

Sophie King

From: Richard Coy
Sent: 18 January 2015 14:39
To: LDF
Cc: ; South Milford Parish
Subject: PLAN Selby - Initial Consultation
Attachments: SMPC PLAN Selby Comments.pdf

Good Afternoon,

Please find attached an below South Milford Parish Council's comments on the PLAN Selby Sites and Policies Local Plan Initial Consultation.

Please note we tried to populate the PDF response form, however there are a number of issues with the form that do not allow you to replicate pages for responses to multiple questions as well as issues with the formatting (even when using Acrobat Pro) we therefore attach our response in standard PDF format and in text below. We would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this email and its contents before the deadline of 17:00 tomorrow.

Regards

Richard Coy
Chair
South Milford Parish Council

Contact Details:

Name	Richard Coy - Chair
-------------	---------------------

Comments:

Topic 1 Chapter 3

Q 8

a) Should PLAN Selby over allocate to allow for any non-delivery on the allocations? By what methods and by how much?

SMPC does not believe that PLAN Selby should over allocate - the plan numbers are carefully calculated and derived from existing population and inward migration calculations, and therefore should represent the maximum sustainable growth of this district. Land availability will respond to market needs and permit speeding up, or slowing down where appropriate over plan period

b) How should PLAN Selby seek to allocate sites in such a way as to secure delivery over the whole plan period?

If the sites and number of homes generated by those sites are evenly spread across the District then this will promote an even and sustainable growth within the District, rather than over saturated pockets of unsustainable expansion.

c) is there opportunity to have contingency sites in case others are not delivered elsewhere in the District? How might the contingency sites release be managed to maintain 5 year housing land supply?

No - as this document recognises many of the District's towns and villages are constrained by Green Belt around their development limits. In some instances it is accepted that limited development within the Green Belt needs to occur, however the vast majority of the Green Belt fulfils the 5 functions of Green Belt, in particular the prevention of urban sprawl and the protection/preservation of individual town and village characters. As such over allocation of sites will inevitably result in developers/house builders promoting unsustainable and unsuitable sites in advance of a reasonable, organic and sequential plan.

Topic 1 Chapter 3

Q9

a) Is a simple percentage growth across all Designated Service Villages a fair and appropriate starting point for deciding the split between DSVs?

SMPC believes that the simple percentage growth of 8% spread evenly across the DSV's is the only starting point for deciding the split and as highlighted in response's to previous questions we believe that a sustainable and active housing market needs even growth across the district to promote choice and sustain annual numbers.

b) Bearing in mind issues such as land availability, flood risk and other technical constraints are there particular criteria that should be taken into account in assessing the final minimum target for DSVs?

Each DSV needs to be assessed on not only the apparent infrastructure within the village but the ability of that infrastructure to expand and accommodate further growth. In the instance of South Milford it is true that there is a train station within the village boundary, however the service that this station provides is limited to east/west travel with no direct access to major conurbations such as York and the current parking and amenities at the station are simply inadequate for even the existing users. Similarly the road access to the village is limited to northern/southern routes, as western access is wholly unsuitable for even medium traffic flow and the village does not have any eastern access to the bypass (A162). Even the north/south access is limited due to weight limit traffic regulations and residential on road parking.

The capacity of local infrastructure also extends to the local schools' ability to expand - in South Milford we have already experienced significant housing growth both before and within the plan period and this has resulted in the construction of an additional classroom to assist in accommodating the numbers. However, any further significant growth in the village population would make it extremely

difficult to accommodate additional numbers within the school without the unacceptable loss of green and hard play space or amenity around the school. Parking on the School grounds for staff is at a premium with teachers double parking - the roads around the school at drop off and pick up are already very busy.

Topic 1 Chapter 3

Q10 The core Strategy sets the rules for choosing sites; but do you have any views on the relative importance or weight to be attached to the criteria for site selection?

SMPC believes that the 4 criteria for choosing sites in the Core Strategy is correct but would suggest that the order be as follows;

1. Previously developed land and buildings within the settlement;
2. Extensions to settlements on previously developed land;
3. Extensions to settlements on greenfield land.
4. Suitable greenfield land within the settlement;

SMPC believes that when allocating future development sites consideration also needs to be given to the following in the priority listed.

1. Ability of adjacent/village infrastructure to accommodate proposals
2. The presence of natural/man made boundaries as physical representations of development limits
3. That an growth to the development limits of a town or village are organic and sympathetic to the existing form and feel of the area

Topic 2 Chapter 3

Q17 What should the approach to employment land be in the rural areas, including DSV?

Given that South Milford is almost exclusively a residential village with only retail (Use class A) SMPC thinks it would be highly inappropriate to accommodate any form of commercial/employment land within the village and this is further supported by the weight restriction through the village which would preclude any B class operations.

Topic 3 Chapter 3

Q22 Should the Development Limits be drawn tightly to maintain the settlement pattern, or loosely around the settlements to enable sympathetic development?

SMPC, reluctantly, accepts that limited development within the Green Belt needs to occur to meet the plan period outputs, however the Green Belt around South Milford fulfils the 5 functions of Green Belt, in particular the first 4 criteria which is that of; the prevention of urban sprawl, prevention of neighbouring towns merging, safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and to preserve the setting and special character - Residents of South Milford are very fond of the still rural feel of the village and like their green space, many of them want more green space. The 5th criteria is to assist in urban regeneration which has been satisfied by some of the recent expansion. Therefore any expansion of the Development Limits around the village needs to follow the existing form of the village with only sympathetic and organic growth in areas that are capable of sustaining additional development.

Topic 4 Chapter 3

Q25 are there any infrastructure requirements that have not been identified, including small scale and local needs?

SMPC believes that PLAN Selby does cover the requirements of South Milford but would draw attention to the following infrastructure needs that are of a particular concern.

- The ability of an existing school to expand/absorb growth - both physically and resource
- The existing parking and passenger amenities at transport hubs
- The effects of recent local flooding events
- The physical state, capacity and suitability of the local road network
- Statutory services, in particular electricity (historic power cuts), continuing Water pressure issues in the village and communications - our broadband capabilities are very limited in a lot of areas.
- Sport and recreation facilities are limited and in need of urgent updates and growth as they do not really meet the requirements of the current population.
- Healthcare requirements would need reviewing.

Topic 5 Chapter 3

Q26 Is it necessary for PLAN Selby to consider: d) identifying suitable areas for renewable and low-carbon schemes by technology? eg wind, solar, hydro

Yes - SMPC strongly feels that without clear guidance and policy landowners are submitting in appropriate applications within areas of not only Green Belt but designated areas of local landscape character.

Chapter 4

Q31 Should PLAN Selby include policies for setting specific house types and sizes, tenures and specialist housing such as care homes and self builds?

No - SMPC believes that the housing market and its stakeholders should/will react to the prevailing market conditions and that all future development should be built strictly in accordance with the South Milford Village Design Statement any new development will need to be sympathetic to the adjacent urban form whilst delivering a range of housing to meet the need. The Residents of South Milford are very fond of the rural/village feel.

Chapter 4

Q32 a) Should PLAN Selby include further policies for any of the following?

Yes to all of the items itemised including a review of Bridleways and the use footpaths as cycle routes

b) Are the other local transport schemes/issues that PLAN Selby should develop policies for?

Yes - as stated previously South Milford train station suffers from inadequate parking and passenger amenities to cope with the existing passenger flow and therefore a policy drafted with other stakeholders needs to be put in place to mitigate the current position as well as the inevitable increase in use as a result of these growth proposals.

Chapter 4

Q33 Should PLAN Selby have more detailed general policies on design by being more specific about the minimum design standards it will seek to achieve, including policy on development density, environmental and quality design benchmarks (such as BREEAM, Lifetime Homes, SBD)?

Yes - SMPC aspires for the best quality housing within South Milford and therefore planning policy documents that cement this as minimum requirements would be welcome. SMPC would also like to see the South Milford Village Design Statement fully adopted and referenced for future planning applications, and if required revisiting across the plan period. Green Space is also very important to the residents of South Milford.

Chapter 5

Q56 a) How should South Milford grow and develop?

SMPC strongly believes that expansion of the village, which will inevitably require a redefining of the development limits and re-appraisal of the surrounding Green Belt should be in a sustainable and organic fashion. The best sites for expansion are on the South East boundary of the village where there are defensible boundaries to prevent sprawl and the local infrastructure is more likely to cope with additional units, rather than on the Northern/Western/Eastern boundaries. The train station does not offer direct links to York.

b) What else is needed in South Milford that could be allocated a site

In order to mitigate the impact of increased housing within the village SMPC would expect as a minimum contributions via CIL or local development tax to improve/expand the following local/community assets:

- The village/WI hall
- Grove House
- The Church hall
- The school
- train parking and passenger amenities
- Open Space & Recreational space
- Expansion of Sports facilities including changing rooms and club rooms
- Refurbishment of existing footpaths - some are impassable.



SOUTH MILFORD PARISH COUNCIL

www.southmilford.org

Initial Consultation Comment Response

Contact Details:

Name Richard Coy - Chair

Comments:

Topic 1 Chapter 3

Q 8

a) Should PLAN Selby over allocate to allow for any non-delivery on the allocations? By what methods and by how much?

SMPC does not believe that PLAN Selby should over allocate - the plan numbers are carefully calculated and derived from existing population and inward migration calculations, and therefore should represent the maximum sustainable growth of this district. Land availability will respond to market needs and permit speeding up, or slowing down where appropriate over plan period

b) How should PLAN Selby seek to allocate sites in such a way as to secure delivery over the whole plan period?

If the sites and number of homes generated by those sites are evenly spread across the District then this will promote an even and sustainable growth within the District, rather than over saturated pockets of unsustainable expansion.

c) is there opportunity to have contingency sites in case others are not delivered elsewhere in the District? How might the contingency sites release be managed to maintain 5 year housing land supply?



SOUTH MILFORD PARISH COUNCIL

www.southmilford.org

Initial Consultation Comment Response

No - as this document recognises many of the District's towns and villages are constrained by Green Belt around their development limits. In some instances it is accepted that limited development within the Green Belt needs to occur, however the vast majority of the Green Belt fulfils the 5 functions of Green Belt, in particular the prevention of urban sprawl and the protection/preservation of individual town and village characters. As such over allocation of sites will inevitably result in developers/house builders promoting unsustainable and unsuitable sites in advance of a reasonable, organic and sequential plan.

Topic 1 Chapter 3

Q9

a) Is a simple percentage growth across all Designated Service Villages a fair and appropriate starting point for deciding the split between DSVs?

SMPC believes that the simple percentage growth of 8% spread evenly across the DSV's is the only starting point for deciding the split and as highlighted in response's to previous questions we believe that a sustainable and active housing market needs even growth across the district to promote choice and sustain annual numbers.

b) Bearing in mind issues such as land availability, flood risk and other technical constraints are there particular criteria that should be taken into account in assessing the final minimum target for DSVs?

Each DSV needs to be assessed on not only the apparent infrastructure within the village but the ability of that infrastructure to expand and accommodate further growth. In the instance of South Milford it is true that there is a train station within the village boundary, however the service that this station provides is limited to east/west travel with no direct access to major conurbations such as York and the current parking and amenities at the station are simply inadequate for even the existing users.

Similarly the road access to the village is limited to northern/southern routes, as western access is wholly unsuitable for even medium traffic flow and the village does not have any eastern access to the bypass (A162). Even the north/south access is limited due to weight limit traffic regulations and residential on road parking.

The capacity of local infrastructure also extends to the local schools' ability to expand - in South Milford we have already experienced significant housing growth both before and within the plan period and this has resulted in the construction of an additional classroom to assist in accommodating the numbers. However, any further significant growth in the village population would make it extremely difficult to accommodate additional numbers within the school without the unacceptable loss of green and hard play space or amenity around the school. Parking on the School grounds for staff is at a premium with teachers double parking - the roads around the school at drop off and pick up are already very busy.



SOUTH MILFORD PARISH COUNCIL

www.southmilford.org

Initial Consultation Comment Response

Topic 1 Chapter 3

Q10 The core Strategy sets the rules for choosing sites; but do you have any views on the relative importance or weight to be attached to the criteria for site selection?

SMPC believes that the 4 criteria for choosing sites in the Core Strategy is correct but would suggest that the order be as follows;

1. Previously developed land and buildings within the settlement;
2. Extensions to settlements on previously developed land;
3. Extensions to settlements on greenfield land.
4. Suitable greenfield land within the settlement;

SMPC believes that when allocating future development sites consideration also needs to be given to the following in the priority listed.

1. Ability of adjacent/village infrastructure to accommodate proposals
2. The presence of natural/man made boundaries as physical representations of development limits
3. That an growth to the development limits of a town or village are organic and sympathetic to the existing form and feel of the area

Topic 2 Chapter 3

Q17 What should the approach to employment land be in the rural areas, including DSV?

Given that South Milford is almost exclusively a residential village with only retail (Use class A) SMPC thinks it would be highly inappropriate to accommodate any form of commercial/employment land within the village and this is further supported by the weight restriction through the village which would preclude any B class operations.

Topic 3 Chapter 3

Q22 Should the Development Limits be drawn tightly to maintain the settlement pattern, or loosely around the settlements to enable sympathetic development?

SMPC, reluctantly, accepts that limited development within the Green Belt needs to occur to meet the plan period outputs, however the Green Belt around South Milford fulfils the 5 functions of Green Belt, in particular the first 4 criteria which is that of; the



SOUTH MILFORD PARISH COUNCIL

www.southmilford.org

Initial Consultation Comment Response

prevention of urban sprawl, prevention of neighbouring towns merging, safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and to preserve the setting and special character - Residents of South Milford are very fond of the still rural feel of the village and like their green space, many of them want more green space. The 5th criteria is to assist in urban regeneration which has been satisfied by some of the recent expansion. Therefore any expansion of the Development Limits around the village needs to follow the existing form of the village with only sympathetic and organic growth in areas that are capable of sustaining additional development.

Topic 4 Chapter 3

Q25 are there any infrastructure requirements that have not been identified, including small scale and local needs?

SMPC believes that PLAN Selby does cover the requirements of South Milford but would draw attention to the following infrastructure needs that are of a particular concern.

- The ability of an existing school to expand/absorb growth - both physically and resource
- The existing parking and passenger amenities at transport hubs
- The effects of recent local flooding events
- The physical state, capacity and suitability of the local road network
- Statutory services, in particular electricity (historic power cuts), continuing Water pressure issues in the village and communications - our broadband capabilities are very limited in a lot of areas.
- Sport and recreation facilities are limited and in need of urgent updates and growth as they do not really meet the requirements of the current population.
- Healthcare requirements would need reviewing.

Topic 5 Chapter 3

Q26 Is it necessary for PLAN Selby to consider: d) identifying suitable areas for renewable and low-carbon schemes by technology? eg wind, solar, hydro

Yes - SMPC strongly feels that without clear guidance and policy landowners are submitting in appropriate applications within areas of not only Green Belt but designated areas of local landscape character.



SOUTH MILFORD PARISH COUNCIL

www.southmilford.org

Initial Consultation Comment Response

Chapter 4

Q31 Should PLAN Selby include policies for setting specific house types and sizes, tenures and specialist housing such as care homes and self builds?

No - SMPC believes that the housing market and its stakeholders should/will react to the prevailing market conditions and that all future development should be built strictly in accordance with the South Milford Village Design Statement any new development will need to be sympathetic to the adjacent urban form whilst delivering a range of housing to meet the need. The Residents of South Milford are very fond of the rural/village feel.

Chapter 4

Q32 a) Should PLAN Selby include further policies for any of the following?

Yes to all of the items itemised including a review of Bridleways and the use footpaths as cycle routes

b) Are the other local transport schemes/issues that PLAN Selby should develop policies for?

Yes - as stated previously South Milford train station suffers from inadequate parking and passenger amenities to cope with the existing passenger flow and therefore a policy drafted with other stakeholders needs to be put in place to mitigate the current position as well as the inevitable increase in use as a result of these growth proposals.

Chapter 4

Q33 Should PLAN Selby have more detailed general policies on design by being more specific about the minimum design standards it will seek to achieve, including policy on development density, environmental and quality design benchmarks (such as BREEAM, Lifetime Homes, SBD)?

Yes - SMPC aspires for the best quality housing within South Milford and therefore planning policy documents that cement this as minimum requirements would be welcome. SMPC would also like to see the South Milford Village Design Statement fully adopted and referenced for future planning applications, and if required revisiting across the plan period. Green Space is also very important to the residents of South Milford.



SOUTH MILFORD PARISH COUNCIL

www.southmilford.org

Initial Consultation Comment Response

Chapter 5

Q56 a) How should South Milford grow and develop?

SMPC strongly believes that expansion of the village, which will inevitably require a redefining of the development limits and re-appraisal of the surrounding Green Belt should be in a sustainable and organic fashion. The best sites for expansion are on the South East boundary of the village where there are defensible boundaries to prevent sprawl and the local infrastructure is more likely to cope with additional units, rather than on the Northern/Western/Eastern boundaries. The train station does not offer direct links to York.

b) What else is needed in South Milford that could be allocated a site

In order to mitigate the impact of increased housing within the village SMPC would expect as a minimum contributions via CIL or local development tax to improve/expand the following local/community assets:

- The village/WI hall
- Grove House
- The Church hall
- The school
- train parking and passenger amenities
- Open Space & Recreational space
- Expansion of Sports facilities including changing rooms and club rooms
- Refurbishment of existing footpaths - some are impassable.