

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

RESIDENTS AND BUSINESSES

| Refer ence | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modificat- ions |
|-------------------------|--|--|---|
| Vision statement | | | |
| 1 | It's not about 2033 - Too many factors beyond our control for this to be our vision - notably the A1M and Bramham Park Estate - the NP doesn't set out strong enough protections for the things we treasure about Bramham now continuing into the future and getting better | Noted | No change |
| 2 | ADD 'Its historical, traditional and rural look and values are wonderfully conserved.' I was aiming with this to strengthen our vision around a changing look and feel to the village | Noted | No change |
| 3 | This is a motherhood statement that could apply to any village, any community who like the village they have chosen and wish to preserve it. There is little in the plan that supports the changes towards vibrancy. | Noted | No change |
| 4 | Emphasis on affordable housing for non professional working people | Covered in HOU policy | None |
| 5 | Not let village become a suburb of Leeds | Noted | No change |
| 6 | Only one shop! How do you propose more shops? | Noted | None Beyond scope |
| 7 | All sounds fine, however must resist Bramham becoming too large. No new town as was proposed at Headley. Would spoil the village | Noted | Amend Strategic Objectives |
| 8 | All Saints Church in the centre of the village should be used much more. | Noted | None Beyond scope |
| 9 | I'm disappointed in the Vision statement. It could almost be summarised as "We like it as it is now, and we want to keep it that way." In my view the Vision needs to set out much more boldly where the Parish is going to be in 2033. I believe that if that is not done, it could effectively invalidate much of the plan as otherwise it jus looks like a "wish list" from the people who returned questionnaires and/or the views of the Steering Group. I am not party to all of the questionnaire responses and drop-in session feedback, but I would imagine that there is a mx of possible scenarios: Two possible examples would be: We want | Policies are evidence based and respond to community | Vision Statement extended |

| Refer ence | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modificat- ions |
|---------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | the village to be a dormitory village for people working in Leeds/York. We want the village to be a self contained community with its own housing and employment. Having decided this overall vision, it can then drive the strategic objectives. For example at the "Dormitory" end of the spectrum the key issues could be communications such as roads and public transport, the "Self-contained" end of the spectrum might have to be more geared to attracting employers, delivering broadband capability etc. This information should then be used firstly to determine the expected population in 2033, and this should determine their profile i.e. what mix of single/couple/family/age group/retirees will be in place. This in turn will drive the overall requirements for housing and schools. drilling down further will inform the decisions on things such as affordable housing, sports and recreational requirements | concerns and issues raised. | |
| 10 | Hopefully by 2033 the A1 bypassing the village will also be largely frequented by lower polluting vehicles and less vehicle movements. It would be good to have traffic calming on paradise way also | Noted | None -Beyond scope |
| 11 | It is very important that Bramham retains its identity and is not merged with other villages, e.g. Clifford, Toulston | Covered in HOU1 | None |
| 12 | However, only the first sentence is a 'vision'. The remaining two sentences are descriptive of how the village is now. The vision should now be to maintain the present character of the village | Noted | Vision Statement extended |
| 13 | Maintain countryside around our village, preventing development immediately on village boundaries. | Covered in Leeds core Strategy | None |
| 14 | I am seriously concerned that the village infrastructure cannot cope with further development. | Noted | None |
| 15 | This is a good broad vision which accommodates the future but not at the expense of historic significance | Noted | None |
| 16 | I broadly agree with the above comments, however the village lacks a restaurant or pub serving food, so that one doesn't have to go outside the village to eat. | Noted | None – Beyond scope |
| 17 | We love living in Bramham. The small and friendly community is perfect. The shop is a very important part of the village | Noted | None |
| 18 | Think we need to expand the Doctor's Surgery. Hopefully the pub in the square will re-open. Would be nice to have marked walking trails around the outskirts of the village | Noted | Refer to BPC |
| 19 | The vision needs to take into account traffic, particularly parking on roads/streets that restricts access. e.g. should one side of every road have double yellow lines? | Noted | None – beyond scope |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|-------------------|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| 20 | Bramham is a wonderful village, all the facilities & most of all the special people which make Bramham so EXTRA special | Noted | None |
| 21 | Only have 1 shop in the village. The vision wording would indicate more than that small shop. | 'shops' includes other businesses | None |
| 22 | We have only one pub open in the village and just one shop - the post office | As above | None |
| 23 | The thing that spoils our village is cars. Parking on the footpath is not acceptable, it is bad if you have a pram or disabled buggy, also why do pedestrians have to walk in road while cars park on the footpath? | Noted | None |
| 24 | Keep housing development to an absolute minimum. | Not in a our remit | None |
| 25 | Should connectivity be part of the vision, i.e. infrastructure including high speed broadband plus public transport connecting to local area and beyond? | Already covered | None |
| 26 | shouldnt change anything we have lived here for 7 years and its beautiful how it is | Noted | None |
| 27 | Need fibre internet into every new home and replace existing copper with fibre in other homes | Noted | None – beyond scope |
| 28 | The vision is merely a statement! | Noted | None |
| 29 | Vision should read ..'and will be wonderfully conserved. The facilities we will have will buck the trend... | Tense correct | Vision extended |
| 30 | Be nice to have a community group that caters for 10-16 year olds, may include table tennis/chess and other table top games to allow good relationships to build - youth club. (happy to head up a committee if enough interest) | Refer to BPC | None |
| 31 | We have seen the number of pubs decline over the years to such an extent that at this present time only one is opening. The School has been a big let down over a long period of time and I certainly do not agree with having an "executive" head. We have one shop | Noted | None |
| 32 | I live in a modern house but the restrictions mean I have to have wooden windows even though they are cold and modern materials are better. I am not allowed to change the colour of my front door. there has never in the history of a village that all houses have to be the same. | Not NP policy | None |
| 33 | The second sentence is descriptive rather than being visionary. Should refer to seeking to retain the existing scale and characteristic building materials and design of the village in future development. Instead of saying the community facilities buck the trend it should state that the communities facilities will continue to be supported in the future with future investment in these facilities. | Noted | Vision extended |
| Objectives | | | |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 1 | Re Objective 2 - ADD 'on a scale appropriate to the size and environment of the village.' I am cautious about this objective meaning large scale developments which wasn't what people wanted | Agreed | Change made |
| 2 | It is difficult to see from the plan how Bramham could meet any financial commitment to support / take over the activities of Leeds University. As an external agency the university will pursue its aims as it see fit. If say there are financial problems the university may not wish / be able to continue the current use. There is no contingency in the plan to cover that risk. | Not proposed | None |
| 3 | Speeding on Bowcliffe Road is an issue. | Noted | None |
| 4 | No more building. Village will loose its character | Noted | None |
| 5 | Allow for limited number of new homes lower prices. | HOU policy | None |
| 6 | <p>Objective 2: But these needs should be driven by the requirements of the new vision (see above).</p> <p>Objective 3: Very laudable, but how can it be delivered? Much lies in the hands of Leeds City Council.</p> <p>Objective 4: But the facilities need to be specifically targeted at the expected population profile.</p> <p>Objective 7: I think to include this smacks of NIMBYism and I don't think it is deliverable. Leeds University (LU) is an independent concern, currently subject to severe financial constraints and it could at any time decide to cease agricultural research at the site. It seems to me that whilst this may not be an imminent threat, it is a possibility that LU will want to vacate before 2033. How can the objective to support the site for agricultural research be met without the involvement of LU?</p> <p>Who else would be interested in such an activity? How could the sale of the site for other purposes be prevented? Whilst ideally I would like the rural ambience of the status quo, I think the plan should include contingency provision for responding to a change of use - and if this is proposed to be residential/industrial development, there needs to be clear requirements regarding the limits, purpose and sustainability of a small hamlet/industrial estate.</p> | <p>Agreed</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>LU support the policy.</p> <p>Noted</p> | <p>Amendment incorporated</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> |
| 7 | As I've said above we need traffic calming measures on Paradise Way. It's also important the character of our village is | Noted-covered in H3 | None |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|-----------|--|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| | preserved carefully | and H4 | |
| 8 | About housing support. I don't feel enough has been done by the village to gain affordable housing for younger generations rather than just over 55s | Noted – covered in HOU | None |
| 9 | The motorists should not be ignored - too much emphasis on cyclists. | Noted | None |
| 10 | Objective 9 - We must not let the business interests of Leeds University dictate developments. | Noted | None |
| 11 | I believe and suggest that there needs to be an objective "to strive to make Bramham a safe place to live for all age and social groups." Among other things this would embrace and build on existing efforts to make the community more inclusive (especially for the elderly and lonely), and to protect our children from dangers (eg traffic hazards, anti-social behaviour etc). | Not for this Plan | None |
| 12 | No more housing as the noise from the motorway is bad enough and causes lower house prices as well as environmental issues . Access should only be via the A64 to any housing development and non through existing roads in the village | Noted | None |
| 13 | The existing roads in Bramham cannot cope with the pressure of the extra vehicles that are associated with new development. The village is turning into a giant car park. Increased traffic flow combined with inconsiderate parking (because of inadequate off street provision) makes pedestrian movement from A to B within the village increasingly difficult/dangerous. This has a massive impact on the young and the elderly in particular. | Noted- referred to in H3 and H4 | None |
| 14 | Headley hall area would be better served as a housing development | Noted | None |
| 15 | It would be hard to disagree because these objectives are so broad. The issues as always are in the details. | Noted | None |
| 16 | It's vitally important that any future housing development is strictly controlled and limited, and kept in the same style of housing. | HOU policy seeks this | None |
| 17 | Important to continue to protect and enhance the rich character and history of the village whilst controlling any future development in a manner sensitive to the Neighbourhood Development Plan | H3 and H4 Policies seek | None |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|-----------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | | this | |
| 18 | The village needs to maintain a small community feel, reflecting its history and natural environment | H3 and H4 Policies seek this | None |
| 19 | Re 8 - Bramham Park, in the past, has sold at least one area in the last 25 years for planning purposes. | Noted | None |
| 20 | New housing development to be kept to an absolute minimum. | Noted | None |
| 21 | Objective 3 include public transport. | In Aspirations | None |
| 22 | Whilst I agree that some more housing is needed, I do not think the village should extend beyond its current boundaries. So any development inside the boundaries should be very sympathetic | Covered in HOU | None |
| 23 | Cyclists - 1) to ride single file and 2) wear reflective clothes. | Not within the remit of this Plan | None |
| 24 | No 5) would help to stop motorists using Clifford Road as a race track! | Noted | None |
| 25 | Too many objectives some contradict each other. What is a community facility? | Defined in text / list | None |
| 26 | Especially trees - we have seen trees conserved when building is done, but the new inhabitants soon find ways to get rid of the trees. | Noted | Tree replacement in NE2 |
| 27 | Objectives must be maintained to ensure the village remains and vibrant yet peaceful place to live | Noted | None |
| 28 | All the above are essential qualities. | Noted | None |
| 29 | I agree with the objectives to sustain and develop existing amenities, not to the expansion of housing or retail facilities | Noted | None |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|-----------|--|--|---|
| 30 | Some are conflicting. Objective 2 potentially conflicts with all other objectives unless narrowed. | Disagree | None |
| 31 | To exclude parking around the war memorial as looks messy and is disrespectful | Highways issue – refer to BPC | None |
| 32 | Not interested in further housing developments. | Noted | None |
| 33 | (6) Impossible in this area. | Disagree | None |
| 34 | New houses should be able to use new materials to save environment by better insulation. | Agree – no restrictions in the Plan | None |
| 35 | The Plan should be primarily about the use and development of land. It is this communities opportunity to guide where and what type of development should happen whilst in general conformity with the Local Plan. The reference to the four housing sites in 4.3.1 is not sufficiently robust to guide development. The Plan needs a specific additional policy for the development of the sites for housing development, as identified in the Local Plan and Site Allocations Plan. There needs to be a clear site policy with a map referencing the potential capacity of each site. The Neighbourhood Plan needs to ensure that development is proportional to the size of Bramham and it complements the scale and character of existing development. A specific policy with criteria covering design, layout, materials and parking requirements would also be helpful. One of the fundamental aims for the NP is to guide development and indicate which key community projects are to be promoted and funded by CIL. | Noted. Policies are designed to cover all development. | None |
| 36 | Parking facilities are not explicitly mentioned in relation to new housing developments. The new build houses on Bowcliffe road clearly did not have enough parking spaces which has led to cars parking on Bowcliffe road. This has increase hazardous traffic flow, particularly in rush hour. The centre of the village is already quite dangerous for pedestrians with cars parked all along the road and questionable parking/ driving practices around the garage. If future housing does not provide adequate parking this will undermine objectives around pedestrian safety. | Noted. | Policies H3 and H4 amended accordingly. |
| 37 | (Objective 2) No Massive Housing Estates. | Noted | None |
| 38 | First, thank you for the opportunity to comment and for clarifying various points when we spoke on Saturday. I know how | Noted – policies & | None |

| Refer ence | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modificat- ions |
|---------------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| | <p>much work has been involved in the production of the document, which is very well presented. The Plan has much to commend it and clearly has kept faith with the original vision which we developed at the outset.</p> <p>The document gives a very full account of responses received from residents, but perhaps the various policies / proposals themselves could be given more prominence, so that it clear what is intended and what the potential impact of the Plan might be. This may help address the following specific areas;</p> <p>Finally, thanks and compliments to the NP Group for its work. I hope that these comments may be of interest / value in the further work on the Plan.</p> | objectives clear | |
| 39 | Can we please protect against future electricity pylons - if we ever get another chance can we please not miss the chance again to push for undergrounding next time - eg insist the Planning Inspector actually visits the area this time | Noted – refer to BPC | None |
| 40 | Is there anything in the NP about farming/food production/good soil classification and the need to protect? How many farms /what type/how much food is produced in the neighbourhood area - how many employed?What % of NP Area is farmed /produces food? | Noted. Would not add to existing policy. | None |
| 41 | Could the NP please have a bigger clearer accurate PROW map for the village ? It looks as the PROW from Freely Lane across the grounds of Bramham Lodge and the one from Almshouse Hill past Hillside Cottage onto Bowcliffe Road are missing but it's hard to tell | Noted | Map included |
| 42 | About Bramham Park Estate StrategyOctober 2014 http://www.bramhampark.co.uk/UploadPDF/141021%20Bramham%20Estate%20Strategy%20FINAL.PD Is this still current and does the NP endorse this strategy? | Plan does not comment | None |
| 43 | To ask the NPG to consider including the official Defra Noise Maps for Bramham published here http://extrium.co.uk/noiseviewer.html# in the interest of improving local noise amenity, now that the noise maps are to be included in the LCC SAP and Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisals and in support of achieving the A1M noise abatement aspiration expressed in the Neighbourhood Plan. | Noted. | |
| 44 | ... these areas which I would like to designate and protect as Green Space in the Neighbourhood Plan The fields have been there for centuries and constitute Lowland calcareous grassland. These green open spaces are a key characteristic of Bramham Character Area 3 described in the Bramham Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan approved as a material consideration in the determination of planning decisions on 19th April 2010 (DN: areas either side of Paradise Way) | Privately owned | None |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|-----------|--|---|------------------------|
| 45 | <p>In explanation of my comment made on 08/02/18 suggesting Bramham NP policy to protect the Bramham Neighbourhood Area against existing and future motorway noise and in view of government guidance that local communities can choose to set planning policies through a neighbourhood plan that is used in determining planning applications my view is that the NP should endorse and comply with Council and Government planning policies and guidance on environmental noise and introduce local policies in the Neighbourhood Plan to reflect and comply with the following policies and guidance: (DN: Guidance quoted)</p> | In Aspirations | None |
| 46 | <p>I hope the NP will protect residents by introducing a policy of resisting new house building or alteration to the landscape, trees and vegetation within a buffer zone between village and A1M - suggest at least 300m. - and of enhancing that buffer zone between village and A1M and adopting a policy of achieving a continuous protective wrap-around green belt buffer zone of planted earth mounds and trees between the village and the A1M by 2033. Highways England in their five year follow up of the 2009 upgrade reported that the wooden noise fences here have a damaging visual effectnot too good at stopping noise either? For A1 Action - noise - we witnessed the effectiveness of roadside earth mounds that absorb the noise instead of bouncing it upwards and overland for a good long way like noise fences do. About 2033 Vision - A1M I've asked Highways England in Leeds about traffic forecasts for the A1M and its current capacity - ie will the A1M be widened by 2033? waiting for their answer. The national motorway traffic forecast for 2040 is a rise of between 45% and 60% so widening here looks likely - if the bridges are ever altered I think we should press /our NP should call for greened road bridges to reconnect the landscape split by the motorway</p> | Noted | None |
| 47 | <p>Could we add a map of the Bramham Green Belt to the NP?</p> | Green belt shown in Policies Map a | None |
| 48 | <p>Could we please use this plan in the NP to show Bramham Park Estate in the NP Area</p> <p>Bramham Park Estate Strategy October 2014 Page 2</p> <p>http://www.bramhampark.co.uk/UploadPDF/141021%20Bramham%20Estate%20Strategy%20FINAL.PDF</p> | The area of Bramham Park within the Parish is already shown on Map 14 | None |
| 49 | <p>This bit of land owned by a church? - turned down for residential allocation for LCC SAP - can't recall reasons. Could we please</p> <p>a) list it as Green Space b) buy it for [knock down pricenow it's not allocated for housing] as village green type extension/allotments etc.c] plant more trees there</p> | Privately owned | None |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|-----------|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| | (DN – land referred to is behind pavilion) | | |
| 50 | I'm writing to ask whether the Masheder Map will be accepted for consideration for inclusion by the NPG after the public consultation deadline. Mr Masheder is committed to providing all the up-to-date information he can and I really want the protection it will give to Bramham by being published in the Neighbourhood Plan. The NP Area error will be corrected, hedgerows and watercourses are being added and a comprehensive new map will be provided | Steering Group referred to LCC for further advice | Replacement map added on LCC advice. |
| 51 | 5. Projects & Aspirations..... A1 noise abatement schemes Suggest: In response to NPPF policy on noise and PPG guidance in support of local action in achieving the Government's noise policy aims set out in the Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE) and in support of the West Yorkshire Authority Combined Transport Strategy policy to mitigate the impacts that major transport corridors have on communities including severance, noise and poor air quality, Bramham will consult and hold a dialogue with Leeds City Council and Highways England on noise from the A1M in Bramham with the aim of maintaining noise below the level identified by the World Health Organisation as damaging to communities, human health and wellbeing. | In Aspirations | None |
| 52 | Appendix 2 page 69 Plan - Entrance to Bramham – Paradise Way/Bowcliffe Road Can we a) remove the long demolished Ambulance Station from this plan b) list/ mark the woodland at Bramham House which has the national designation of UK BAP Priority Habitat Deciduous Woodland as Local Green Space | a Not considered necessary b –covered in replacement map | Replace Leeds Habitat map |
| 53 | People are misinterpreting this statement: APPENDIX 3 – Community Survey 2016 31% fully support proposals for development at Bramham House Now that the neighbourhood has been informed about specific development proposals for Bramham House it's misleading and open to misinterpretation and misuse to say that "31% fully support proposals for development at Bramham House." It should be made clear that the Community Survey did not consult on the specific proposals for development at Bramham House which were made known to the community in October 2017 after the closing date for the Community Survey 2016 and could not therefore be consulted on in the Community Survey 2016. For avoidance of doubt and misuse the NP should specify | Appendix 3 now removed from plan, and Community Survey will be covered in Consultation Statement which will clarify. | None |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|-----------|--|---|--|
| | <p>what were the development proposals for Bramham House that were consulted on in the Community Survey 2016.</p> | | |
| 54 | <p>Highways England has already acknowledged the greater than expected visual impact on the surrounding landscape of the wooden noise fences and is pondering what to do - Highways England and the network operators Connect and RMS have huge influence over our NP environment - have they been consulted on their environmental policies/future plans? Also - I asked Richard Marsh [Senior Nature Conservation Officer Landscape Team Environment & Design Group Strategic Planning Leeds City Council] about this ecological report re university farmland https://publicaccess.leeds.gov.uk/online-applications/files/38E91AFBA6C07B3B0036D2492004BF2C/pdf/15_02188_FU-ECOLOGY_ASSESSMENT-1337937.pdf "The desktop study reported no designated or non-designated nature conservation sites on or adjacent the study area. There are two Leeds Nature Areas located to the north and north-east but segregated from the site by 250 and 600 metres respectively.....The desktop study did not identify records for the specially protected great crested newt. This consultancy has however identified this species in the local vicinity, the records centre has been notified of the details to update the database. The records are recent and from 2013. This shows the presence of the species in a breeding pond some 490 m to the east...." he advises "if the site you refer to is not part of the Leeds Habitat Network then you could push for it to be included as part of a local extension." so can we please include it in the NP? His other comments on the NP : it is good to see the Leeds Habitat Network shown but instead of referring to it as "designated as different habitats" it may be better to explain it as "The Leeds Habitat Network has been identified to deliver a coherent ecological network as per Core Strategy Policy G9 and in Bramham is made up of designated sites including Local Wildlife Sites and other land that physically connects these sites." can we use his wording as well as/instead of "designated as different habitats"? to show compliance with CSP G9? It may be worth showing the designated Local Wildlife Sites (Bramham Park and Wothersome Wood) that occur in the NP area. Does the NP do this? The priority should be to protect and enhance the parts of the Leeds Habitat Network that occur in the NP area. This seems to</p> | <p>Highways England has been consulted.</p> <p>The presence of great crested newts is covered in Policy NE2 introduction,</p> <p>Useful clarification</p> <p>Bramham Parks is already identified and Wothersome</p> | <p>Amend as proposed to include reference to Leeds Habitat Network</p> |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|-----------|---|--|---|
| | <p>be the only way to get LCC recognition/protection for our green biodiverse bits</p> <p>NE2 – it seems unclear what the justification is for including the “Wildlife Area behind the Senior Citizens Centre” – it may be better to try and identify local extensions to the Leeds Habitat Network across all the NP area and justify why any additional parts have been added to it at the local level (see comment below). I think this area and the beck generally is under threat following the change of use of the White Horse pub and the development of the woodyard - anyone seen the kingfishers lately ? it might be better protected if we designated it part of /an important connection with the Leeds Habitat Network</p> <p>NE2 a) refers to achieving enhancements adjacent to development sites – this may be difficult to achieve if expected as part of the development (i.e. S106 or CIL would be required). I think we should stick to this ideal in the NP - after all planning policies change every few weeks - for instance the best and most versatile/good growing land at Farfield House - how great if we could use it productively for allotments which would promote physical activity AND biodiversity AND locally produced food.</p> <p>5 Projects and Aspirations – this is a good idea to achieve locally beneficial projects – in relation to nature conservation I would recommend that there is an aspiration to identify and map locally important extensions to the Leeds Habitat Network based on local knowledge and scrutiny of known mapped habitats such as woodland and semi-improved grassland, hedgerows, smaller water courses etc. This may take a couple of years to achieve but would be worthwhile long-term.</p> <p>Following his advice about 5 Projects and Aspirations - I'd like to see the woodland at Bramham House identified as an extension to the Local Habitat Network please.</p> | <p>Woods is outside of the Parish</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>noted</p> | <p>None</p> <p>Now included on Leeds Habitat Network plan</p> |
| 55 | <p>I'm not happy that Bramham House is airbrushed out. I think it should at least be listed at 4.5.1 and get some of the honourable mentions it does in the CAA: Page 14 records Bramham House as a Positive Building - Although it is now vacant and in a poor state of repair, its grounds play an important role in the conservation area; stretching between Bowcliffe Road and Freely Lane then mature trees and vegetation are an important part of the landscape of the village. Page 8 Within the conservation area there is recreation ground and the land surrounding Bramham Lodge and Bramham House are important green areas,.....the mature trees which are present within these areas are visible for much longer distances and have a positive impact upon the character and appearance of the village.</p> | Noted – now subject to planning application to which objections can be lodged. | None – beyond scope of NP |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|-----------|---|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| | <p>You may have guessed I'm against the Care Home proposal - mainly because of the loss of trees plants birds hedgehogs butterflies bats etc and because it's so much bigger and more destructive than and in conflict with the 2015 Development Brief http://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/documents/s128629/planning which was drawn up after a site visit by no less than the Chief Planning Officer and based on the latest policies -</p> <p>http://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/documents/s128627/Report%20to%20Chief%20Planning%20Officer.pdf reports</p> <p>"2.2 One of the key issues that has affected the sale of the site has been the uncertainty surrounding the fate of Bramham House in particularly the viability of conserving the building versus demolition. The matter reached a conclusion following a site visit in March 2014 when the Chief Planning Officer concluded that a presumption should remain for retention and restoration of the building and a new viable use found for it.</p> <p>3.2 It is important for any future scheme to retain, reuse and refurbish Bramham house and ensure that additional development within its grounds is respectful to its setting and enhance the character and appearance of the Bramham Conservation Area."</p> <p>I also believe it's not right for the intended Care residents - the noise is often stunning and the grounds are full of steep slopes - from the point of view of existing residents - I recall one landslip/slope slump when the slope behind the houses on Bowcliffe Road was disturbed and so would worry about disturbing the slopes - I asked Andrew Windress whether the construction method would involve pile driving into the bedrock for the foundations - he said that would be decided after the granting of planning permission - not very reassuring - we also don't know whether the retaining walls behind the Bowcliffe Road houses would be damaged by removing trees or by the extra run-off from new roads, roofs and hard standing - the removal of trees and vegetation would also allow more noise from the A1M to affect the area.</p> <p>- also- not least - I loathe the idea of privatised care when Leeds could do this: http://www.henrybootconstruction.co.uk/news/archive-2/2017-2/january/works-completed-at-wharfedale-view-extra-care-housing-yeadon-270117/</p> <p>LCC's Martin Blackett has said " about the Wharfedale View scheme at Yeadon unlike Bramham House this is a bespoke Council retained and managed initiative, part funded by the Homes and Communities Agency with specific outputs required rather than the private facility that the developer has chosen at its own discretion to advance for the property once they become owners."but in any case - Leeds planners are under a statutory obligation now to make provision for the elderly - Leeds have already trawled SAP allocated sites for suitability and locally two are earmarked for elderly care: HG2-22 1154 Church Street (land to east of), Boston Spa together with HG2-23 3132 Church Street, Boston Spa and the Mercure Hotel Wetherby site so</p> | | |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|-------------------------|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | no-one at LCC trawling for sites suitable for elderly care thought Bramham House was suitable. Martin Blackett has said it's not being sold at an undervalue so the attraction for a care home developer is difficult to spot. | | |
| 56 | Richard Marsh has sent me the attached which is part of the official Local Habitat Network [LHN] map validated and supported by the Council and in clear detail- he's given permission to use it but he says "West Yorkshire Ecology may be able to pass you a better version for the whole of your N Plan area – probably best to talk to whoever is producing your N Plan and find out if they already have nature conservation designations shown – as it would be better to ask for these at the same time (possibly on a different map)." If we can get it and because it's in much better detail - could I suggest publishing it instead of or as well as Map 3 in the Neighbourhood Plan? Mr Marsh is keen to see locally valued habitats and species which may not appear on the LHN put forward/recognised as part of NPs. | Previous comments refer | Previous comments refer |
| 57 | 4.4.2 NE2: Enhancement and protection of nature areas and biodiversity Map 3: Leeds Habitat Network The Leeds Habitat Network map, (map 3 below) shows areas within the parish which have been designated as different habitats by Leeds City Council. I think there's an error in the Leeds Habitat Network [LHN] map used as Map 3 http://www.leeds.gov.uk/SiteAllocationMaps/SAP%20and%20AVL%20Documents/09%20Nature%20Conservation%20Background%20Paper%20Publication%20Draft%20Final%20pt1lr.pdf because it omits the UK BAP / Priority Habitat Deciduous Woodland at Bramham House shown on the Defra /Natural England Magic Map http://www.natureonthemap.naturalengland.org.uk/MagicMap.aspx | Previous comments refer | Previous comments refer |
| Policy area CF1- | | | |
| 1 | In principal but not without a risk assessment and plan as to what cost would be to residents. | Noted | Policy CF1 amended |
| 2 | more detail needed | Noted | As above |
| 3 | But I have doubt about what would be done in an adverse situation. For example, if it was proposed to close one or both of the public houses, would the community be prepared to step in? | Noted | As above |
| 4 | The wildlife area by the senior citizens shelter should be included? | Already included as Green Space | none |
| 5 | I agree with this aspiration but would temper it with a need to ensure the commensurate investment in supporting village infrastructure such as improved access, footpaths, parking in order to ensure sustainability and minimise the impact of such developments on residential surroundings (eg Freely Lane) | Noted | As CF1 above |
| 6 | Improved facilities must include car parking. | Noted | none |

| Refer ence | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modificat- ions |
|---------------|---|---|---|
| 7 | Red Lion seems to be permanently closed - this is not acceptable. | Noted | none |
| 8 | The Red Lion P.H. should be upgraded - consideration given to a cafe/coffee shop. | Noted | none |
| 9 | Protecting the Red Lion has been done with little success in 2017 - majority of year closed. | Noted | none |
| 10 | I do agree with the statement, however I think funds allocated to improve the Senior Citizens Shelter should be very limited unless we have strong evidence that the number of residents who will use this facility will increase once the building is in a better state of repair | Noted | As CF1 above |
| 11 | The hairdressers is a current local facility. | Noted | none |
| 12 | to improve a little not a lot | Noted | none |
| 13 | All the above facilities ensure encouragement to continue to live in or move to a small village and not feel totally cut off. | Noted | none |
| 14 | Some but not all of it as some are out of the PC control, e.g. Red Lion. | Noted | none |
| 15 | All the above are essential qualities | Noted | none |
| 16 | the value of senior citizens centre? Will this be relevant to needs of older population in future & value for money? | Noted | none |
| 17 | What about the development at Bramham House - no movement on this for years. | Noted | none |
| 18 | Only problem noise level is high and my windows are rubbish at attenuation. | Refer to earlier action proposed ?????? | Refer to earlier action proposed |
| 19 | It should only be development proposals which are acceptable in all other respects which then include proposals for community facilities which would be supported. Otherwise this would suggest that if a developer puts forward positive proposals for community facilities then any development proposals would be accepted. | Disagree – wording is correct | None |
| 20 | The encouragement of additional car parking provision associated with Bramham School and the Playing Field should be abandoned. It would be an inappropriate “solution” to a poorly-defined “problem”, (even regardless of the costs and management implications). More sustainable responses should be sought, in line with the original vision and having regard to the environment and public health, particularly air quality, to encourage and facilitate other modes of travel by the promotion of Travel Plans for the user groups concerned. The pursuit of more intensive sporting facilities at the Playing Field potentially contradicts and undermine its role as a village facility. (we already have the experience of the impact of regular use by non-local bodies, which has raised issues about public safety, as well as implications in terms of excessive wear and damage to the field. The notion of more facilities may well appear to be supported by questionnaire answers –(recalling the original BSLA exercises!) – but this alone does not establish a | Bramham school outside of the parish. Policy reflects community survey | None None |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|------------------------|---|---|------------------------|
| | case. Again there would be practical issues of capital and revenue funding and important management issues to consider. | responses | |
| Policy Area LR1 | | | |
| 1 | However the walkers/cyclists/dog walkers etc., must respect the land they are trampling over!!! | Noted | None |
| 2 | Local farmers, landowners need to provide access to the countryside. | | |
| 3 | This should be a priority | | |
| 4 | Keen to ensure we retain cycle paths & increase if possible. | | |
| 5 | Footpaths need to be kept clear, not overgrown. | | |
| 6 | The existing cycle track into Wetherby is well used! | | |
| 7 | Current footpaths around the perimeter of the village are overgrown with grass restricting the width of the original paths (needs clearing). If an elderly person requires assistance one person has to walk on the uneven overgrown grass or grass verge. | | |
| 8 | As a general improvement access to school needs improving. | | |
| 9 | Only if they are enforced. Why have cycle tracks that the numerous groups of cyclists do not use? | | |
| 10 | This is very important. | | |
| 11 | Agree with a), but not sure about b) - do we need new paths/tracks? | | |
| 12 | Confusion half way down Heygate Lane as to footpath/right of way for walkers. | | |
| 13 | Very important for the health of the population to encourage walking around the village & local area | | |
| Policy Area LR2 | | | |
| 1 | The pavilion was built on the premise it would be used for sports, accessible to all, used by many people and groups, based locally and across Leeds. It is ideal for disabled groups There is nothing in the plan to suggest how this will happen except a running track for which there is no rationale. Teenagers are not supported yet the plan identifies there are few facilities for this group. | All points noted. The list in LR2 emerged from extensive consultation but does not exclude additional | None. |
| 2 | The village hall could also be used for sports and leisure facilities | | |
| 3 | Please keep lighting levels low to minimise impact on bats and nearby residents. | | |
| 4 | Need to cater for children of all ages- eg 8-18 year olds, scooter/skate park | | |
| 5 | Perhaps not running track - expensive. Use fields and tracks | | |
| 6 | leave it as a field!! | | |
| 7 | 7 Who will pay for all these schemes? | | |

| Refer ence | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modificat- ions |
|---------------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 8 | Building facilities does not drive participation. A substantial sum was spent on an ill conceived, poorly designed sports pavillion. A single use facility, which cannot be reconfigured for alternative use. The gym equipment is barely used. I'm unclear why there is shelter available for use by just one part of the community; further development of which to include toilet facilities etc should not be pursued unless it is a facility available to all. | facilities where demand is identified. The pavilion and Senior Citizens Centre have numerous users. | |
| 9 | This need to be more specific to the identified requirements. For example, if the future population has more children, more playground facilities will be required, whereas if there will be more retirees, the Senior Citizens' Centre may need enhancement. In my view the inclusion of a running track is not at all sensible: Wetherby has a population of 12,000m (and a larger catchment population) with an affiliated running club with several hundred members and even it cannot justify a running track. There are probably more people in Bramham who would use MUGA (Multi-use Games Area) facilities aimed at the teenage population (who probably didn't complete the questionnaires). | | |
| 10 | This proposal must be to benefit lots of groups not just "our" football team! | | |
| 11 | Please respect the current pitches for football, a running track might interfere | | |
| 12 | As a keen runner, I am 100% in favour of the running track proposal | | |
| 13 | Not sure our village needs some of these facilities, such as a running track. The play area is already very good for the size of the village | | |
| 14 | To a degree. I do not wish to see a running track or significant enhancement to the pavilion that decreases the available sports field playing space. I think it's important that we as a village retain open green space where families can enjoy outdoor activities together (rounders, football) in an informal way. And do please protect the ability for their dogs to be included and exercised off-lead on the sports field (ensuring that all owners clean up after their pets). | | |
| 15 | Rather than a "closed" list of specific facilities, I would like to see this objective be more open to encourage the development of facilities to support particular currently "excluded" groups in the community such as teenagers, the elderly and the infirm. That said I would also encourage the provision and maintenance of bus shelters and community gardens | | |
| 16 | In terms of the enhanced use of the Pavilion care must be taken not to turn the top of Freely Lane into a Car Park. Enhanced use depends upon there being a strict control of vehicular access. | | |
| 17 | Money should be spent on things like Senior Citizens Shelter only if it is used by the seniors of Bramham.. | | |
| 18 | Ensure off road parking is considered. | | |
| 19 | Do not agree with running track running track or further cycling routes | | |
| 20 | Pavilion parking needs increasing or monitoring | | |
| 21 | Village demographics suggest additional childrens' facilities are required | | |
| 22 | As above, I am not sure that the funds required to enhance the Senior Citizen Centre are funds well spent? I wonder if there is an alternative way that we could accommodate the wishes of the regular users of this centre without having to invest | | |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| | thousands of pounds in making it fit for purpose? I think this building should have a separate section within this plan and not be lumped together with The Pavilion as its purpose and needs are very different | | |
| 23 | Where is the business plan that supports these? Otherwise it just becomes a wish list | | |
| 24 | Don't think we need a boules playing area though! | | |
| 25 | Agree in general, but the playing field is the only large green field in the village and should remain as a field for children to play, the gala, etc. I could not support a running track around the field which would be difficult to maintain and may well be misused or used by a very small % of inhabitants. | | |
| 26 | Considering the opposition to the Pavilion when it was planned and the subsequent bad feeling from a section of residents during its build etc will we see no opposition to any proposed additions to facilities at the playing fields or will we see this plan being adopted hence preventing any opposition? | | |
| 27 | The particular excludes provision for teenagers, for example a skateboard park. This would be preferable to Boules | | |
| 28 | Scooter park would be fabulous! The small one at Deepdale is well used by Bramham children, be nice to have our own | | |
| 29 | (but not senior citizens centre). Older people need to be part of an active whole community not separate, research evidence suggests integration & physical activity for the whole population is better way forward. | | |
| 30 | In principle subject to details of proposed location and impact. | | |
| 31 | Tennis courts would be a good addition to this list. Having moved from Roundhay the free courts there are extensively used. | | |
| Policy Area HOU1 | | | |
| 1 | Affordable starter homes are vital to the desired mix within the village. | The policy as written emerged from extensive consultation which identified the prioritised housing type. | Amend H3 and H4 to include car parking needs Amend HOU1 to clarify 'affordable' and link to LCC strategy. |
| 2 | I am not in favour of a swathe of affordable starter homes. Emphasis should be put on a 'few more' affordable and elderly rather than a 'lot' more as indicated in the results. The majority also indicated 'about right' on 3-4 and 1-2 bed. | | |
| 3 | Far too prescriptive without specifying where they will be best placed | | |
| 4 | Why is it limited to where there are 10 or more dwellings? can the policy not apply to smaller developments ? | | |
| 5 | Need affordable housing, there are enough "expensive" houses, | | |
| 6 | Emphasis on affordable homes. | | |
| 7 | Concern that new developments may not fit in and look odd. | | |
| 8 | No more development. Keep village feel. | | |
| 9 | Need 5 bedroom houses for larger families | | |
| 10 | Family homes a priority | | |
| 11 | Emphasis on affordable housing/flats | | |
| 12 | No flats, unsightly. Affordable housing not to be given to benefit claimants | | |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|-----------|---|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| 13 | No more building. | | |
| 14 | Give priority to family homes | | |
| 15 | Mainly a and b | | |
| 16 | Families leave Bramham, due to a lack of family homes with 3 to 4 bedrooms. There is not a lack of smaller homes, suitable for either single person / couple occupancy. Specific provision for the retired should not be pursued, given the average pensioner income exceeds that of the average worker. A retirement village, as proposed at the childrens home is not consistent with creating a balanced community | | |
| 17 | This is far too specific and is likely to be at odds with the planning facilities of Leeds City Council/National Government | | |
| 18 | 3-4 bed more of a priority than 1-2 bed? | | |
| 19 | As long as affordable housing for all is on the map too! | | |
| 20 | New housing should be limited to very small developments of brown-field sites. | | |
| 21 | Restrictions should exist to stop new housing being sold as buy-to-let. | | |
| 22 | No new developments other than infilling in spaces within village. | | |
| 23 | We must avoid elitism driven by high house prices | | |
| 24 | Really like the order of priority | | |
| 25 | Would be even better if the wording was 'MUST provide... affordable starter home(s) | | |
| 26 | I don't think there should be a prescribed mix but that each development should be considered on its own merits, providing the most suitable housing for the site and current requirements | | |
| 27 | Affordable starter homes should not be integrated into developments where clearly it will not enhance the development. Social experiments where political correctness in some perceived idea will encourage social mixes and other PC dogma should not be encouraged. Such experiments only cause tensions within communities where you try to create a false society no one wants | | |
| 28 | I think c) above should be deleted. These will not help to retain the village atmosphere as there would likely be a high turnover of residents | | |
| 29 | Maybe recognise in this hierarchy other assisted living and/or warden-controlled properties for the disabled and infirm (dementia friendly)? | | |
| 30 | I think starter homes and for the Elderly are fine but definitely no flats | | |
| 31 | Although I consider Bramham to be "full up" , a) and b) must be prioritised. By providing smaller units, downsizing within Bramham will free up larger family homes, also potentially reducing the need for car parking space | | |
| 32 | In principle yes but May need 5 or 6 bedroom houses for large families | | |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|-----------|---|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| 33 | The existing character and standard of housing should be maintained | | |
| 34 | Also height of the properties should be restricted or in keeping with surrounding houses | | |
| 35 | Not sure why flats are needed in Bramham | | |
| 36 | Define "affordable". What is affordable to some is not affordable to others. This is a cop out statement. Give more detail. | | |
| 37 | 10 or more dwellings should attract a high % of starter homes as there is such a lack of these currently. | | |
| 38 | I disagree with the priority order. I suggest d), a), c), b). | | |
| 39 | Developers have tried to introduce more affordable housing. Planning restrictions (parking etc.) restrict this (I know, I've tried!) to support more affordable housing. | | |
| 40 | Totally agree | | |
| 41 | I am uncomfortable about the village getting too big. So I would object to any development of 10 homes or more. | | |
| 42 | Starter homes and elderly should be priority. | | |
| 43 | think we have enough in bramham | | |
| 44 | No more 2-storey houses | | |
| 45 | Limited number with 4 bedrooms if detached | | |
| 46 | Planning Regs already require affordable housing every 5th house, why change? | | |
| 47 | Focus on new build bungalows to reflect community | | |
| 48 | It was sad to see that LCC had passed a development on the woodyard of brick and stone houses uncharacteristic if that part of the village. Flats should be no more than 3 stories. Where possible, new properties should be of stone as the historical nature of Bramham is built of stone | | |
| 49 | Financially it will be impossible to determine such a mix and therefore would exclude any investment in building homes in the village | | |
| 50 | Opposed to further development | | |
| 51 | Bramham is an unlikely future domicile for people seeking starter homes - it is too far from any centre. Priority (d), (b), (a), (c) is more realistic and does not conflict with the other major policies of the plan | | |
| 52 | Not interested in further housing developments | | |
| 53 | What about bungalows. | | |
| 54 | Also look into social housing | | |
| 55 | Subject to the addition of a new policy to cover potential allocated sites limiting new development sites to those identified | | |
| 56 | There should be provision to allow small developments of exclusively starter homes. Given the age profile of the village the demographics attracted to these homes would be beneficial | | |

| Refer ence | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modificat- ions |
|---------------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 57 | Bramham lacks family homes in the £300-500k area | | |
| 58 JL | Affordable housing I suggest that the reference to the 10-unit threshold should be omitted. I know why it is there and the basis for its inclusion. However, the Plan should seek to extend the boundaries beyond what is already established in City Council policy and a more ambitious approach is appropriate, even if it cannot be guaranteed to succeed. Also, within the Plan period, it is quite possible that national policy and practice on this point may change, so that the threshold may not be maintained – it has already been the subject of numerous legal challenges. | | |
| 59 JL | I suggest also that provision for younger families / new households should be given particular priority, in line with the views consistently expressed by the community. In turn, this approach should be applied to specific sites where development is anticipated – notably Bramham House. (the work on the Plan should ultimately be judged by its influence on the ground. We know from the Headley experience and the response to the solar power scheme at Paradise Farm that the NP Group can also play an active part in responding to actual proposals. | | |
| | Policy Area NE1 | | |
| 1 | BUT only if we add the woodland at Bramham House and the small field between the Pavilion and Aberford Road to the list | All noted. LGS are designated in accordance with NPPF guidance and when designated receive protection commensurate with Green Belt. Sites within the Conservation Area already have protection. | No change. |
| 2 | The field on Aberford Road by the playing fields, land by the Allotments - why are these discounted | | |
| 3 | what about the wooded area behind Firbeck Road/the old hall/windmill hill. Should that be designated?, | | |
| 4 | add flower beds by beck and surgery | | |
| 5 | I think a serious omission is the land between the Playing Field and Aberford Road (known locally as "Coopers Field") If there is a requirement to expand the recreational facilities (e.g. boules area), this is the obvious area to utilise. Without any protection, it will become a housing development | | |
| 6 | There's no substance to this policy? Are green spaces protected? | | |
| 7 | And please do NOT turn Freely Lane into a road!! | | |
| 8 | Would also like to see entrances to village at Windmill Road, Toulston Lane and Clifford Road to be classed as green spaces to maintain the integrity of the village | | |
| 9 | The character of the village has been eroded by the development of small "infill" sites and I strongly agree with the protection of remaining green spaces. | | |
| 10 | Green spaces need to be maintained for future residents | | |
| 11 | Potential development to support the above may have to commandeer to above the above requested | | |
| 12 | Cars should not be parked on these areas! | | |
| 13 | Also Lyndon Road/Lyndon Avenue | | |

| Refer ence | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modificat- ions |
|------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | Some sites are privately owned. | |
| Policy Area NE2 | | | |
| 1 | Add Bramham in Bloom Lyndon Road and Protection of the edges of waterways and local woods to the list of protected nature areas please. It doesn't currently go far enough/protect enough | Noted. Beck protection - Environment Agency cleans Beck. | New habitats identified and revised mapping included. |
| 2 | With the exception of the wildlife area, I question how often this is used by Bramham residents | | |
| 3 | what about the wooded area behind Firbeck Road/the old hall/windmill hill. Should that be protected?, | | |
| 4 | The background to this policy includes the Leeds Wildlife Habitat Network. West Yorkshire Ecology Service has been encouraged to make additions to the District wide network for any Neighbourhood Plan areas. We recommend three types of addition to the Bramham cum Oglethorpe Neighbourhood Plan WHN 1) Any areas covered in the national Principal Habitats Inventory (Natural England), 2) Any areas of deciduous woodland not already covered, 3) Hedgerows. We have generated a Shape Geographical Information System (GIS) file with these combined additions. It would also be appropriate to include Local Wildlife Sites (Bramham Park and Wothersome Woods) on your biodiversity map. We had produced a GIS shape file for you with these as well | | |
| 5 | Provision to retain perhaps the largest green space within the village at the childrens home is required. Development within the site should respect the footprint of the existing site. The site provides a habitat for several species of owl, plus bats | | |
| 6 | I would also have included the course of Bramham Beck from the A1 to the Parish boundary (opposite Bramham Primary School). In the past there has been serious flooding and this watercourse needs protection for example, neighbouring properties on Firbeck Road should be prevented from building into the beck/hindering the flood plain | | |
| 7 | Need to ensure Bramham beck is regularly cleaned out. It is still a flood risk in the lower part of the village and is dreadfully silted in the area of the red Lion pub. We should resist loss of any facilities we currently have | | |
| 8 | This is highly important to me and I think the village should be example of what can be achieved when residents work together to value our natural environment | | |
| 9 | Firmly in favour of this - trees and wildlife spaces very important | | |
| 10 | Not just trees planted and left but maintained | | |
| 11 | The beck/stream should be regularly cleared of debris | | |
| 12 | Ditto as above | | |
| 13 | Could more bulbs, flowers, wild flowers be planted along Paradise Way/where visitors come into the village from the A1? | | |
| 14 | Trees should be replaced 4:1 as 25% will die and 25% will be damaged. | | |
| 15 | Extend Bramham in Bloom if possible! | | |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|-----------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|
| 16 | Subject to development proposals being acceptable in all other respects. | | |
| Policy Area H1 | | | |
| 1 | BUT only if we add Bramham House to the list | All potential assets identified through significant consultation and investigations. | Add slipway and pump to H1. |
| 2 | Could it include the slipway down to Carr Beck near the garage please? (This may be protected under 'Views' too. | | |
| 3 | Provision to retain perhaps the largest green space within the village at the childrens home is required. Development within the site should respect the footprint of the existing site. The site provides a habitat for several species of owl, plus bats | | |
| 4 | Also include the pump? | | |
| 5 | The battlefield sign should be moved closer to the village to discourage vandalism. | | |
| 6 | Why has the historic wall water hole near to the mounting steps on Bowcliffe Road been blocked in? | | |
| 7 | Are there any other non-designated heritage assets not on the list...maybe replace "are" with "include"? What about the airfield? | | |
| 8 | The street scene should be protected especially in respect of materials used and sympathetic extensions to existing properties | | |
| 9 | There was nothing there prior to the above being placed. Time moves on. These can be relocated | | |
| Policy Area H2 | | | |
| 1 | I support moving the cross into the village. | Noted | None |
| 2 | Beware renewable energy schemes | | |
| 3 | No developments should happen in this area. | | |
| 4 | Strongly support | | |
| 5 | Battlefield as a project seems to have been neglected recently? | | |
| 6 | No development should take place either within or or adjacent to these sights | | |
| 7 | Bramham's heritage is vital and gives the village its special character | | |
| 8 | Not convinced development would deliver against objectives | | |
| 9 | Decision based on compromise | | |
| 10 | No development should be permitted within this area. | | |
| 11 | Unclear what development would be permitted, does this suggest housing development? | | |
| Policy Area H3 | | | |
| 1 | ADD h) Any religious buildings are in keeping with historical and local religion and the 'look' of Bramham. It is important that this is kept on top of. We were told we would get change of use for a garage under permitted development but I welcome the fact we weren't allowed to by LCC Planning and as a result had to go through Planning. | Comments noted. | Amend H3 to cover |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|-----------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 2 | too much street furniture already! | <p>Point 5 regarding sites - it was decided on by the steering group early on NOT to allocate sites.</p> <p>Current wording considered sufficient for protection of conservation area.</p> <p>War Memorial area covered in section 5.</p> | parking. |
| 3 | I repeat this all sounds lovely but who pays for these projects? | | |
| 4 | Over the years, Bramham has been "illuminated" by excessive street lighting, much of which remains on through the night. This creates visual pollution, plus associated environmental impact of electricity usage. Mature trees removed during development should be replaced like for like with reasonably sized, young trees - not a sapling | | |
| 5 | In my view ALL new development on previously undeveloped sites should be in areas identified in the Neighbourhood Plan as suitable for development (I'm sure the Questionnaire respondents will have come up with suggestions for these sites). I queried this at one of the drop-in sessions and was told the Policy would be to leave this decision to Leeds City Council. My view is that if suitable sites are not identified, it will not be LCC which decides where new development is - it will be the Developers. This is exemplified by sites such as Church Fields at Boston Spa. This was a protected area but a developer out in a planning application for 170+ houses which was rejected by LCC, but a subsequent Public Inquiry authorised the development (and indeed several more throughout Leeds) because not enough other sites had been identified for development. Had there been a Boston Spa Neighbourhood Plan which protected Church Fields but identified other development sites, the outcome may have been different | | |
| 6 | Ensure the current CAAMP is recognised as being extant | | |
| 7 | No development should take place without adequate parking | | |
| 8 | No map attached | | |
| 9 | In general yes, but no infill development (d) should be permitted and (f) fences should be avoided | | |
| 10 | New should be new old needs to be restored | | |
| 11 | The language of this policy is framed as if the development will go ahead and then it will be seen how much can be done to preserve the conservation area. The emphasis should be that the development will only go ahead if the conservation area is preserved or enhanced. | | |
| 12 | It is disappointing that no mention is made of the need to improve the immediate environment around the War Memorial, possibly linked to the recovery of the eyesore site on Almshouse Hill. These would seem to be potentially suitable subjects for use of any CIL monies which may materialise. | | |
| Policy Area H4 | | | |
| 1 | Please add as below (taken from the Plan) e) It is essential that spaces between buildings are given a high priority. | Spacing and car parking already addressed in | .Cover innovative design at H4 |
| 2 | The vision is for a thriving, vibrant community with shops and businesses but there is nothing in the plan how this will be supported or achieved. | | |
| 3 | No brick buildings | | |
| 4 | All as above re Policy H4, plus: I find it difficult to believe that there are no strategic plans in place to address the "industrial | | |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|-------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|
| | and commercial" development in the Parish. E.g. what plans are there to support and develop the commercial activity around Bowcliffe Hall with a view to attracting more employment to the area? | H4 | |
| 5 | In some instances addition of modern design rather than faux-historical is favourable | Bowcliffe? | |
| 6 | c) local infrastructure should also explicitly include flood protection and prevention measures. Also suggest wording reflects that off-road and visitor parking, vehicle and pedestrian access and turning points all need to be sufficient | | |
| 7 | The local stone and panted/tiled roof formula should be compulsory. | | |
| 8 | No development should take place without adequate parking | | |
| 9 | Sustainable builds | | |
| 10 | Infrastructure should be priority. | | |
| 11 | No more 2 storey houses | | |
| 12 | What is local building design/form/style? You cannot something when you do not have a standard and have allowed many residents to use designated parking for extending properties. | | |
| 13 | Opposed to further housing development | | |
| Policy Area H5 | | | |
| 1 | Could the view from Firbeck (No.1) and Lyndon towards Clifford and the School be included? | Noted | None |
| 2 | No development. Keep village feel. | | |
| 3 | No development should take place without adequate parking. | | |
| 4 | Land on Almshouse Hill - careful control. | | |
| 5 | LCC do act to do this on new developments, but later individual householders seem able to do as they wish! | | |
| 6 | But using new materials | | |
| Policy Area UoL1 | | | |
| 1 | It may be better to develop this whole site as a separate entity with its own infrastructure rather than just in-fill all the green spaces and those between Clifford and Bramham | Noted. | Amend 4.6 UoL to include renewable energy, and also to constrain future |
| 2 | Unsure what research is taking place. Also need more information on renewable energy | | |
| 3 | Only small scale renewable energy schemes | | |
| 4 | Housing on this site more beneficial | | |
| 5 | No ugly renewable energy schemes. Waste of money | | |
| 6 | Small scale renewable energy schemes should exclude wind turbines (visual impact, intermittent generation). | | |
| 7 | See also my comments on Objective 7. I don't think that the conclusions drawn and subsequent strategic objectives/policies are borne out by the questionnaire responses. | | |

| Reference | Comments | Response of the Steering Group | Proposed modifications |
|-----------|--|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| 8 | Must first know what "small scale renewable" means, i.e. wind farms? | | development. |
| 9 | We do NOT want large turbines - must be avoided. Those near Lotherton spoil the skyline. | | |
| 10 | Thank you for all your work in preparing this Plan. | | |
| 11 | (3rd bullet point deleted) - Keep site green! | | |
| 12 | Perhaps make more use of renewable energy schemes. | | |
| 13 | Development of any scheme should not be allowed as they will be seen as precedents for future plans | | |
| 14 | Renewable energy schemes & reuse for buildings for housing yes. But some of this area would be better used as a housing development | | |
| 15 | Renewable energy? Fields of solar panels? | | |
| 16 | No wind turbines or solar panel fields please. | | |
| 17 | Any expansion of research facilities and methods adopted by the research should all fall within the policies identified in the Plan and not have any detrimental effect to the character and value of the village | | |
| 18 | Albeit if a site is considered suitable should be assessed on its own merits & other village wide enhancements. | | |
| 19 | Agree with re-use of buildings but not renewable energy | | |
| 20 | Limited - Water gathering-ground for Tadcaster Breweries. | | |
| 21 | No renewable energy schemes | | |
| 22 | Definitely no wind farms | | |
| 23 | This section is the key part of the plan. University of Leeds has long intended to develop the estate with proposals going back over decades. Any concession to 'Trojan Horse' schemes (e.g. small- scale renewable energy schemes') potentially destroys the entire neighbourhood plan. | | |
| 24 | No wind turbines | | |
| 25 | Renewable energy More analysis would be helpful, in differentiating different categories. I am fully committed to RE in principle, but do not favour unconditional support (ie there is a need to consider opportunity land cost in the case of certain solar schemes -as above- as well as sourcing issues in relation to bio-mass.) The possible scope for a community based RE strategy could be recognised as an aspiration, at the very least. | | |