may well be accurate but is unlikely to be no more or less so in effect that the current CAAMP on which final policy will be based.</p> <p>AGREE – Pre-Submission NP will include specific detail on a list of identified/ mapped key views in support of the policy.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the CA (any CA) is as large or small as it needs to be, relative to the historical and/or architectural quality of a locality as revealed by systematic assessment based on Historic England guidance. Assessment of character of PIW outside the current CA will be put to LCC for their view as to whether it justifies any extensions or satellite designations.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI BH2	<p>Historic England – we welcome and support the suite of Built Environment policies set out in the draft PID, especially those relating to Local Heritage Areas (LHAs) and Non-Statutory Heritage Assets (NSHAs).</p> <p>Historic England – with regards LHAs, we would suggest that HE’s Advice Note 1 (HEAN1) “Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management” is cited, and</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – specifically cite advice note as suggested. Use advice note to guide</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>each LHA should briefly highlight the elements of the area which warrant their identification as an LHA.</p> <p>LCC - policy should identify but not designate.</p> <p>as above.</p> <p>No real details but agree in principle.</p> <p>Ditto above.</p> <p>Ditto.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>A development plan would be superb.</p> <p>Financial provision should be made for businesses and residents in those designated areas to maintain or renew features.</p> <p>The whole village should have conservation area extensions.</p>	<p>AGREE</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – full details will be provided at NP Pre-Submission stage.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – unclear to what exactly comment relates.</p> <p>AGREE – idea has merit. Other NPs have included provision for PC-administered grant schemes using CIL, alongside an information/awareness-raising leaflet, in their non-planning actions/projects.</p> <p>DISAGREE – CA designation is based on historical and/or architectural quality. Many areas of the village are not of sufficient quality to warrant designation.</p>	<p>structuring/content of LHA assessment(s).</p> <p>ACTION – policy to use ‘identification’ rather than ‘designation’ terminology.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add non-planning action point/project to this effect.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>I suppose so, but the devil is in the unwritten detail.</p> <p>Non planning actions. What evidence is there of 'the community' identifying action? Also hypothetical.</p> <p>Conservation area large enough.</p> <p>Old pool bank area should be included in local heritage/conservation zone and views/green space protected.</p>	<p>NOTED – full details will be provided at NP Pre-Submission stage.</p> <p>NOTED – non-planning actions proposed in the PID are based on community consultations to date. It is unclear in what way such actions are deemed hypothetical.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the CA (any CA) is as large or small as it needs to be, relative to the historical and/or architectural quality of a locality as revealed by systematic assessment based on Historic England guidance. Assessment of character of PIW outside the current CA will be put to LCC for their view as to whether it justifies any extensions or satellite designations.</p> <p>DISAGREE – Old Pool Bank area is within the existing CA. More precisely it forms one of its boundaries with land to the south-east within the CA and agricultural land to the north-west outside.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<b>PI BH3</b>	<p>Historic England – we welcome and support the suite of Built Environment policies set out in the draft PID, especially those relating to Local Heritage Areas (LHAs) and Non-Statutory Heritage Assets (NSHAs).</p> <p>Historic England – in relation to NSHAs, we would suggest that HE’s Advice Note 7 (HEAN7) “Local Heritage Listing” is</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – specifically cite advice note as suggested. Use advice note to guide</b></p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>cited, and each should briefly highlight the elements which warrant their identification as a NSHA.</p> <p>LCC - policy should identify a list backed up by evidence.</p> <p>I broadly support these but feel the other areas, especially transport &amp; traffic &amp; community services are more important.</p> <p>As BH2.</p> <p>Ditto above but agree in principle x2.</p> <p>Definitely need the phrase "avoiding or minimising conflict".</p> <p>I agree with sympathetic enhancement to improve the village.</p> <p>Sympathetic enhancement needs to be agreed. What is sympathetic enhancement? i.e. how much enhancement is ok?</p>	<p>AGREE – list will be based on assessment of each potential asset, based on historic England advice.</p> <p>NOTED - with NP policies the issue of relative importance is irrelevant. It is a matter of putting in place a comprehensive suite of policies to be applied on an ongoing basis, as appropriate, by LCC planners in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE – or something similar. Exact wording to be devised and made available in Pre-Submission NP.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE – the nature and amount of ‘sympathetic enhancement’ would be considered and agreed via the planning application process on a case by case basis.</p>	<p>structuring/content of NSHA assessment(s).</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>This whole area is also open to interpretation of what individuals or planning depts see as "sympathetic".</p> <p>We do not agree with development or sympathetic enhancement. The area should be left as it is without building it up. As with all the other questions, the implication is that there is going to be building over green land and the proposals are put in place to appease individuals.</p> <p>So what does this mean?</p> <p>Hypothetical.</p>	<p>NOTED – the ultimate arbiter(s) in these matters are LCC planning officers, LCC members and planning inspectors involved in determining planning applications and appeals. Planning is always a question of policy/information interpretation to some degree.</p> <p>DISAGREE – this PI relates only to development affecting what will be an agreed list of ‘Potential Non-Statutory Heritage Assets’, ie works to such assets or affecting the setting of such assets. Such development can enhance, eg via restoration of original features, the architectural or historic character of an asset, ie ‘sympathetic enhancement’. This PI relates in no way to ‘building up’ or ‘building over green land’.</p> <p>NOTED – in short, it means that buildings/structures not good enough to be listed by Historic England, but nonetheless possessing of some historic and/or architectural merit, would have their character protected against unsympathetic development. And that enhancements, such as restoration work, would be encouraged.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the PI will be translated into a policy which once adopted will be practically applied to planning</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Does this refer to buildings outside the Conservation area? Bh3 poorly worded.</p> <p>All three intentions are good but in some respects it will be necessary to balance preservation of the past with the need to move on into the future.</p> <p>Depends on the list.</p>	<p>applications affecting listed assets. As such the PI is not hypothetical.</p> <p>NOTED – within the CA, it refers to buildings/structures not already ‘listed’ by Historic England (HE) or identified as ‘positive buildings’ within the CAAMP by LCC. Outside the CA it refers to ‘unlisted’ buildings/structures. In both cases, it refers to buildings/structures that will have been assessed using HE advice and adjudged to meet qualifying criteria. The wording of the PI is not the wording of the final policy.</p> <p>AGREE – this will be reflected in the Pre-Submission policy wording.</p> <p>NOTED – there will be an informal sites consultation early in 2018 which will include candidate NSHA sites.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<p><b>Built Heritage – Non-Planning Actions/ Projects</b></p>	<p>Not sure if these are a priority. Pool is well placed for travel to work in Otley/Bradford/Harrogate and Leeds, however publicising of any local job opportunities would be useful.</p> <p>Definite need for conservation areas, park area with seating but not for recreational use.</p> <p>Ideal in an ideal world. Should not be developed at the expense of some of the previously listed aims. This was a</p>	<p>NOTED – all finally agreed non-planning actions/projects will be prioritised in a ‘project delivery plan’ to feature in the ‘Monitoring &amp; Implementation’ chapter of the Pre-Submission NP.</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>1) NOTED - all finally agreed non-planning actions/projects will be</p>	<p><b>ACTION – priorities of agreed actions to be determined.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>1) ACTION – priorities of agreed actions to be determined.</b></p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	clear well-expressed, easy to follow document. Hope the results are encouraging.	prioritised in a 'project delivery plan' to feature in the 'Monitoring & Implementation' chapter of the Pre-Submission NP. 2) NOTED	2) NO ACTION
	Ditto.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	As above.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I think all projects will enhance the village and should be pursued.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Admirable.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Loads of houses in the village already.	NOTED – the NP is not proposing more housing in the village.	NO ACTION
	Yes please.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I am not sure about further conservation areas.	NOTED – proposals for any such will be based on thorough assessments carried out by local experts in line with Historic England guidance on such matters.	NO ACTION
	All points raised are ok with me.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Is this pie in the sky or has Walter Mitty taken over the Parish Council? Well we can dream but where is the money coming from?	NOTED – the NP is a 10 year plan and will include a 10 year project programme/delivery plan, subject to annual review and change – it will not be set in stone. The Pre-Submission NP will indicate potential sources of	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>To be encouraged.</p> <p>The principle seems ok.</p> <p>We definitely do not agree with the non-planning actions and projects. The problem has been caused by building houses in a rural area, bringing too many people into the area and people who want city living in a countryside location. If you want city life, then live in a city.</p> <p>Can we make sure reduction of heavy traffic and speeding including Old Pool Bank hamlet please, so we are not forgotten. There is a move to assert our identity as we often feel excluding from main village activity.</p> <p>It would be helpful to add web links into the document to enable better decision making and gain more information. From what has been put in the plan so far, it looks a reasonable proposal.</p> <p>Generally very good.</p>	<p>funding for each agreed project, building on the information contained in the PID 'Implementation' section.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – the historical reasons for any problems which PIW currently experiences are now irrelevant. The non-planning actions/projects are designed to improve the lot of those who now live in PIW. There is no logic re opposing projects/actions which address problems on the basis of the alleged historical source of those problems.</p> <p>NOTED – unclear how this relates to 'Built Heritage' non-planning actions. Relevant however to 'Traffic &amp; Travel' – matters are already in hand re addressing Old Pool Bank hamlet's issues.</p> <p>NOTED – more information/links to information will be provided on the NP website once the Pre-Submission NP has been produced.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	Happy, thanks.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	These would be desirable.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Build heritage affects a specific are of the village centre and should be consider just for that part.	DISAGREE – PIW’s historic mills for eg lie largely outside the village centre and yet are of clear built heritage value, as evidenced by both local study and Leeds Civic Trust support.	NO ACTION
	Agree.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I feel there is a danger that all the provisions put on new builds will either make them too expensive to be classed as 'affordable' or just make them look like fake late Victorian houses.	DISAGREE – the cost of ‘affordable’ new builds will be determined by national formula not by design requirements. The cost of cheaper market homes will be determined primarily by their size and general location. Significant new building is unlikely to be a feature in the CA or LHAs and so will not be subject to the PI requirements set out. Final Pre-Submission policies will make it clear that pastiche development is not encouraged.	NO ACTION
	None.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Sensible.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	None.	NOTED	NO ACTION
<b>PI CFS1</b>	LCC - ok in principle.	NOTED	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	The Half Moon Pub as a community facility should be mentioned and a view taken on its future operation.	AGREE – should be included on list of community facilities.	ACTION – include Half Moon PH on list of community facilities. Add an associated non-planning action/project re Asset of Community Value registration.
	Very important.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	See BH2.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Plans already in re restaurant at Pool Business Park.	NOTED – planning permission already granted.	NO ACTION
	Walking facilities are very important.	AGREE – unclear how this relates to CFS1. Relevant however to ‘Traffic & Travel’ – will be covered by TT1 and non-planning actions/projects.	NO ACTION
	Would like to see "list to be agreed".	NOTED - there will be an informal sites consultation early in 2018 which will include candidate community facilities for the list.	NO ACTION
	Certainly to protect existing community facilities.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Yes, in principle, but wonder how realistic some of these are with Otley so close.	NOTED – it is considered reasonable to try to protect PIW’s remaining community facilities. The realism of such an approach can only be judged relative to the success of the policy once adopted over the NP’s 10 year life.	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>There are few enough facilities already. We must particularly retain the Post Office and other businesses.</p> <p>This objection is based on a "take-away" premises in particular - noise, litter and possible associated anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Definitely not.</p> <p>Who will agree the list, can the community make suggestions.</p> <p>Depends what those facilities are.</p>	<p>AGREE/NOTED – re Post Office. Case for ‘other businesses’ to be considered.</p> <p>NOTED – unclear how this relates to CFS1. Relevant however to CFS3 (NB now CFS4). CFS3 should specifically resist takeaways.</p> <p>DISAGREE – it is considered wholly appropriate and in line with community wishes to try to resist the loss of PIW’s few remaining community facilities.</p> <p>NOTED – NP Steering Group will compile candidate list. There will be an informal sites consultation early in 2018 which will include candidate community facilities for the list. Community is welcome to put forward suggestions to the steering group/PC for the list.</p> <p>NOTED - there will be an informal sites consultation early in 2018 which will include candidate community facilities for the list for community comment.</p>	<p>ACTION - include Post Office and village shop on list of community facilities. Add associated non-planning action/project re Asset of Community Value registration and consider if others should be added. Consider case for inclusion of ‘other businesses’ in drawing up full list of facilities to be protected under policy.</p> <p>ACTION – draft Policy CFS3 (NB now CFS4) to specifically resist hot food takeaways.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – invite suggestions via posting on NP website.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Retention of the pharmacy is vital, given the government's gradual reduction of funding whilst simultaneously urging patients to see their pharmacist instead of their GP.</p> <p>Its difficult to agree with this when the list has not been defined.</p> <p>Depends on list.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - there will be an informal sites consultation early in 2018 which will include candidate community facilities for the list for community comment.</p> <p>NOTED - there will be an informal sites consultation early in 2018 which will include candidate community facilities for the list for community comment.</p>	<p>ACTION – include pharmacy on list of community facilities and add non-planning action re Asset of Community Value registration.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI CFS2	<p>LCC – ok.</p> <p>Need some clarification of acceptable development.</p> <p>Again, pending clarification of "acceptable development".</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE – wording is imprecise and unclear.</p> <p>AGREE – wording is imprecise and unclear.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – wording to be replaced with 'Development that is acceptable in principle.....' ie that is in line with other applicable planning policies. Eg housing development on an allocated site that creates new facility would be welcomed.</p> <p>ACTION – wording to be replaced with 'Development that is acceptable in principle.....' ie that is in line with other applicable planning policies. Eg housing development on an allocated site that creates new facility would be welcomed.</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>But needs to integrate with existing Whiteley Sports and Social facilities.</p> <p>"otherwise" means?</p> <p>Don't understand.</p> <p>insufficient information.</p> <p>I think the PC has to be sensitive to existing business.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – unclear what the relevance of comment is to PI CSF2. The policy could relate to any new facility/service which may or may not have anything to do with sport/social facilities and/or the Whiteley site.</p> <p>AGREE – wording is imprecise and unclear.</p> <p>NOTED – unclear what exactly is not understood. In short, policy intention is that development that is acceptable in principle (ie in line with other applicable planning policies – such as housing development on an allocated housing site) which would also deliver a new community facility would be welcomed.</p> <p>NOTED – actual policy wording, plus fuller supporting text, will be provided at Pre-Submission NP stage, which together will hopefully provide sufficient information.</p> <p>NOTED – while it is accepted that the policy would relate to some facilities provided on a commercial basis, the</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – wording to be replaced with 'Development that is acceptable in principle.....' ie that is in line with other applicable planning policies. Eg housing development on an allocated site that creates new facility would be welcomed.</p> <p>ACTION – wording to be replaced with 'Development that is acceptable in principle.....'</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Ensure improved bus services which will enable access to other facilities and services.</p> <p>In this present and foreseeable climate, any additional services and facilities are nil.</p> <p>This could be a great asset to the village if new community facilities and services could be found.</p> <p>Define acceptable development please?</p> <p>If this is with local residents in mind.</p>	<p>majority in PIW are non-commercial. The actual policy will take specific account of commercial interests by including a viability test triggering exclusion from policy provisions.</p> <p>AGREE – not directly relevant to this policy, but covered in ‘Traffic &amp; Travel’ by TT2.</p> <p>NOTED – this is a 10 year plan and development-led opportunities may present themselves during this period. The policy creates the necessary conditions for taking advantage of them should they arise.</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>AGREE – wording is imprecise and unclear.</p> <p>AGREE – it is a policy about new facilities for the local community, hence ‘community facilities’.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – wording to be replaced with ‘Development that is acceptable in principle.....’ ie that is in line with other applicable planning policies. Eg housing development on an allocated site that creates new facility would be welcomed.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>As long as the streets are clean. Some streets are very dirty.</p> <p>Provided any new development is made in a suitable location.</p> <p>Definitely not.</p> <p>We would encourage development of facilities such as healthcare, educational and library. However we have concern about an increase in retail - shop and restaurant facilities, due to the potential for an increase in traffic, pollution (air, noise, light etc) &amp; road safety issues that would inevitably be associated with such development.</p> <p>Yes But so long as they are not ' Pie in the sky ' projects.</p>	<p>NOTED – the policy does not relate to street cleaning services, rather to physical facilities.</p> <p>AGREE – this is one of the reasons why the PI refers to ‘otherwise acceptable development’, ie development acceptable in terms of both type and location (nb but subject also to development/sites which the NP cannot oppose).</p> <p>DISAGREE – it is considered wholly appropriate and in line with community wishes to try to resist the loss of PIW’s few remaining community facilities.</p> <p>NOTED – policy does not relate to retail/shops/restaurants. This would be covered by PI CFS3 and with safeguards re the types of concerns raised. CFS2 would cover health, educational and library facilities.</p> <p>NOTED – each proposed facility would be judged on its merits.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<b>PI CFS3</b>	<p>LCC - ok subject to general conformity with local strategic policies and regard to national planning Policies.</p> <p>Should not be a first priority and what we have is very adequate.</p>	<p>NOTED – Pre-Submission policy will be drafted within this conformity context.</p> <p>NOTED - with NP policies the issue of priority is irrelevant. It is a matter of putting in place a comprehensive suite of policies to be applied on an ongoing</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>It has to be. Unfortunately as we have got rid of our local shops we need a local doctor, surgery to walk to not ride to.</p> <p>I live near Pool Business Park and would not like to live next door to any development of any kind. Shops create youngsters congregating in that area.</p> <p>Due to the layout of the village I think any retail service facilities will be detrimental.</p> <p>Concern re over expansion.</p> <p>Must integrate with existing/relocate facilities to form a "hub" with car parking area i.e. Post Office/Garage/Half Moon.</p>	<p>basis, as appropriate, by LCC planners in the determination of planning applications. While existing provision may be considered adequate, it is considered prudent to leave the door open to potential additional provision.</p> <p>NOTED – see immediately above re ‘priority’ issue. This policy would not cover new health provision. PI CFS2, however, would.</p> <p>NOTED – Pool Business Park already constitutes ‘a development’. Any further development at that location would be within the existing park. This would not be a suitable location for a shop.</p> <p>NOTED – existing retail services are not considered to be detrimental. Any additional services are likely to be small scale and likewise, not detrimental.</p> <p>NOTED – any expansion would be small scale.</p> <p>NOTED – village centre constraints, such as poor land availability, limited parking and pedestrian safety, means that this can be no more than an aspiration.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – identify village centre ‘opportunity sites’ through which integration could be delivered if opportunities present themselves.</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Traffic through Pool should not be increased.</p> <p>I support new business but consideration of traffic problems and loss of green belt is crucial.</p> <p>No large development in excess of Pool requirements bringing in more traffic.</p> <p>Only concern regarding all the above 3 is wish for a village centre but development at Pool Business Park is well outside village "centre".</p> <p>Our Post Office needs to be protected.</p>	<p>AGREE – PI GE6 ('Green Environment') would work to try to achieve this. CFS3 could include safeguards re location, access, parking etc.</p> <p>NOTED – traffic problems are addressed via PI GE6 ('Green Environment'). CFS3 could include safeguards re location, access, parking etc. The NP will not and indeed could not propose any development on Green Belt. Green Belt matters are outside the remit of the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – neither national nor Leeds Core Strategy planning policy would allow such retail/service development in the Neighbourhood Area. NP PI CFS3 would relate to small scale development within this context.</p> <p>NOTED – village centre constraints, such as poor land availability, limited parking and pedestrian safety, means that this can be no more than an aspiration. Restaurant permission at business park already granted.</p> <p>AGREE – not an issue for PI CFS3. Can be included in list of facilities to be protected under CFS1. Could also be registered as an Asset of Community Value.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – identify village centre 'opportunity sites' through which integration could be delivered if opportunities present themselves.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION – consider inclusion of Post Office/shop on list of community facilities. Consider registration of Post Office as an Asset of Community Value and its identification as such in relevant non-planning action point.</b></p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>ditto above and subject to financing - source?</p> <p>Welcome more facilities to encourage younger communities, families to the area, restaurant, takeaway etc. Library, permanent or mobile, welcomed.</p> <p>I would be concerned if the proposals were to include large retail development as this would spoil the village feel.</p> <p>With reservations about siting and LOCAL needs.</p> <p>Depends on parking impact - traffic etc.</p>	<p>AGREE – not an issue for PI CFS3. Can be included in list of facilities to be protected under CFS1. Could also be registered as an Asset of Community Value. PC could identify funding (eg CIL) and link to possible future need to bid for asset.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – neither national nor Leeds Core Strategy planning policy would allow such retail development in the Neighbourhood Area. NP PI CFS3 would relate to small scale development within this context.</p> <p>NOTED - hard for policy to apply a local need test – higher level retail policy limits acceptable scale of development relative to Pool’s place in hierarchy of centres. Policy will set out requirements re access and parking.</p> <p>NOTED – traffic problems are addressed via PI GE6 (‘Green Environment’). CFS3 could include safeguards re access, parking etc.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – consider inclusion of Post Office/shop on list of community facilities. Consider registration of Post Office/shop as an Asset of Community Value and its identification as such in relevant non-planning action point. Consider linking CIL/other PC funding to action point re shop in ‘project delivery plan’.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Certainly if possible new retail and service facilities would be an asset to the village.</p> <p>I am unconvinced that retail / restaurant facilities in Pool Business Park would be successful. It is physically, and more important, psychologically, outside the village proper. Even local residents are unaware of its existence. Whilst parking provision may be very difficult, I think that such (much needed) facilities would only work if they are in the centre of Pool. Moreover, in order for the village to be a more living, vibrant place, the centre is the area which needs enhancing.</p> <p>Doesn't this contradict with the vision - problems with traffic, pollution and safety will have been alleviated.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>I do not want a supermarket. The village would attract more cars.</p> <p>Provided any new facilities do not exacerbate the current traffic problems.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – planning permission already granted for a restaurant at Pool Business Park. Plan/policy intention is for existing village centre facilities to remain and for new to be located centrally.</p> <p>DISAGREE – PI would relate to only small scale development within the context of what is acceptable from a higher level planning policy perspective and wouldn't be expected to generate any significant extra traffic. PI could include safeguards re access, parking etc.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – Pool's place at the bottom of the identified centre hierarchy means that higher level planning policy would prevent supermarket development.</p> <p>NOTED – traffic problems are addressed via PI GE6 ('Green Environment'). CFS3 could include safeguards re access, parking etc.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>This will increase traffic and impact on existing facilities.</p> <p>Definitely not.</p> <p>Would any retail/shop facilities be viable in a village as small as Pool. Customers would also need somewhere to park - this is a problem for the existing shops.</p> <p>I would support it if Pool had a bypass.</p> <p>Again I would prefer that "Policy will...." rather than "Policy may...."</p> <p>See previous comments - its not just access and parking, its the overall increase in traffic movement &amp; vehicle numbers - the roads in Pool can not cope with this. Noise, light and air pollution are also concerns.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – PI would relate to only small scale development within the context of what is acceptable from a higher level planning policy perspective and wouldn't be expected to generate any significant extra traffic. PI could include safeguards re access, parking etc.</p> <p>DISAGREE – it is considered that limited additional retail/service provision would benefit the community.</p> <p>NOTED – viability is a business not a planning matter. Proposals would be assessed within the context of what is acceptable from a higher level retail planning policy perspective. Policy will ensure that provision be conditional on parking provision.</p> <p>NOTED – considered to be beyond the scope of the NP.</p> <p>AGREE – it is now clear that planning policy will address this matter.</p> <p>NOTED – such concerns are likely to be unfounded given the small scale level of development that would be involved, ie most likely within an existing building.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – policy will be drafted to support new retail and service provision subject to development requirements such as access and parking.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Current facilities are limited.</p> <p>Due to the litter we already suffer from the garage and other food outlets.</p> <p>My only concern would be if any new retail facility affects our one general store and Post Office which is such an asset to the community of Pool.</p> <p>This should be proportional to the needs of the community. There are already under-utilised business facilities. Looking to the future additional retail space on even a moderate scale could be a white elephant given the unstoppable progression to online shopping.</p>	<p>Significant increases in traffic movements as a result are unlikely.</p> <p>AGREE – policy would aim to support further provision.</p> <p>NOTED – litter bins could be provided as a condition of any planning permission and the requirement highlighted in the NP policy.</p> <p>NOTED – viability is a business not a planning matter. Proposals would be assessed within the context of what is acceptable from a higher level retail planning policy perspective.</p> <p>NOTED - viability is a business not a planning matter. Proposals would be assessed within the context of what is acceptable for a village such as PIW from a higher level retail planning policy perspective.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – include litter bin provision in policy requirements.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<p><b>Community Facilities &amp; Services – Non-Planning Actions/ Projects</b></p>	<p>Not sure if these are a priority. Pool is well placed for travel to work in Otley/Bradford/Harrogate and Leeds, however publicising of any local job opportunities would be useful.</p> <p>Ideal in an ideal world. Should not be developed at the expense of some of the previously listed aims. This was a clear well-expressed, easy to follow document. Hope the results are encouraging.</p>	<p>NOTED – all finally agreed non-planning actions/projects will be prioritised in a ‘project delivery plan’ to feature in the ‘Monitoring &amp; Implementation’ chapter of the Pre-Submission NP.</p> <p>1) NOTED - all finally agreed non-planning actions/projects will be prioritised in a ‘project delivery plan’ to feature in the ‘Monitoring &amp;</p>	<p><b>ACTION – priorities of agreed actions to be determined.</b></p> <p><b>1) ACTION – priorities of agreed actions to be determined.</b></p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
		Implementation' chapter of the Pre-Submission NP. 2) NOTED	
	Ditto.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	As above.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I think all projects will enhance the village and should be pursued.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	This Is not in the spirit of the setting up of Pool Memorial Hall by the Whiteleys. This venture is outside the original remit which was to benefit all the village - not as a business development opportunity. Acceptability would depend upon how sensitively the scheme is managed.	NOTED – venture would not affect the primary use of the hall.	NO ACTION
	Admirable.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Loads of houses in the village already.	NOTED – the NP is not proposing more housing in the village.	NO ACTION
	ACV identification good. Can't say I'm fussed about the rest.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	All points raised are ok with me.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Is this pie in the sky or has Walter Mitty taken over the Parish Council? Well we can dream but where is the money coming from?	NOTED – the NP is a 10 year plan and will include a 10 year project programme/delivery plan, subject to annual review and change – it will not be set in stone. The Pre-Submission NP will indicate potential sources of	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>To be encouraged.</p> <p>The principle seems ok.</p> <p>We definitely do not agree with the non-planning actions and projects. The problem has been caused by building houses in a rural area, bringing too many people into the area and people who want city living in a countryside location. If you want city life, then live in a city.</p> <p>Can we make sure reduction of heavy traffic and speeding including Old Pool Bank hamlet please, so we are not forgotten. There is a move to assert our identity as we often feel excluding from main village activity.</p> <p>It would be helpful to add web links into the document to enable better decision making and gain more information. From what has been put in the plan so far, it looks a reasonable proposal.</p> <p>Generally very good.</p>	<p>funding for each agreed project, building on the information contained in the PID 'Implementation' section.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – the historical reasons for any problems which PIW currently experiences are now irrelevant. The non-planning actions/projects are designed to improve the lot of those who now live in PIW. There is no logic re opposing projects/actions which address problems on the basis of the alleged historical source of those problems.</p> <p>NOTED – unclear how this relates to 'Community Facilities &amp; Services' non-planning actions. Relevant however to 'Traffic &amp; Travel' – matters are already in hand re addressing Old Pool Bank hamlet's issues.</p> <p>NOTED – more information/links to information will be provided on the NP website once the Pre-Submission NP has been produced.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	Happy, thanks.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	These would be desirable.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	It would be very beneficial to have e.g. a doctors in the village. Additionally with young families settling in Pool for their future a nursery or other daycare setting should be encouraged (that offers full working hour coverage - not 9-3).	NOTED – while not relevant to CFS3, this will be covered by CSF2 ‘Provision of New Community Facilities’.	NO ACTION
	The opportunity has been missed, due to bad planning, to minimise the effect of the Shell Filling Station on traffic. This area still needs attention. The Filling Station should not be allowed to affect other local facilities including the Post Office and General store.	NOTED – the NP cannot do anything with regard to historical planning decisions. Unclear from comment as to what attention is still needed, therefore impossible for NP to address.	NO ACTION
	Agree.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	None.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Not sure either village hall needs a "development plan".	DISAGREE – needed to safeguard the facility’s longevity and to guide its development from village hall to community centre in the original spirit of Whiteleys.	NO ACTION
	Hopefully any new facilities will be made accessible for ALL, including people with disabilities and special needs.	AGREE	<b>ACTION – specify access for all in action points as appropriate.</b>
	None.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Excellent.	NOTED	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
PI TT1	<p>LCC - ok in principle subject to evidence, policy clarity.</p> <p>Several pedestrian public rights of way seem to have disappeared.</p> <p>Not sure increase in cyclists is advantageous.</p> <p>No more bikes through main street.</p> <p>I welcome anything that means less use of cars.</p> <p>Anything that encourages less use of cars is to be welcomed.</p> <p>Within limits.</p> <p>Fantastic.</p> <p>With proviso not through Main Street.</p> <p>This would be fantastic.</p>	<p>NOTED – policy will be acceptable in these terms.</p> <p>NOTED – as comment does not specify which ones/provides no evidence, it is hard for the NP to address the issue.</p> <p>DISAGREE – it is considered that the encouragement of cycling could impact favourably on vehicle road usage. The identified cycle network would focus on off-road routes concentrating any increase away from the road network.</p> <p>NOTED - the identified cycle network would focus on off-road routes and not include a route through Main Street.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – unclear what type of limits are being suggested or in relation to what.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - the identified cycle network would focus on off-road routes and not include a route through Main Street.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – use NP www to appeal for more information on this matter.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>In the absence of traffic restrictions on Old Pool Bank, a footpath would be of benefit to residents.</p> <p>If this was possible it would be another great asset to the village.</p> <p>High priority for me.</p> <p>Too much traffic through a small village. Bad for pedestrians. Hard to cross the road.</p> <p>Cycle network should be intrude on current road infrastructure. Cycle routes should be in addition to the existing road widths.</p> <p>As stated earlier, I am very much in favour of this. I would greatly welcome a safe cycling route between Pool, Otley &amp; beyond, and even up to Old Pool Bank [Not sure how to achieve that, but I'd like it!] HOWEVER, it should not be at the expense of reducing the current road space. Indeed, I strongly recommend REMOVING the little used cycle lane up Pool Bank, which causes congestion and pollution in Pool, and discourages the use of motorcycles, which can significantly contribute to reducing congestion and</p>	<p>AGREE – this will be encompassed in the identified footpath network and is already specifically identified under non-planning actions/projects.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - with NP policies the issue of priority is irrelevant. It is a matter of putting in place a comprehensive suite of policies to be applied on an ongoing basis, as appropriate, by LCC planners in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>AGREE – NP policies and actions designed to address these issues.</p> <p>NOTED - the identified cycle network would focus on off-road routes and not include a route through Main Street or on unsuitable existing roads.</p> <p>1) NOTED – route to Otley and beyond will be achieved through Wharfedale Greenway. The identified cycle network would focus on off-road routes and not include a route through Main Street or on unsuitable existing roads. 2) DISAGREE – re removal of Pool Bank New Road cycle route. Minority view. No evidence to justify action.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>pollution, provided they have sufficient road space to keep moving.</p> <p>What about cycleway from Pool to Otley? This was in the planning stages some years back?</p> <p>Footpaths yes</p> <p>"improvements" to cycling facilities concern me after the disastrous cycle lane blunder up Pool Bank. Getting rid of cars is not going to make someone want to cycle up such a massive hill !</p> <p>The traffic has increased no end. If the Leeds/Bradford airport expands it will get heavier.</p> <p>All four of the traffic and transport intentions are, we believe, vital for the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Is this an asset? Will it not attract more people to the village and contribute to parking and traffic congestion problems.</p>	<p>NOTED – route to Otley and beyond will be achieved through Wharfedale Greenway.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>1) DISAGREE – re removal of Pool Bank New Road cycle route. Minority view. No evidence to justify action. 2) NOTED - the policy will identify a cycle network focussing on off-road routes and not include routes through Main Street or on unsuitable existing roads. There is no NP policy (or hope) re getting rid of cars.</p> <p>NOTED - PI TT1 part of TT policy suite to try to address. Also specific action under ‘non-planning actions/projects’ re airport expansion.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – yes – because will help to address traffic issues. Those people attracted by network will be largely on bikes/foot and off-road and arriving by those means. An associated car park is not considered desirable as do not want</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>We do not agree. No development or building is wanted by us or warranted. It is this that has brought too many people into a rural location. The area itself was not the problem. Stop building houses.</p> <p>This is an important aim!</p> <p>We need improvement in existing footpaths, which are too narrow and highly dangerous particularly Main Street and Arthington Lane. The road network in Pool needs serious thinking - as traffic volumes are inevitably going to increase.</p> <p>The Wharfedale Greenway development is very important to the wellbeing of Pool residents.</p> <p>This needs to be focussed on commuting cycle access into Leeds/the airport etc rather than 'leisure' cycling greenways.</p>	<p>to encourage cars into the village to then access the Greenway.</p> <p>DISAGREE – this PI is not promoting any development/building/housing. Its reference to development relates to any such occurring (which it may and which NP would be powerless to resist) being used positively to benefit the local cycling/walking network.</p> <p>NOTED – although it is a PI not an aim.</p> <p>AGREE – TT1 is not directly relevant to these issues, which are largely non-planning in nature, but is designed to try to encourage more people out of their cars. Non-planning actions/projects in this section directly address these issues. Serious thinking re road network considered beyond the scope of the NP.</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>DISAGREE – on-road cycle lanes to such destinations are not considered to be feasible, eg for reasons of topography. There are already objections to the cycle lane on Pool Bank New Road. They are also considered unhealthy due to</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	Traffic problems have been ignored ridiculous tolerance.	<p>pollution levels. There are no feasible high speed, off-road commuter routes.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP cannot reverse any historical failings – whether of the PC or higher authorities. What it can do/will do is seek to address traffic problem issues going forward.</p>	NO ACTION
PI TT2	<p>LCC – ok in principle.</p> <p>Critically important that strategic planning and development to address this key issue is done to avoid "ad hoc" piecemeal growth of infrastructure/transport/traffic.</p> <p>Ban HGV from Main Street.</p> <p>A bus shelter is needed on both sides of Pool Bank. Bus stop to protect people from flood roads.</p> <p>The need to resolve the amount of traffic congestion we all experience on a daily basis.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – such an approach reaches beyond remit/power of the NP and its suite of TT policies. Also needs to be remembered that the statutory planning/development process, and TT2 within that, has only limited influence on public transport provision. Policy needs to be complemented by non-planning action/project.</p> <p>NOTED – this is not relevant to TT2. It is however covered under TT non-planning actions/projects.</p> <p>NOTED – although unclear from comment description exactly where bus shelters are required.</p> <p>AGREE – TT2 is part of suite of NP policies designed to address this. There is also a specific non-planning action covering this issue.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – add 'non-planning action/project' re improvements to public transport.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – add' provision of bus shelters as needed' to 'improve public transport' non-planning action point.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Critical to resolve the unacceptable traffic congestion we all experience daily.</p> <p>Excellent.</p> <p>Any improvements to public transport are welcomed as they are currently inadequate.</p> <p>Reduction in heavy/large vehicles must be restricted - e.g. if wider than road space allocated resulting in mounting pavements.</p> <p>Railway station at Arthington?</p> <p>Bus links to Harrogate and Leeds need improvement.</p>	<p>AGREE – TT2 is part of suite of NP policies designed to address this. There is also a specific non-planning action covering this issue.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>NOTED – this is not relevant to TT2. It is however covered under TT non-planning actions/projects.</p> <p>NOTED – NP cannot include planning policies in relation to land outside the Neighbourhood Area, although TT3 covering ‘rail link reinstatement’ implicitly supports this. It could however include a non-planning action/project re this.</p> <p>NOTED – X85 service to Leeds now introduced, but evenings/Sunday service in need of improvement. Harrogate services considered to be fine. This is too specific for planning policy, but such needs could be specified under non-planning actions/projects.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add non-planning action/project re improvements to public transport.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add non-planning action/project re this issue – perhaps linked to airport expansion related measures.</p> <p>ACTION – add non-planning action re specific public transport improvements.</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Vague and unfunded.</p> <p>A rail link other than Weeton would be well received as inability to park at Weeton after 7am is a huge issue.</p> <p>This will then reduce the necessity for additional services and facilities in Pool.</p> <p>Policy doesn't reflect the fact that the way forward is likely to change significantly over the next 10 years with the advent of new technology such as driverless cars, car ownership etc.</p>	<p>NOTED – in a topic area such as public transport, where the influence of planning policy is limited, it is difficult to be more specific re either needed improvements or funding. There is however scope for more detail to be included and potential funding sources highlighted under non-planning actions/ projects and in associated project delivery plan to be included in Pre-Submission NP.</p> <p>NOTED – comment is more directly relevant to TT3. TT3 and/or non-planning actions/projects need to specify a railway station at Pool as part of the rail link reinstatement aspiration. Action could be extended to lobbying for expanded parking at Weeton and for integration of Weeton train and bus services.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the two issues are not necessarily mutually inclusive. No guarantee that sought for improvements will be forthcoming.</p> <p>NOTED – planning policy can only reflect and must be in conformity with the prevailing national and Local Plan planning policies in force at the time. Such higher level policies do not</p>	<p><b>ACTION – add non-planning action etc re public transport.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION – amend policy re Pool Station and add associated non-planning actions as suggested.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>If routes and networks could be organised and integrated this would be very good. Most certainly a rail link once more if possible.</p> <p>If cars are the lowest component in the "food chain" surely re-established rail links would perhaps be worthwhile in reducing traffic levels.</p> <p>We do not agree. No development or building is wanted or warranted. Stop building houses.</p> <p>Connectivity must be improved, particularly if there is housing development.</p> <p>Yes we need improvement in public transport links, but we also need improvement in the roads that will take that public transport!</p> <p>There is no bus service from pool to leeds without walking up to the A660 so we have to use our car every time we want to go anywhere.</p>	<p>currently reflect this wholly likely scenario.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE – NP policies are being crafted to reflect this view. Add associated non-planning actions/projects.</p> <p>DISAGREE – this PI is not promoting any development/building/housing. Its reference to development relates to any such occurring (which it may and which NP would be powerless to resist) being used positively to benefit the public transport network.</p> <p>AGREE – hence policy approach.</p> <p>1) NOTED – TT2 is designed to address the public transport dimension. Add non-planning action re road improvements, 2) NOTED – major road improvements considered beyond the scope of the NP.</p> <p>DISAGREE – X85 service introduced since launch of consultation, but evenings/Sunday service in need of improvement.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – add rail-related non-planning action(s).</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>1) ACTION – add non-planning action re improvements to roads</b> 2) NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – add non-planning action re specific public transport improvements.</b></p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	Anything that diverts traffic from the main street is a big asset. I am disappointed that a bypass is not planned. Surely as a main route to the airport it is important to improve the existing route.	1) NOTED – bypass considered beyond the scope of the NP. 2) NOTED – re other road improvements.	1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – add non-planning action re improvements to roads.
PI TT3	<p>LCC - Ok in principle subject to general conformity and regard to national planning policy.</p> <p>Don't see this as a very likely outcome/not a priority.</p> <p>Supporting this means supporting reopening Arthington Station.</p> <p>I believe there is adequate rail links already.</p>	<p>NOTED – policy will be acceptable in these terms.</p> <p>NOTED – agreed unlikely that link will be reinstated in plan period, but policy is designed to keep the option open for that period by preventing development that would prejudice such reinstatement per se. With NP policies the issue of priority is irrelevant. It is a matter of putting in place a comprehensive suite of policies to be applied on an ongoing basis, as appropriate, by LCC planners in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>NOTED – NP cannot include planning policies in relation to land outside the Neighbourhood Area, although TT3 covering 'rail link reinstatement' implicitly supports this. It could however include a non-planning action/project re this issue.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the only easily accessible rail link for Pool is the Harrogate-Leeds line at Weeton, with inadequate parking. TT3 is part of a suite of NP planning policies and non-planning</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add non-planning action/project re this issue – perhaps linked to airport expansion related measures?</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Not sure this is practicable.</p> <p>A nice idea but the route has been built on in Pool and the Greenway will use some of the route to the West. However when gravel extractions happens to the East of Otley, a rail link to Menston and/or the Harrogate line could be partly funded by the extractor company.</p> <p>How can it go along the Old Railway line. Surely this is the route for the Greenway.</p>	<p>actions/projects designed to move away from Pool's dependence on the car and its attendant traffic problems towards more sustainable transport solutions.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy intention to keep the option of future rail reinstatement open by preventing further obstructive development is considered practicable. The practicability of actual reinstatement is doubtful during the 10 year life of the NP but that is not the issue here.</p> <p>1) NOTED – the intention of the policy is to keep the option of future rail reinstatement open by preventing further obstructive development. The policy would protect a general line which would not preclude Greenway development.</p> <p>2) NOTED - the effective working of the policy would allow for the type of implementation/funding possibility suggested. Could add a rail-related non-planning action/project to embrace input to the type of opportunity highlighted.</p> <p>NOTED - the policy would protect a general line which would not preclude Greenway development.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – add non-planning action/project as suggested.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	Great idea.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	A rail link would be excellent.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Commendable ambition but unlikely given that we are unable to even by-pass the village for vehicles. A rail link would be prohibitively expensive.	NOTED - the policy intention is to keep the option of future rail reinstatement open by preventing further obstructive development. The practicability of actual reinstatement is doubtful during the 10 year life of the NP but that is not the issue here.	NO ACTION
	Are parts of the route already built on!	AGREE – yes. The intention of the policy is to keep the option of future rail reinstatement open by preventing further obstructive development. The issue of ‘getting round’ the existing obstruction would need to be addressed as part of any serious consideration of actual rail reinstatement.	NO ACTION
	A rail link would be good, but highly unlikely.	NOTED – the policy keeps ‘the dream’ alive by maintaining the physical conditions which would still make it theoretically possible. The likelihood of link reinstatement during the NP’s life is probably nil but this is a long term aspiration.	NO ACTION
	Is this not at odds with the creation of the Wharfedale Greenway.	NOTED - the policy would protect a general line which would not preclude Greenway development.	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	I have campaigned for this for years and as a boy I used Arthington and Pool station quite often.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Seems an impossible dream - it would be amazing.	NOTED – the policy would at least keep ‘the dream’ alive.	NO ACTION
	This would be great, but unfortunately I think it will be aspirational.	NOTED – the policy itself is not aspirational but it does keep alive the aspiration of rail reinstatement.	NO ACTION
	I'd love this to happen. But, er, you have noticed that there are already very expensive houses built on the former rail track at Old Pool Bank, haven't you? Willow Court is built on the old station and railway lines. This will cause problems I think.	AGREE – yes. The intention of the policy is to keep the option of future rail reinstatement open by preventing further obstructive development. The issue of ‘getting round’ the existing obstructions would need to be addressed as part of any serious consideration of actual rail reinstatement.	NO ACTION
	But we need a rail link. Airport railway link? Could we influence this?	AGREE – attempting to influence developments would be a valuable complement to the policy.	ACTION - add rail/airport related non-planning action/project.
	I think the rail link should be reinstated to Leeds Station at Arthington.	NOTED – planning policy would provide for this in so far as it can affect matters on the ground within the Neighbourhood Area (NA). Complementary non-planning action(s) to support this, extending to matters outside of the NA.	ACTION – add rail-related non-planning action(s)
	What would happen to existing developments and the need to infill under New Pool Bank railway bridge.	NOTED - the issue of ‘getting round’ the existing obstructions would need to be	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>A priority to reduce road traffic.</p> <p>A train service would be a great asset to the residents of pool and would help residents to settle in pool and work in leeds.</p> <p>Sorry but this is rubbish Arthington to Otley rail link would have to demolish lots of perfectly good houses.</p> <p>Any future developments should contribute to providing an alternative route around the village.</p> <p>Rail link would be superb.</p>	<p>addressed as part of any serious consideration of actual rail instatement. This goes beyond the immediate intention of the policy.</p> <p>AGREE – policy designed to contribute to a longer term approach to achieving this aim.</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>DISAGREE - The intention of the policy is to keep the option of future rail reinstatement open by preventing further obstructive development. The issue of ‘getting round’ the existing obstructions would need to be addressed as part of any serious consideration of actual rail instatement.</p> <p>NOTED – however an alternative rail route/link around the village is unlikely to be feasible, given the additional track length/cost involved. The principle of development contributing to any such route is however supported and covered under TT2. An alternative road route, i.e. by-pass considered to be beyond the scope of the NP.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>This is the route of the Wharfedale Greenway and surely is more beneficial than a proposed railway link - which I don't believe would ever happen!</p> <p>I question whether or not this is practical. It would need significant support and funding from Central Government. Highly unlikely in my view.</p> <p>More traffic.</p>	<p>NOTED - the policy would protect a general line which would not preclude Greenway development. In policy terms, it is not a case of one being more beneficial than another – both policy approaches can co-exist. Rail link reinstatement is aspirational – the policy intention is to keep the option of future rail reinstatement open by preventing further obstructive development which would certainly mean it would never happen.</p> <p>NOTED - the policy intention is to keep the option of future rail reinstatement open by preventing further obstructive development. The practicality of actual reinstatement is moreorless nil during the 10 year life of the NP and would ultimately require significant strategic funding but that is not the immediate issue here.</p> <p>NOTED – unclear how comment relates to TT3. On the basis that it may mean the return of the railway/a station to PIW would attract more traffic, this is speculative and would need to be modelled. Detailed plans would need to look at car parking provision to accompany a station. For now, the policy is about preserving the on ground conditions necessary to keep</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Existing developments along the line of the former railway line (e.g. Willow Court and the Otley bypass) would seem to present difficulties in reinstating the line.</p> <p>A rail station in Arthington would be brilliant, and would mean that we could consider leaving our car at home to travel in to work in Leeds.</p> <p>But it should be more active about reinstating the railway.</p>	<p>the possibility of rail reinstatement open, not about actual rail development.</p> <p>DISAGREE - The intention of the policy is to keep the option of future rail reinstatement open by preventing further obstructive development. The issue of 'getting round' the existing obstructions would need to be addressed as part of any serious consideration of actual rail reinstatement. The Otley bypass issue lies outside the Neighbourhood Area and NP planning policy cannot address it. However the draft Otley NP contains a comparable policy re rail link reinstatement. Need for a rail-related non-planning action/project to embrace input to issues such as Otley bypass.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE - Need for a rail-related non-planning action/project to complement planning policy</p>	<p>ACTION - add a rail-related non-planning action/project to embrace input to issues such as Otley bypass.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add a rail-related non-planning action/project to complement planning policy.</p>
PI TT4	<p>LCC – ok.</p> <p>Subject to appropriate location, capacity etc.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE – policy should be caveated in this way.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add caveats re location, capacity etc to actual policy wording.</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Plans should also address problems created by holiday-makers parking on public roads whilst flying from Leeds/Bradford airport.</p> <p>Essential.</p> <p>I'm not sure where this would be. This PI appears to contradict some of the others in encouraging walking/cycling. Parking in the village centre is not, I don't think, a huge issue.</p> <p>If implemented sensitively.</p> <p>But cannot, at this stage, identify such space?</p> <p>Consultation of future "double yellow lines" with the residents should be made available. Parking improved for the social club.</p>	<p>AGREE – there is already a non-planning action/project to address this.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is not considered that there is any contradiction. Accepted it is not a huge issue but parking is limited aside from at the village hall. Accordingly the PI is flexible and aspirational rather than advancing any firm proposal or site. Any proposed sites would be assessed on their individual merits. Policy should however be caveated re location.</p> <p>NOTED – policy should be caveated accordingly.</p> <p>AGREE – no suitable location currently suggests itself, so PI is couched in flexible, aspirational terms.</p> <p>1) NOTED – re double yellows - consultation on LCC plans is in the gift of LCC Highways. The PC will act on community requests re double yellow lines as made and encourages any such requests. 2) NOTED – there is no land to increase capacity.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – amend existing action point to also embrace current effects as well as effects of future expansion.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – add caveat re location to actual policy wording.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION – add caveat to address the concern.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>But to integrate with CFS3/CFS2.</p> <p>Again - "otherwise" what?</p> <p>Is the parking the proposed at the end of Mill Lane?</p> <p>New car park welcomed for football on main field as people regularly park outside my house and my husband cannot park his van (Wharfe Crescent).</p> <p>Need to discourage traffic in the village.</p>	<p>NOTED – all intentions are considered to be compatible. Improvements under TT2 would not necessarily remove the aspiration for additional car parking. The ultimate reinstatement of a rail link would necessitate considering the issue of car parking at any new Pool Station, but TT3 is not concerned with actual reinstatement, rather with preserving the on-ground conditions that would keep open the future possibility of such reinstatement.</p> <p>AGREE – wording is imprecise and unclear.</p> <p>NOTED – no - no location is specified or in mind.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP does not identify a location for any such car park, but policy, but policy would support an acceptable scheme.</p> <p>AGREE – NP policies/actions designed to try to achieve this aim. TT4 is about solving local problems not about attracting more cars into the village.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – wording to be replaced with 'Development that is acceptable in principle.....' ie that is in line with other applicable planning policies. Eg housing development on an allocated site that creates new facility would be welcomed.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>If space could be found for this it would be another great asset to the village.</p> <p>We have too many cars in the village already. Park &amp; Go schemes to be considered. Rail links faster from airport. Direct train to London from airport? Influence Virgin trains??</p> <p>Maybe - is there actually a problem with parking in the village except at school times around the school/village hall? And that's partly down to moronic individuals selfishly parking like idiots... Sorry !</p> <p>Yes to a new car park at Arthington and in the village of Pool.</p> <p>More shops, more car parks, more cars.</p>	<p>AGREE</p> <p>AGREE - TT4 is about solving local problems not about attracting more cars into the village. The other issues raised are strategic in nature and involve solutions that would need to be implemented outside the Neighbourhood Area – as such NP planning policy cannot address them. Could add a rail-related non-planning action/project to complement planning policy in order to influence matters beyond the NA</p> <p>NOTED – TT4 is about solving local problems. These include Wharfe Crescent, at village shops/PO, the Half Moon, Shell Garage and when sports/other events at recreation ground.</p> <p>NOTED – however, NP planning policy cannot address the issue of a new car park in Arthington as it lies outside the Neighbourhood Area.</p> <p>NOTED – the scale of retail/car park development anticipated as a possible result of NP policies is of such small scale that no significant, if any, increase in cars using the village is expected.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – as suggested.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Depends on the type of development.</p> <p>Non planning action. Establishment of dedicated school bus pick-up point at Pool Village Hall car park! Why this over used and abused car park? Any school pick-up point should be on school property.</p> <p>I live on Park Square and the parking on our street for the school can at times be completely inconsiderate. I have only lived in Pool since March but the entrance to my street has been blocked on a weekend twice by people using the cricket club.</p> <p>There is currently nowhere to park in pool.</p> <p>As a pool resident, we've never needed to drive and park in the village. As such, I don't see the need for additional parking. Also wouldn't increased parking encourage more traffic into the village rather than try to lower the amount?</p>	<p>There are no firm NP proposals for either shop(s) or car park.</p> <p>AGREE – wording requires clarification.</p> <p>NOTED – this refers to pick-up point for PHGS pupils. As such would not be appropriate to use primary school land. Needs to be clarified in action point.</p> <p>NOTED – the 'solution' may lie with the school/sports club who could be approached re laying out of traffic cones at key times to prevent inconsiderate parking.</p> <p>NOTED – NP policy seeks to address this issue.</p> <p>NOTED - TT4 is about solving local problems not about attracting more cars into the village. The scale of car park development anticipated as a possible result of NP policy is so small that no significant, if any, increase in cars using the village is expected. Other residents have clearly articulated</p>	<p>ACTION – policy wording to be amended to 'development that is acceptable in principle.....' ie that is in line with other applicable planning policies. Eg housing development on an allocated site that creates new car park would be welcomed.</p> <p>ACTION – add information re PHGS pupils to action point.</p> <p>ACTION – add new non-planning action re approaching school/sports club about coning of streets at key times to prevent inconsiderate parking.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
		parking problems which they experience.	
<b>Transport &amp; Traffic – Non-Planning Actions /Projects</b>	<p>As a regular walker / cyclist I know road circumstances need to change but due to the river crossing this is very unlikely to change in the next 20 years. We need to concentrate on issues that will promote tourism 1. Car Park 2. Leisure 3. Food outlets 4. Employment</p> <p>Not sure if these are a priority. Pool is well placed for travel to work in Otley/Bradford/Harrogate and Leeds, however publicising of any local job opportunities would be useful.</p> <p>School pickup point and electric charging points are needed and reduction of traffic, particularly HGVs.</p> <p>Ideal in an ideal world. Should not be developed at the expense of some of the previously listed aims. This was a clear well-expressed, easy to follow document. Hope the results are encouraging.</p> <p>Establishment of an electric charging point at the Shell Garage will have a minimal impact on air quality in Pool. Adequate provision in new housing stock (and existing</p>	<p>NOTED – the priorities for non-planning actions/projects will be decided and included in the Pre-Submission NP. With policies, it is not a question of concentrating on one thing or another. It is a matter of putting in place a comprehensive suite of policies to be applied on an ongoing basis, as appropriate, by LCC planners in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>NOTED – all finally agreed non-planning actions/projects will be prioritised in a ‘project delivery plan’ to feature in the ‘Monitoring &amp; Implementation’ chapter of the Pre-Submission NP.</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>1) NOTED - all finally agreed non-planning actions/projects will be prioritised in a ‘project delivery plan’ to feature in the ‘Monitoring &amp; Implementation’ chapter of the Pre-Submission NP. 2) NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – every little helps. Housing comments addressed in Housing section.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – priorities of agreed actions to be determined.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>1) ACTION – priorities of agreed actions to be determined.</b> 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	houses if possible) will have a greater effect (see H2, above).		
	Traffic calming measures - humps through the village and 20mph speed limit.	NOTED – 20mph limit already referenced in action point. Humps discussed and rejected.	NO ACTION
	When the new road east of Otley is built, HGV should be directed to this road not up Pool Bank New Road. In North Yorkshire road improvements are made without any extra housing - why not in LCC?	1) NOTED – HGV action as suggested should be added to HGV action point. 2) NOTED – LCC road improvements are an issue for LCC and not the PC/this NP.	1) ACTION – as suggested. 2) NO ACTION
	Ditto.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	As above.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Any types of new building must take into view a) schooling, b) extra road traffic c) poor roads now in use.	NOTED – unclear how this relates to non-planning actions/projects. In response, yes, they must, do and will do – by LCC at strategic level and through NP policies.	NO ACTION
	I think all projects will enhance the village and should be pursued.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Pool Bridge and nearby roads not made for the heavy, noisy and the amount of traffic which is now using it.	AGREE – NP seeking to address in so far as is possible.	NO ACTION
	Paths need widening - Hunters/Min Str.	AGREE – already included in relevant action point.	NO ACTION
	Admirable.	NOTED	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	Shocked that only 43% said they consider a (re-opened) train station at Arthington "extremely/very important". Thought the percentage would be considerably higher.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Very much support the improvements to footpaths/rights of way in particular. The creation of new ones.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Loads of houses in the village already.	NOTED – the NP is not proposing more housing in the village.	NO ACTION
	No mention made of the improvements needed to the two junctions of the A658 and A659. Potentially the junction of the Shell Garage.	NOTED – non-planning action re road improvements could be added to cover this.	<b>ACTION – add non-planning action as suggested.</b>
	Very keen on all that. Especially footpaths down Old Pool Bank and out to the Hunters, cycle provision.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Don't think a 20 mph limit is necessary though - I want drivers through Pool looking where they are going, not at their speedo.	DISAGREE – very much a minority view.	NO ACTION
	I like the idea of a dedicated school bus pick up point and the reduction of heavy good vehicles through Pool and the 20mph zones.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	All points raised are ok with me.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Is this pie in the sky or has Walter Mitty taken over the Parish Council? Well we can dream but where is the money coming from?	NOTED – the NP is a 10 year plan and will include a 10 year project programme/delivery plan, subject to annual review and change – it will not be set in stone. The Pre-Submission NP will indicate potential sources of	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
		funding for each agreed project, building on the information contained in the PID 'Implementation' section.	
	All nine of those under the traffic section are vital to the future of the village.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	The problem of Heavy Goods Vehicles through Pool is an urgent problem to be solved.	AGREE	NO ACTION
	To be encouraged.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	The principle seems ok.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	We definitely do not agree with the non-planning actions and projects. The problem has been caused by building houses in a rural area, bringing too many people into the area and people who want city living in a countryside location. If you want city life, then live in a city.	DISAGREE – the historical reasons for any problems which PIW currently experiences are now irrelevant. The non-planning actions/projects are designed to improve the lot of those who now live in PIW. There is no logic re opposing projects/actions which address problems on the basis of the alleged historical source of those problems.	NO ACTION
	Can we make sure reduction of heavy traffic and speeding including Old Pool Bank hamlet please, so we are not forgotten. There is a move to assert our identity as we often feel excluding from main village activity.	NOTED – matters are already in hand re addressing Old Pool Bank hamlet's issues.	NO ACTION
	Just be aware of the traffic implications for the proposals and the effect of this on the environment (e.g. your reference to the airport expansion).	NOTED	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Reduction of speeding to 20mph should cover the whole village, including Old Pool Bank area.</p> <p>It would be helpful to add web links into the document to enable better decision making and gain more information. From what has been put in the plan so far, it looks a reasonable proposal.</p> <p>Generally very good.</p> <p>Happy, thanks.</p> <p>These would be desirable.</p> <p>Definitely supportive of additional public transport. This is already improving with the X85 introduction.</p> <p>More specific traffic control measures need to be introduced to make all exits/entrances to the A659 and A658 safer for pedestrians and vehicles. Speed control and controlled crossings would help achieve this.</p> <p>Pavements are a big issue - we need better provision of safe pathways in our village. Safe access to the bus stop for the X52 to Harrogate (by the Shell garage) is also needed (this is used as a school bus too). Foot access to the Shell garage is also a real concern. Agree with all the</p>	<p>NOTED – 20mph limit can only be implemented on roads where it is technically feasible.</p> <p>NOTED – more information/links to information will be provided on the NP website once the Pre-Submission NP has been produced.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – add reference to public transport improvement in non-planning actions.</p> <p>NOTED – considered an intractable problem. More controlled crossings = more standing traffic = more pollution. No obvious solution, but possibility can be encompassed under catch-all ‘highway improvement’ non-planning action.</p> <p>NOTED – covered by existing non-planning action re ‘improvements to footpaths’. ‘Action’ can cite highlighted area as an eg.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – add ‘where feasible’ to existing non-planning action.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – add reference as suggested.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION – add non-planning action re ‘highway improvements’.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION – add eg to action point as highlighted by comment.</b></p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>actions to reduce traffic volume, particularly heavy goods vehicles.</p> <p>We feel that one of the most important improvement in pool is regular public transport from pool into leads. This would give a massive benefit to all the residents. Currently the bus service is essentially useless.</p> <p>There is no mention of the airport (or I missed it), as this is likely to expand there will be more pressure of the transport network and potentially a greater noise impact.</p> <p>The chance of a Pool by-pass is nil.</p> <p>It seems to me that one answer to traffic problems is to ban HGV's from Arthington lane. This is east/west traffic. Those travelling east from Otley direction would be directed onto the Harrogate road then at the end of the Harrogate by-pass turn right back towards Harewood and visa versa. Although this would put a few extra miles on their journey it would remove so much congestion from the centre of the village and Arthington lane where in many places HGV's can only get passed each other by mounting the pavement.</p> <p>There are Non-Planning Actions/Projects related to Traffic but, since this is listed in the Objectives first, surely it deserves a Policy Intention.</p>	<p>NOTED – currently no reference to public transport improvement – this could be added. X85 introduction has improved things but service would benefit from further improvements on evenings/Sundays.</p> <p>NOTED – this is already covered in an action point.</p> <p>NOTED – the by-pass issue is considered beyond the scope of the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – this is not considered acceptable by NYCC as applicable Highways Authority because doesn't provide an alternative direct route.</p> <p>NOTED – unfortunately most of the traffic related matters are non-planning in nature. Where they can be linked to</p>	<p><b>ACTION – add 'public transport improvement' action, with specific reference to X85 improvements.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>None.</p> <p>Would it be possible to ban hgvs from Main street at peak hours?</p> <p>Better footpath and cycle routes etc would be good</p> <p>the proposed projects regarding traffic volume/speed/ routing through Pool seem impossible to accomplish. Whats the answer? Send all the traffic somewhere else for them to sort out!</p> <p>Hopefully any new facilities will be made accessible for ALL, including people with disabilities and special needs.</p> <p>Don't allow any housing or development that makes the transport situation even one car worse.</p> <p>Definitely need more public transport.</p> <p>Farcical.</p>	<p>'development' ie statutory planning, this has been done via a PI.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – no because there is no alternative direct route.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it remains to be seen how much success the proposed actions can achieve. It is likely that the real answers are strategic and probably far too expensive to achieve.</p> <p>AGREE – 'access for all' should be built into all new facilities.</p> <p>NOTED – an unrealistic request as the NP cannot prevent new development in line with higher level national/LCC planning policies, eg infill/windfall or on safeguarded housing land such as Old Pool Bank site.</p> <p>AGREE – PI in place aimed at improvements. Add complementary non-planning action/project.</p> <p>NOTED – unclear why suite of non-planning actions/projects designed to</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – ensure that need for 'access for all' is flagged up in all relevant action points.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – add non-planning action/project as suggested.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
		try and tackle PIW's traffic/travel issues is deemed farcical. Impossible to respond properly without detail as to why farcical.	
<b>Transport &amp; Traffic - General</b>	<p>JohnsonMowat – we are aware of the traffic issues and recall from our local consultation event for the planning application of the 70 dwelling the continued request from members of the public for the delivery of the Pool Western bypass which is currently absent from any LCC local plan document. From reading the draft NP, it would appear the NP Steering Group are no longer pursuing this and instead are seeking to improve public transport and other sustainable modes of transport. We support this approach and look forward to any dialogue where the housing proposals can assist.</p> <p>NYCC - the Neighbourhood Plan should recognise the importance of the A658 linking North Yorkshire to Leeds Bradford airport and urban centres in West Yorkshire.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – unclear how the NP should do this in practical policy or non-planning action/project terms.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<b>E: Housing – Supporting Text</b>	JohnsonMowat – we welcome the acknowledgement that Pool has a role in delivering a proportion of housing via the LCC CS and SAP.	NOTED – the acknowledgement relates to the position as handed down by the adopted Core Strategy.	NO ACTION
<b>PI H1</b>	JohnsonMowat – we write on behalf of our client, Taylor Wimpey, who have an interest in the current UDPR Safeguarded Land on the western edge of Pool in Wharfedale. The land is covered in the Draft NP in Section (nb page) 13. The response is intended to be an introductory letter from which we can hopefully liaise with the NP Steering Group over coming months as the NP progresses. On that basis, the comments are intended as general observations only.	NOTED – further consultation will take place as part of an ‘informal sites consultation’ scheduled for early in 2018.	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>JohnsonMowat – our clients control the majority of land contained within the 23ha of ‘Safeguarded Land’ referenced in the NP text. Our client requests to be involved with the dialogue regarding that land given any such aspirations can only be achieved through dialogue.</p> <p>JohnsonMowat – please note it is likely our clients will lodge an appeal against the LCC refusal of the 70 dwelling proposal on the UDPR Safeguarded Land. However, in doing so, our client is keen to maintain dialogue with reps of the parish council and NP steering group, given that even the 70 dwelling proposal will deliver some of the aims being sought in the NP such as affordable housing and considerable CIL payments.</p> <p>LCC - opportunity to work with the parish council on this.</p> <p>Feel there are sufficient houses to date. Already causing problems re traffic/school size etc.</p> <p>Particularly the increased provision of suitable housing for elderly and disabled - little available at present.</p> <p>I would restrict any future development at Old Pool Bank.</p>	<p>NOTED – further consultation will take place as part of an ‘informal sites consultation’ scheduled for early in 2018.</p> <p>NOTED – involvement in any appeal would be a PC issue rather one for the NP Steering Group, although some sharing of views would be likely via joint members.</p> <p>NOTED – a joint PC/LCC workshop approach similar to that employed re Parlington (Aberford NP) and East of Otley (Otley NP) may be beneficial.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP cannot oppose housing land already identified by LCC in an adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>AGREE – this is specifically covered in PI H3.</p> <p>NOTED – the extent of the future development has already been determined in an LCC adopted plan which the NP cannot change.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – initiate workshop approach with LCC</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	No new housing off old Pool Bank until strategic/green issues/infrastructure issues have been properly addressed.	NOTED – this is not a requirement which NP policy is able to impose. Requirements re green infrastructure/ green space within the development are however possible.	ACTION – include green infrastructure and green space requirements/aspirations.
	Only on LCC site allocation plan - no other development.	NOTED – the NP cannot guarantee the prevention of small scale infill or windfall development in line with adopted higher level LCC planning policy re non-allocated housing sites. Or allowed on appeal by Government inspectors. NP policies are designed however to control such development as far as is possible.	NO ACTION
	Must have control over future development.	NOTED – the NP cannot guarantee the prevention of small scale infill or windfall development in line with adopted higher level LCC planning policy re non-allocated housing sites. Or allowed on appeal by Government inspectors. NP policies are designed however to control such development as far as is possible.	NO ACTION
	No new housing before a bypass.	NOTED – NP policy cannot require this, although a bypass ('relief road'?) as part of any development may be possible. The issue of major infrastructure such as a by-pass is considered beyond the scope of the NP.	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>The prospect of 540 dwellings on Old Pool Bank would completely destroy the village.</p> <p>Development of housing on Old Pool Bank should be strongly resisted. The Old Pool Bank/A660 junction at the Bar House is simply not capable of dealing with any more traffic.</p> <p>Too much housing.</p> <p>Most certainly safeguard land on Old Pool Bank - at present a noisy and awkward "rat run". If it could be done !!</p> <p>No new housing which will make Old Pool Bank almost impossible to residents.</p> <p>Also as Old Pool is at the moment far too busy it should also be made into a one way system.</p> <p>How are you going to ensure the housing is the same texture?</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP cannot oppose housing land already identified by LCC in an adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP cannot oppose housing land already identified by LCC in an adopted Local Plan. NP policy can however seek to control site access requirements.</p> <p>NOTED - the NP cannot oppose housing land already identified by LCC in an adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>NOTED – for clarity, ‘safeguarded land’ refers to land safeguarded by LCC for future housing purposes. It is not land safeguarded FROM future development.</p> <p>NOTED - the NP cannot oppose housing land already identified by LCC in an adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>NOTED – subject of current LCC consultation.</p> <p>NOTED – ‘housing texture’ generally will be covered in the NP’s ‘Built Heritage’ policies. The site is also adjacent to the PIW Conservation Area and subject to LCC Core Strategy design policy. These will seek to ensure that the texture is in</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – include site access requirements/aspirations.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – include design/layout requirements/aspirations.</b></p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>We do not want or need further development or building of houses/businesses in the village or surrounding area. The Policy Intentions merely accept that the area will be built up. The natural countryside and Pool village will disappear and be lost.</p> <p>Don't want to see new building on green space at Old Pool.</p> <p>I am supportive of new housing but wouldn't want Pool to become too 'built up' and lose its character. It would depend on the site. Also, there needs to be some thought about how this will impact upon the primary school in terms of capacity / intake.</p> <p>Some new housing ---yes too much and we won't be a village any more.</p>	<p>sympathy with the site's built context. Policy H1 can also set more detailed site-specific 'texture' requirements (with justification) and aspirations.</p> <p>NOTED - the NP cannot oppose housing land already identified by LCC in an adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>NOTED - the NP cannot oppose housing land already identified by LCC in an adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>NOTED – the site for a possible future 540 homes has already been identified/ agreed by LCC, ie 'Land at Old Pool Bank'. The impact upon the school has already been assessed by LCC in doing so. Any further housing proposals would need to be assessed for impact in the same way in line with LCC and NP policy.</p> <p>NOTED – the site for a possible future 540 new homes has already been identified by LCC. Whether there is any more will depend on any future proposals/decisions on infill/windfall sites, which NP policy will seek to control.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Before any future developments are considered a secure route should be found for a bypass which is vital due to the increased traffic congestion and pollution. This should be a priority.</p> <p>Any new development needs to take into consideration access roads. ie Any access onto Old Pool Bank should be denied as it is already a dangerous link to and from the A660, where motorists seem to speed.</p> <p>This policy is quite vague, I don't really understand it.</p> <p>This is not a clear policy. I would support it if it was explicitly ensuring continuity of safeguarded land at old pool bank, but the current wording is ambiguous.</p>	<p>NOTED – the future development at Old Pool Bank has already been considered and agreed many years ago by LCC. A bypass could yet be part of any future development of this site. The issue of major infrastructure such as a by-pass is considered beyond the scope of the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – NP policy can seek to control site access requirements.</p> <p>NOTED – the PI is deliberately vague at this stage until a full discussion can be had as to what development requirements/aspirations should be attached to any development of land at Old Pool Bank for housing, eg in terms of road access, green space, design/ layout.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy is not ensuring /could not ensure the continuity of the safeguarded housing land for housing at Old Pool Bank as this is a LCC policy/ allocation. Neither is the policy ensuring the safeguarding of that land in its current undeveloped state – this is something which the NP cannot do given its existing identification for housing by LCC.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – include site access requirements/aspirations.</b></p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Shocking that any new development is considered when the parish can't cope with existing traffic.</p> <p>Strategic infrastructure plan required to frame any developments.</p>	<p>NOTED – the development was considered and agreed by LCC many years ago. The NP can do nothing to change this fact.</p> <p>NOTED – LCC ‘strategic infrastructure plan’ accompanying the adopted Core Strategy identifies no such infrastructure needs for PIW as a result of new proposed developments. Policy H1 will identify requirements/ aspirations in relation to any Old Pool Bank housing development.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI H2	<p>As above.</p> <p>Essential.</p> <p>Need clarity of what new housing - executive or affordable?</p> <p>Is isn't clear what new housing means. Affordable housing or executive housing?</p> <p>The criteria should also include a) adequate space for 3 wheelie bins (per dwelling) b) capacity for charging electric cars in new housing developments.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – this will be covered under H3 where smaller housing types (including starter homes) and the housing needs of the elderly will be specified, as set out on PID P13. ‘Affordable housing’ as legally defined is already adequately covered by LCC Core Strategy policy.</p> <p>NOTED – these are detailed design criteria rather than criteria for determining whether a housing development is acceptable in principle. NP could however look at developing a more detailed housing design policy within the context of the existing Core Strategy Design Policy P10.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider possibility of ‘housing design policy’ as suggested.</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Again no specific details.</p> <p>New housing should carry solar panels and other environmentally beneficial technology. Any new development should include either electric vehicle charging points to every home or have a facility within new development for such.</p> <p>Traffic should avoid village centre.</p> <p>Impractical to safeguard would we have, given that traffic congestion remains - further large scale development would ruin the village - green space between Pool and Old Pool Bank should be retained.</p>	<p>NOTED – the PI was designed to obtain support or not for the principle of a policy to frame criteria on a number of matters. The detail of those proposed criteria will be included in the Pre-Submission NP.</p> <p>NOTED – Government policy does not allow NPs to include planning policy in relation to housing standards and sustainability. The NP could however look at developing a more detailed housing design policy within the context of the existing Core Strategy Design Policy P10 to include reference to electric vehicle charging points.</p> <p>NOTED – policy should include a criterion addressing this point. This would supplement GE5 on development impacts on the AQMA.</p> <p>NOTED – PI H2 is designed to resist further housing development on currently non-allocated or identified housing sites, based on locally derived criteria. This within the context of a higher level policy which would also test the merits of housing on such sites. The NP cannot oppose the already identified development of 540 homes on 'safeguarded housing land' at Old Pool Bank.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider possibility of 'housing design policy' as suggested.</p> <p>ACTION – include criterion regarding routing of traffic to avoid Main Street.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Not sure about this where is the land?? Is anywhere available??</p> <p>Off street parking? Residents fighting for car park spaces could be an issue?</p> <p>Like at Garnett Wharfe, consider a restricted access with no through access to Pool Village.</p> <p>Ditto H1.</p> <p>It should be more clear that any new housing on non-allocated sites has to actively improve the transport and infrastructure situation.</p>	<p>NOTED – policy does not relate to any particular/specific piece of land. Rather it would relate to any land, not already identified for housing (as is case with Old Pool Bank), where housing proposals were put forward.</p> <p>NOTED – policy would require new off-street parking to service housing on any new sites as one means of making such housing acceptable. Spaces would be provided in accordance with LCC standards. It is impossible to legislate for exactly how many cars any new residents would have and therefore how many spaces would be needed in order to avoid potential conflicts. Conflict is likely to be greater if no off-street parking provided.</p> <p>NOTED – specific measures such as this would need to be assessed on a site by site basis, but would be encompassed by general policy tests in respect of access, road safety and congestion.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – this view can be reflected in the final policy wording.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p><b>ACTION – include wording in policy to the effect that in order to be acceptable, housing development should contribute to improvements to</b></p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	LCC - there is an opportunity here but it will depend on evidence, the clarity of the policy and more generally on expectations.	NOTED – policy will be acceptable in these terms.	local transport/infrastructure, relative to its impacts.  NO ACTION
PI H3	<p>LCC - this should be positively worded, to meet the housing needs of the local community and others.</p> <p>As above, however any new housing should be of the more affordable type/starter homes etc.</p> <p>If considerations are taken regarding my comments re H2.</p> <p>Too bland. Not nearly specific enough. Developers will interpret to meet their own needs.</p> <p>See H2.</p> <p>If sympathetic to the heritage of the area.</p>	<p>NOTED – policy will be couched in these terms.</p> <p>NOTED – policy can/will address the evidenced need for smaller/starter homes. ‘Affordable’ housing has a particular legal definition in statutory planning terms and is not covered by this policy. It is considered that LCC Core Strategy affordable housing policy adequately meets PIW’s needs, relative to available evidence.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the final policy will be worded in order to specifically highlight the house types needed locally, ie smaller, starter, meeting elderly needs.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – ‘Heritage’ matters are covered separately in policies under ‘Built</p>	<p>ACTION – policy to be worded in order to highlight the meeting of particular evidenced local needs within the context of also meeting a more general need.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Very important to have affordable housing for our young people.</p> <p>More houses needed for small families to encourage younger people to the area.</p> <p>With an emphasis on AFFORDABLE housing to keep our children in the village.</p> <p>First time buyer homes should be a priority and not just flats. More provision for younger disabled. Priority much be given to residents of Pool before others.</p>	<p>Heritage'. NP policies are applied collectively thereby ensuring that both heritage and housing mix issues are considered together in relation to any planning application for housing.</p> <p>NOTED - 'Affordable' housing has a particular legal definition in statutory planning terms and is not covered by this policy. It is considered that LCC Core Strategy affordable housing policy adequately meets PIW's needs, relative to available evidence. The policy will however highlight need for smaller/starter (and therefore cheaper) homes.</p> <p>NOTED – final policy wording will reflect this.</p> <p>NOTED - 'Affordable' housing has a particular legal definition in statutory planning terms and is not covered by this policy. It is considered that LCC Core Strategy affordable housing policy adequately meets PIW's needs, relative to available evidence. The policy will however highlight need for smaller/ starter (and therefore cheaper) homes.</p> <p>1) NOTED – policy will highlight need for smaller/starter homes.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>No to extra housing.</p> <p>Most certainly, to blend in with the village as it stands but this I fear may be difficult to achieve.</p> <p>Ditto H1.</p> <p>The wording is rather vague. Certainly affordable housing should be the major type of development.</p> <p>Would need to see more information - this is very vague.</p>	<p>2) NOTED – policy can highlight the need for housing for independent living. 3) DISAGREE – policy cannot require that such priority be given in respect of market housing.</p> <p>NOTED – this policy does not relate to the provision of extra housing. Rather it seeks to influence the mix of housing provided in any new future housing developments (eg Old Pool Bank) which the NP is powerless to prevent.</p> <p>NOTED – the success of the policy will only be measurable over the lifetime of the NP</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the final policy will be worded in order to specifically highlight the house types needed locally, ie smaller, starter, meeting elderly needs. ‘Affordable’ housing has a particular legal definition in statutory planning terms and is not covered by this policy. It is considered that LCC Core Strategy affordable housing policy (35% in PIW) adequately meets PIW’s needs, relative to available evidence.</p> <p>NOTED – the final policy will be worded in order to specifically highlight the</p>	<p>2) ACTION – ensure specific policy reference is made to need for housing for independent living. 3) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>We need more local affordable housing so that young and old can stay in the village and are not priced out of the market.</p> <p>Affordable housing must be a priority.</p> <p>Planners should be aware that developers often make a token gesture towards provision of so called affordable housing and the needs of single occupants and the elderly. The village does not need a further proliferation of "executive" housing - the occupiers of these appear to be less likely to contribute to the village community.</p>	<p>house types needed locally, ie smaller, starter, meeting elderly needs.</p> <p>NOTED - 'Affordable' housing has a particular legal definition in statutory planning terms and is not covered by this policy. It is considered that LCC Core Strategy affordable housing policy adequately meets PIW's needs, relative to available evidence. The policy will however highlight need for smaller/ starter (and therefore cheaper) homes.</p> <p>NOTED - 'Affordable' housing has a particular legal definition in statutory planning terms and is not covered by this policy. It is considered that LCC Core Strategy affordable housing policy adequately meets PIW's needs, relative to available evidence.</p> <p>NOTED - 'Affordable' housing has a particular legal definition in statutory planning terms and is not covered by this policy. It is considered that LCC Core Strategy affordable housing policy adequately meets PIW's needs, relative to available evidence, ie 35% of new housing. As observed, however, this is subject to viability testing which often means a reduction in provision which neither LCC or this NP can do anything about. The NP policy will highlight need</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
		for smaller/starter/elderly (and therefore cheaper) homes.	
<b>PI E1</b>	<p>LCC - there is an opportunity to look at this.</p> <p>As long as green space is not developed.</p> <p>If this doesn't impact on green space. Increase traffic noise levels therefore impact on quality of living in Pool in Wharfedale.</p> <p>Whilst bearing in mind that Pool Village Hall must not be viewed as a "business opportunity". This is a facility for use by village organisations.</p> <p>We cannot have it all.</p> <p>No mention of safeguarding home based business or supporting development.</p> <p>See H2.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – policy relates to the protection of existing employment uses/land, not the development of new on either green or any other land use type.</p> <p>NOTED – policy relates only to protecting employment uses on the sites already used for such uses.</p> <p>NOTED – would not affect primary use of hall.</p> <p>NOTED – however policy relates to what the community already has.</p> <p>NOTED – in planning terms, such businesses do not require safeguarding and do not need planning permission in order to develop, as they are by definition 'home-based' ie carried out as a subsidiary part of a predominant residential use. As such no planning policy is required.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	No large increase in traffic or business parking.	NOTED – policy relates to protecting existing employment uses on existing employment sites rather than to the operation of those uses on those sites.	NO ACTION
	Definitely.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Impact on heavy commercial transport?	NOTED – any heavy commercial traffic associated with those existing permitted employment uses is an already given impact. Any increase from such uses would be beyond the control of the planning system. By not protecting current employment use, a change of use, eg to housing could occur. While this would reduce HGV numbers, it could increase car numbers. It is considered that there is no impact from this policy	NO ACTION
	We must protect local employment sites at all costs. Good for people out of work. A good thing for everybody.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I like the idea of a restaurant or cafe by the river. It would be an ideal place to build it with upstairs with a lift.	NOTED – permission now granted.	NO ACTION
	Ditto H1.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Community facilities and a combined health services centre would be at the top of my list!	NOTED – not relevant to PI E1 but to CFS2.	NO ACTION
	Be willing to evolve and move with the times - don't impose constraints on that.	DISAGREE – in this particular respect, it is considered necessary to protect	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>Weidmans would make a perfect site for housing development.</p> <p>Depends on the list.</p>	<p>existing employment in PIW if it is not to become an increasingly unsustainable dormitory settlement.</p> <p>DISAGREE - it is considered necessary to protect existing employment in PIW if it is not to become an increasingly unsustainable dormitory settlement.</p> <p>NOTED – a candidate list will be included in the ‘informal sites consultation’ scheduled for early 2018.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<p><b>Employment – Non-Planning Actions/Projects</b></p>	<p>Not sure if these are a priority. Pool is well placed for travel to work in Otley/Bradford/Harrogate and Leeds, however publicising of any local job opportunities would be useful.</p> <p>Ideal in an ideal world. Should not be developed at the expense of some of the previously listed aims. This was a clear well-expressed, easy to follow document. Hope the results are encouraging.</p> <p>Is the provision of enhanced broadband speeds to be incorporated in the Non-Planning Actions?</p> <p>To encourage small "cottage industries" by helping the village Post Office to expand.</p>	<p>NOTED – all finally agreed non-planning actions/projects will be prioritised in a ‘project delivery plan’ to feature in the ‘Monitoring &amp; Implementation’ chapter of the Pre-Submission NP.</p> <p>1) NOTED - all finally agreed non-planning actions/projects will be prioritised in a ‘project delivery plan’ to feature in the ‘Monitoring &amp; Implementation’ chapter of the Pre-Submission NP. 2) NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – there is not considered to be an internet issue within PIW. Provision of direct fibre optics to the home is not a planning issue.</p> <p>NOTED – PI CFS3 would support such expansion.</p>	<p><b>ACTION – priorities of agreed actions to be determined.</b></p> <p><b>1) ACTION – priorities of agreed actions to be determined.</b> 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	I very much agree with promoting, supporting and developing local business and we need to be mindful that other policies do not prevent or cause unnecessary barriers to these ends.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Ditto.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	As above.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I think all projects will enhance the village and should be pursued.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	A noble ambition but will conflict with the "pull" of Leeds and Bradford for career based employment. Of limited local benefit for people without wider horizons. Hopefully will be taken up and developed.	DISAGREE – numbers of home-based, often 'hidden' businesses, practitioners etc is on the increase in settlements such as PIW.	NO ACTION
	Promotion of job opportunities.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Admirable.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	It would be good (if it was possible) to create a Pool Working Hub - and at Pool Memorial Hall excellent - and a small business location if it could be found.	1) NOTED 2) DISAGREE – the NP is not looking to identify/provide a physical location for the development of small businesses, but rather to promote PIW as a general location for small businesses to establish.	1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION
	Loads of houses in the village already.	NOTED – the NP is not proposing more housing in the village.	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	Not sure I would use any of these; but as a local self-employed worker, it might enhance my business opportunities, so I'm all for it.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	All points raised are ok with me. One thing comes to mind in creating "Pool Working Hub" - where will all the cars be parked?	NOTED – it is anticipated that such a hub would be small-scale and that existing parking provision would be adequate.	NO ACTION
	Is this pie in the sky or has Walter Mitty taken over the Parish Council? Well we can dream but where is the money coming from?	NOTED – the NP is a 10 year plan and will include a 10 year project programme/delivery plan, subject to annual review and change – it will not be set in stone. The Pre-Submission NP will indicate potential sources of funding for each agreed project, building on the information contained in the PID 'Implementation' section.	NO ACTION
	Yes a cafe that sells food and good coffee. You could buy something to eat from there like a market - have stalls downstairs. Reception areas - inside or outside. Media centre.	AGREE – this is part of the hub plan.	NO ACTION
	To be encouraged.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Good for younger entrepreneurs.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	The principle seems ok.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	We definitely do not agree with the non-planning actions and projects. The problem has been caused by building houses in a rural area, bringing too many people into the	DISAGREE – the historical reasons for any problems which PIW currently experiences are now irrelevant. The	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	area and people who want city living in a countryside location. If you want city life, then live in a city.	non-planning actions/projects are designed to improve the lot of those who now live in PIW. There is no logic re opposing projects/actions which address problems/offer opportunities on the basis of the alleged historical source of those problems.	
	Can we make sure reduction of heavy traffic and speeding including Old Pool Bank hamlet please, so we are not forgotten. There is a move to assert our identity as we often feel excluding from main village activity.	NOTED – matters are already in hand re addressing Old Pool Bank hamlet’s issues.	NO ACTION
	It would be helpful to add web links into the document to enable better decision making and gain more information.	NOTED – more information/links to information will be provided on the NP website once the Pre-Submission NP has been produced.	NO ACTION
	From what has been put in the plan so far, it looks a reasonable proposal.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Generally very good.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Happy, thanks.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	These would be desirable.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Employment outside the home should be encouraged using existing sites.	NOTED – action re promotion of PIW as a sustainable small business location addresses this point.	NO ACTION
	Agree with most - small businesses should however look to Pool Business Park, to avoid any development within	AGREE – NP is not promoting physical small business development in the	NO ACTION

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>the village centre itself where roads cannot support any further development.</p> <p>There seems little to try and attract new business to the area - perhaps this isn't desirable?</p> <p>None.</p> <p>All sensible provided the scale of these facilities and actions are in keeping with the size and nature of Pool AS A VILLAGE.</p> <p>Make transport links to places with decent employment (Leeds, Bradford, Harrogate) better.</p>	<p>village centre. PI E1 seeks to protect existing business locations such as Pool Business Park.</p> <p>NOTED – the aim is to maintain PIW’s employment/economic base and hence its sustainability. The proposed actions and PI E1 are designed to contribute to achieving this aim by trying to make PIW a more attractive small business location – the target market is home-based businesses and those which could take up any spaces on existing employment sites.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the aim is to provide local support to PIW’s small business community.</p> <p>AGREE – the NP’s suite of ‘Traffic &amp; Travel’ policies and actions/projects is designed to do just this.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<b>Employment - General</b>	<p>NFU - Food production is a key priority for economic growth both nationally but also importantly in such a rural area. In the Government white paper ‘Local Growth: realising every place’s potential’ the Government makes clear that the first priority “is to return the nation’s economy to health”. This includes creating “the conditions that will help business and gets the economy growing” and this includes the support for farming enterprises so vital to the rural economy and enabling them to remain</p>	<p>NOTED – it is considered that the NP creates the conditions for supporting both PIW’s employment/economic base and its rural environment. This is within the context of higher level LCC policies which already support rural/farm diversification.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
	<p>viable through diversified enterprises. We would expect that any proposals for developing farms will take this into account.</p> <p>NFU - Diversification is in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that provides that local authorities should support development that enables farmers to become more competitive and sustainable and diversify into new opportunities. A key message within the NPPF is the need for economic growth. "A positive planning system is essential, because without growth, a sustainable future cannot be achieved. Therefore, significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system...the default answer to development proposals is yes."</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP has been prepared within this national context and within the more detailed and supportive context of the LCC adopted Core Strategy.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
<p><b>General-Allocations</b></p>	<p>Coal Authority - As you will be aware the Neighbourhood Plan area lies within the current defined coalfield. According to the Coal Authority Development High Risk Area Plans, there are recorded risks from past coal mining activity in the form of one recorded mine entry. If the Neighbourhood Plan allocates sites for future development in these areas then consideration as to the development will need to respond to these risks to surface stability in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Leeds Development Plan.</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP will not be allocating any sites for future development.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
General - Timeframe	JohnsonMowat – we are aware of the difficulties currently facing the Leeds SAP and are mindful the Core Strategy Review is underway with the aim of extending the Leeds Local Plan period to 2033. With that in mind, we consider it may be prudent for the NP to reflect this period from now to the end date in that emerging plan, that being the period 2017 to 2033.	DISAGREE – it is considered more prudent to reflect the plan period of the adopted development plan against which the NP will be examined in early 2019, rather than the emerging plan which is still in its very early stages. It is highly unlikely that a revised Core Strategy will have been adopted by this date.	NO ACTION