

Unique Id	Cmt Respondent Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
1	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	When delivering the envelopes this morning, I received very positive comments & full support for the work you have led on the LNP. I think the summary document is superb! Succinct & attractively presented.	Accept		None
2	Resident	Summary	Specific	P. 12.	Drafting Line2.	na	On page 12, Delivery of the Plan, line 2- I believe it should read "the Linton Village Society has..."	Accept	None as not in main document	None
3	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	This is a great document and we would suggest the following inclusions:	Accept		None
4	Resident	Full	Specific	P. 8	Flood	Yes	Section 35. Should state:- "The golf club land known as Linton Ings is also a flood plain for the River Wharf."	Accept		The open nature of the landscape gives rise to spectacular long views from the plateau, south over the river to Collingham and beyond, west to Cow Wood and Wood Hall, and north over much of newer Linton with attractive houses nestling in the eastward-running wooded slopes. Some of these slopes, together with Linton Lane, benefit from much valued views across the Golf Course. The golf club land known as Linton Ings, is traversed by a disused elevated railway embankment and is bounded to the east by the River Wharfe and is also a flood plain for the river.
5	Resident	Full	Specific	P. 26	Footpaths	Yes	Section 97. After narrow lanes insert "No footpaths and some poor footpaths."	Accept	To say "narrow and discontinuous" in order to clarify point. Also should be "footways"	Done
6	Resident	Full	Specific	P. 28	Transport	Yes	Section 100. After Wetherby to Leeds, insert - "Only of a one hour frequency."	Accept	Clarify to "currently one hour in frequency"	The village is served by one bus route (Wetherby/Leeds) and also has a number of school buses at appropriate times. The bus service is currently at an hourly frequency.
7	Resident	Full	Specific	P. 30	Footpaths	Yes	Section 107. After "which is in" insert "Unsafe pedestrian walking distance."	Reject	Do not agree that the "distance" is unsafe.	None

Unique Id	Comment Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
8	Resident	Full	Specific	Paragraph D1	Footpaths	No	<p>We are concerned about the proposed footpath / bridleway going up our field off Northgate Lane. This particular field is ideal for keeping sheep in as it is very sheltered. We used to keep sheep in this field but have been unable to do so for several years due to the behaviour of unauthorised footpath walkers. We used to have a gate on the roadside, but it was left open frequently, notices destroyed, and when fastened with wire, this was cut off. We have had sheep savaged by dogs who were running loose, with their owners, motorbikes joyriding, and our sheep scattered. Our sheep are a high health status flock, being maedi - visna accredited, which means that if they mix with other sheep we have to keep them in isolation for 6-months and then have them all bloodtested at great expense.</p> <p>Hence, several years ago, we had to fetch our sheep away from this field and have had to revert to growing crops in it instead. We have a footpath that runs through our farm already, and have had to use tactics such as building a stile to stop gates being left open. The vast majority of footpath walkers are very responsible and pleasant, but there are a few who feel it is their right to do whatever they want, and go wherever they want, and have been known to retort when approached with comments such as "I didn't pay all this money to come and live in the countryside to be told what I can do."</p> <p>The proposed footpath is actually a right of way for Mr. Hartley, who owns the field above ours, for his contractors tractors and machines to have access, and can be very busy at certain times. If this proposed footpath were to be accepted it would connect with an existing footpath, but not a bridleway, and we are not clear as to whether the proposal is for just a footpath or a bridleway also.</p>	Further Action	Proposal for circular walks is key to Project 13 in LNP. Landowners concerns are valid. Consultation meeting with landowners arranged.	Deletion of proposed footpath parallel to Northgate Lane. Amend Map .
9	Resident	Summary	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I support the proposals in the Linton Neighbourhood Plan. Thank you to the steering committee for your time and thoughtfulness they have put into it.	Accept		None
10	Resident	Not specific	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I have read the pre-submission draft and found it to be a very comprehensive document and support it's submission. Thanks to everyone involved in producing the document.	Accept		None
11	Resident	Full	General	None	Trees	na	Whilst not a planning issue I do wish that more could be done to control the blight of unmanaged conifers which are allowed to grow over 50 ft blocking views and daylight.	Reject	LNP cannot control hedges/trees in private ownership in this regard. However, the plan does mention preference for native species.	None
12	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I would like to sincerely thank all the people who have worked so hard on this project on the village plan. Particularly Tony Riall.	Accept		None
13	Resident	Full	General	None	Highways	Yes	Any objection to large numbers of housing in this area is the traffic, which is already terrible, also parking in Wetherby!	Accept		None
14	Resident	Full	General	None	Irrelevant	na	It is nearly impossible for residents to park & shop, it is particularly hard for older residents. No public taxis on a town the size of Wetherby is outrageous. Also cost of petrol and queuing nearly all the way to Harrogate.	Reject	Wetherby issues not covered by LNP	None

Unique Id	Cmt	Respondent Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
15	Resident	Full	General	None	Highways	na	Wetherby lngs narrow road is ridiculous - this is going to be an awful problem with all the extra traffic with new housing, & no train service is ridiculous. It is no longer such a pleasant place to reside with this traffic problem at the moment.	Reject	Wetherby issues not covered by LNP.	None	
16	Resident	Full	Specific	12.8	Highways	Yes	Highways. Traffic & speeding is a concern. Our house backs onto main street & traffic noise has increased.	Accept		None	
17	Resident	Full	Specific	12.8	Highways	Yes	Concerns on cut through traffic.	Accept		None	
18	Resident	Full	Specific	12.8	Highways	Yes	30 mph doesn't appear to have made any difference.	Accept		None	
19	Resident	Full	Specific	14	Footpaths	Yes	Footpath improvement. To allow for a pram. To collingham and wetherby would be welcomed.	Accept		None	
20	Resident	Full	Specific	15.4	Open space	Yes	Add openspace. Childrens play facilities would be welcomed.	Accept		None	
21	Resident	Full	Specific	P. 49	Gen. Positive	Yes	I fully support the vision and objectives in part 49.	Accept		None	
22	Resident	Full	Specific	Section 11.2	Character	Yes	I support the comments in 61, 62, 63, 64 about ways of maintaining the villages character.	Accept		None	
23	Resident	Full	Specific	Section 11.2	Principles/Policy	Yes	The design and development principles are important and I fully agree. Also policy A2 Design and Extensions.	Accept		None	
24	Resident	Full	Specific	Section 11.2	Skyline	Yes	I agree that views are important and any development on high ground is likely to alter the village environment. Overbearing building on the skyline should not be permitted.	Accept		None	
25	Resident	Full	Specific	Section 11.2	Footpaths	Yes	I have supported the idea of a continuous footpath to Wetherby since 1970. The last barriers, up Kiln Hill and a short section further on, would greatly improve pedestrian safety. (and enhance the Edan Wav).	Accept		None	
26	Resident	Full	Specific	Section 11.2	Site Comment	Yes	There is much that can be said about the various potential development sites, I agree with the summary of comment about these sites.	Accept		None	
27	Resident	Full	Specific	Section 11.2	Open space	Yes	The idea about making the land adjoining the memorial hall available as common land is most welcome.	Accept		None	

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
28	Resident	Full	Specific	General	None	Village Asset	Yes	Although not particularly mentioned in the document, the "daffodil bank" at the end of Linton Bridge is the first sight of Linton, coming from Collingham. The bank has a millenium tree, a purple beech, planted in 2000.	Accept	Add comments supporting - possibly new para after 37	Text added
29	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive		Yes	Snerial Note attached by Iain Gilmour on the Daffodil Bank. We feel the pre submission draft is excellent in all areas and fully appreciate the vast amount of hard work undertaken by the committee who are committed to protecting the village as a whole and protecting it's character. A tremendous achievement by all. Thank you. In principle we are supportive of the paln and the proposed projects to help deliver the vision. We would offer a number of comments as follows:	Accept		None
30	Resident	Summary	General	None	Gen. Positive		Yes	In principle we are supportive of the paln and the proposed projects to help deliver the vision. We would offer a number of comments as follows:	Accept		None
31	Resident	Summary	Specific	A1	Village Asset		Yes	Wilflower planting - We note the proposed additional bulb planting under the projects to help deliver the vision on page 5 and would suggest consideration also be given in places to wilflower planting. In certain circumstances this may be longer duration flower interest, support wildlife and provide lower maintainance solution.	Accept	Add comment supporting	Additional bulb planting and/or the sowing of wilflower seeds.
32	Resident	Summary	Specific	Map 5	Village Asset		Yes	Additional view on Map 5. It is surprising to see that there is no important view from either the layby on the road (for from the road itself) between Collingham and Wetherby looking to the west over the golf course. This always strikes me as impoant context for Linton as a village nestled down in the valley and within trees.	Accept	Map 5 to be revised	Update
33	Resident	Summary	Specific	A1	Des. Principles/ Policy		Yes	Addition of policy to require maintainance of buildings to protect the conservation area. Much is made in the document about the control of new building (which I understand would include the knocking down and rebuild of existing property) and of extensions to existing buildings to protect the the character of the conservation area. There is for example a property within the conservation area close to College farm that is in considerable disrepair and must be considered to be detracting from the character. Policy should allow maintenance to be required by the owner or to allows property to be taken into control for the benefit of the village.	Reject	Consulted with LCC Conservation Officer and there are no powers to enforce this.	None
34	Resident	Summary	Specific	A1	Des. Principles/ Policy		Yes	Location of screen planting. Projects to help deliver the vision on page 5 notes screen planting in areas having a negative impact on the rural character but makes not mention of where such planning is considered necessary.	Accept	Identify locations for screen	Screen Planting to soften the impact of stone walling at for example the front of Wetherby Golf Club, and on Northgate Lane near the junction with Tibgarth;
35	Resident	Summary	Specific	A1	Des. Principles/ Policy		Yes	Design Requirements. Policy A1 to be expanded - especially for re-build of extant property to not that "space retained between buildings and the street simialr to the space between neighbouring properties" which is the wording used for extensions in policv A2.	Further Action	Planning Aid England has provided alternative words for consideration	Recognising and reinforcing the distinct local character (as set out within the Character Assessment at Appendix 1) in relation to height, scale, spacing, layout, orientation, design and materials of buildings. The use of vernacular detailing is encouraged.
36	Resident	Summary	Specific	B5	Des. Principles/ Policy		Yes	Division to flats - Policy B5 rightly refers to the need to respond to changing demographic profile. Care should however be taken to ensure that any sub-division of dwellings does not lead to an increase in the amount of on-street parking and would only be supported where off-street parking for the inevitable additional vehicles could be provided.	Reject	Off street parking covered by Leeds Street Design Guide.	None

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
37	Resident	Resident	Summary	Specific	F2 Des. Principles/Policy	Des. Principles/Policy	na	There is a risk of a gradual reduction in internet speed as more and more users add to the network. We would suggest a strengthening of the policy to require demonstration by new developments that their additional connection would lead to NO reduction in internet speed to existing properties and users. This may potentially require a survey of existing internet speed to be undertaken.	Reject	Linton now has fibre optic. Large expansion and/or more take-up will degrade speed. LNP cannot cover this issue.	None
38	Resident	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	The plan covers all issues of concern. Particularly the matter of keeping a "rural village" perspective.	Accept		None
39	Resident	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Highways	Yes	Our main concern is the increase in traffic in an already congested Linton Lane with dangerous corners on a main bus rout.	Accept		None
40	Resident	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Sustainability	Yes	Issues about where the children from new houses go to school How are the surgery's going to cope. It is already difficult to get appointments.	Accept		None
41	Resident	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Village Asset	Yes	I think is important that the skyline from Tripp Lane, across the valley to the Ridge is maintained uninterrupted, in keeping with the rural "hilly" environment.	Accept		None
42	Resident	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	An expressive, well argued & presented document. Thanks to everyone involved in a very difficult and extensive exercise.	Accept		None
43	Resident	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Special Projects	Yes	We agree with the overall conclusions and projects in Categories B, C & D.	Accept		None
44	Resident	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Village Asset	Yes	Under category A - Preservation & Enhancement of the Built Environment we're pleased you've highlighted the importance of views in Map 5, specifically view 7.	Accept		None
45	Resident	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	However, bearing in mind the Golf Club's lack of maintenance over recent years of the hedges & trees fronting all the way along Linton Lane we suggest you add a statement requiring landowners to keep their boundaries tidy, pre-settable and to a standard of the rest of the village. No doubt you'll be able to put that into appropriate legalize ^{legalize} !	Reject	LNP cannot control hedges/trees in private ownership.	None
46	Resident	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Excellent plan - well done to the team who have put this together for the good of our village. We support the points & principle of the plan.	Accept		None
47	Resident	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Open space	Yes	We make reference to policy E2 - we believe that some comment open space facilities fro children would be an excellent addition and provide families with a focus point within the village.	Accept		None
48	Resident	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Footpaths	Yes	We are also in favour of developing footpaths and access to Wetherby to reduce car journey's & traffic through the village.	Accept		None
49	Resident	Resident	Full	Specific	B2. Drafting PAS Site	Drafting PAS Site	Yes	We think that the sentence beginning "SHLAA2136, The Ridge..." should end after the words "from development". All else to be deleted. We think that it is a hostage to fortune to include such words as "housing needs and site assessments".	Reject	The LNP would not comply with LCC Core Strategy	None

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
50	Resident	Summary	Specific	1A Village Maps	Asset	Yes	There should be a reference to protecting the views to the west from the top of the Ridge, in line with Page 3 objective 3 "to protect the landscape generally (including wildlife habitats etc.). These comments to also be reflected in the full document. I am in support of this plan.	Accept		None	
51	Resident	Summary	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes		Accept		None	
52	Resident	Summary	Specific	D1	Footpaths	Yes	As regards footpaths, cycleways, bridleways - I would like to support the general improvement of these facilities, particularly where this will allow access in a loop or from the bridge to the public footpath at Trip Lane, is part of the wider walking network I would ask for consideration on that the village plan supports the improvement of the surface of this part of Linton Common and is dangerous for walkers and cyclists with many potholes. Additional signage should also be considered in view of the shared access to walkers and vehicles. A speed reduction to 20 mph could also be better signed. The footpath from Linton Common to Trip Lane should be improved (essentially a muddy steep path as present). Thank you.	Accept	There is a requirement for suitable maintenance of Linton Common to achieve safe pedestrian access.	Add : An example is Linton Common. This is a public footpath, 1.2m wide and also a private vehicular access. The surface has many potholes which are a hazard to pedestrians. The condition of the footpath between Linton Common and Trip Lane is currently suitable for its use as a footpath, and will be included in on going inspections and maintenance schedules.	
53	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Section 6	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	Document provided with suggestion of addition to Section 6 of the LNP. [Full section suggested and provided]. Document in email to JB and PK.	Accept	Add some sections to policy A1 & justification. Add contribution as small appendix. Add additional text from archeological report for Linton	Text added	
54	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	P. 13. Drafting	Objective 3.	Yes	Although little development is envisaged in and around Linton within your Plan, WYAAS would ask that you included reference to "the historic environment" within Objective 3 (page 13) for protection.	Accept	Add proposed text to Objective 3	To protect the environment generally, including agricultural land, woodland, wildlife habitats, the historic environment and particularly the key views into and out of the Conservation Area.	
55	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Section 12	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	With regard to Section 12: New Housing Development (p. 12), we would recommend adding a 5th Objective "5. To ensure that where appropriate, archaeological investigation/ recording takes place in advance of any proposed development.	Accept	Consider addition to Policy A1	Included as i.	
56	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Having been present at the open days and every Steering Committee Meeting I am impressed by the level of detail contained in the full document and also by the concise nature of the Summary version which still brings out the salient points of the plan. Both documents reflect the views and comments expressed through the Village Survey and the deliberations of the residents through the Steering Committee. The Drafting Committee have obviously spent a huge amount of time getting the Linton Plan to this stage and deserve the thanks of our community for helping to protect our village.	Accept		None	
57	Resident	Summary	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Totally agree with all that has been suggested.	Accept		None	

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Docu ment Reference	Cetegy (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
58	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	The Jamieson family appreciate the time and effort that has gone into producing the Linton Neighbourhood Plan. Thank you to the Linton Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group and the Parish Council. I have read the pre-submission draft and note the following comments below:	Accept		None	
59	Resident	Full	Specific	Cat B. P1. B1	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	Replicate in this section the points on designs of extensions from A2. In particular extensions will be in materials to complement the existing or neighbouring houses. The use of smoked glass on a recent new build is not characteristic of the Linton vernacular into the village (especially considering its prominent position).	Accept	Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England. Policy A1 and A2.	Residential extensions will be supported where they are in accordance with Policy A1 (where applicable) and	
60	Resident	Full	Specific	E2.	Open space	Yes	I would be interested in participating in the committee who help to define how the local green space in the village is utilised (representing families with young children).	Accept	Not LNP issue.	None	
61	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Special Projects	Yes	With regard to the ranking in the Priority Projects list within the full document. I give a high priority rating to points 10 and 13 and change point 9 from low to medium.	Reject	Ranking agreed by SG and no other comments to suggest change to order.	None	
62	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	1. The full document is an epic effort by a small number of highly motivated local individuals. The rest of us should be most grateful. 2. The presentation / layout of both documents is of a high order: assisted by the top quality paper selected. 3. There is potential to cross reference specific summary pages to the full document.	Accept		None	
63	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Drafting	Yes	4. In the full plan I do like the 1923 Village Plan and also the age chart on page. 29	Accept	Only the Main document will be produced at next stage.	None	
64	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	5. Both documents refer to control of HGV access: I would have used this section to promote single deck buses.	Reject	LNP has no powers to enforce this.	None	
65	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I fully agree with the all the objectives set out in the Linton Neighbourhood Plan.	Accept		None	
66	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Having attended a few of the neighbourhood meetings in the village hall and followed the proceedings, I have seen how difficult it is to get the overall feel of what the residents want and to put that into a document that means something. There have been questionnaires for residents to also comment on which I found useful. I just hope that some if not all the suggested improvements can be done. Finally the various committees have in my opinion produced a full document which does represent the village feelings.	Accept		None	
67	Resident	Summary	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	We are broadly in agreement with the summary version of the plan. Our comments relate to the solar sites and we feel the only site fit for building would be the site on Northgate Lane. We should not give the okay to build on Green Belt. At one of the meetings at Woodhall Mr Weaver informed those present the Leeds Planning had informed him that there would be no building on the Greenbelt if the residents so desired. It is nice to see the 30 miles per hour signs up at last. Next the grass verge on Linton Lane are a disgrace!	Accept		None	
68	Resident	Summary	General	None	Highways	Yes		Accept		None	
69	Resident	Summary	General	None	Highways	Yes		Accept		None	

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Docu ment Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
70	Resident	Full	General	None	Highways	Yes	Thus Summary document is a comprehensive and carefully considered response to the issues facing Linton going forward. It accurately & articulately expresses views which I share as to how to preseve and protect our community whilst at the same time respecting and shouldering an appropriate level of responsibility for suitable and carefully managed development and imrnovement.	Accept		None	
71	Resident	Full	General	None	Village Asset	Yes	In particular the preservation of the Green spaces in the village centre - Trip Lane, Northgate Lane and Memorial Hall are vital for the amenity value within the village.	Accept		None	
72	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I am hugely impressed with the quality of work that the LNP team have produced and immensely grateful to you all for your time and commitment. It really is appreciated and you have accurately reflected our views. Thank you.	Accept		None	
73	Resident	Summary	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	General Feedback: we support the Linton Neighbourhood Plan as drafted.	Accept		None	
74	Resident	Summary	Specific	Policy	Highways B4.	Yes	wholeheartedly support a reduction in the speed limit from 30 mph to 20 mph particularly coming into the village from Collingham, up the hill after Linton Bridge.	Accept		None	
75	Resident	Summary	Specific	Policy	Footpaths B4.	Yes	We would also support an improvement in footpaths at this point.(see item 74 above)	Accept		None	
76	Resident	Summary	Specific	Policy	Footpaths D1.	Yes	Improvement in footpaths / additions to allow safe pedestrian access along main street / Linton Lane - Wetherby.	Accept		None	
77	Resident	Summary	Specific	Policy	Open E2. space	Yes	Agree and support childrens play area (traditional and in keeping) would be appreciated.	Accept		None	
78	Resident	Summary	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Just to say thank you for your nice brochure. It all looks very nice. I am afraid for a long time I have been unale to come to any events owing to ill health and my age being 88. But I do take an interest in things. I thank you to everyone who looks after things.	Accept		None	
79	Resident	Summary	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	In general terms the "draft" is excellent and a credit to the steering group and drafting team.	Accept		None	
80	Resident	Summary	Specific	Policy	Footpaths D1.	Yes	My only slight reservation related to the drawing relating to the footpath at Kiln Hill connecting with the Linton Lane footpath to Wetherby. Due to the scale of the drawing it is a little difficult to understand the exact nature / design of the proposal.	Accept	Drawing to be improved.	Update	
81	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Footpaths	Yes	The footpath plans from village hall towards Wetherby look fine. Could not really add to this. Except a narrower path would be better than none at all. New pathway at the bottom of Little Acres new development is less than 1.8 metres if this is the legal requirement? 3/4 of a metre is easily enough - if legal.	Reject	This would be controlled by Highways. LNP cannot alter this.	None	
82	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Village Asset	Yes	Trees to Ridge. Can we resist any further felling of trees if they are not diseased. The whole character of the Ridge is being changed!	Accept	LNP Project 14 covers this	None	
83	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Agree with proposals.	Accept		None	

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
84	Resident	Summary	Specific	A1 Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	"Development which adversely affects views indicated on Map 5 will not be permitted". Map 5 should add arrow from the Ridge and Muddy Lane be added to the table i.e. protecting views of the people that live on the Ridge	Yes	Map 5 to be revised. Private views cannot be reflected on this map nor can they be protected.	Reject	None	
85	Resident	Summary	Specific	B2 Drafting	Yes	The sentence should finish at : The Ridge, Linton which continue to be protected from developments.	Yes	LNP would not comply with L	Reject	None	
86	Resident	Summary	Specific	X Drafting	Yes	Map Blue The Ridge (sic?)	Yes	Map 5 to be revised	Accept	Update	
87	Resident	Full	Specific	None Open space	No	Concerned regarding the development of local green space. Idea sounds reasonable, but worried it will attract a certain teenage element later in the evening / overnight - therefore would oppose.	No	There is strong majority of support for this initiative, but further consultation is required.	Reject	None	
88	Resident	Full	General	None Gen. Positive	Yes	Fund raisers doing an excellent job - creating good community spirit & intercommunication.	Yes		Accept	None	
89	Resident	Full	Specific	None Sustainability	Yes	Infrastructure of the village does not support the logistical nightmare that would ensue following the majority of the proposed designated sites.	Yes		Accept	None	
90	Resident	Full	Specific	None Highways	Yes	Trip Lane and Northgate Lane in particular are totally unsuitable areas for development due to the nature of the limited road conditions.	Yes		Accept	None	
91	Resident	Full	General	None Gen. Positive	Yes	I agree with the proposals to maintain and enhance the character of the village.	Yes		Accept	None	
92	Resident	Full	Specific	E2 Open space	Yes	In particular, I agree with the prospect of more, green public space in the heart of the village (near the Memorial Hall). At present this area is overgrown and unused. Clearing this area will allow villagers, especially young children, to play together in a way that is currently not possible.	Yes		Accept	None	
93	Resident	Full	Specific	B4 Highways	Yes	I agree the highways proposals. The difficulties are correctly identified.	Yes		Accept	None	
94	Resident	Full	Specific	B1 Gen. Positive	Yes	I agree with this proposal. There is some scope for new housing in Linton.	Yes		Accept	None	
95	Resident	Summary	Specific	Page 3 Gen. Positive	na	Page 3 - category A.?	na	see 98 - review	Accept	Included within a:	
96	Resident	Summary	Specific	Page 3 A Gen. Positive	na	Policy A1 Design & Development ?	na	see 98 - review	Accept	Included within a:	
97	Resident	Summary	Specific	Page 3 Gen. Positive Policy A1	na	Point 9 ?	na	see 98 - review	Accept	Included within a:	
98	Resident	Summary	Specific	Page 3 Point 9 A1 Drafting	Yes	Many properties constructed of "limestone" as well as sandstone/millstone grit particularly in conservation area.	Yes	Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England. Policy A1 and A2. Add Natural Stone	Accept	Included within a:	

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
99	Non-resident		Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Well done! Lets hope all the TPO's get passed & implemented.	Accept		None
100	Resident		Summary	Specific	Policy A1 & 6	Gen. Positive	Yes	I agree with the LNP recognising the need to respect the "rural feel of Linton" and any development should consider the "visual impact" from local and longer distance views.	Accept		None
101	Resident		Summary	Specific	Policy I2	Footpaths	Yes	I believe "accomodating footways and also grass strips in verges" should be a big plus for parents walking with young children, of course using material suitable for the area.	Accept		None
102	Resident		Summary	Specific	Policy A3	Gen. Positive	Yes	Agree with Community Involvement being part of planning permission process for new dwellings.	Accept		None
103	Resident		Summary	Specific	Policy A1	Gen. Positive	Yes	We will support "small scale development as long as it does not extend the village into countryside"	Accept		None
104	Resident		Summary	Specific	Policy B4	Village Asset	Yes	Agree strongly that the Trip Lane / Main Street junction does not alter in size or character.	Accept		None
105	Resident		Summary	Specific	Policy D1	Footpaths	Yes	We agree that considering improving footpaths, cycleways and bridleways within the village will increase safety of families walking and cycling. This can only be an advantage for people of Linton.	Accept		None
106	Resident		Summary	Specific	Policy E1/E2	Open space	Yes	We agree strongly that designating the land (as Green Space) owned by the Trustees of Linton Tennis Club and north of the existing protected Green Space should be a positive move for the village. More playing grass area by the back of the tennis courts will be used by children and possibly at fund-raising events e.g. football coaching.	Accept		None
107	Resident		Summary	Specific	Policy F2	Gen. Positive	Yes	A "community statement" should be incorporated and accompany planning applications for new developments.	Accept		None
108	Resident		Summary	Specific	*	Highways	Yes	Category B. "PROJECTS TO HELP DELIVER OUR VISION" - Definitely believe in idea to introduce 20 mph zone in Main Street.	Accept		None
109	Resident		Full	Specific	Draft 8.3. P8.	Drafting	na	We mention sites 150/151 but there is no indication of a key for 150/151 to allow for xfer or lookup.	Accept	Covered by Appendix A	Text added
110	Resident		Full	Specific	None	Drafting	na	Suggest adding table/figure references with numbers for all figures / tables.	Accept	Include reference	Update

Unique Id	Comment Category	Response	Comment	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
111	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Drafting	Yes	Given Spofforth Hill developments is it worth adding a section specifically on the bottleneck at Main St/Bridge that cannot be alleviated / indicate villages concerns specifically about cut through as congestion gets worse in Wetherby.	Accept	Add suitable text	Options have been considered to improve the highway network in Linton. Three of the main issues are within the Conservation Area. Main Street is constrained by buildings and substantial stone walls, the junction of Trip Lane and Main Street is to be designated as Local Green Space (see section E1) and is to retain it's current alignment, and the junction of Main Street and Northgate Lane also needs to retain it's rural character. Highway alterations at each location are likely to have an unacceptable impact on the visual, historic and/or spatial character of Linton Conservation Area. <i>Options for controlling traffic therefore rely on traffic calming</i> Done
112	Resident	Full	Specific	Section 9 of Draft 8.3	Drafting	Yes	Section 9 no longer mentions the GP's. As these are fundamental I believe these ought to be re-stated and our design objectives related to these directly. The GP's ought to still have primacy.	Accept	Add Guiding Principles to Section 9	
113	Resident	Full	Specific	Map 5	Drafting	Yes	Sightlines needs to be bolder.	Accept	Map 5 to be revised	
114	Resident	Full	Specific	Map 5	Drafting	Yes	View towards The Ridge needs to be clarified.	Accept	Map 5 to be revised	
115	Resident	Full	Specific	Map 5	Drafting	Yes	The second "8" indicating the sightline on Northgate Lane has been placed too far up Northgate Lane and indicates a view for which there is no risk. I think there is a place for two "8's" but one, in my view, ought to indicate we don't really want a valley of new housing on a main entry route into Linton. I'd place it near to where the view will be changed most significantly adjacent to Sirklinghall end of the Tiberth development	Accept	Consider when revising Map 5	
116	Resident	Full	Specific	Page 36.	Drafting	Yes	The Kiln Hill path plan ought to have colour coding to indicate the path route as it is currently unclear.	Accept	Drawing to be improved.	
117	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Vision+Objective	na	The vision statement could be "tightend up". No mention of how this was agreed/endorsed.	Superseded	Comment does not relate to final Pre-submission Draft LNP	Update
118	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Objectives section	Drafting	na	Is there a corresponding policy for each objective. Refer to Local Green Space? Not sure what 7 means Some Green Space is already protected in Linton, worthwhile to acknowledge. What is the plan period? Not installing street lights... is this a policy? Use of pics, sketches, plans?	Superseded	Comment does not relate to final Pre-submission Draft LNP	Update
119	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A1	Drafting	na		Superseded	Comment does not relate to final Pre-submission Draft LNP	None
120	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A2	Drafting	na	Typos Evidence?	Superseded	Comment does not relate to final Pre-submission Draft LNP	Update
121	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A3	Drafting	na	Decision making is for LPA Feedback from community... what if this feedback contradicts the neighbourhood plan (if made) or local planning policy?	Superseded	Comment does not relate to final Pre-submission Draft LNP	None
122	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B1	Drafting	na	Is this a policy?	Superseded	Comment does not relate to final Pre-submission Draft LNP	None
123	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B2	Drafting	na	Delete "following a..."	Superseded	Comment does not relate to final Pre-submission Draft LNP	None

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
124	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B3	Drafting	na	Apply to existing dwellings?	Superseded	Comment does not relate to final Pre-submission Draft LNP	None	
125	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B4	Drafting	na	Would benefit from a plan and better to say "development within xxx must..."	Superseded	Comment does not relate to final Pre-submission Draft LNP	None	
126	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B5	Drafting	na	This is very difficult to do without allocating a site. How can this be implemented for applications for single dwellings?	Superseded	Comment does not relate to final Pre-submission Draft LNP	None	
127	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy C1	Drafting	na	Define harmful. Is this a policy? Should be re-phrased to say "any development..."	Superseded	Comment does not relate to final Pre-submission Draft LNP	None	
128	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy D1	Drafting	na	Map not available... More difficult to do without an allocation.	Superseded	Comment does not relate to final Pre-submission Draft LNP	None	
129	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy E2	Drafting	na	Policy unclear, unable to provide a comment.	Superseded	Comment does not relate to final Pre-submission Draft LNP	None	
130	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy F1	Drafting	na	Including an expansion of the garden centre or new buildings on site?	Superseded	Comment does not relate to final Pre-submission Draft LNP	None	
131	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	The draft Linton Neighbourhood Plan is an excellent document.	Accept		None	
132	Resident	Full	Specific	Policy B2	Gen. Positive	Yes	I particularly support the vision to return The Ridge PAS site to the green belt.	Accept		None	
133	Resident	Full	General	Policy D1	Gen. Positive	Yes	Also, to provide a footpath at kiln hill (supportive) - a sympathetic footpath not a tarmac & concrete.	Accept		None	
134	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Many thanks to the Drafting Committee for their hard work in preparing this document.	Accept		None	
135	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I am keen to support all aspects of the Linton Neighbourhood Plan. I believe it is important to protect and enrich the landscape through sensitive development.	Accept		None	
136	Resident	Full	General	Page 13. Objective 3	Gen. Positive	Yes	The varied landscape is a major attraction of the village and should be well protected and enhanced by further tree, shrubs and bulb planting.	Accept		None	
137	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I fully support the vision & objectives for Linton as set out in the Linton Neighbourhood Plan.	Accept		None	
138	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	The village is well used for leisure activities particularly running and cycling.	Accept		None	
139	Resident	Full	Specific	Page 1	Gen. Positive	Yes	A number of "new trails" suitably marked would add further interest.	Accept		None	

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
140	Resident		Not specific	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I would like to congratulate the Drafting Committee on producing a document that reports accurately and concisely the wishes of the residents of Linton Village. As a member of the Steering Group I have had the opportunity to attend many meetings and observe the process of the development of the LNP.	Accept		None
141	Resident		Not specific	Specific	69	Gen. Positive	Yes	The Linton Village Survey confirmed in the most democratic manner the wishes of the village.	Accept		None
142	Resident		Not specific	General	82	Gen. Positive	Yes	The Steering Group spent considerable time considering the SCHLAA sites and every opportunity was given (and taken in several meetings) to Landowners, Residents and Developers to present their case for development. The Village confirmed the initial opinions reflected in the Linton Village Survey.	Accept		None
143	Resident		Not specific	General	12.2 B1	Gen. Positive	Yes	I endorse this policy statement.	Accept		None
144	Resident		Not specific	General	93	Gen. Positive	Yes	I support this policy.	Accept		None
145	Non-resident (Specialist)		Not specific	General	None	Irrelevant	na	Thank you for consulting Harrogate Borough Council on the Pre-submission draft of the Linton Neighbourhood Plan. At this stage Harrogate Borough Council has no comments to make, subject to the draft plan conforming to the settlement growth strategy of Leeds City Council, as contained in the emerging Leeds Core Strategy DPD. The Council would welcome the opportunity to comment on any changes made to the plan as it progresses towards becoming part of the Development Plan for Leeds., Yours sincerely, <i>Ina Varea</i>	Accept		None
146	Non-resident (Specialist)		Not specific	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	See you tomorrow but read the document last night and thought on the whole it was excellent. Thanks to you and your colleagues.	Accept		None
147	Resident		Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I have read the full draft Linton Neighbourhood plan prepared for pre-submission consultation. I am very impressed with the quality of the document. You and all those who have contributed are to be congratulated on the hard work, skill and knowledge which has clearly gone into it's preparation. I agree with the majority of the document and only have a few comments to make. The references are to the full draft document.	Accept		None
148	Resident		Full	Specific	Paragraph 46	Drafting	Yes	Paragraph 46 refers to the green belt. Is it not rather defeatist to refer to the possibility that the green belt boundary will remain little changed? I would prefer a reference to the fact that high priority is to be given to returning all or part of The Ridge to green belt and agricultural use (paragraph 150 (2) on page 44).	Accept		None

Unique Id	Comment Category	Response	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
149	Resident	Full	Specific	Map 5	Drafting	Yes	Yes	When I reviewed map 5 in paragraph 65 I could not understand why the views covered by SHLAA 1309 and 2136 (paragraph 82) were not included. I consider the view over land at SHLAA 1309 to be beautiful one over agricultural land taking in a ridge line. In paragraph 90 one of the key points abstracted from the village surveys was that 99% of those responding agreed that wooded hillsides, ridge lines and open country views should be protected. In my opinion the land at SHLAA 1309 and 2136 and indeed some land which adjoins these sites has been excluded incorrectly and I would like to see Map 5 in paragraph 65 amended accordingly. The importance of this point is clear from 11.2 on pages 18 and 19 where the first point on page 19 makes reference to map 5. If the map is not changed in my opinion there should at least be separate reference to the beauty of SHLAA 1309, 2136 and surrounding areas. This should be in both paragraph 65 and	Accept	Map 5 to be revised. However, private views cannot be reflected on this map nor can they be protected.	Update
150	Resident	Full	Specific	Page 19	Drafting	Yes	Yes	Under 11.2 on page 19 I was surprised to see that not installing street lights appeared last. Based upon results of the village surveys it should appear much higher up the list and certainly within the top five points on page 18. At the moment it appears to be an afterthought of which of course it is not. I wholly agree with paragraph 78. This clashes with certain of the SHLAA shown in paragraphs 81 and in my opinion this should be made clear in paragraph 78.	Reject	The order of the points in Policy A1 does not refer to their importance. All points carry equal weight.	None
151	Resident	Full	Specific	Para 78	Gen. Positive	Yes	Yes	Paragraphs 86 and 87 are very welcome and make good sense.	Accept		None
152	Resident	Full	Specific	Para 86 & 87	Gen. Positive	Yes	Yes	Paragraphs 86 and 87 are very welcome and make good sense.	Accept		None
153	Resident	Full	Specific	Para 88	Drafting	No	No	I have seen no evidence to support the wording used in paragraph 88. In my opinion either the evidence should be stated or the wording excluded.	Reject	The two Village Surveys support this paragraph (see para 89).	None
154	Resident	Full	Specific	Para 88 and 89	Drafting	No	No	The village survey speaks for itself and in my opinion the words in paragraph 88 and 89 should be excluded and replaced by the results of the village survey of June 2013. This would allow the reader to make his or her own mind as to what the conclusion is. Interestingly if words are to be used to sum up the attitude to further development I believe those in 12.2 on page 24 are in all probability more appropriate.	Reject	The Village Surveys have been used as evidence to support this paragraph.	None
155	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Drafting	Yes	Yes	I believe that the last line of paragraph 102 should read ageing rather than aging. On a similar topic paragraph 105, the first line should have a added between us and very.	Accept	Change spelling	Done
156	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Drafting	No	No	I am very surprised by the first sentence of paragraph 143. Which multiple housing development is being referred to? It does not seem to me, based upon the rest of the document, that this wording is true. If I am right there will be not much money from the CL to fund the different proposals in this plan.	Reject	The wording is not specific to any given development. It's a general statement.	None
157	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Drafting	No	No	I personally would rather have no development and no CL. This of course goes back to paragraph 88/89 and the views of the village on this point.	Reject	The Village Survey June 2013 results support a small amount of development if benefits are delivered to villages.	None

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
158	Resident	Full	Specific	Para 143	Drafting	No	In my opinion paragraph 143 needs to be properly reconciled to paragraph 88 to 89. By using reasonable assumptions it would be possible to quantify the different levels of CIL assuming different degrees of development at realistic property values. At the same time a broad estimate of what each project for Linton might cost would be helpful. I know nothing about how valuable CIL is but my concern is that at the moment we have no means of understanding how realistic it is to think that the projects priority list can be achieved. Expectations may be raised (and voted on!) without any realistic assessment of how achievable the projects are. At the moment this is doing what many politicians do - setting out an uncostered vision without any realistic assessment of what each project will cost, how it will be paid for and over what period each item is likely to be delivered. I believe that this is an area where the plan should be significantly improved. It may be that if values were ascribed to the different projects that the priorities would change? As you know it is often best to get some reasonably priced, but very beneficial quick wins to get people involved and enthused. In my opinion priority 16 on page 45 should be a high priority. Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.	Reject	Projects are aspirational and it is difficult to forecast costings. Projects Priorities List was agreed by SG and no other comment regarding Project 16 position has been received.	None	
159	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	General	None	Irrelevant	na	Thank you for your email dated 11 June 2014. The Commission does not have the resources to respond to all consultations, but will repond to consultations where it considers they raise issues of strategic importance....	Accept		None	
160	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Many thanks to you and the team for the effort you have all put in and congratulations to whoever did such an excellent desk top publishing job. Bob	Accept		None	
161	Resident	Full	General	None	Drafting	Yes	I have read the full document and think that the committee have done an excellent job of covering every issue with regard to the protection and improvements to Linton Village.	Accept		None	
162	Resident	Not specific	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	We give our full support to the NP proposals.	Accept		None	
163	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	No specific concerns, I'm generally supportive of your actions to introduce a 20 mph speed limit on Main Street, extend the 30 MPH limit on Northgate and look to control HGV access through Linton.	Accept	HGV Access restrictions are appropriate.	No change required	
164	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	General	None	Irrelevant	na The commission does not have resources to respond...	Accept		None	

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
165	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I am in agreement with the Draft Plans conclusions and proposals.	Accept		None	
166	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	General	None	Irrelevant	na	It is not the intention of Walton PC to comment on the plan.	Accept		None	
167	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I agree with and support the Linton Neighbourhood Plan.	Accept		None	
168	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	The Ridge should definitely be returned to Green belt as to allow development would increase traffic on Northgate Lane which is dangerously narrow at the start and part way along. Residents from any such development would start to use muddy lane as a pedestrian shortcut to the village Risking their lives as Muddy Lane is steep, slippery with a Blind bend asking for an accident.	Reject	Muddy Lane is not a proposed footpath. Width issues of Northgate Lane are covered.	None	
169	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	General	None	Irrelevant	na	Note: English Heritage provided a map of designated heritage sites - hardcopy provided and filed.	Accept	Check to be made to all designated historic sites included	No change required	
170	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Please accept this as my support for the Linton Neighbourhood Plan.	Accept		None	
171	Resident	Full	General	Para. 1	Gen. Positive	Yes	Agree with all the design & development.	Accept		None	
172	Resident	Full	General	Para. 2	Gen. Positive	Yes	Agree with all the design & development.	Accept		None	
173	Resident	Full	General	Para. 3	Gen. Positive	Yes	Agree with all the design & development.	Accept		None	
174	Resident	Full	General	Para. 4	Gen. Positive	Yes	Agree with all the design & development.	Accept		None	
175	Resident	Full	General	Para. 5	Gen. Positive	Yes	Agree with all the design & development.	Accept		None	
176	Resident	Full	General	C1	Gen. Positive	Yes	Agree with all the design & development.	Accept		None	
177	Resident	Full	General	D1	Gen. Positive	Yes	Agree with all the design & development.	Accept		None	

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
178	Resident	Full	General	E1	Gen. Positive	Yes	Agree with all the design & development.	Accept		None	
179	Resident	Full	General	E2	Gen. Positive	Yes	Agree with all the design & development.	Accept		None	
180	Resident	Full	General	F1	Gen. Positive	Yes	Agree with all the design & development.	Accept		None	
181	Resident	Full	General	F2	Gen. Positive	Yes	Agree with all the design & development.	Accept		None	
182	Resident	Full	General	Page 9.	Highways	No	<p>"Improve Surface or Stammerge Lane"</p> <p>Much discussion was held in the Village Hall regarding the subject of improving the surface of Stammerge Lane until it was pointed out that it is a private lane & therefore the only improvement that could be carried out would have to be with the consent of the owners. [I am surprised it is still showing in the pre-submission draft].</p> <p>A meeting was set-up by Ken Morton of the Steering Group & representatives of the owners of Stammerge Lane. At the meeting it was concluded again that no improvements were desired - inevitable extra traffic, increased traffic speeds & increased danger to children / parents & dogs were cited as some of the reasons. Already the bridge end of Stammerge which has been newly tarmaced has had a dramatic increase in traffic speeds. This confirms the worries of the majority of residents.</p> <p>WE DO NOT WANT ANOTHER RACE TRACK LIKE TRIIP LANE!</p>	Reject	LNP reflects the SG discussions and the output from the Stammerge Lane/Main Street Focus Group. However text to be revised to ensure clarity regarding surface improvement to exclude tarmacing.	Stammerge Lane is a Public Byway, and as a traditional "Green Lane" it would not be appropriate for it to be Tarmacked. From time to time the surface needs maintenance to make it suitable for pedestrians, and also for wheel chair users and buggies. Materials used need to be sympathetic to ensure that Stammerge Lane remains a tranquil location from a by-gone era.	
183	Resident	Full	General	None	Highways	na	Please find enclosed two photographs of recent damage caused on Main St by a speeding car. Would you kindly forward it to the appropriate person. Thank You.	Reject	LNP process not responsible for recording accidents/damage	None	
184	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I broadly concur with the vision, objectives and planning policies and projects for the village.	Accept		None	
185	Resident	Summary	General	None	Des. Principles/Policy Gen.	Yes	I particularly welcome the proposed planning policies for both A2 and B5 which are relevant to the age profile that currently exists within the village.	Accept		None	
186	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	After reading, Linton Village Plan, for me everything is fine, ...	Accept		None	

Unique Id	Cmt	Respondent Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
187	Resident	Full	General	None	Sustainability	Yes apart from one thing any building in the vilage must take care not to block the sewerage or drains with wood or rubble we are having trouble with smells at the moment and cannot cope. I think you have put a lot of work in preparing the neighbourhood plan. Thank vou.	Accept		None	
188	Resident	Full	General	None	Des. Principles/ Policy	Yes	An impressive and proficient LNP. I agree with ALL the objectives in particular numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7. I also support all "Policies".	Accept		None	
189	Resident	Full	General	None	Highways	Yes	Re: blind bends. I would point out that there is a blind bend just beyond "The Ridge" on Linton Lane. I know of one accident which occurred when someone was visiting my house (Southernhey), a few years ago. He was turning righg to access "The Ridge" when an oncoming car came round the bend & hit his car, causing considerable damage. Fortunately no one was hit.	Reject	The independent Highways Assessment has not identified this as a 'blind bend'.	None	
190	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Excellent document. Our particular concerns are:	Accept		None	
191	Resident	Full	General	None	Highways	Yes	i. roads unable to bear increased traffic	Accept		None	
192	Resident	Full	General	None	Footpaths	Yes	ii. Narrow footpaths or none at all.	Accept		None	
193	Resident	Full	General	None	Des. Principles/ Policy	Yes	iii. Preservation of nature / trees	Accept		None	
194	Resident	Full	General	None	Skyline	Yes	iv. Preservation of distant views (a) Northgate Lane to The Ridge, (b) View from Leeds / Wetherby road. Some of them already desicrated.	Accept		None	
195	Resident	Full	General	None	Open space	Yes	v. Remaining open space in village centre to be preserved.	Accept		None	
196	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I fully support the matters set out in the document. Thank you for your hardwork.	Accept		None	
197	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	A very well written document, the contents of which I wholeheartedly support. Thank you for all the hard work.	Accept		None	

Unique Id	Comment Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
198	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	General	None	Irrelevant	na	Many thanks for consulting the Workshire Wildlife Trust on your neighbourhood plan. Unfortunately we do not have the capacity to look at your plan in detail at the moment. I hope the attached information sheet will be useful for including. Futher information about the planning system and biodiversity can be found on our website at http://www.vwt.org/we-defend-wildlife . I approve the draft plan in its current form.	Accept	Review information sheet	Update
199	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes		Accept		None
200	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on the pre-submission draft of the Linton Neighbourhood Plan. We have now had the opportunity to (have) considered the vision, objectives and planning policies set out in the draft plan. We are happy to confirm that we have no formal comments to make at this stage. Should you require any further information or clarification please contact me on the details below SECTION 14: Category D: Footpaths, Cycleways and Bridleways	Accept		None
201	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Section 14. Category D.	Drafting	Yes	There are several examples within the report where the wrong terminology has been used to describe roadside "footways" as footpaths. This needs correcting as the term footpath is also used in the report to describe Public Footpaths across fields etc. and the two terms are not interchangeable. Footways form part of the adopted road network looked after by Leeds Highways, whereas Public Footpaths, Bridleways and Byways are Public Rights of Way looked after by the Public ROW section in Parks & Countryside. Also, the former are recorded on the Highways Street Register whereas the latter are recorded on the Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way".	Accept	Full review of Section 14 and amendments made to text as necessary	Added new paragraph explaining the difference and corrected the terminology "Footways form part of the adopted road network looked after by Leeds Highways, whereas Public Footpaths, Bridleways and Byways are Public Rights of Way looked after by the Public ROW section in Parks & Countryside. Also, the former are recorded on the Highways Street Register whereas the latter are recorded on the Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way".
202	Resident	Full	General	None	Footpaths	Yes	Whilst we would support local aspirations to seek improvements for new footpaths and bridleway links and for Sodom Lane to be formally recognised as a Public Right of Way, it needs to be recognised that creating new public paths across privately owned land is usually dependent on the cooperation of the landowner, unless there is sufficient evidence of unchallenged use to enable a claim for public right of way to be made.	Accept	Consultation to take place with landowners where required.	None
203	Resident	Full	General	None	Highways	Yes	As for improving the surface of Stammergate Lane (a Public Byway) it depends really on what is envisaged here. As a traditional "Green Lane" it would not really be appropriate for it to be Tarmacked but a more sympathetic surfacing technique may be possible provided there was local agreement on what this should be. Leeds City Council Public ROW would be happy to discuss this further with the Parish Council but I should emphasise that anything above basic path maintenance here would need additional capital funding . Finally there seems to be no mention in the text of cycleways but it should perhaps be noted that the signed "West Yorkshire Cycle Route" passes through the village on Linton Lane and links Collingham to Wetherby and beyond. I hope these suggestions are helpful?	Accept	Surface Treatment of Stammergate Lane of valid concern with residents. Project 5 text to be amended accordingly.	Stammergate Lane is a Public Byway, and as a traditional "green lane". It is very important to the character and appearance of the natural environment of Linton. The lane also provides opportunities for views towards fields and mature trees to the east of the village. This helps to further establish Linton as a village with a rural character. It would therefore not be appropriate for it to be fully tarmacked. From time to time the surface needs maintenance to make it suitable for pedestrians, and also for wheel chair users and buggies. Materials used need to be sympathetic to the environment to ensure that Stammergate Lane remains a tranquil location with no encouragement for through vehicular traffic.
204	Resident	Full	General	None	Highways	Yes		Accept	Consider inclusion in LNP	The key routes shown on Map 7 are as follows: • The signed National Cycle Route 66 links Mirfield to York and includes a section along Main Street and Linton Lane. This is also part of the 150 mile "West Yorkshire Cycle Route".

Unique Id	Comment Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
205	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	General	None	Gen. Negative	No	General Comment: The document fails to make any development allocation within any of its policies and, as such, it fails to satisfy the legislative requirement for a Neighbourhood Plan. Having not included even a single small development allocation, the draft Plan cannot be considered as conforming Neighbourhood Plan and could not ultimately be approved as SPD to any Leeds City Council Development Plan.	Reject	A NP does not have to allocate sites.	None
206	Resident	Full	General	Para 18.	Site Comment	No	Paragraph 18: This failure is compounded by the fact that the Village Surveys carried out in October 2012 and June 2013, clearly identified a majority of residents in Linton parish wishing to see at least a modicum of local needs development over the course of the next twenty years. Any such development would not be a substantive strategic allocation in the context of the emerging Leeds City Plan and would therefore not (be?) in conflict with its draft proposals and allocations. Instead, any small allocation would be focused on satisfying an identified need for downsizing over time from existing residents living in 5, 6 or 7-bedroom houses, who have expressed a desire to ultimately move into smaller 3 and 4-bedroom houses, which are at a premium in the area.	Reject	See comment 205	None
207	Resident	Full	General	None	Vision+Objective	No	Vision and Objectives: the Vision and Objectives listed on pages 12 and 13 are broadly those set before residents at the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meetings and at the open weekend, where they were broadly supported by an overwhelming majority of residents. However, the text clearly envisages some new development but the draft Plan makes no provision for it and as such it fundamentally fails in one of its primary tasks.	Reject	A NP does not have to allocate sites. The LNP allows suitable sites to come forward.	None
208	Resident	Full	General	Category A1.	Design Principles/Policy	No	Policy A1 Design & Development: Again, by failing to make any development allocation the draft policy has become quite generic rather than specifying positively where development would be acceptable any where it would it would not be acceptable (sic). Within and adjoining the Linton conservation and its few listed buildings and other important buildings, setting is as important as character and appearance and it should be recognised and safeguarded. Maintaining space between buildings is important as is the massing and proportion of buildings, but the Plan needs to be more prescriptive as to what it would and would not consider acceptable.	Accept	Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England. Policy A1 and A2.	Recognising and reinforcing the distinct local character (as set out within the Character Assessment at Appendix 1) in relation to height, scale, spacing, layout, orientation, design and materials of buildings. The use of vernacular detailing is encouraged.
209	Resident	Full	General	Category A2.	Design Principles/Policy	No	Design of Extensions: Extensions needs to be subservient in scale to the original structure to which they attach and their design and material form should be complementary though not necessarily replicating the original.	Accept	Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England. Policy A1 and A2.	are complimentary to the host building but subservient to it

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
210	Resident	Full	General	Category B. Objective 1 and 2.	Des. Principles/Policy	Category B. Objective 1 and 2.	No	Category B: New Housing Development. Objectives: Objectives 1 and 2 on page 21 clearly envisage new housing development taking place within Linton over the course of the 20-year plan period, which is supported. However, the Plan then dismisses all nine sites that were considered potentially suitable for development for a variety of different reasons, even though some sites, particularly site 10 at Green Lane, received a degree of public support amongst local residents at the Steering Groups and open weekend. By refusing to consider any potential variation to the Green Belt boundary that surrounds Linton, other than suggesting that The Ridge site now be included within Green Belt land, the Plan's policies effectively conflict with the stated objectives by failing to make any sort of provision that could	Reject	A NP cannot allocate Green Belt and does not have to identify any housing sites. The LNP is defining criteria for sites that may come forward in the future.	None
211	Resident	Full	General	Para. 87.	Gen. Negative	Para. 87. Gen. Negative	No	The Memorial Hall Trustees do not have "insurmountable concerns over the impact on the Memorial Hall" that could not be overcome. The current Trustees opposition is based on an erroneous and misguided interpretation of the law and could be open to challenge through the arbitration of The Charity Commissioners should a majority of residents be supportive towards small-scale, local needs development taking place on an unconstrained part of Green Lane land, as recognised at Paragraph 88 and 89 of the draft plan.	Accept	A review of text required and delete 'insurmountable'	Access would need the permission of the trustees to the Linton Memorial Hall, and civil engineering works. After consultation the current Trustees did not support the development proposals. The consent of the Tennis Club Trustees would also be required. The site is partly Zone 2 flood plain
212	Resident	Full	General	Policy B1.	Gen. Negative	Policy B1. Gen. Negative	No	Policy B1. The first half of the draft policy is generally supported in terms of scale of any new development but the second part needs, in our opinion, to be revised slightly, so that it reflects the pattern and form of surrounding developments (s), ensures accessibility to village services, community facilities and bus stops (as stated at Policy B3) and does not extend the village into "open countryside", rather than "the surrounding countryside", which could effectively rule out any and all edge of settlement development no matter how accessible it might be and how well related it might be to neighbouring development.	Accept	Policy B1 text to be revised.	Development will be supported where it is small-scale (10 or less units), does not extend the village into open countryside, reflects the pattern and form of surrounding development and is in a sustainable location.
213	Resident	Full	General	Site 10 - Green Lane	Gen. Positive	Site 10 - Green Lane	Yes	A small amount of development upon this site, outside of the area constrained by Flood Zone 2, would accord generally with draft Policies B3 and B4, which are supported and could also be compatible with draft policy B5, which is also supported.	Accept	This site is green belt and cannot be allocated.	None

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Documentation Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
214	Resident	Full	General	Category C: Village Facilities...	Asset	Village	No	Policy C1: No mention has been made in this draft policy to the established commercial livery in Green Lane, immediately behind Linton Tennis Club and The Memorial Hall, which is an error. During the last two years when the Neighbourhood Plan has been debated and the landowner has made this site available as a potential development allocation site, as he had been encouraged to believe that the village and it's residents might be supportive of some development on a part of the land in exchange for the remainder being made available for wider community use and benefit. However, if the majority of the village residents now wish to effectively prevent any further development from occurring in Linton, the landowner would wish to recommence his commercial livery business or even possibly sell the land to another commercial operator. In such circumstances, vehicular access to the site is already established and secured by Deed along the bye way of Green Lane and the policy ought to reflect that, in the same way that it has acknowledged all the other commercial, community and recreational uses that exist in Linton.	Reject	We accept this land could return to it's previous use as an operating business (a livery). This is supported by the LNP (Pol F1).	None
215	Resident	Full	General	Category F: Local Economy	Asset	Village	No	Para. 135: The table attached at paragraph 135 fails to acknowledge the existing commercial livery in Green Lane, which could recommence operation at any time. A small change should be included in the Plan, similar to that requested in relation to Category C and draft policy C1.	Reject	In the village survey this was not identified as an existing business and therefore this could not be included in this list.	None
216	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive		Yes	I think your lack of response simply reflects the quality of the work you have done on this project, thereby reducing the need for the rest of us to comment.	Accept		None
217	Resident	Full	General	None	Drafting		Yes	In para 118 of the full document you refer to Linton Common as being "unmade private road". Although Private it should not be unmade.	Accept	Revision of text required	• Linton Common is a private road, and tarmacadam footpath;
218	Resident	Full	General	None	Highways		Yes	With the exception of one householder from Linton Road to the footpath to Trip Lane the remainder refuse to fulfill their responsibility to maintain their part of the Common. This as because they use the pot holes to act as speed calmers. Those of us from the footpath to Linton Grange, having exhausted avenues of help such as local councillors, Highway Authority etc. and continuing to suffer damage to vehicle tyres, wheels and suspension paid for repairs to be effected. This was only partially successful given the legal position whereby we could only repair without any element of improvement. We have pointed out to councillors and others that this stretch of road is in fact a public footpath which attracts a number of walkers who might well suffer injury should they fall. Unfortunately no-one of influence cared. We are simply left with an unsightly image of this part of the	Accept	There is a requirement for suitable maintenance of Linton Common to achieve safe pedestrian access.	The Highways Assessment recognised pedestrian access along Main Street towards Collingham as a significant hazard. A focus group was established to consider this specific problem and concluded that practicable alternatives to satisfactorily cater for pedestrians and vehicles along this route did not exist. The conclusion is that pedestrians should be encouraged by signage to use Stammergate Lane.

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
219	Resident	Full	General	None	Irrelevant	na	na	<p>I am sending these comments to you as I am unable to access the comment form on the Linton Village website.</p> <p>Thank you for inviting the Leeds Local Access Forum (LLAF) to comment on the Neighbourhood Plan Pre-submission draft.</p> <p>As the consultation period falls between meetings of the LLAF, it has not been possible for the LLAF to formally consider the document. However, I have circulated the information to Forum members who may wish to respond as individuals. In the same way I submit the following comments.</p>	Accept		None
220	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Drafting	Yes	Yes	<p>These comments related to Section 14 Category D Footpaths, Objective 5 and 6.</p> <p>The 2 objectives are clearly stated:</p> <p>5. To improve the highways through the village and to develop a safer route for pedestrians from Linton to Wetherby and Collingham.</p> <p>6. To improve the existing footpath network by creating new footpaths and cycleways to extend connectivity and improve access to the surrounding rural countryside. (I would suggest changing cycleways to bridleways).</p>	Accept	Revise text of Objectives 5 and 6	6. To improve the existing public rights of way network by creating new footpaths and bridleways to extend connectivity and improve access to the surrounding rural countryside.
221	Non-resident	Full	Specific	Objective 5	Drafting	Yes	Yes	<p>However, the text that follows, in it's loose use of the word footpath and occasionally footway, does not clearly make a distinction between the 2 objectives.</p> <p>Objective 5 is concerned with creating new footways (places where pedestrians can walk alongside the highway) or improving existing ones. I would recommend that "footway" is used in this context. For example on page 36 should be "Kiln Hill footway".</p>	Accept	Revise text of Objectives 5 and 6	Objective 6. To improve the existing public rights of way network by creating new footpaths and bridleways to extend connectivity and improve access to the surrounding countryside.
222	Non-resident	Full	Specific	Objective 6	Drafting	Yes	Yes	<p>Objective 6 is concerned with the footpaths in the surrounding countryside. I would suggest that the phrase "the existing footpath network" is replaced with "the existing public rights of way network". Public rights of way (PROW) include footpaths, public bridleways and public byways, all of which are present in the village, and are protected by law by the Highways Act.</p> <p>I would be helpful if there were 2 discrete sections - one dealing with footways and another covering the surrounding countryside.</p>	Accept	Revise text of Objectives 5 and 6	Objective 6. To improve the existing public rights of way network by creating new footpaths and bridleways to extend connectivity and improve access to the surrounding countryside.
223	Non-resident	Full	Specific	Map 7	Drafting	Yes	Yes	<p>May I also suggest that it would be helpful to base Map 7, which, as it stands, I feel is not very clear, on the Definitive Map, a copy of which which you should be able to obtain from Leeds City Council's PROW Section (contact Bob Buckenham bob.buckenham@leeds.gov.uk). The map will show what public rights of way already exist and their status (footpath, bridleway or byway), and also which other routes that may have higher rights. The map could then be annotated with the aspirational routes described in the text.</p>	Accept	Map to be changed - and requested	

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Docu ment Refer ence	Catego ry (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
224	Non-resident	Full	Specific	Policy D1.	Drafting	Yes	I support Policy D1. I also support the projects that will help deliver the vision. In particular, the provision of a footway on Kiln Hill will be of great benefit of walkers on the Ebor Way and villages alike, and the proposed link between Public Footpath Collingham 18 and Northgate Lane, as an example of creating new access links to the countryside as well as circular routes. I hope you find these comments helpful. I am taking this opportunity to copy this email to Bob Buckenham, Public Rights of Way Manager	Accept		None	
225	Non-resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Both East Keswick and Bardsey Parish Councils consider this an excellent document and hope that it passes all the tests to be accepted as a Neighbourhood Plan.	Accept		None	
226	Landowner	Full	General	None	Irrelevant	No	Dear Sirs, Thank you for your email. The whole nation desperately needs new housing... why are the Linton DC wishing to keep "their" village an "exclusive enclave"? Even the Princes Royal says every village in the country should provide 10 new dwellings! Two government planning experts deemed the site a future potential residential development... and that was years ago! I am at a loss to understand why such a resourceful DC... made up of property developers... lawyers... consultants etc. are prompting a NP that does not yet accord with an unknown future 'core strategy'?	Reject	The LNP will not be submitted for independent examination until after the LCC Core Strategy is ratified.	None	
227	Landowner	Full	General	None	Gen. Negative	No	In regard to their concerns about the PAS site known as the 'RIDGE' ... I understand that Kebbells Homes have adequately addressed every concern in their recently lodged planning application.	Reject	See Policy B2.	None	
227	Landowner	Full	General	None	Gen. Negative	No	In regard to the whole Linton NP process... I believe the DC have failed in their duty to properly engage with the community from the very beginning... The purpose of undertaking community engagement is to accurately inform it's residents ... the failure to do this is well documented in their own minutes. They have failed in the very Basic Conditions of openness and transparency ... ignored the existing Evidence Based and breached their own constitution on many occasions.. intimidation.. predetermined prejudice and discrimination have no place in the drafting of a NP under the Localism Act... it's ultimately legality will be robustly challenged. Kind Regards, Three Generations Linton Village Stakeholder, Steering Group Member. PS. It was recently suggested by the DC chairman that we could gift the land to the Village! How many of the DC would gift me their lifetime	Reject	The consultation process is well documented.	None	
228	Landowner	Full	General	None	Gen. Negative	No	I wish to state that I believe the plan has no status whatsoever and is premature pending approval of the Leeds local plan core strategy and site allocation plan, which are a pre-requisite context before any neighbourhood plan could be advanced.	Reject	See 226.	None	

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment or Specific Reference	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
229	Landowner	Full	Specific	12.3 and 12.4	Gen. Negative	Gen. Negative	No	I object to sections 12.3 and 12.4 of the Draft Plan. I believe, and can provide evidence to show, that these sections are based on a pre-determined policy pushed through by members of the Drafting Committee and therefore should be removed from the Plan. It is clear that there is a need for some new housing growth in the village and as an identified PAS site, our land is appropriate to come forward now, hence the planning application recently submitted by Kebbell Homes.	Reject	The consultation process is well documented.	None
230	Landowner	Full	Specific	12.3	Gen. Negative	Gen. Negative	No	In section 12,3, 93 it states "The subsequent SG meeting confirmed this opinion and agreed to investigate returning the whole site to Green Belt" - I wish to state that I was banned by the Drafting Committee from attending the Steering Group meeting on the 3rd July, 2013 (Please see copy of my email to and from Patrick Kirk and email response from Jill Bolton), which is referred to in the above statement and which I believe is contrary to the Terms of Reference (Please see attached copy). As I was discriminated against by the Drafting Committee, I was unable to voice my opinion at these important SG decision making meeting in regards to this issue and I believe that the process was undemocratic and was not in line with the guidelines of	Reject	The meeting was for residents only.	None
231	Landowner	Full	Specific	12.3	Site Comment	Site Comment	No	In section 12.3, 92 it states 'In addition, site specific problems make the Ridge unsuitable for development. These include: The site occupies a prominent ridgeline and extends beyond the village built area. If developed it would impact upon country side views and would be an unacceptable extension to the countryside. These statements clearly ignore and do not take into account the findings of the two UDP Government Inspector's reports, one being in 2000 and the other in 2005 (see copy inspectors report).	Reject	Paragraph 92 reflect the outcome of the consultation process.	None
232	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Gen. Negative	Gen. Negative	No	We strongly disagree that Riverside Nursery has Community Value. The massive juggernauts thuner up and down the narrow lane which bisects the gardens in Linton Common, churning up the road and creating potholes, danger and noise. When the nursery was selling plants it grew, that was fine. Now that it is importing millions of plants from the continent, it has become a real nuisance. The access is not suitable for the way the nursery is being developed. (20/07/2011)	Accept	It is now proposed that businesses should only be considered an Asset of Community Value if they provide a social function. Therefore it is proposed that Riverside Nursery is removed from ACV.	None
233	Non-resident	Full	Specific	None	Gen. Positive	Gen. Positive	Yes	I am the membership secretary of the Wetherby & District Branch of the Ramblers Association. I have read some part of the Linton Development plan in detail and skipped over other bits but just wanted to say, maybe understandably, that really my main interest relates to no 6 of the objectives covering footpaths. As our group quite often walk through and near Linton we would also be keen to see the footpath network maintained and wherever possible increased for us to use. Good luck with the plan	Accept		None

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment or Specific Reference	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
234	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Gen.	Positive	Yes	I am in support of the plan, however I have a few specific points to make:	Accept		None
235	Resident	Full	Specific	Policy A1	Des. Principles/Policy		Yes	Policy A1. all the points I agree with particularly the use of materials to maintain the appearance of the village.	Accept		None
236	Resident	Full	Specific	Policy 1B	Des. Principles/Policy		Yes	Policy 1B. Small scale development is not clear. Can we specify a number e.g. less than 10 and there are not multiples of 10 permitted?	Accept	Small scale development needs more clarity.	Development will be supported where it is small-scale (10 or less units), does not extend the village into open countryside, reflects the pattern and form of surrounding development and is in a sustainable location.
237	Resident	Full	Specific	Policy B4	Highways		Yes	Policy B4. Agree. We live just up Trip Lane and see how problematic the use of the junction already is. It is not helped to traffic to the hotel which tends to be large vans and trucks in a hurry. Futher traffic would make residents more miserable as they struggle to give way to others.	Accept		None
238	Resident	Full	Specific	Policy B5	Des. Principles/Policy		Yes	Policy B5. The village does not have facilities for older people who need to walk to the shops to get a paper or milk. The idea that people will down-size and stay in Linton in their advanced years doesn't fit due to lack of facilities. People who have moved from the village tend to choose central Wetherby where they get comnanv and facilities in abundance.	Reject	The Village Survey October 2012 indicated a desire for residents to stay in Linton and downsize.	None
239	Resident	Full	Specific	Policy D1	Highways		Yes	Policy D1. My husband would like a cycle path from Collingham to Wetherby that uses the old railway line and would allow traffic free cycling.	Reject	Not viable	None
240	Resident	Full	Specific	Policy E1/E2	Open space		Yes	We have discussed the use of the green space adjacent to the tennis courts at our Memorial Hall meetings. The committee appears to be broadly in support of this although would not want the area to have specific play equipment. They would prefer that the area be used for ball games or picnics for example.	Accept	Further consultation required with LTC and LMH	None
241	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Special Projects		Yes	Projects - I am particularly supportive of improvement to the gateways of the village. Also support for the Memorial Hall would be appreciated to help it provide better faciilities and attract new customers.	Accept		None

Unique Cmt Id	Respondent Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
242	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	na	<p>Thank you for consulting the Council on the Linton Pre-submission neighbourhood plan (2014-2029). This plan has come a long way and it's good you have reached this important milestone.</p> <p>I am writing to set out the headline comments from the Council's perspective but may I first of all congratulate you and the Linton steering group on a document that is professional and easy to read.</p> <p>I would like to suggest that we meet to discuss the detailed feedback with my colleague David Feeney, Head of Forward Planning and Implementaiton. Due to availability, it would be helpful if we coul dmeet to discss during August, if convenient.</p> <p>In terms of the plan, there are a number of points to emphasise and explain:</p> <p>Timing and risks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. While legislation does allow a neighbourhood plan to come forward in advance of the Core Strategy and Site Allocation Plan it does raise the risk of challange (perhaps from a landowner that feels that their site has not been given due consideration); 2. The draft Site Allocation Plan may propose a different approach in Linton that includes the allocation of a development site; 3. If there are insufficient sites for development in the Outer North East Housing Market Area this will only increase the above risks. 	Superseded	Superseded by formal detailed response.	None
243	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Polices	Des. Principles/Policy	na	<p>Planning Policies</p> <p>A number of the policies put forward in the draft plan are considered to be appropriate more or less as they are (b3, d1)</p>	Superseded	Superseded by formal details response.	None
244	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Polices	Des. Principles/Policy	na	<p>whilst others (e1, e2) could benefit from further work.</p>	Superseded	Superseded by formal detailed response.	None
245	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Polices	Des. Principles/Policy	na	<p>Policy B2 is premature in advance of the draft Site Allocations Plan</p>	Superseded	Superseded by formal detailed response.	None

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
246	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policies	Des. Principles/Policy		na	and the remainder (a1, A2, A3, b1, f1, F21) raise issues regarding their general conformity with the NPPF or the local Development Plan. As they are currently drafted, they are not considered to be in general conformity.	Superseded	Superseded by formal details response.	None
247	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive		Yes	<p>I am responding to a call from Jill earlier today, following the email from Brian on Sunday, and fortunately it was Club Night tonight which give Gill, Brian and I, 3 Members of the Committee including 2 Trustees, a chance to talk about the situation we have with the LNP and the land at the North end of the courts, I will speak to Roger Limbert the 3rd Trustee as soon as possible.</p> <p>First I would like to say the Drafting Committee and Steering Group have done a superb job of completing a draft of a particularly challenging and complex subject that really does the village proud. I am sure everyone in the village will be unanimous in their appreciation of the hard work that has been done to get the draft to this stage.</p>	Further Action	Further consultation required with LTC and LMH	
248	Resident	Full	Specific	Page 37 Map 8	Drafting		Yes	<p>To establish the position of the land belonging to the Tennis Club, on page 37 Map 8 shows a plan of the Courts but this is not accurate, as it shows a map with 2 categories on it, 'Local Green Space' and 'Outdoor Sports Provision'. These categories are misleading. To be accurate, The land to the North of the Tennis Club and the land to the South of the Tennis Club and strip along the East side and a triangle to the West side should be marked as 'Protected Green Space' which is what they are, and the Courts, and the Club House, marked as outdoor Sports Provision. Furthermore, the land to the North of the courts is part owned by the Tennis Club and part owned by Linton Village Hall but no boundary is indicated. A further inaccuracy exists because the Map is called Map 8 Proposed additional amenity space leaving the reader to have to link Proposed additional amenity space with Local Green Space.</p> <p>What I am saying is this map and descriptions are misleading and presumptuous as they refer to 'Proposed' whilst we are a long</p>	Further Action	Further consultation required with LTC and LMH and assess accuracy of map and text changes.	The Trustees of both Linton Memorial Hall and Linton Tennis Club have now discussed the possibility of their land being used as amenity space. They have agreed in principle that it should be so used, and that the project should be pursued by Linton Delivery Committee (see section 18) . The Parish Council has also agreed in principle to fund the maintenance costs for its upkeep.

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
249	Resident	Full	Specific	Page 37	Open space	No	<p>Furthermore, on Page 37 it states;</p> <p>123. The tennis courts and land surrounding Linton Memorial Hall are already Protected Green Space. (N1 Protected Green Space in the UDP and SAP, June 2013 - proposed Outdoors Sports Provision Plan 6.5B). There is a small area of land adjacent to the Linton Tennis Club and Linton Memorial Hall, which is owned partly by the Trustees of the Memorial Hall and partly by the Trustees of Tennis Club.</p> <p>This is correct. However, it goes on to say.</p> <p>This has been identified as possible additional amenity spaces, which could in future be used for village events and recreation and is show on Map 8 below. This is listed as high priority in the Project Priorities List (see Section 18) To facilitate this project, the area of land should be designated Local Green Space.</p> <p>I am afraid this statement is the one the Tennis Committee disagree with. It would be impossible to play Tennis satisfactorily with a space which is used for Village Events or Recreation directly in view of the Player Playing North. This is why at Wimbledon and other tennis clubs the area to the end of the courts has no low level / eye level seating.</p>	Further Action	Further consultation required with LTC and LMH	The Trustees of both Linton Memorial Hall and Linton Tennis Club have now discussed the possibility of their land being used as amenity space. They have agreed in principle that it should be so used, and that the project should be pursued by Linton Delivery Committee (see section 18) . The Parish Council has also agreed in principle to fund the maintenance costs for its upkeep.	
250	Resident	Full	Specific	Page 44	Open space	No	<p>Also referring to page 44 item 18. PROJECTS FOR LINTON we cannot agree to section 4. 'Create additional amenity space in the heart of the village possibly with seating areas (see Map 8). Policy Number E2' because Additional seating will bring contention between Green Space and Tennis Playing and may also attract the wrong people to loiter in the area and potentially cause damage.</p> <p>We would prefer to see additional seating on the West side of the courts, where there is already one seat.</p>	Further Action	Further consultation required with LTC and LMH	The Trustees of both Linton Memorial Hall and Linton Tennis Club have now discussed the possibility of their land being used as amenity space. They have agreed in principle that it should be so used, and that the project should be pursued by Linton Delivery Committee (see section 18) . The Parish Council has also agreed in principle to fund the maintenance costs for its upkeep.	
251	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Open space	No	<p>On page 47 Item 20. APPENDIX 1: GREEN SPACE AVAILABLE IN LINTON we cannot agree to the Size and Accessibility Comment 'At the heart of Linton' and this neither indicates size or Accessibility, only location. A more appropriate comment would be 'very small' or 'less than an Acre' and 'Accessible with the permission of the Tennis Club'.</p>	Further Action	Further consultation required with LTC and LMH	Text in section amended to reflect latest consultations	
252	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Open space	No	<p>Brian has heard, verbally only, in one of the meetings about a proposal to screen the area with a green mesh, again whilst this is not mentioned in the document it is however a verbal 'proposal' which the Club is against. This is what Brian refers to in his email.</p>	Accept		Text in section amended to reflect latest consultations	
253	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Open space	No	<p>Therefore I believe we are fulfilling the requirements of the LNP by proposing that the land to the North of the courts remains categorised as Protected Green Space' and remains in the form that it is currently in, and is available for the Village to use for Events with the agreement of the Committee, which we have done in the past (Jubilee and Villaege Fate).</p>	Further Action	Further consultation required with LTC and LMH	Text in section amended to reflect latest consultations	

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
254	Resident	Full	Specific	Table 126 Page 38	Open space		No	I am sorry if the Table 126 on page 38 'Local green Space' has the local significance 'Owned by Trustees of the Linton Memorial Hall and Trustees of Linton Tennis Club in excess of 50 years. Vital to Open Space project' however we believe that the Protected Green Space will serve the purpose of the Open Space project just as adequately.	Further Action	Further consultation required with LTC and LMH	Text in section amended to reflect latest consultations
255	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Des.	Positive	Yes	A formal note to say that we are totally in support of the draft LNP.	Accept		None
256	Resident	Full	Specific	Principles/Policy	Principles/Policy		Yes	We would like to see a re-instatement of the Guiding Principles. Regards.	Accept	GPs to be added to Section 9	Done
257	Resident	Full	General	A2 B2	Des. Principles/Policy		Yes	Strongly agree with all the policies suggested, particularly A2 and B2. I feel the Ridge site would be particularly damaging to the open ridge lines in Linton from a sotherly approach and create traffic issues during and after construction.	Accept		None
258	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Principles/Policy	Des. Principles/Policy		Yes	A2 will always be left wide 'subjective' interpretation by applicants, planning officials and commentators unless some form of design guide was put forward as a next step. The Homeowners design guide already exists as a national policy and could be used as a starting point to embellish the specifics of your suggested policies for Linton Villaae.	Accept	Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England. Policy A2.	No change
259	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Principles/Policy	Des. Principles/Policy		Yes	In terms of future development it is interesting to read that the number of younger families in Linton has declined in the last 10 years. Speaking as a family of three younger children there does appear to less younger kids than when we moved to the village in comparison to say Collingham. Higher house prices obviously play a part but I do think Linton being peceived as an older residential area may put younger families off locating here. Inevitably applications will be made in the village over the next plan cycle, welcome of not; to keep vibrancy and a mix of ages in the village I would suggest a policy specifically seeking developments including lower cost family housing.	Reject	Core strategy covers the need for affordable housing.	None
260	Resident	Summary	General	None	Gen. Positive		Yes	A very well prepared and carefully proposed document. The Drafting Committee are to be congratulated for the time and effort they have put into constructing a well thought out and colourful Neighbourhood Plan.	Accept		None
261	Resident	Summary	Specific	None	Footpaths		Yes	We agree with the proposed footpaths particularly those giving safe passage to pedestrians along Linton towards Wetherby.	Accept		None
262	Resident	Summary	Specific	A1	Des. Principles/Policy		Yes	Fully agree.	Accept		None
263	Resident	Summary	Specific	A2	Des. Principles/Policy		Yes	Fully agree	Accept		None

Unique Id	Comment Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
264	Resident	Summary	Specific	A3	Des. Principles/Policy	No	Do not see how this can be made to work. There is already a process for anyone to comment on a Planning Proposal. Seems to imply that if an applicant can drum up enough support from Neighbours the application will be viewed favourably - not a good idea.	Reject	The community involvement has been agreed by the SG, but accept that the Policy text needs amending.	Planning applications for development of more than 1 new property or for a change of use shall be accompanied by a Statement of Community Involvement. This statement must include:
265	Resident	Summary	Specific	B1/B2	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	Agree	Accept		None
266	Resident	Summary	Specific	B3	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	Somewhert "tongue in cheek" as the one bus per hour through the village is hardly ever packed with local residents!	Accept		None
267	Resident	Summary	Specific	B4	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	Agree	Accept		None
268	Resident	Summary	Specific	B5	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	Fully agree	Accept		None
269	Resident	Summary	Specific	c1	Des. Principles/Policy	na	I object strongly to the term "Garden Centre" with regard to Riverside Nursery. It most definitely does not have consent to trade as a garden centre. Any application to extend the business further would be objected to by most of the residents along the common. It certainly does nothing to enhance the character of the conservation area as witnessed by the horders of vehicles and articulated lorries using the common and the quantities of litter they leave behind	Accept	Text regarding 'garden centre' to be amended	Removed from the table and Policy
270	Resident	Summary	Specific	d1	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	Agree	Accept		None
271	Resident	Summary	Specific	e1/e2	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	Agree	Accept		None
272	Resident	Summary	Specific	F1	Des. Principles/Policy	na	See "C1" comment above.	Accept	Riverside Nursery is a business so qualifies under F1 but company title to be changed in text	Removed from the table and Policy
273	Resident	Summary	Specific	F2	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	Any improvement in broadband service would be good.	Accept	Linton now has fibre optic facilities.	None

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Docu ment Refer ence	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
274	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Highways	Yes	<p>Thank you for the email of 11 June 2014 consulting The Coal Authority on the above.</p> <p>The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body which works to protect the public and the environment on coal mining areas.....</p> <p>As you will be aware the Collingham and Linton parish area is outside of the defined coalfield and therefore The Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>... it will not be necessary for the Collingham and Linton Parish Council to provide The Coal Authority with any future drafts or updates to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan....</p>	Accept	None	
275	Business Owner/Manager	Summary	Specific	None	A1	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	The new speed limit of 30 mph through Linton is a good move for pedestrians, home owners and gives more time for cars/ buses etc. to overtake cyclists.	Accept	None	
276	Business Owner/Manager	Summary	Specific	A1	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	I welcome the planning process for the future especially: A1 Design and Development	Accept		None	
277	Business Owner/Manager	Summary	Specific	A3	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	Community Involvement I hope that these principles can be applied to "clean up" the western end of Linton Common from the blot on the hillside left by the developer who is trying to build a very ugly house/barn.	Accept	Outside the LNP remit	None	
278	Business Owner/Manager	Summary	Specific	F2	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	Improvements to existing broadband is essential if we are to "keep up" with change.	Accept	Linton now has fibre optic facilities.	None	
279	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I am impressed with the detail in the plan and I don't think any amendments need to be made.	Accept		None	
280	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I don't think that the draft plan needs any amendments and think that the drafting committee have done a fantastic job in attempting to protect our interests. Well done indeed. With sincere thanks.	Accept		None	
281	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	We think all appropriate matters have been well covered in this draft document and hope it is successful in obtaining all the necessary approvals.	Accept		None	
282	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I congratulate the LNP Drafting committee on the draft Neighbourhood plan and it has my full support.	Accept		None	

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment or Specific	Docu ment Refer ence	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
283	Resident	Full	Specific	82	Gen. Positive	Yes	I do feel that the draft does not fully emphasise the time and effort undertaken on two points. 1. There could be a paragraph or appendix outlining the dates and quantity of meetings undertaken by the Drafting Committee and Steering Group etc. which would record the time and effort taken by those involved.	Accept	This will be covered in the Consultation Statement	None	
284	Resident	Full	Specific	86	Gen. Positive	Yes	The report does not give enough emphasis to the consideration that committee's gave to the Landowners and Developers. For example, they attended several Steering Group Meetings, spoke at length on their SHLAA sites to villagers and presented their plans and attended the Open Days. Thank you very much for the report which clearly has been well researched and taken a lot of hard work. We note the plan and will be eager to hear if it is adopted. Kind regards...	Accept	Consider amendments to text	In particular meetings took place with all site owners/agents, many of whom attended SG meetings and took opportunity to make presentations.	
285	Non-resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Thank you very much for the report which clearly has been well researched and taken a lot of hard work. We note the plan and will be eager to hear if it is adopted. Kind regards...	Accept		None	
286	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	na	Purposely left blank - see entry at 491	Accept	Purposely left blank - see 491	None	
287	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I have no further comments to make with regard to the documents presented.	Accept		None	
288	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Fully supportive of the proposals contained within the Linton Neighbourhood Plan.	Accept		None	
289	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Congratulations on producing such a well argued and presented plan.	Accept		None	
290	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	No	I just wonder whether those receiving the plan might summarise it as 'The LNP seeks to preserve and enhance the unique character of the village and to resist any further development beyond that already approved' Are you comfortable with the unintended consequences of such an interpretation?	Reject	The plan provides guidelines to support appropriate development.	None	
291	Resident	Full	Specific	Page 13. Objective 1	Gen. Positive	Yes	One query re objective 1 on page 13. This does not seem to make sense.	Accept	Reword for improved grammar.	To ensure carefully and sensitively designed development that protects and enriches the landscape and built setting throughout the Neighbourhood Area.	
292	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Highways	Yes	Finally you might add a paragraph noting that there have been some welcome developments even as the plan was being prepared. In particular the extended 30 mph zone and the availability of fibre optics for fast broadband.	Accept	Add to text	During the time taken to prepare this Plan there have been some pleasing developments, namely, the introduction of a 30 MPH speed limit along Linton Lane, in place of the previous 40 MPH limit and the introduction of fibre optic connections producing higher broadband speeds in parts of Linton.	
293	Resident	Summary	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I am very impressed with the Plan. It covers all important aspects.	Accept		None	
294	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Highways	Yes	I am particularly pleased to read that the hazard at the junction of Trip Lane/Main Street has been identified.	Accept		None	

Unique Id	Cmt	Respondent Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
295	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I wholeheartedly support this plan.	Accept		None	
296	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I think the Plan is thoughtful and considered both in the requirements for any future development of housing and the protection of housing and the protection & enhancement of our beautiful village and surrounding countryside.	Accept		None	
297	Resident	Full	General	None	Footpaths	Yes	I am particularly pleased with the plans for better/additional footpaths in the locality	Accept		None	
298	Resident	Full	General	None	Open space	Yes	I am particularly pleased with ...and the proposal for a community space near the tennis courts.	Accept		None	
299	Resident	Full	Specific	Polices	Gen. Positive	Yes	I wholeheartedly support this plan.	Accept		None	
300	Resident	Summary	Specific	D1	Footpaths	Yes	After 40+ years I would appreciate a safe footpath to Wetherby.	Accept		None	
301	Resident	Summary	Specific	E1	Open space	Yes	Additional green space would be very welcome.	Accept		None	
302	Resident	Summary	Specific	Polices	Gen. Positive	Yes	Altogether a very impressive document. I congratulate the committee.	Accept		None	
303	Resident	Summary	Specific	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	The draft is comprehensive and well presented.	Accept		None	
304	Resident	Summary	Specific	None	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	I ask has any consideration been given to the likely requirement for affordable housing to be included in any future planning application for multiple units. And what the impact / consequences of any such requirement would be?	Accept	Will be considered as part of any multiple unit planning application in accordance with the core strategy.	None	
305	Resident	Summary	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Thank you very much for the preparing such a positive and useful Neighbourhood Plan.	Accept		None	
306	Resident	Full	Specific	Page 3	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	We agree with the objectives raised in the consultation plan on page 3 of the summary of the pre-submission plan.	Accept		None	
307	Resident	Full	General	None	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	We do not suggest any alterations to these objectives as we think the document states these objectives very well.	Accept		None	
308	Resident	Full	Specific	D1	Footpaths	Yes	We especially approve of the improvements to footpaths as listed on page 9 of the summary document (Policy D1)	Accept		None	
309	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I feel the document has captured & presented the views of the community very accurately.	Accept		None	
310	Resident	Summary	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	My comments refer to the Summary version of the plan.	Accept		None	
							We agree in principle to the majority of the proposals within the plan however, there is one aspect which we disagree				

Unique Cmt Id	Respondent Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
311	Resident	Summary	Specific	Policy B4	Highways	No	<p>under section Policy B4 - Development Criteria - Highways. It is mentioned within the area of 'Projects to help deliver our vision' the proposal to introduce a 20 mph limit in Main St. We are not in favour of this proposal as we feel that Main Steet is not an area where traffic speed is an issue. Zones of 20 mph should be restricted to areas where there is a school or other such environment that requires this necessity. I do appretiate that is a Montesorri nursery in the Village Hall but this is set back from the road and appears to have no impact on the general traffic flow. In our view, Main Street has natural restrictions for traffic by way of sharp bends and limited width of the road.</p> <p>I do hope that our comments will be considered along with others that have been submitted, so that all residents views are reflected in the plan.</p>	Reject	Village Survey October 2012 confirmed 76% in favour of 20mph.	None
312	Resident	Summary	Specific	D1	Footpaths	Yes	<p>The only aspect of the Plan we wish to comment on relates to policy D1 concerning the construction of a footpath North of Kiln Hill to Linton Memorial Hall.</p> <p>We have lived in Springwell House (adjacent to Kiln Hill) for over 20 years and during that time we have always maintained the grass verge on which the proposed footpath is to be located. We were not certain as to whom this land belongs but during our occupancy, there are certainly been no effort by the Council to maintain it.</p>	Accept		None
313	Resident	Summary	Specific	D1	Footpaths	No	<p>Whilst we have no objection in principle to the establishment of a crossing relates to the proposed crossing point from one side of Linton Lane to the other, which is directly adjacent to our property and is likely to infringe on our privacy. Users of the footpath are likley to converge very close to the window of our sitting room.</p> <p>For the reason we must object to the siting of the crossing point and request that an alternative be considered</p>	Reject	This crossing is considered the safest point due to sight lines.	None

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment or Specific	Docu ment Refer ence	Cetegory (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
314	Resident		Summary	Specific	C1	Highways	Yes	<p>I have reviewed the summary version of the pre submission draft.</p> <p>A point of concern lies in Category C policy C1 ref Riverside Nursery. It states "Any measure to improve these facilities and services for the benefit of the residents of Linton will be supported."</p> <p>We already experience a high volume of traffic many large articulated lorries using the Common (a private road) particularly in Spring to access the Nursery. This does not accord with the statement in Category B Policy B4. "Control HGV access through Linton".</p> <p>Additionally, we also experience a high volume of car traffic using the Common to reach the Nursery dueing certain week days in Summer.</p> <p>As you would imagine the volume of traffic to the Nursery does impact on our enjoyment of our property and living in Linton. Additionally, we have to maintain the Common road surface outside our property, by filling in the potholes created by passing traffic.</p>	Accept	Highways issues would need to be considered for any further business development. See 232. With regard to HGV access 16.1 will be updated appropriately.	The aim of the LNP, therefore, is to maintain and strengthen the present local economy and the businesses active in it. These are: various agricultural activities, The Windmill Inn, Riverside Plant Nursery, Montessori Nursery School and Wetherby Golf Club. These businesses are all appropriate to the scale and setting of Linton and the support through this Plan is caveated by the need to ensure the existing scale is maintained. Residents have expressed, for example, concern that if the businesses were allowed to expand unchecked then this would be likely to have inappropriate traffic impact on Linton.
315	Resident		Summary	Specific	F1	Des. Principles/ Policy	Yes	<p>Consequently, I am also not comfortable with the statement made in category F, Policy F1 ref Local Business Support as it relates to the Nursery.</p> <p>Basically any proposal which may have the effect of increasing vehicular traffic along the Common, will impact upon residents living on Linton Common. Sincerely, Bruce Turnbull.</p>	Accept	See 314 above.	The aim of the LNP, therefore, is to maintain and strengthen the present local economy and the businesses active in it. These are: various agricultural activities, The Windmill Inn, Riverside Plant Nursery, Montessori Nursery School and Wetherby Golf Club. These businesses are all appropriate to the scale and setting of Linton and the support through this Plan is caveated by the need to ensure the existing scale is maintained. Residents have expressed, for example, concern that if the businesses were allowed to expand unchecked then this would be likely to have inappropriate noise and traffic impact on Linton.
316	Resident		Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	<p>Firstly, I would like to personally thank everyone involved in producing this draft Neighbourhood Plan. It is obvious to me that a great deal of thought, planning and consultation within the village community (and externally) has taken place and I do not feel the plan represents the beliefs and will of a quorum of people who live/work within Linton Village and our community.</p> <p>Overall, I personally think that the neighbourhood plan represents a really positive vision for the future improvement and regeneration of Linton Village. Additional comments below</p>	Accept		None
317	Resident		Full	Specific	B4. 12.10	Highways	Yes	<p>I personally, strongly agree with extending the 30 mph speed limit all the way up Northgate Lane. Improvement of pathways for access to the residential properties would also be welcome. The upper part of Northgate Lane towards Sicklinghall is currently a national speed limit zone and I regularly see cars travelling here at 60 mph. As such the upper part of Northgate lane is not currently a safe place to walk</p>	Accept		None
318	Resident		Full	Specific	B2. 12.3 12.5	Site Comment	Yes	<p>Protected Area of Search Site (The Ridge).</p> <p>I strongly agree with all the points made in objection to the development of the Ridge Site and Support Policy B2.</p> <p>I would support any move to return "The Ridge" to Green Belt and aericural use.</p>	Accept		None

Unique Id	Comment Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
319	Resident	Full	Specific	B2.16.4	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	Broadband speeds have increased significantly in Linton since October 2012 and I now get around 30 Mbps (via BT Infinity) which is a x15 improvement over what I was getting. This is still somewhat short of the fastest available service so I think we should still campaign for fastest speeds possible.	Accept		None
320	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Seems fine; keep new development to a minimum & maintain rural qualities/values/amenities.	Accept		None
321	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Gen. Negative	No	Oppose development to Golf Club along linton lane.	Accept		None
322	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Footpaths	Yes	Complete a good footpath along the full length of Linton Lane.	Accept		None
323	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Thank you for consulting North Yorkshire Country Council on the pre-submission Linton Neighbourhood Plan. I can confirm that the Plan does not raise any strategic issues for the County Council and we have no comments.	Accept		None
324	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I have read the proposed draft and agree with the document.	Accept		None
325	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	na	... We have concluded that we have no representation to make on this occasion. This is because the ... boundary does not encroach on the consultation zones of major hazard... does not need to be informed on the next stages in the adoption of the Neighbourhood plan.	Accept		None
326	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	The draft plan does not need any amendments.	Accept		None
327	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I am in agreement with the plan. T. Old	Accept		None
328	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	The document is well constructed and reflects the aspirations and comments expressed at the village meetings that I/we have attended. Thereby we think it forms an appropriate basis for progress.	Accept		None
329	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Happy with the content of the pre-submission draft of the Neighbourhood Plan for Linton. Congratulations and thanks to the team who prepared it.	Accept		None
330	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	No amendments required.	Accept		None
331	Resident	Summary	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	We agree with the vision and objectives proposed for the village of Linton.	Accept		None

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
332	Resident	Full	General	None	Highways	Yes	Stammergate Lane should be left as a "country lane", ideal for walkers, but to remain unsuitable for vehicles except for residential access.	Accept		None	
333	Resident	Full	General	None	Highways	Yes	Exit from the Windmill car park and Stammergate Lane is made dangerous by vehicles speeding up the hill towards the Windmill. Some form of traffic slowing or calming would make it safer - for example "speed bumps".	Reject	We propose 20 mph speed limit.	None	
334	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I have no objection to a few more houses being built in and around Linton. The proposed properties will be subject to normal planning application procedures and scrutiny and I am sure these evaluations will be robust enough to ensure the village character is maintained.	Accept		None	
335	Resident	Full	Specific	A2	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	I have no objection to dormer windows and see no need to dictate on which side of a property these should be put. See policy A2. Planning regulations and gaining permission to build will ensure the property is suitable.	Accept	Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England. Policy A2.	Removed	
336	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	I do not wish the area by the tennis courts to become a community open space. Movement and noise from this proposed area will distract tennis players, and the provision of green net screens will spoil the view currently enjoyed from the courts.	Reject	Further consultation required with LTC and LMH	None	
337	Resident	Full	General	None	Footpaths	No	I do not think there will be any benefit from creating a further footpath as proposed on map 7, to travel from Stammergate Lane turing towards the disused railway embankment till it joins the open space owned by the Linton tennis club. There is already a safe walk along Stammergate Lane with an option of crossing a property via a public right of way, to continue walking along Green lane and up to emerge on the Main Street by Linton village hall	Reject	The community feels strongly that more circular footpaths are appropriate.	None	
338	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Negative	No	Finally, no one is entitled to a view of distant horizon view for ever. Planning regulations will safeguard our village, but we must accept a growing population all wanting to live in nice houses and communities and many developments have been positive in our village bringing in some lovely new people.	Reject	The LNP can protect public views	None	

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment or Specific Reference	Docu ment	Cetegory (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
339	Resident	Full	General	None	Drafting	No	Overall the plan gives an impression that it was drafted from two different perspectives. The first which is pertinent and generally well set out focuses on LCC recognition of Linton as a rural settlement with no specific housing requirement to comply with its Core Strategy Policy H2. The second conflicting perspective, which is probably a left-over from the original SHLAA Planning Stage requiring 375 houses, seems to open doors for developers to come in with downsizing buildings and thereby produce funds for our "pet" projects so that we could subsequently be regarded as "good people", "politically correct", etc. No matter what residents might sometimes say it seems highly unlikely that anything in this context would receive genuine majority support and consequently it would be advisable to avoid the slightest open door for builders to barge through. However to define standards for renewal and replacment would of course be a different issue and therefore needs inclusion. The detailed comments set out below are larely aimed at the apparent inbalance described above. There is also an attempt to highlight the importance to the village of arable farming which is still the most significant and strategically important economic activity within our boundaries.	Reject	The LNP aims to provide guidelines for future planning applications.	Update comment on arable farming.	
340	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Highways	No	Finally I regrettably have to record that the proposals on Stammergate/Main Street do not reflect the conclusions of the sub-committee that I attended or steering committee discussions. Maybe also an opportunity is being missed to deal with the really important problem for the future of the village. This is traffic on Main Street between the Memorial Hall and the Wharfe Bridge, and ther need for a rural-style traffic calming scheme similar to that in Burn Bridge and numerous other rural villages. Changes to Stammergate Lane, which with Green Lane retain a genuine atmosphere, are not the answer.	Reject	LNP reflects the SG discussions and the output from the Stammergate Lane/Main Street Focus Group. However text to be revised to ensure clarity regarding surface improvement to exclude tarmac.	Update	
341	Resident	Full	Specific	4.28	Drafting	na	Local referendum to be organised by LCC '50% to be in favour' - 50% of what? Property owners, residents (age), those voting? It is recommended that since the 2011 census records 516 adult residents, at least 50% of this number should record 'Yes' to adoption of the final plan ie say 260 votes.	Accept	Amend text to clarify	1. If there is a favourable response to the referendum, which means more than 50% of those voting stating that they wish Leeds city Council to use the Linton Neighbourhood Plan for the consideration of planning applications, Leeds City Council must then adopt the Plan. Once it has done so, the Linton Neighbourhood Plan will become part of the statutory Local Plan for the area and becomes an important document in deciding planning applications in Linton. This legal standing differentiates this document from existing documents such as the Collingham with Linton Village Design Statement (VDS) and the Linton Conservation Area Appraisal Management Plan (CAAMP), which only have the status of non-statutory planning support documents.	
342	Resident	Full	Specific	9.1 & 9.2	Drafting	na	To ensure that further multiple housing development is prevented'. This gives the impression that we want builders to respond but it is doubtful this is a real need of residents.	Reject	Change of text would be inappropriate. The LNP is not anti development and is providing guidelines for future development.	None	

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
343	Resident	Full	Specific	9.8	Drafting	Yes	Delete or replace with 'to support and strengthen the farming activities of the area'.	Accept	Review text	The primary economic activity within the village boundaries continues to be arable farming but otherwise it is almost exclusively a residential community with just a few local services/businesses. . The vast majority of service providers (Health Centres, schools, etc.) and businesses (shops, office, petrol stations, etc.) are located close by in either Wetherby (the majority) or Collingham. To support and strengthen the farming activities, small number of local businesses and those working from home.	
344	Resident	Full	Specific	10	Drafting	Yes	Planning Policies Village can essentially stand still from a housing development viewpoint. This section needs careful revision. Needs serious consideration to avoid leaving an open goal for developers Delete - unnecessary. (sic)	Accept	The Village Survey June 2013 indicated a strong support for some small amount of development. Therefore deletion of 12.5, 12.6 and 12.7 is inappropriate See above	None	
345	Resident	Full	Specific	12.5, 12.6, 12.7	Drafting	na	Delete - unnecessary. (sic)	Reject	See above	None	
346	Resident	Full	General	12.11, 12.12	Drafting	No	Delete - These sections are irrelevant and inconsistent with the primary theme of the Plan and in particular the theme in sections 11 and 12.1. Inclusion would provide an open gateway for developer attention.	Reject	See above. Deletion of 12.11 and 12.12 inappropriate.	None	
347	Resident	Full	General	14.0 Para 116	Drafting	No	Stammergate Lane is a private road... between the river bridge and the Windmill Inn'. Delete the last clause ie 'but would benefit from some surface improvements to facilitate use by them'. NB See overall introductory comments.	Reject	Review of text required	1. Stammergate Lane is a Public Byway, and as a traditional "green lane". It is very important to the character and appearance of the natural environment of Linton. The lane also provides opportunities for views towards fields and mature trees to the east of the village. This helps to further establish Linton as a village with a rural character. It would therefore not be appropriate for it to be fully tarmacked. From time to time the surface needs maintenance to make it suitable for pedestrians, and also for wheel chair users and buggies. Materials used need to be sympathetic to the environment to ensure that Stammergate Lane remains a tranquil location with no encouragement for through vehicular traffic	
348	Resident	Full	General	Para 121	Drafting	No	The content of this section is misleading and does not reflect my recollection of the conclusions of the focus group's views.	Reject	LNP reflects the SG discussions and the output from the Stammergate Lane/Main Street Focus Group. However text to be revised to ensure clarity regarding surface improvement to exclude tarmacking see above	1. Stammergate Lane is a Public Byway, and as a traditional "green lane". It is very important to the character and appearance of the natural environment of Linton. The lane also provides opportunities for views towards fields and mature trees to the east of the village. This helps to further establish Linton as a village with a rural character. It would therefore not be appropriate for it to be fully tarmacked. From time to time the surface needs maintenance to make it suitable for pedestrians, and also for wheel chair users and buggies. Materials used need to be sympathetic to the environment to ensure that Stammergate Lane remains a tranquil location with no encouragement for through vehicular traffic.	
349	Resident	Full	General	14.3	Drafting	No	Delete 'improve the surface of Stammergate Lane'	Reject	see above	1. Stammergate Lane is a Public Byway, and as a traditional "green lane". It is very important to the character and appearance of the natural environment of Linton. The lane also provides opportunities for views towards fields and mature trees to the east of the village. This helps to further establish Linton as a village with a rural character. It would therefore not be appropriate for it to be fully tarmacked. From time to time the surface needs maintenance to make it suitable for pedestrians, and also for wheel chair users and buggies. Materials used need to be sympathetic to the environment to ensure that Stammergate Lane remains a tranquil location with no encouragement for through vehicular traffic	
350	Resident	Full	General	16.1 Para 131	Drafting	Yes	Re-write as follows 'The primary economic activity within the village boundaries continues to be arable farming but otherwise it is almost exclusively a residential or Collingham'.	Accept	Review text	The primary economic activity within the village boundaries continues to be arable farming but otherwise it is almost exclusively a residential community with just a few local services/businesses. . The vast majority of service providers (Health Centres, schools, etc.) and businesses (shops, office, petrol stations, etc.) are located close by in either Wetherby (the majority) or Collingham.	

Unique Id	Cmt Respondent Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
351	Resident	Full	General	Para 133	Drafting	Yes	Add 'These are farmland, the Windmill... Golf Club'.	Accept	Review text	The aim of the LNP, therefore, is to maintain and strengthen the present local economy and the businesses active in it. These are: various agricultural activities, The Windmill Inn, Riverside Plant Nursery, Montessori Nursery School and Wetherby Golf Club. These businesses are all appropriate to the scale and setting of Linton and the support through this Plan is caveated by the need to ensure the existing scale is maintained. Residents have expressed, for example, concern that if the businesses were allowed to expand unchecked then this would be likely to have inappropriate noise and traffic impact on Linton.
352	Resident	Full	General	17	Drafting	No	Community Infrastructure Levy. Since Para 144 highlights that 'many of the projects will have little cost etc.'	Reject	The CIL will be used where possible to fund Projects. The CIL may come from future housing development from both Linton and Collingham and will be decided by CWI PC	None
353	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	General	None	Drafting	na	It would be preferable to avoid the whole section whilst recognising that the levy structure exists Ex Merlin Ash comment - purposely left blank (so not to disturb numbering on hard copy). See 481	Accept		None
354	Resident	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	We are supportive of the Linton Plan (via email - single sentence)	Accept		None
355	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	General	None	Irrelevant	Yes	Thank you for asking the Homes and Communities Agency to comment on the Linton Neighbourhood Plan in our role as a Statutory Planning Consultee. We have no comments to make at this time.	Accept		None
356	Resident	Full	Specific	None	Village Asset	No	We strongly disagree that the Riverside Nursery has Community Value. The massive Juggernauts thunder up and down the narrow lane which bisects the gardens in Linton Common, churning up the road and creating potholes, danger and noise. When the Nursery was selling the plants it grew, that was fine. Now that it is importing millions of plants from the continent, it has become a real nuisance. The access is not suitable for the way the nursery is being developed. Linton Common Residents Group.	Accept	It is now proposed that businesses should only be considered an Asset of Community Value if they provide a social function. Therefore it is proposed that Riverside Nursery is removed from ACV.	Removed from the table and Policy

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
357	Business Owner/Mgr	Full	General	None	Gen. Positive	na	na	We noted several positive and helpful comments regarding the Club and our future relationship with the village; these are very welcome to the management committee and to all our members.	Accept		None
358	Business Owner/Mgr	Full	Specific	None	Footpaths	No	No	<p>However, the draft does contain a few suggestions which would need to be subject to formal and detailed discussions with the Golf Club, for example, circular walks and new footpath proposals on golf course land and wall-screening at the car park.</p> <p>We could not support new footpaths within the golf course due to the significant Health & Safety risks to pedestrians from stray golf balls unless there was a possibility of changing the course layout as part of a future land development.</p>	Accept	Footpath proposals are not near to locations used for golf, but fully accept that consultation and agreement with the golf club would be required.	None
359	Business Owner/Mgr	Full	Specific	None	Village Asset	No	No	<p>Screening the car park wall may well increase the road safety risk through reduced visibility as well as having a cost and maintenance impact which Wetherby Golf Club cannot commit to.</p> <p>Wetherby Golf Course will continue to maintain its hedges and trees to ensure road traffic safety when necessary.</p>	Reject	However it is clear consultation would be required.	None
360	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	<p>Timing / risks. (Summary...)</p> <p>It is clear from the comments made by NP examiners that the absence of an adopted CS and/or SAP is not a reason to delay the process of a neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>...</p> <p>The least risky approach would be to wait for the CS and SAP to be adopted.</p>	Accept	The LNP is not to be examined until after the CS has been adopted but will not await the SAP as that is not seen as being detrimental to the LNP when finally published, save that it may impact on PP.B.2 – the Ridge Site - which has been drafted as an interim policy. There is therefore no need to wait for the SAP	None
361	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	<p>a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State</p> <p>....</p> <p>The NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development (economic, social and environmental).</p> <p>Furthermore the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' is the key thread running through the plan-making and decision-taking processes of the planning system. This can be achieved by objectively assessing needs and positively seeking opportunities to meet the development needs of an area....</p>	Accept	A sustainability assessment w	None

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Docu ment Refer ence	Cetegory (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
362	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	Neighbourhood Plans should have a positive vision and, together with the Local Plan, provide a practical framework within which planning decisions can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. The NPPF states that plans should:	Accept	Covered	None
363	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	i) find creative ways of enhancing and improving the places in which people live;	Accept	Covered	None
364	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	ii) support and promote sustainable economic development to deliver homes, jobs, infrastructure and thriving local places. Local and Neighbourhood plans should promote a strong rural economy by	Accept	Covered	None
365	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	a) supporting sustainable growth and expansion of businesses	Accept	Covered	None
366	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	b) promoting agriculture and other land based rural businesses	Accept	Review Section F	Done
367	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	c) supporting sustainable tourism and leisure developments in appropriate locations to address unmet needs	Accept	Covered	None
368	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	d) promoting the retention and development of local services and facilities.	Accept	Covered	None
369	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	A wide choice of high quality homes should be delivered to boost supply, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. Plans should provide for a mix of housing to meet the needs of different groups in a community and identify size, type, tenure and range of housing required in specific locations :	Accept		Update
370	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	iii) seek high quality design and a good standard of amenity. Local Plans and neighbourhood plans should have robust and comprehensive policies setting out the quality of development expected based on clear objectives for the future of the area and the area's defining characteristics. They should not be unnecessarily prescriptive or detailed and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development. They should not try to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative in an attempt to ensure development conforms to certain development forms or styles however, seeking to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness is acceptable. Policies and decisions should also address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and	Accept	Covered	None
371	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	iv) promote the vitality of our main urban areas whilst protecting Green Belts and the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it. Development is inappropriate in the Green Belt, subject to certain exceptions:	Accept	Covered	Update

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment or Specific	Docu ment Reference	Cetegory (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
372	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	v) consider climate change, the reuse of existing resources, renewable resources/energy and a low carbon future. It is important to adopt a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change and to support measures to help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy to achieve a low carbon future. It is the responsibility of all communities to contribute to achieving this. Indeed there is scope for community-led initiatives for renewable and low carbon energy to be taken forward through neighbourhood planning. Issues such as flood risk, water supply and changes to biodiversity and landscape should also be considered.	Accept	LNP is silent on this issue.	None	
373	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	vi) contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. It is important to	Accept	Covered	None	
374	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	a. protect and enhance valued landscape, biological conservation interests and soils b. recognise the wider benefits of ecosystem services	Accept	Consider Appendix for species and habitats	Insert after para 37 38. Within the Plan Area, there have been a number a sightings of species which are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, which have been recorded by West Yorkshire Ecology as follows: otters, voles, bats (Vesper, Soprano Pipistrelle, Common Pipistrelle and Pipistrelle), Pale St John's Wort, and Thistle Broomrape. 39. Also within the Plan Area and immediately adjacent to the built area are the following UK Priority Habitats – Deciduous Woodland; Floodplain Grazing; Lowland Calcareous Grassland.	
375	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	c. minimise the impact on biodiversity and improve biodiversity where possible	Accept	Consider Appendix for species and habitats	Insert after para 37 38. Within the Plan Area, there have been a number a sightings of species which are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, which have been recorded by West Yorkshire Ecology as follows: otters, voles, bats (Vesper, Soprano Pipistrelle, Common Pipistrelle and Pipistrelle), Pale St John's Wort, and Thistle Broomrape. 39. Also within the Plan Area and immediately adjacent to the built area are the following UK Priority Habitats – Deciduous Woodland; Floodplain Grazing; Lowland Calcareous Grassland.	
376	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	d. prevent development contributing to unacceptable levels of soil/air/water/noise pollution	Accept	Consider change to F.1	No change required	
377	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	e. remediate and mitigate derelict/contaminated land;	Accept	No site allocation in Plan Little derelict land in Linton	None	
378	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	vii) encourage the effective use of land by reusing previously developed land;	Accept	No site allocation in Plan Little previously developed land available.	None	
379	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	viii) promote mixed use developments and encourage the use of land which will achieve multiple benefits (e.g. for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, carbon storage, or food production);	Accept		None	
380	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	ix) conserve heritage assets. Plans should contain a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including measures to prevent substantial harm by development;	Accept	Covered	None	

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
381	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	x) make full use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable. Sustainable transport modes should be favoured as well as measures to reduce congestion and greenhouse gas emissions and to give people real choice in how they travel. Priority should be given to walking, cycling and public transport; and	Accept	Consider amendments to B3 No amendment proposed. Scale of development is insufficient to have an impact on sustainable transport except for Policy B3 which promotes access to public transport and facilities	No change required
382	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	xi) support strategies to improve health, social, recreational and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs. It is important to:	Accept	Covered	None
383	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	a. plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments;	Accept	Covered	None
384	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	b. guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs;	Accept	Covered	None
385	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	c. ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise in a way that is sustainable, and retained for the benefit of the community; and	Accept	Covered	None
386	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	d. ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services.	Accept	Covered	None
387	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	Yes	Yes	The NPPF also promotes high quality infrastructure such as high speed broadband and other communications networks which is essential for sustainable economic growth and is important in enhancing the provision of local community facilities and services. Plans should support the expansion of these technologies	Accept	Clearly state as requirement.	Add new para: The LNP supports the expansion of high quality infrastructure such as high speed broadband and other communications networks which is essential for sustainable economic growth and is important in enhancing the viability of local businesses and local community facilities and services, and also encouraging individuals to work from home.
388	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	Yes	Yes	The draft Linton Neighbourhood Plan is considered to generally have regard to the provision of the NPPF. It promotes sustainable development and has the preservation and enhancement of the parish at its heart. It supports local businesses in principle and Policy B1 expresses support for small-scale development which will not extend the built up village envelope into the surrounding countryside however the draft plan does not specifically allocate any sites for new housing development which creates some uncertainty over the extent to which the plan provides real support for growth as promoted in the NPPF. It would be useful to show more clearly how the village envelope could accommodate development and how this could be delivered. There is clearly the desire to return all or part of the PAS site to Green Belt and agricultural use however the Core Strategy refers to the use of PAS and Green Belt for possible development even if specific sites are not identified. Through the public engagement process, some need for housing has been identified, particularly for properties to allow current residents to downsize, but it is not clear whether this will meet all local needs and there is no indication of what size, type or tenure they may be or where they may be located.	Reject	NPs do not have to identify or allocate sites. The LNP provides for small-scale development. There are no sites in Linton capable of being allocated because all except the PAS site is in Green Belt, which cannot be allocated by NPs. Arguably the LNP cannot allocate the PAS site for development, as it is part of a city-wide review, PAS policies are retained in the Core Strategy and the Interim PAS Policy may be regarded as Strategic.	Update

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment or Specific	Docu ment Refer ence	Catego ry (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
389	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	Yes	Yes	The draft plan seeks good quality design and includes some policies with very specific requirements for development and extensions. It is considered these are rather too prescriptive in places, though it is acknowledged that much of the village is a conservation area. Further views on this are contained in the detailed policy section, under Policies A1 and A2. The conservation of heritage assets and the natural environment is covered along with the identification and protection of village facilities, services and greenspaces. Additional greenspaces are proposed to be protected. The plan promotes walking and cycling and requires proposed development to improve footpath and bridleway access when appropriate. There are a number of projects to improve opportunities for walking and cycling	Accept	Revision text of Policies A1 and A2 by Planning Aid England proposed	Update
390	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	No	No	It is felt that the draft plan does not address the issues of climate change, renewable resources and energy and flood risk sufficiently. These are important considerations in the NPPF therefore it would be advisable to consider them through the neighbourhood plan, however if you feel you have nothing to add at the specific local Linton level, then the higher order policies in the Core Strategy are sufficient though these should not be replicated in the neighbourhood plan just for the sake of saying something	Accept	No evidence to support policies over and above the Core Strategy	None
391	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	b) The making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) contributes to the achievement of sustainable development	Accept	LNP does not need to quantify number of units. Sustainability Appraisal to be completed. Footpath Policv D.1 to be amended. NPs do not need to identify any sites.	Update
392	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	Yes	Yes	The plan identifies clearly a number of natural and historic... << and goes on to bullet list positive aspects of the plan >> Overall, sustainable development is a core theme running throughout the document and this is clearly reflected through many of the policies. The plan does not identify any sites for new development, instead being focussed on the protection and enhancement of the existing environmental, social and economic characteristics of the village. In general terms, the plan promotes the provision of small scale development focussed particularly on meeting future local housing needs of older residents however it is unclear whether there are real opportunities to deliver this. It also contains specific reference to protecting and improving open space provision, footways, footpaths and cycleways but again there are issues of how this will be delivered. It supports local business and has a clear focus on the importance of community and the social wellbeing of the village.	Accept		None
393	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	As outlined previously, it is suggested that the draft plan should consider low carbon energy e.g. wind turbines, solar energy etc and show how these can contribute to sustainability of the village and plan if relevant. Linton does flood at times therefore the plan should address this as well as suggest mitigation measures to reduce the risk of flooding e.g. the use of porous surfaces.	Reject	Do not have to consider as community silent on this issue. No flood risk assessment required	None
394	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	c) That making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority.	Accept	Covered	None

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Docu ment Refer ence	Cetegory (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
395	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	The policies contained in the draft Linton Neighbourhood Plan should be in conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. Currently the statutory development plan for the Leeds area is the Revised Unitary Development Plan 2006, however the Core Strategy (which will, once adopted, replace the strategic policies of the RUDP) is nearing adoption. The City Council has already had an indication of what modifications the Inspector thinks are necessary to make the plan sound and has recently advertised a second set of such proposed modifications. Once the Core Strategy is amended accordingly, it is hoped that it will progress through the City Council's formal approval process and be officially adopted by the Council before the end of this year. It is therefore highly likely that the Core Strategy will be part of the statutory development plan for Leeds by the time the draft Linton plan progresses to examination and referendum and certainly during the life of the neighbourhood plan, therefore it is appropriate to consider the draft policies in the context of the Core Strategy rather than the RUDP.	Accept	The LNP will be subject to examination post ratification of the CS.	None
396	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	Most policies in the Core Strategy that concern a wider area than just the parish might be considered strategic, but the following are considered to be relevant to the draft Linton Neighbourhood Plan.	Accept		
397	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	SP1 (location of development), SP2 (hierarchy of centres) and SP 7 (distribution of housing) As Linton falls outside the settlement hierarchy, it is not expected to accommodate significant growth. However, Policy SP7 seeks 700 dwellings in 'other rural' locations over the plan period and Linton would be considered as one such location therefore it may need to take a limited role in meeting the needs across the district. The draft plan does not identify any land for housing development. The plan suggests there is a need for properties for people to 'downsize' but is there any other need from within or outside the village e.g. properties for those wanting to get on the property ladder, sheltered accommodation, affordable housing etc? Indeed paras 47 and 54 of the NPPF expect housing need of an area to be clearly planned for. It would be useful to quantify the need and say something on how this could be delivered. 'other rural' locations over the plan period and Linton would be considered as one such location therefore it may need to take a limited role in meeting the needs across the district. The draft plan does not identify any land for housing development. The plan suggests there is a need for properties for people to 'downsize' but is there any other need from within or outside the village e.g. properties for those wanting to get on the property ladder, sheltered accommodation, affordable housing etc? Indeed paras 47 and 54 of the NPPF expect housing need of an area to be clearly planned for. It would be useful to quantify the need and say something on how this could be delivered.	Accept	Paras 47 and 54 of NPPF state that NP's do not need to do housing plan.	No change required.

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment or Specific	Docu ment Refer ence	Catego ry (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
398	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	<p>H2 (Housing Development on non-allocated sites), H3 (Housing Density), H4 (Housing Mix), H5 (Affordable Housing), H7 (Gypsies and Traveller accommodation), H8 (Housing for Independent Living)</p> <p>It is important that neighbourhood plan policies are consistent with these policies. Policy B3 needs to be consistent with H2 and Policy B5 consistent with H4 and H8. The draft neighbourhood plan makes reference a number of times to new development being at a low density however Policy H3 allows a much higher minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare (net). The neighbourhood plan should therefore set out the circumstances where higher densities will or won't be acceptable and provide evidence and reasons why higher densities won't be acceptable.</p>	Accept	Review with LCC again.	The Leeds Core Strategy Policy H3 describes density requirements for new housing. It recognises that settlements outside the hierarchy, and Linton is such a settlement, contribute little to the overall housing numbers and that the area of land to be used for any housing development will be small. No specific density criteria are therefore deemed necessary for future developments in Linton. Spatial character is more important than density. It may be appropriate for a small number of smaller dwellings to be located on an existing individual plot. This would increase the density locally. By maintaining appropriate separation from the plot boundaries and by sensitive boundary treatment the spatial character can be maintained.
399	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	<p>SP8 (Economic development priorities)</p> <p>This policy supports the growth and diversification of the rural economy within the context of the settlement hierarchy and the protection and enhancement of a high quality rural environment. It also reflects para 28 of the NPPF. The draft Linton Neighbourhood Plan is considered to be in general conformity with this</p>	Accept	Covered	None
400	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	<p>EC2 (Office development), EC3 (Safeguarding existing employment)</p> <p>Policy EC2 allows office development up to 500sqm in places outside the settlement hierarchy like Linton without sequential or need tests. You may consider it sensible for the neighbourhood plan to comment on how such proposals would be viewed by Linton. Policy EC3 notes there may be a case to retain business premises in areas of shortfall (including Outer North East Leeds). Does Linton have any small businesses and business premises? If so, the neighbourhood plan should set out its position regarding future loss or retention of such premises.</p>	Accept	The Feb 2012 CS states in smaller urban settlements not generally outside the hierarchy. Check final CS. We support existing businesses see Policy F1. Review if change of ownership of business might have impact on Linton.	No change to text required
401	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	na	<p>P4 (Stand-alone food stores), P9 (Community Facilities)</p> <p>Policies P4 and P9 are considered to be strategic policies and as such it would be useful for retail provision to be considered by the Linton neighbourhood plan group. Policy P4 is generally permissive of small retail outlets e.g. a supermarket up to 372 sqm so is there anything you would like to say in the plan in relation to such proposals in the Linton context? There is no requirement to explicitly address this if there is nothing 'Linton-specific' you would like to add. Policies C1 and E2 of the draft neighbourhood plan are supportive of community facilities but may be they could be strengthened to seek protection if a need</p>	Accept	No evidence for or against. As it is allowed by CS then any proposals would be considered against the Policies A to F of the Plan. Validate possibly this should say F1 not E2. Check C.1 and F1	No change to text required

Unique Id	Comment Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
402	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	<p>T2 (Accessibility and new development)</p> <p>Policy B3 of the draft neighbourhood plan deals with this but doesn't have the detailed criteria set out in T2. T2 should not be replicated but may be it could inform any revisions to this policy.</p>	Accept	Discussed with LCC and Planning Aid. LCC stated T2 of the CS is relevant for developments of a minimum number of 5 properties. If the LNP is relevant for smaller developments then evidence such as a local transport plan is needed to support it. Assess further justification required. Amend Policy B.3.	Expanded justification and evidence provided.
403	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	<p>SP13 Strategic Green Infrastructure, G1 (Enhancing and extending Green Infrastructure), G2 (Tree Cover), G3 (Open space standards), G4 (New Greenspace) G6 (Protection of Greenspace), G7 (Cemeteries), G8 (Protection of habitats), G9 (Biodiversity improvements)</p> <p>Green infrastructure is very important, especially as Linton lies within the Wharfe Valley. The draft neighbourhood plan generally promotes the maintenance and enhancement/extension of these elements though may be more could be said on biodiversity improvements and how local green infrastructure could be better connected and enhanced. The designation of greenspace is broadly in accordance with these policies.</p>	Accept	No action required	None
404	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	<p>EN1 (Climate Change), EN2 (Sustainable design and construction), EN3 (Low carbon energy), EN5 (Flood Risk)</p> <p>As mentioned previously, the neighbourhood plan should consider the issues dealt with in these policies if there is something specifically relevant to Linton you would like to include. Parts of Linton lie within the River Wharfe's floodplain therefore it is expected that flooding should be addressed</p>	Accept	No requirement for flood assessment	None
405	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	<p>The Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document is part of the Local Development Framework. The plan sets out where land is needed to enable us to manage resources, like minerals, energy, waste and water over the next 15 years, and identifies specific actions which will help us use our natural resources in a more efficient way. There are no waste or mineral allocations or safeguarded sites in the Linton Neighbourhood Area. There could be sand and gravel deposits in the Wharfe Valley, however Policy Mineral 6 states that it is unlikely that proposals for the extraction of sand and gravel within the area to the East of Pool in the Wharfe Valley will be supported</p>	Accept	Noted	None

Unique Id	Comment Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
406	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Process	na	<p>d) The making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.</p> <p>"The key EU obligations to consider are considered to be:</p> <p>""Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (Strategic Environmental Impact Directive).</p> <p>""""Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment (Environmental Impact Assessment Directive)</p> <p>""""""Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora</p> <p>""""""""Directive 2009/147/EC on the conservation of wild birds.</p> <p>You will receive a formal response from the City Council on the need for any assessments in relation to these European Directives, however following consultation with the Environment Agency, English Heritage, Natural England and the Council's Nature Conservation Officer, the general view is that the policies and proposals in the draft Linton Neighbourhood Plan would not have a significant effect on the environment, habitats or birds of the area and therefore formal assessments will not be</p>	Accept	LCC to send response shortly. No significant comments expected	Chase
407	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A1	Des. Principles/Policy	na	<p>3. Planning Policies</p> <p>Policy A1</p> <p>New development must preserve and enhance the village of Linton by:</p> <p>Recognising and contributing to the distinct rural feel of Linton... << goes on to enumerate elements of policy without comment - which is later >></p> <p>The intentions behind this policy are honourable and clear however the requirements put on new development particularly to preserve and enhance the whole village of Linton are very stringent. It is suggested that with some rewording, the intention of the policy can still be kept but the detail could be more appropriate. The key factors to consider are size, scale, form and style.</p> <p>Specific comments</p>	Accept	Planning Aid England to provide alternative words for consideration	Amend A1 and A2
408	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A1	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	<p>It is suggested that some of Linton has a rural feel, whilst other sections have a more built up and 'suburban' feel;</p>	Accept		None

Unique Id	Comment Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
409	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A1	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	A clearer definition of what is meant by the 'space and proportion of a building plot' would be useful and clarity on how the Local Planning Authority (LPA) would actually assess this. You may like to consider some words which refer to respecting the spatial character around a planning application site;	Accept	Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England. Policy A1 and A2.	Recognising and reinforcing the distinct local character (as set out within the Character Assessment at Appendix 1) in relation to height, scale, spacing, layout, orientation, design and materials of buildings. The use of vernacular detailing is encouraged.
410	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A1	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	Respecting local landscape quality will be a material consideration in some circumstances, though not in all planning applications. Current planning legislation does not attach much importance to the preservation of views therefore it would be difficult to refuse an application due to its impact on views. There is a potential conflict between the preservation of views and support for development which should be balanced through a carefully worded policy. It would be useful to have more explanation of the blue areas on Map (page 17), particularly when the red arrows do not point towards an identified area:	Accept	This is considered by residents to be very important. Public views can be protected and endorsed in the LNP. Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England Policy A1 and A2	Considering the visual impact of proposals on key views and vistas of the local landscape (as shown on Map 5) and minimising adverse impacts on these views. Preservation of undeveloped wooded hillsides and ridgelines is a key material consideration.
411	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A1	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	You may want to consider softening the language in respect of landscaping schemes, may be to something like 'Where appropriate landscaping schemes should seek to include native species'. It will not always be appropriate or necessary to incorporate native species:	Accept	Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England. Policy A1 and A2.	Incorporating landscaping to mitigate the visual impact of development and to ensure that proposals merge into the existing village context. Landscape schemes should seek to include native species (where appropriate).
412	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A1	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	The LPA cannot prevent the removal of trees unless they are protected by TPO or conservation area. It would be useful to include a definition of 'trees that have a significant amenity value.' Furthermore, the LPA cannot judge whether a company is 'reputable' or not:	Accept	Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England. Policy A1 and A2.	Seeking to retain mature or important trees. Development that envisages the loss of ancient trees or trees of good arboricultural and/or amenity value will not be permitted unless justified by a professional tree survey/arboricultural statement acceptable to the local Planning Authority. Where removal of such trees can be justified, replacement(s) with trees of similar amenity value and maturity should be provided. Included within a:
413	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A1	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	It would be difficult to insist that all new development be in millstone grit or sandstone, though certainly there are more controls over materials within the conservation area. The use of materials that respect and reflect the predominant ones in the village today can be encouraged through policy or may be millstone grit or sandstone could be encouraged where appropriate:	Accept	Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England. Policy A1 and A2.	Included within a:
414	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A1	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	Furthermore, it would be difficult to stipulate that development must be two storey in height, however again there is scope to encourage and highlight that development proposals will be considered against existing building heights and scale and that they must respect the character and scale of the area:	Accept	Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England. Policy A1 and A2.	Included within a:
415	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A1	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	A similar approach is suggested in respect of the issues of vernacular style, pitched roofs and regularly spaced windows, particularly outside the conservation area.	Accept	Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England. Policy A1 and A2.	Included within a:
416	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A1	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	Clarity on what 'regular spaced windows' are would be welcome;	Accept	Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England. Policy A1 and A2.	Included within a:
417	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A2	Des. Principles/Policy	na	Policy A2 In addition to the requirements of Policy A1 the following shall apply to the design of extensions << enumerates clauses>>	Accept		None

Unique Id	Comment Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment or Specific Reference	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
418	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A2	Des. Principles/Policy	na	General Comments This policy should be considered in the context of permitted development rights. Again, the key factors to consider are size, scale, form and style. Specific comments	Accept	Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England. Policy A1 and A2.	Residential extensions will be supported where they are in accordance with Policy A1 (where applicable) and
419	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A2	Des. Principles/Policy	na	It would be difficult to insist that spaces are retained between buildings but there would be scope for a requirement for extensions to respect the architectural and spatial character of the streetscene: It would be more important that extensions complement the existing property than neighbouring properties;	Accept	Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England. Policy A1 and A2.	do not dominate or detract from the spatial character of the street scene
420	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A2	Des. Principles/Policy	na	Again it would be difficult for the LPA to refuse dormers on the front elevation; There are some such dormers in Linton already and additional ones have been approved recently;	Accept	Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England. Policy A1 and A2.	are complimentary to the host building but subservient to it
421	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A2	Des. Principles/Policy	No	The LPA would seek to ensure that the detail of extensions mirrors that of the main dwelling outside a Conservation Area.	Accept	Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England. Policy A1 and A2.	Removed
422	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A2	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	Policy A3	Accept	Consider with revision text by Planning Aid England. Policy A1 and A2.	are complimentary to the host building but subservient to it
423	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A3	Des. Principles/Policy	na	To involve residents in << goes on to enumerate clauses>>	Accept	Ought not be a clause.	None
424	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A3	Des. Principles/Policy	na	General Comments This is rather an onerous requirement which is significantly over and above the requirements of the Core Strategy and the NPPF and whilst it is reasonable to encourage applicants to engage in consultation, the Council cannot refuse an application which does not or ignores the views of residents but is compliant with national and local development plan policies. Indeed, the Council's own Statement of Community Involvement cannot enforce public consultation rather it highlights the risk if consultation is not undertaken.	Further Action	Review whether NP Policy complies with CS and review of NPPF reference. LCC cannot impose public consultation. Review Evidence text as required.	Planning applications for development of more than 1 new property or for a change of use shall be accompanied by a Statement of Community Involvement. This statement must include:
425	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A3	Des. Principles/Policy	na	Policy B1	Further Action	See above.	Planning applications for development of more than 1 new property or for a change of use shall be accompanied by a Statement of Community Involvement. This statement must include:
426	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B1	Des. Principles/Policy	na	Development will be supported where it is small-scale and does not extend the village into the surrounding countryside.	Accept	None	None
427	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B1	Des. Principles/Policy	na	General Comments There may be cases where development which extends the village into the countryside is deemed acceptable against other planning policies e.g. Green Belt or the Site Allocations Plan may actually allocate land for development. Nevertheless, Green Belt policy in the UDP/Core Strategy will be relevant and prevent sprawl into the surrounding countryside.	Accept	Review of text for countryside. Need to identify number of houses per plot and consider including village envelope map. Wording of PP B2 and B3 to be reviewed	Linton does not possess the range of services and therefore it is likely that the Green Belt within Linton will be retained throughout the Plan period
428	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B1	Des. Principles/Policy	na	It would be useful to define the terms 'small scale' and 'countryside'.	Accept	Define small scale - see above	Development will be supported where it is small-scale (10 or less units), does not extend the village into open countryside, reflects the pattern and form of surrounding development and is in a sustainable location.

Unique Id	Comment Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
429	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B2	Des. Principles/Policy	na	<p>Policy B2</p> <p>SHLAA 2136, The Ridge, Linton will continue to be protected from development until its longer term allocation has been determined via the Local Plan Sites Allocation Plan, following a comprehensive Green Belt review, housing needs and sites assessments.</p> <p>General Comments</p>	Accept	Need to clarify wording in CS and ensure Policy text is in compliance.	None
430	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B2	Des. Principles/Policy	na	<p>No decision has been made on the future of the PAS site as this will be made through the Site Allocations Plan process and as such there is a risk this policy will become out of date very quickly subject to the SAP being adopted. A comprehensive Green Belt review is not being undertaken, rather a selective review in relation to the allocation of sites for housing, employment, retail and greenspace.</p> <p>Policy B3</p> <p>New development should be located within 5 minutes' walk / 400 metres of a bus stop, and will encourage opportunities to walk safely to local facilities such as Linton Memorial Hall and to services available in Collingham and Wetherby.</p> <p>General Comments</p>	Accept	as above	"Comprehensive" taken out
431	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B3	Des. Principles/Policy	na	<p>This appears broadly compatible with the aims of sustainable development and its aims to facilitate walking and the use of public transport is highly commended. However it would be interesting to know which areas of the village would be beyond the distance threshold. If there is a lot of housing in these outer areas, it would be difficult to refuse another house in a residential area for this reason.</p> <p>This repeats much of the Core Strategy accessibility standards and therefore it is questionable whether the policy is necessary.</p>	Accept	None	None
432	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B3	Des. Principles/Policy	na	<p>Policy B4</p> <p>No development will be permitted that increases turning traffic at the Trip Lane/Main Street junction which is sub-standard and cannot be improved without serious detriment to the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Development which increases turning traffic at the Northgate Lane/Main Street junction will only be permitted if improvements are made to the sub-standard geometry of this junction. These improvements must be sympathetic to the character of the Conservation Area.</p>	Accept	None	None
433	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B3	Des. Principles/Policy	na	<p>Accessibility criteria do not apply to small developments. Therefore LNP needs to cover this issue.</p>	Reject	Accessibility criteria do not apply to small developments. Therefore LNP needs to cover this issue.	None
434	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B4	Des. Principles/Policy	na	<p>Policy B4</p> <p>No development will be permitted that increases turning traffic at the Trip Lane/Main Street junction which is sub-standard and cannot be improved without serious detriment to the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Development which increases turning traffic at the Northgate Lane/Main Street junction will only be permitted if improvements are made to the sub-standard geometry of this junction. These improvements must be sympathetic to the character of the Conservation Area.</p>	Accept	None	None

Unique Id	Comment Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
435	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B4	Des. Principles/Policy	na	This is felt to be rather onerous and could not be given much weight without evidence to demonstrate harm. Improvements to junctions can be sought through S106 agreements if they directly relate to a development and are required to make the development acceptable. An increase in traffic does not necessarily lead to harm to highway safety.	Accept	Need to define 'harm'. Highways Assessment has been used as evidence to support this, and photographic evidence included in LNP. Review evidence. Divide Policy B4 into two policies	Policy B4: Development which provides improved highway safety at the following junctions, and is sympathetic to the character of the Conservation Area, will be supported: Trip Lane/Main Street Junction Northgate Lane/Main Street Junction Changes to the alignment of the junction of Trip Lane and Main Street will not constitute an acceptable improvement.
436	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B5	Des. Principles/Policy	na	Policy B5 << restatement>>	Accept	None	None
437	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B5	Des. Principles/Policy	na	General Comments Whilst this shows a genuine desire to provide a mix of dwelling types to meet an identified need, as the NP is not allocating housing sites, the policy is almost impossible to deliver. If sites were to be found, it would be overly restrictive to allow only properties for existing residents to 'downsize' or for the elderly. Is there any other demand? The LPA would find it difficult to impose specific house types or styles on a developer or insist on a certain size of dwelling however Policy H4 of the Core Strategy generally provides for a mix of dwelling types and sizes.	Accept	The LNP actually states a mix of dwelling types including aging demographic profile. Textual change.	Any new housing development must provide a mix of dwelling types to include dwellings with less than four bedrooms to suit the changing needs of an ageing demographic profile.
438	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B5	Des. Principles/Policy	na	Clarity is needed on the term 'downsizing'. What size properties are you envisaging?	Accept	None	None
439	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy B5	Des. Principles/Policy	na	Clarity is needed on the term 'downsizing'. What size properties are you envisaging?	Accept	See 437 above	Any new housing development must provide a mix of dwelling types to include dwellings with less than four bedrooms to suit the changing needs of an ageing demographic profile.
440	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy C1	Des. Principles/Policy	na	Policy C1 << re-statement of document>>	Accept	None	None
441	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy C1	Des. Principles/Policy	na	General Comments A clear definition of 'harmful' would be important though it would still be difficult for the LPA to enforce. Neighbourhood Plans can, however, identify Assets of Community Value and set out aspirations in relation to these.	Accept	Amend harmful in Policy C1	Development will not be supported that results in the loss of or has a significant adverse effect on the following village facilities and services: Take Montessori Nursery School out as this is a service run from the Memorial Hall and cannot be protected thro planning.
442	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy D1	Des. Principles/Policy	na	Policy D1 << re-statement of document>>	Accept	None	None

Unique Id	Comment Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment or Specific Reference	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
443	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy D1	Des. Principles/Policy	na	This policy is broadly in compliance with other higher order policies, though you may like to consider some minor wording changes e.g. replace "will take all reasonable opportunities" with "should take opportunities." Care needs to be taken with terminology, roadside paths are 'footways' (looked after by Highways and on the Highways Street Register) whereas 'Public Footpaths, Bridleways and Byways are looked after by Public Rights of Way and on the Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way. The Council would in principle support improvements for new footpaths and bridleway links and for Sodom Lane to be formally recognised as a Public Right of Way, however creating new public paths across privately owned land is usually dependent on the cooperation of the landowner, unless there is evidence of unchallenged use allowing a claim for a public right of way to be made. Stammergate Lane is an existing 'Green Lane' therefore a more sympathetic surface than tarmac would be suitable. Leeds City Council PROW would be happy to discuss options with the Parish Council however there would be a funding implication for anything more than basic path maintenance. With no development sites, there is the issue of how any improvements	Accept	Planning Aid proposes change of text to Policy D.1 to remove specific routes from policy.. Check use of wording for footway and footpath. Review text for Stammergate Lane	Policy D1: Any proposed development will take all reasonable opportunities to improve footpath and bridleway access, by, for example, facilitating new circular walks and new safe alternatives to existing routes in line with the route network shown in map 7. Any proposed improvements will be expected to take advantage of features such as good views, amenity areas and also provide further planting as part of the proposals. See new paragraphs added with regard to aspirational routes and delivery.
444	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy D1	Des. Principles/Policy	na	There is no mention of cycleways and that the 'West Yorkshire Cycle Route' passes on Linton Lane and links Collingham to Wetherby and beyond.	Accept	Review adding text to SectionD.1.	The key routes shown on Map 7 are as follows: • The signed National Cycle Route 66 links Mirfield to York and includes a section along Main Street and Linton Lane. This is also part of the 150 mile "West Yorkshire Cycle Route".
445	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy E1	Des. Principles/Policy	na	Policy E1 << re-statement >>	Accept	None	None
446	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy E1	Des. Principles/Policy	na	It would be useful if these spaces were identified on a plan. A neighbourhood plan can actually designate Local Green Space so maybe you should consider using this power to actually designate rather than just indicate they 'should be designated'. If this is something you would like to do, more work would be needed to show clearly the justification for this and how sites would be delivered.	Accept	Amend designation & wording. The NP does not need to specifically show how delivery will be achieved. Consult with LCC Highways over the proposals involving the 2 grass triangles. Additional text in description - n 38	The following sites as identified on Map are designated as Local Green Space and will be protected from development or change of use which would adversely affect their value to the local community: • Village Green Triangle on Trip Lane; • Northgate Lane green with Village Pump • Land adjacent to the Linton Tennis Club and Linton Memorial Hall • The Daffodil Bank and Old Road
447	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy E2	Des. Principles/Policy	na	The intention behind this policy is understandable though you may want to revise it slightly as it appears to suggest that any development that helps to provide children's play facilities or amenity green space will be supported. May be something that conveys that the provision of children's facilities/green space is encouraged where appropriate to the scale of a development, provided the development complies with higher level policies	Accept	Amend E.2	Development that assists in the provision of additional children's play facilities and/or amenity green space to meet the standards of Policy G3 in the Leeds Core Strategy will be supported subject to normal town planning considerations.
448	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy F1	Des. Principles/Policy	na	This is generally a good aspiration but giving blanket support in principle to business development is far reaching and somewhat open ended, though you do refer to compliance with 'normal town planning considerations'.	Accept	Review of Policy F.1. to ensure policy text does not give open ended support for business which might impact on village later.	Development which provides support and encouragement to existing Linton businesses and ensures viability is maintained and strengthened will be supported. Any development which involves a major change in the character/size of a business with consequential increases in noise or traffic will not be acceptable.

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
449	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy F2	Des. Principles/Policy	na	na	This reflects the NPPF and supports business and technological growth however it is rather onerous to expect all applications to show how the proposed development would contribute to, and be compatible with, internet connectivity and it is unclear what individual developments can do. Future improvements in technology may make ducting obsolete. The plan must state what time period it covers.	Accept	Review current text for F.2	Development proposals that impact positively on internet connectivity will be supported in principle. Proposals must also fully comply with the other LNP Planning Policies.
450	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Gen. Positive	na	na		Accept	On front cover	None
451	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Gen. Positive	na	na	You may need to consider impacts of the plan on the viability of development if the plan is imposing extra considerations or 'burdens' on development, over and above that required usually by planning legislation.	Reject	There are no large burdens imposed.	None
452	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Vision+Objective	na	na	The reference to avoiding high density housing reflects the protection of the current settlement and property types but does this reflect local housing need? Smaller properties (including possible conversions) could be higher density without destroying local distinctiveness. May be a reference to 'appropriate densities' would be more suitable.	Accept	Review vision statement	Amended
453	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Vision+Objective	na	na	2. What are 'the future needs of Linton residents'?	Accept	Consider amending Objective 2	.To continue to monitor the future needs of Linton residents and ensure that any multiple housing development is wherever possible, tailored to those needs.
454	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Vision+Objective	na	na	7. Are the 'village assets' to be protected listed in Policy C1?	Accept	Review Assets in C1	Amend Project: Register Assets of Community Value included in the table above.
455	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	11.1	Vision+Objective	Yes	Yes	11.1 A1: Design and Development "How does this section add to the CAAMP which is already adopted and providing protection? There no reference to the Collingham with Linton Village Design Statement which provides more detailed information on historical, design, conservation and highways issues"	Accept	CAAMP is non-statutory and therefore needs to be incorporated in the LNP. Review additional information from VDS.	Added to para 62: N.B. In addition to the CAAMP the Collingham with Linton Village Design Statement (VDS) fully describes the village character and is used as source material for the Character Assessment at Appendix 1.
456	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Vision+Objective	Yes	Yes	The City Council is unable commit to 'improve verges and paths using sympathetic materials' therefore it can only be regarded as an aspiration.	Reject	Within the conservation area the council are obliged to use sympathetic materials.	New paragraph: "Similarly elsewhere across the village footways will need to be maintained. There is always a balance to be achieved between cost, appearance and achieving safety standards. The photograph on page 19 of Northgate Lanes shows what Leeds City Council were able to provide as maintenance within the Conservation Area. The combination of stone kerbs and grass verge represents the desired standard across the whole of Linton, and it is recognised and accepted that the tarmac strip represents the most appropriate option for surfacing. In order to deliver this aspiration it may be necessary to supplement Leeds City Council budgets with alternative funds (see section 18 Projects for Linton)"

Unique Cmt Id	Respondent Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
457	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Vision+Objective	Yes	It would help if there was a definition of the term 'improving', particularly in light of the fact that if it refers to maintenance then the repair the footpaths will to be based on the city wide strategy for selecting schemes, budget constraints etc. 'Sympathetic' is a subjective word therefore it would be helpful to have some clarity on what is meant exactly. As stone is the main building material, does this mean the desire is to have stone flagged footways and stone kerbs? This may not be the most suitable material for the elderly as flags easily get damaged when overrun by vehicles or tree roots extend under them.	Accept	Stone kerbs and tarmac surfaces is acceptable generally. Consider additional text to Project 22.	New paragraph: "Similarly elsewhere across the village footways will need to be maintained. There is always a balance to be achieved between cost, appearance and achieving safety standards. The photograph on page 19 of Northgate Lanes shows what Leeds City Council were able to provide as maintenance within the Conservation Area. The combination of stone kerbs and grass verge represents the desired standard across the whole of Linton, and it is recognised and accepted that the tarmac strip represents the most appropriate option for surfacing. In order to deliver this aspiration it may be necessary to supplement Leeds City Council budgets with alternative funds (see section 18, Projects for Linton)".
458	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Special Projects	No	The City Council must be able to replace any white painted fences that fulfil a highway function and are a highway asset with materials that fulfil modern safety standards when required.	Reject	Within the conservation area the council are obliged to use sympathetic materials.	None
459	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 77	Special Projects	No	Para 77 - It is not necessarily correct to say that the Green Belt will be maintained throughout the Plan period as this remains to be determined through the Site Allocations Process which is ongoing at the moment.	Accept	Review and amend text.(Para 77)	Linton does not possess the range of services and therefore it is likely that the Green Belt within Linton will be retained throughout the Plan period
460	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 80	Special Projects	Yes	Para 80 - opportunities for housing development will need to be considered within the context set out in paras 74 - 79 but it is not advisable to say development opportunities are severely limited.	Accept	Consider change of text	Changed severely limited to constrained.
461	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 126	Special Projects	Yes	Para 126 - there needs to be some clarification on the difference between a 'village green' and 'green space.'	Further Action	Consult with LCC and review text	
462	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Special Projects	Yes	You have done well in identifying projects but it would be useful to have them shown on a plan. Delivery is clearly an issue particularly with the lack of any housing allocations. However the plan refers to CIL money from developments in Collingham as well as Linton so this could be a valuable source of funding although the scale of future development in Collingham is also uncertain. You may want to produce a delivery plan.	Reject	Do not think it possible to produce a delivery plan	
463	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	The introduction refers to the plan must be compatible with 'National and European policies.' This should be national planning policy and EU law including human rights.	Accept	Add to Pra 2.	2. Local communities can now set out their vision for an area and shape planning policies for the use and development of land. It is about local rather than strategic issues. This Neighbourhood Plan must be compatible with National Planning Policy, European Policies and the strategic elements of Leeds City Council's Local Development Framework (Local Plan). 3. One of the basic conditions that will be tested by the independent examiner is whether the making of the neighbourhood plan is compatible with the key European Union obligations, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐ The Strategic Environmental Impact Directive; ☐ The Environmental Impact Assessment Directive; ☐ The conservation of natural habitats and wild fauna and flora; ☐ The Directive on the conservation of wild birds.

Unique Id	Comment Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
464	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 29	Gen. Positive	Yes	Para 29 states that if there is a favourable referendum then the neighbourhood plan becomes part of the development plan. A neighbourhood plan becomes part of the development plan only once the City Council has adopted the plan which it must do as soon as a positive referendum result is known as long as it is satisfied that the neighbourhood plan doesn't breach EU obligations and human rights.	Accept	Add text to Para 29	1. If there is a favourable response to the referendum, which means more than 50% of those voting stating that they wish Leeds city Council to use the Linton Neighbourhood Plan for the consideration of planning applications, Leeds City Council must then adopt the Plan. Once it has done so, the Linton Neighbourhood Plan will become part of the statutory Local Plan for the area and becomes an important document in deciding planning applications in Linton. This legal standing differentiates this document from existing documents such as the Collingham with Linton Village Design Statement (VDS) and the Linton Conservation Area Appraisal Management Plan (CAAMP), which only have the status of non-statutory planning support documents.
465	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Gen. Positive	na	Children's Services notes that the plan makes reference to the school provision in the local area and for clarity the following points are worth noting. The settlement of Linton falls into the Primary Planning area for Wetherby and Collingham. There is currently capacity in the schools in that planning area to accommodate local demand. Children's Services expects that demand from the Linton area will be considered as part of the planning for Wetherby and Collingham and factored into any changes to the number of school places needed across that area into the future. The plan comment on Secondary school places is	Accept	Consider adding blue text to Para 107	With regard to the provision of education, the settlement of Linton falls into the Primary Planning area for Wetherby and Collingham. There is currently capacity in the schools in this planning area to accommodate local demand. Children's Services expects that demand from the Linton area will be considered as part of the planning for Wetherby and Collingham and factored into any changes to the number of school places needed across that area into the future. The most convenient primary school for Linton is Lady Elizabeth Hastings Church of England Primary School, Collingham, which is in walking distance from the heart of the village. This school is often over-subscribed and may be more so with the likelihood of housing development within Collingham.
466	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Gen. Positive	na	Public Health The plan has taken care to consult widely and has taken into consideration many of the issues that are important to protect public health.	Accept	None	None
467	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Des. Principles/Policy	Yes	The plan acknowledges the issues around increased rural traffic (97% of people are concerned) and the need to protect green space.	Accept	None	None
468	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Footpaths	Yes	It values highway improvement and pedestrian safety, increased cycle ways and improved connectivity to the rural countryside. However, although it points to the disadvantages of narrow pavements, and the inconvenience/safety hazards that may cause to users in terms of accommodating pushchairs, it does not seem to have considered the additional hazards for wheelchair users. This is pertinent since the report states there is a greater concentration of elderly people than in Leeds as a whole and this is likely to increase (p29). Housing type has been considered with this elderly increase in mind, but perhaps more consideration could be given to the non-housing needs of this increasing elderly	Accept	However, this is a non-planning issue	None
469	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Footpaths	Yes	The trees are rightly valued as green amenity, but could, in winter, pose a leaves slip hazard to all, but particularly elderly/disabled people. This may increase their social isolation as they become afraid to walk about in the local area.	Accept		None
470	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Footpaths	Yes	Developing safer routes for pedestrians from Linton to Collingham and Wetherby is welcomed, but would suggest that this considers the particular needs of less active groups, who may increasingly rely on personal transport (thus further adding to the traffic nuisance).	Accept		None

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Docu ment Refer ence	Cetegy (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
471	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Whilst this plan has a focus on preserving the village character and heritage, in terms of business support, perhaps more consideration could be given to encouraging businesses that will help sustain the increasingly elderly population in the future e.g. around adequate nutrition, reducing social isolation, transport etc. Demographic change is leaving more older people without family nearby.	Accept		None	
472	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Nature Conservation Nature conservation issues are generally well covered in the plan. It would be a good objective to ensure that the area adjacent to Linton Common SSSI remains undeveloped and is positively enhanced to extend the area of Magnesian Limestone Grassland.	Accept	Review add as appendix		
473	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	Heritage The draft neighbourhood plan makes clear reference to the heritage assets of the village, the Linton Conservation Area boundary and the Linton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan. It aims to conserve the character and historical value of the village and its surroundings both within the conservation area and beyond which is in line with Local Plan policies and national legislation and guidance relating to the historic environment	Accept		None	
474	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 140	Gen. Positive	Yes	Community Infrastructure Levy (Section 17) and Projects for Linton (Section 18): Paragraph 140 is accurate for the Parish Council's CIL spending, however, the Regulations only allow the City Council to spend the CIL on "funding the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure to support the development of its area," i.e. not also on "anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area."	Accept	Amend text of Para 140 The Local Authority is required to spend this levy by funding the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure to support the development of its area. The same also applies to Parish Council who can in addition spend the levy on anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that any development places on an area.	Done	
475	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 141	Gen. Positive	Yes	You may wish to add to paragraph 141: "In order to ensure that individual developments are not charged for the same infrastructure items through both S106s and the CIL, a S106 contribution cannot then be made towards an infrastructure item already on the List. The City Council has to spend its CIL income on items on the Reg123 List, but Parish Councils have no requirement to do so."	Accept	Suggestion included	Done	

Unique Id	Comment Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
476	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 143 and 145	Gen. Positive	Yes	Paragraphs 143 and 145 assume that the City Council will spend its CIL funds in the village. This may be the case but is not a guarantee as depends on more strategic decisions, the type and amount of development which comes forwards, its impacts, and the amount of CIL raised in the meaningful proportion in this highest residential zone of £90 psm compared to only £5 psm elsewhere in the District. The Government's intent in introducing the CIL is to break the link between a specific development and the spending of its CIL payment. Therefore, the Council cannot support the neighbourhood plan in having a statement that Similarly, 145 should be changed to say OSome of the projects, however, are more suitable for delivery by the Parish Council and some by LCC. It is envisaged that the Parish Council will use its meaningful proportion and LCC may use CIL and other funding sources funds accordingly.	Accept	Review amend para 143 Multiple housing development in and around Linton will no doubt increase pressure on highways inside the village and its surroundings, and also increase demands for local facilities such as schooling healthcare public	Done
477	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 143	Gen. Positive	Yes	Similarly, 145 should be changed to say OSome of the projects, however, are more suitable for delivery by the Parish Council and some by LCC. It is envisaged that the Parish Council will use its meaningful proportion and LCC may use CIL and other funding sources funds accordingly.	Accept	Review amend para 145 145. Some of the projects, however, are more suitable for delivery by the Parish Council and some by LCC. It is envisaged that the Parish Council will use its "meaningful proportion" and LCC may use CIL and other funding sources	Done
478	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 89	Gen. Positive	Yes	We do want to work with parish councils to further define these points to make sure that development is incentivised and impacts are mitigated, but this needs to come once there is more certainty both in the Site Allocations Plan and in likely sites/amounts for windfall. For instance, as the Draft Plan points out, no sites were supported in the Site Allocations Plan (Issues and Options) and paragraph 89 shows the majority of residents want either no new houses, or only up to 10 new houses. 10 large houses with garagescould equate to around £108,000 CIL (25% meaningful proportion of £27,000) which clearly will not fund all the infrastructure projects identified in Section 18, especially if brought forwards one or two houses at a time.	Accept	Many of the projects are low cost and fund raising in Linton may be significant.	None
479	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Section 19	Special Projects	Yes	It is very encouraging and positive that the community has identified a number of projects in Section 18 in the Projects Priority List, and the delivery agency as set out in Section 19. With minimal new development then there would obviously be only minimal impact on infrastructure, and therefore the projects in the priority list would not be needed as a result of new growth but to meet existing needs/desires. This is therefore a further reason why the City Council cannot commit to CIL spending on those projects, as CIL spending can only be as a result of new development. Some of the projects are wider than just CIL spending, as is then acknowledged below the table, but it would be useful to also highlight this in paragraph 150. It may also help clarity to distinguish between those which are 'physical' measures and those which are not such as returning The Ridge to green belt,	Accept	Note we can expect little contribution from LCC towards our projects. We may split the projects in the delivery stage but consider this unnecessary for the Plan	None

Unique Id	Comment Category	Response	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
480	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 146	Gen. Positive	Yes	Paragraph 146 is supported. It may assist to include an example of the amount of payment which could be received for a new individual house (e.g. 4 bed plus garage = approximately 120 sqm). N.B. Self-build houses and residential extensions are exempt from having the CL. Designated sites	Accept	Noted	None
481	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Nature	Yes	<p>As identified in para 34 of the plan, the plan area includes Linton Common Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), a nationally designated site protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).</p> <p>While we welcome in principle Policy D1 regarding footpaths, cycleways and bridleways, we advise that Natural England should be consulted on any works to the footpath connecting Linton Common to Tripp Lane where said work is within or that is likely to affect Linton Common SSSI.</p> <p>Natural England notes that allocations (Linton ref) 3 and 4 lie adjacent to, or in close proximity to, Linton Common SSSI, but that these allocations are not supported by the Plan. Nevertheless we advise that should development come forward on these allocations or other sites on, adjacent to, close to or otherwise likely to affect Linton Common SSSI, Natural England should be consulted under section 28(1) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and Schedule 5 of the Development Management Procedure order 2010.</p>	Accept		None
482	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Nature	na	<p>Strategic Environmental Assessment</p> <p>Natural England provided advice regarding the screening of Linton Neighbourhood Plan under the Strategic Environmental Assessment of Plan and Programmes Regulations 2004 in our letter dated 19 June 2014 (our ref 122394) attached for your convenience.</p>	Accept		None

Unique Id	Comment Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
483	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Gen. Positive	Yes	<p>Progress of other Plans</p> <p>Natural England note that Leeds Core Strategy has not yet been adopted and that there is therefore potential for the Linton Neighbourhood Plan to progress before the Core Strategy is adopted. We suggest that the compliance of the draft Neighbourhood Plan with Leeds Core Strategy is reviewed once the Core Strategy is adopted.</p> <p>The following is offered as general advice which may be of use in the preparation of your plan:</p> <p>Natural England, together with the Environment Agency, English Heritage and Forestry Commission has published joint advice on neighbourhood planning which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans and development proposals. This is available at: http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf</p> <p>Local environmental record centres hold a range of information on the natural environment. A list of local records centre is available at: http://www.nbn-nfbr.org.uk/nfbr.php</p>	Accept	LNP will not be submitted for independent examination under LCC Core Strategy ratified.	Update
484	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Nature	na	<p>Protected landscapes</p> <p>National Character Areas (NCAs) divide England into 159 distinct natural areas. Each is defined by a unique combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural and economic activity. Their boundaries follow natural lines in the landscape rather than administrative boundaries, making them a good decision making framework for the natural environment.</p> <p>http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/publications/nca/default.aspx</p>	Accept		None
485	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Nature	Yes	<p>Protected species</p> <p>You should consider whether your plan or proposal has any impacts on protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced standing advice to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected or Biodiversity Action Plan species should they be identified as an issue.</p> <p>The standing advice also sets out when, following receipt of survey information, you should undertake further consultation with Natural England.</p>	Accept	Consider adding an appendix detailing these requirements & refer to these in "5. Linton's Rural Landscape"	Update

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
486	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Drafting	No	No	Natural England Standing Advice Local Wildlife Sites You should consider whether your plan or proposal has any impacts on local wildlife sites, eg Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR) or whether opportunities exist for enhancing such sites. If it appears there could be negative impacts then you should ensure you have sufficient information to fully understand the nature of the impacts of the proposal on the local wildlife site.	Accept	The proposals do not have an impact on SNCI or LNR	No change required
487	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Nature	Yes	Yes	Best Most Versatile Agricultural Land Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services (ecosystem services) for society, for example as a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, as a store for carbon and water, as a reservoir of biodiversity and as a buffer against pollution. It is therefore important that the soil resources are protected and used sustainably. Paragraph 112 of the National Planning Policy	Accept		Suggestion included
488	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Nature	Yes	Yes	Framework states that: 'Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality'. General mapped information on soil types is available as 'Soilscapes' on the www.magic.gov.uk and also from the LandIS website; http://www.landis.org.uk/index.cfm which contains more information about obtaining soil data.	Accept		Review amend para 143 Multiple housing development in and around Linton will no doubt increase pressure on highways inside the village and its surroundings, and also increase demands for local facilities such as schooling, healthcare, public utilities, policing, waste services and leisure, most of which are currently provided outside Linton. These are the types of projects LCC may fund through the CIL.
489	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	None	Nature	Yes	Yes	Opportunities for enhancing the natural environment Neighbourhood plans and proposals may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment, use natural resources more sustainably and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature.	Accept		Review amend para 145 145. Some of the projects, however, are more suitable for delivery by the Parish Council and some by LCC. It is envisaged that the Parish Council will use its "meaningful proportion" and LCC may use CIL and other funding sources accordingly.

Unique Id	Cmt Category	Respondent	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Docu ment Refer ence	Cetegy (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
490	Non-resident (Specialist)		Full	Specific	None	Nature	Yes	Opportunities to incorporate features into new build or retro fitted buildings which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes should also be considered as part of any new development proposal.	Accept	Consider adding references to this in an appendix.	Editing committee agreed this was not required.
491	Non-resident (Specialist)		Not specific	General	None	Gen. Positive	na	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the emerging Linton Neighbourhood Plan proposals. Unfortunately, we have been unable to view the documentation as the web links are not working. I am able however to give you some general comments with regard to our approach to Neighbourhood Plans. The West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA) do not object to the proposals for Neighbourhood Plans in principal and would welcome the opportunity to contribute to the future development of these plans.	Accept		None
492	Non-resident (Specialist)		Not specific	General	None	Gen. Positive	na	The West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan seeks to ensure comprehensive sustainable transport links with key destinations in West Yorkshire metropolitan area. Through working in close partnership with public transport operators and district councils, WYCA seek to implement a high quality, accessible network that reflects changing journey patterns both within the Metropolitan area itself and its journey to work area. We therefore want to ensure that any Neighbourhood Plans, which fall within West Yorkshire's journey to work area: Promote future development patterns of development consistent with the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan; Maximise the opportunities for the use and improvement of the public transport, freight, cycling and walking networks serving key development and regeneration areas; Identify and protect future routes and site specific locations for new transport schemes and proposals;	Accept		None
493	Non-resident (Specialist)		Not specific	General	None	Gen. Positive	na	Establish and promote appropriate parking standards for different types of location and development which maximise and incentivise the use of sustainable travel modes;	Accept		None
494	Non-resident (Specialist)		Not specific	General	None	Gen. Positive	na	Identify walking, cycling and way finder measures alongside bus infrastructure improvements.	Accept		None
495	Non-resident (Specialist)		Not specific	General	None	Gen. Positive	na		Accept		None

Unique Cmt Id	Respondent Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
496	Non-resident (Specialist)	Not specific	General	None	Gen. Positive	na	It should also be noted that some transport schemes that impact the plan area may fall outside the plan boundary. Where this occurs, the policy within the plan needs to acknowledge that developer contributions (particularly when the Community Infrastructure Levy is introduced) can be used outside the plan boundary for schemes that ultimately may benefit the area. We would welcome the opportunity to work with you to jointly identify any opportunities for improving public transport access and infrastructure to the area in support of its future development.	Accept	Projects mentioned to support	None
497	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 2	Gen. Positive	na	What are the European Policies?	Accept	Amend Para 2 - text from LCC	2. Local communities can now set out their vision for an area and shape planning policies for the use and development of land. It is about local rather than strategic issues. This Neighbourhood Plan must be compatible with National Planning Policy, European Policies and the strategic elements of Leeds City Council's Local Development Framework (Local Plan). 3. One of the basic conditions that will be tested by the independent examiner is whether the making of the neighbourhood plan is compatible with the key European Union obligations, namely: <input type="checkbox"/> The Strategic Environmental Impact Directive; <input type="checkbox"/> The Environmental Impact Assessment Directive; <input type="checkbox"/> The conservation of natural habitats and wild fauna and flora; <input type="checkbox"/> The Directive on the conservation of wild birds.
498	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 3	Gen. Positive	na	Suggest a reference to social and economic benefits also	Reject	This will be covered in Sustainability Appraisal	Update
499	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 4	Gen. Positive	na	Add word "further" in front of hearings	Accept	Review amendments to text in para 4	Done
500	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 5	Gen. Positive	na	Change sequentially to "proportionately"	Accept	Amend Para 5	Done
501	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 20	Gen. Positive	na	Text does not make it clear which sites are being considered? Those in the issues and options report?	Reject	Text is clear	None
502	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 31	Gen. Positive	na	Add "and forms part of a wider strategic network across the Metropolitan District of Leeds".	Accept	Amend para 31	The Wharfe Valley forms the southern boundary of the Linton Neighbourhood Plan Area and is recognised by Leeds Core Strategy Spatial Policy 13 as Strategic Green Infrastructure. It forms part of a wider strategic network across the Metropolitan District of Leeds".
503	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 32	Gen. Positive	na	Give examples of species	Accept	Consider in Appendix	Insert after para 37 38. Within the Plan Area, there have been a number of sightings of species which are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, which have been recorded by West Yorkshire Ecology as follows: otters, voles, bats (Vesper, Soprano Pipistrelle, Common Pipistrelle and Pipistrelle), Pale St John's Wort, and Thistle Broomrape. 39. Also within the Plan Area and immediately adjacent to the built area are the following UK Priority Habitats – Deciduous Woodland; Floodplain Grazing; Lowland Calcareous Grassland.
504	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 38	Gen. Positive	na	Is there any reference to Linton in the Doomsday Book?	Accept	Include information from WYAS	Some knowledge of habitation in the area goes back at least to the Iron Age, and to the Roman villa "Dalton Parlours". There is evidence of significant Roman activity. The village is referred to in the Domesday Book. In the late 19th century, Linton had 4 farms, a 25 year old school (to
505	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 46	Gen. Positive	na	We do not know whether the Green Belt boundary will be changed during the Plan period, this will be determined by the site allocations plan	Accept	Review text in para 46	51. The majority of the Plan Area is Green Belt and this has served to protect Linton from significant development. It is expected that the Green Belt boundary will remain little changed through the Plan period and beyond but this will depend upon the Leeds City Council Site Allocation Plan and any Green Belt review undertaken.

Unique Id	Comment Category	Comment on full/summary document	Comment General or Specific	Document Reference	Category (w.r.t. plan production)	Support Theme in LNP Draft (Yes/No or na)	Comment. Text captured verbatim (name anonymised). No changes to content although some paragraphs have been split to pull out individual comment clauses.	Accept, Reject, Further Action	Reason/Comment/Action	Document Update Action
506	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Vision	Gen. Positive	na	by ensuring positive management of future developments at app	Accept	Review amend to Vision	Done
507	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Vision	Gen. Positive	na	delivery "and monitoring" of the LNP	Accept	Review amend to vision	Done
508	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Objective 9	Gen. Positive	na	delivery "and monitoring" of the LNP	Accept	Review amend to Objective 9	To support residents in an ongoing basis in the delivery and monitoring of the LNP.
509	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 59	Gen. Positive	na	Change word decisions to applications	Accept	Review amend to para 59	Done
510	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 66	Gen. Positive	na	it is more important that the density of any new developemnt is appropriate and reflects the existing spatial characteristics of the area.	Accept	Review amend to para 66	The Leeds Core Strategy Policy H3 describes density requirements for new housing. It recognises that settlements outside the hierarchy, and Linton is such a settlement, contribute little to the overall housing numbers and that the area of land to be used for any housing development will be small. No specific density criteria are therefore deemed necessary for future developments in Linton. Spatial character is more important than density. It may be appropriate for a small number of smaller dwellings to be located on an existing individual plot. This would increase the density locally. By maintaining appropriate separation from the plot boundaries and by sensitive boundary treatment the spatial character can be maintained.
511	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Policy A1	Gen. Positive	na	Would a lack of Street Lights be a safety issue?	Reject	Majority want Linton to remain a dark village	None
512	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 73	Gen. Positive	na	add to second sentence "and monitoring"	Accept	Review amend to 73	This has encouraged a stronger community spirit and it is vitally important that in the future residents continue to be involved in the Plan delivery and monitoring.
513	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 75	Gen. Positive	na	...Green Belt and forms part of a Special Landsapce Area...the whole of Linton is included within the network of Strategic Green Infrastructure.	Accept	Review amend to para 75	Outside the village envelope and current built areas, all of the land within the Neighbourhood Area (apart from one area) was designated Green Belt and forms part of a Special Landscape Area in the Leeds City Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP). The Key Diagram in the Leeds Core Strategy maintains the Green Belt boundary and also shows the whole of Linton as being within the network of Strateaic Green Infrastructure. Linton does not possess the range of services and therefore it is likely that the Green Belt within Linton will be retained throughout the Plan period
514	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 77	Gen. Positive	na	should not say the Green Belt within Linton Neighbourhood Area will be maintained throughout the Plan period - this can only be determined through the site allocationbs process.	Accept	Amend para 77 to reflect.	
515	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 80	Gen. Positive	na	This should be considered within the context of the Site Allocations Plan	Reject	The LNP will be submitted before the site allocation plan.	None
516	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 82	Gen. Positive	na	The SHLAA has been updated since 2012	Reject	The analysis was based on SHLAA 2012.	None
517	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 112	Gen. Positive	na	no % support for white post and rail fence	Accept	Review presentation of information	"Added post survey" included on table
518	Non-resident (Specialist)	Full	Specific	Para 126	Gen. Positive	na	Table of Local Green Space -it would be useful to have actual sizes	Accept	Measure and amend text	Done