

## Discussion Paper 4

### Why do we need to review the Neighbourhood Plan?

#### Introduction

Now that we have had our first meeting we need to get down to business. We need to formally advise Leeds City Council (LCC) of our intention to review the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) and to seek permission to extend the boundary. We will need to agree a supporting statement to set out our proposals and an addendum to justify seeking to extend the boundary. I will circulate a further discussion paper to address the boundary extension. This paper seeks to stimulate discussion amongst the group about what we, as a community, hope to achieve by reviewing the Plan, what our priorities are, and how we hope our Parish will move forward into the middle of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

This is a discussion paper I have produced and inevitably it covers matters I have thought significant. It is not intended to be a definitive plan for the way forward but to focus discussion in our meetings to arrive at a consensus as to how we wish to proceed. LCC will inevitably have views on matters we should discuss and I am sure many of you will also feel there are matters which are important that I have omitted.

#### Our Approach

I am aware from discussions with colleagues that there are different views about our approach to the Review. I think these can be summarised below,

Option 1 – some say we should carry out a light touch review, which would involve tweaking the odd policy and adding the northern quadrant. We would not seek new evidence to support this review but would rely on the evidence base of the original plan. This would enable us to secure quick adoption of the Plan and ensure that we maximised the Community Infrastructure Levy to the benefit of the parish.

Option 2 – some say that we should use the existing NP as a baseline and build on this to provide more focussed policies which could be more effective when dealing with planning applications. eg. New policies could address design matters and new projects but this approach would involve undertaking fresh surveys and compiling a fresh evidence base. Unless we keep on top of this, time could pass and benefits may be lost.

Option 3 – a compromise approach is to adopt a hybrid approach. This would involve retaining much of the existing NP and selecting key areas to which would be applied more focussed policies and which would require a fresh evidence base for those policies.

#### Review Check List

I have set out below a check list of the matters which the NP review could address and which can form the reasons for seeking a review. Again, these are my personal thoughts designed in part to stimulate debate and to identify which issues the Group feel are important. Again, I cannot claim that this list is exhaustive and if you feel any topic has been omitted please let me know.

1 The NP will need to take account of the new Parish boundary and the extended boundary beyond the parish and where necessary will need to introduce new policies to address issues in these areas.

2 The NP will need to take on board the Government's new proposals for Planning (details have already been circulated) and in particular articulate what "living with beauty" means for Barwick and Scholes.

- 3 The NP will need to review housing provision and we will have to decide if we need to allocate sites to meet a specific need we may identify.
- 4 Now that the East Leeds Orbital Road ( ELOR) is being built do we need additional policies to address the impact it is likely to have?
- 5 Do we need to review the list of Non- Designated Assets identified in the NP ( see page 37)
- 6 Do we need to review our Public Rights of Way network?
- 7 Do we need more positive policies on renewable energy and should we consider if the NP should address climate change more generally?
- 8 As well as 2 above, should we look to review our design policies in the light of recent government pronouncements and should we seek the views of local architects as to what they suggest we should be seeking to achieve for Barwick and Scholes and the northern quadrant?
- 9 More generally should we “beef up” our policies relating to new development?
- 10 Do our policies on drainage and flood prevention need to be updated?
- 11 Is our policy on new business development sufficient? Should this be looked at in the light of possible changes in the way we work in future with more people looking to work from home?
- 12 Should we look carefully at the village hub policies for Scholes now there is no shop in the village? Government policy now allows retail premises to convert to residential use without the need for planning permission. Should the Group be actively looking at the future of the former shop premises on Rakehill Road and a future use for the library building if the Library closes as is widely expected ?
- 13 Are the NP policies sufficient to assist and help existing businesses in Barwick?
- 14 Should the NP look for the provision of a retail hub in the northern quadrant or leave this for LCC and the Consultative Forum to address as they are looking at the East Leeds Extension as a whole?
- 15 Should we review our existing community facilities and assets of community value and the policies to protect these. Should we look at provision in the northern quadrant? ( I am seeking a copy of our registered assets and will circulate on receipt)
- 16 As you know the East Leeds Extension is expected to add 15,000 new people to this area when completed. Current plans are for 2 primary schools, one of which will be in the northern quadrant. LCC consider that existing secondary school provision is adequate and no new school is planned. Should the NP address this issue. Existing policy CF2 supports expansion of the existing Primary schools in Barwick and Scholes, although in the case of Barwick scope for expansion is limited without encroaching onto other community facilities.
- 17 When the NP was produced there was a comprehensive survey of green spaces undertaken and these are recorded in the NP. Some of the areas included have been questioned since the Plan was adopted as they lie on private land. So it is likely this aspect of the NP will need to be reviewed and it will be necessary to include new areas which come into being in the northern quadrant and the country park as well as the landscaped areas alongside ELOR.
- 18 At the last meeting there was concern about the risk of coalescence of Scholes with the Northern quadrant. Should the NP have policies to address this risk?
- 19 Should the NP have policies to control development around any Park and Ride facility on the A64?
- 20 Should the NP have policies to shape the development of the proposed country park and woodland which lies to the east of ELOR north of the A64 and extends north of Skeltons Lane?

21 If all goes to plan, the Parish Council could find itself with around £0.75m of Community Infrastructure Levy albeit over a period of 10-20 years, together with an increase in precept income from the additional houses. Should the NP seek to identify a project or projects which should be addressed with this money and possibly other funding or should it leave these decisions to the Parish Council at the time?

P R Maude

February 2021