

From Mrs Pauline Leppingwell MBE

Initial Consultation Comments Form - Plan Selby

Dear Sir,

Set out below is my response to the questions in Plan Selby.

About Whitley

Before I commence with the response, I would like to the LDF team to be aware of certain facts about Whitley village. These facts are pertinent to the ability for Whitley to grow as a sustainable settlement.

During the preparation for the LDF in 2010/11 Whitley was classed as a secondary village but without any consultation or notice, it was switched to DSV status by linking it with Eggborough. The parish council and many residents have objected to this linking with Eggborough because of the implications for further developments and also it was done without any consultation or notice.

Apart from the primary school, we do not share any services with Eggborough any more that the other nearby villages of Hensall, Kellington or Cridling Stubbs. The services that are available in Eggborough are limited and have become less and less over the years.

Eggborough and Whitley are distinct separate villages with clear demarcation between the two communities – green belt, the railway line, the canal and the M62 motorway. Both villages have their own parish councils.

Whitley has no mains gas so all heating fuel has to be delivered by tankers and wagons. The only bus service runs north/south between Doncaster and Selby with no bus services running east/west. Trains connecting Leeds to Goole are limited to two per day and in view of the above, it is hardly surprising that car ownership in Whitley is high with most people travelling to the larger nearby towns for their employment, shopping and their other needs. The nearest banking facility, variety of shops and a petrol station is in Askern in South Yorkshire.

The responses below have been chosen because they are relevant to our area. Many of the questions have no responses because we do not have the necessary knowledge or expertise to comment.

Topic/Chapter Sustainability Appraisal Report. – Chapter 1.

Question no. 1

Paragraph 1.22 & 1.23

It is essential that HRA regulatory requirements are adhered to. The plan must ensure that designated sites are protected. It is also important the nature conservation throughout the district should be given a high priority. Too often housing developers do as little as possible to protect habitats. There is strong evidence that in Whitley, habitats for bats and other species have not been protected by the developers i.e. Whitley Farm, Whitley Lodge and Poplar Farm.

Topic/Chapter Habitat Regulations Ass.- Duty to Co-operate – Screening Methodology – Chapter 1

Question no. 2

Paragraph 1.24 to 1.28

This subject is important for those settlements that are close to several LA boundaries. This lack of co-operation can be seen where East Yorkshire authorities have allowed large manufacturing plant to be built close to the boundary with Selby DC without any thought being given to improving the road infrastructure. The result is that HGVs access the site via country roads and small nearby villages in Selby DC area. Heck and Great Heck are perfect examples of this. In Whitley, Whitefield Lane is totally unsuited to the type & volume of traffic that uses it when travelling to and from Gale Common, Kellingley Colliery and Darrington Quarry.

Topic/Chapter The Engagement Plan – Planned Approach - Chapter 1

Question no. 4

There is no doubt that a lot of work has gone into Plan Selby. Criticisms of the consultation process are as follows:

1. The terminology used is too complex and requires specialist knowledge. It is difficult to assess the contents of each document and printing it is a non-starter for most individuals.
2. The consultation process will only be viewed and completed by a small percentage of Selby district residents. **I do not think that the consultation process has worked for residents, who will be affected by any changes.**
3. Once the first stage is over can we have an analysis of the responses received showing the % submitted by ordinary residents as opposed to parish councils, developer & land

agents, business interests etc? This will show whether or not this exercise is truly a public consultation process that has engaged the wider public.

4. The timing of the consultation process could not have been worse – The run up to Christmas 2015. More time should have been given to study and complete Plan Selby documents.

Topic/Chapter- Key Aims & Objectives – Chapter 2

Question no. 5

Paragraph 5a and 5b

5a

I agree with aims and objectives as set out. The site selection process must take into account the sustainability of sites and the views of **residents** and others affected by any developments. Green belt boundaries are important to many residents of rural villages and boundaries must be safeguarded. Loss of productive farmland is not in the interests of Selby or the wider area.

5b To help with climate change all new housing should be required to have solar panels fitted to provide electricity and hot water.

Topic/Chapter Key Issues Chapter 3

Question no. 6

Paragraph

6a These are the right topics.

6c The order should be:

T2

T4

T1

T6

T3

T5

Topic/Chapter

Question no. 9

Paragraph 3.31 to 3.2

- a. A simple percentage growth across all DSV is not fair or equitable. Account must be taken of individual DSV facilities and the amount of growth experienced by the DSV in the years leading up to 2014. In the case of Whitley, it has experienced 88% growth in housing

stock over the period 2001 to 2014 without any improvement in community facilities or infrastructure. Where the DSV consists of two settlements of differing populations and area, say an 8% growth target should be apportioned in relation to the current housing stock in each settlement.

- b. Water and sewerage capacity, school places and the effect on changing the nature of the village, all of these factors are important in determining the future growth potential.

Topic/Chapter Topic 3 Defining areas for promoting dev. & protecting key assets

Question no. 22 Paragraph

Development limits should be tightly to maintain the settlement pattern and nature of the settlement. In Whitley most of the greenbelt is fertile and highly productive farmland, which should not be lost to development. Only in exceptional circumstances should greenbelt be developed. In Whitley the current development limits provide gaps in the dwellings which provide long distance views of the countryside. This enhances the nature of the village and they should not be lost. Exhaust first of all, brownfield land for development.

Topic/Chapter Topic 4

Question no. 32 Paragraph

a) Plan Selby should include further policies for the following:

- ❖ Active Traffic management
- ❖ Capacity improvement
- ❖ Cycle routes
- ❖ Car parking
- ❖ Electric Vehicle charging points.

Topic/Chapter Topic 4

Question no. 33 Paragraph

a) Selby DC should have more detailed general policies on design. Many of the recent developments in Whitley are poorly designed and seek only to achieve high density, which impacts on the quality of life for those living there:

- ❖ Many estate roads are too narrow leading to parking on pavement.
- ❖ Single garages are too narrow for modern family cars, meaning that cars are left on drive.

- ❖ Many residents have three or more cars and are unable to park on their property.
- ❖ Where possible all houses should have solar capture panels for hot water and electricity.
- ❖ Reasonable sized gardens should be provided.
- ❖ Design for the heating of homes should provide options to choose fuel types.

b) This is absolutely essential that SDP should have more detailed policies on design to avoid the dwellings becoming outdated. This applies mainly to the houses provided by the large national house builders. Design and density should be in keeping with nearby houses in village situations.

Topic/Chapter Topic SDP Local plan policies.
--

Question no. 37

Paragraph

a) All of the current policies in table 10 should be retained for use in Plan Selby.

Topic/Chapter 6 Settlements. – Designated Service Villages
--

Question no. 48

Paragraph

a) Despite several requests to explain and justify why Whitley is linked with Eggborough, a satisfactory explanation was never received. The two villages are separate with their own parish council. In 2010 Whitley was listed under secondary villages but by 2011 it seems to have morphed with Eggborough and become a DSV. Anyone who visited Whitley would be hard pressed to see it as service village because it has no shops or community buildings and the infrastructure is poor. Whitley is a long linear village which straddles the A19 and all brownfield sites have either been built upon or already have planning applications submitted. **Pages from the Selby District Local Plan dated February 2005 pages 142, 143 and 144 state the following:**

- ❖ **There are no shops, no village hall and one public house in Whitley.**
- ❖ **Constraints – Whitley is inset within the West Yorkshire Greenbelt.**
- ❖ **Opportunities for growth in Whitley are however fairly limited and development on a significant scale would encroach into open countryside and be harmful to the character and form of village.– Despite the above statements, since 2005 there have been more than 140 houses built in Whitley.**
- ❖ **The sewage system has limited capacity at the treatment works. This was in 2005!**
- ❖ **Misinformation and errors about services and public transport in the document state the following:**

There is a petrol station – this was closed and built upon, there are frequent bus services linking Whitley to Selby/Doncaster and Pontefract/Knottingley. This is incorrect in that the bus to Selby/Doncaster is hourly, there is no bus service to Pontefract/ Knottingley and there are only two trains per day linking Goole to Leeds. Because of the poor public transport links the car ownership in Whitley is very high and most residents, who are employed, commute by car to the nearby towns and cities.

Given the above true facts, I think there should no development outside the current development limits and certainly not onto greenbelt land. The one remaining brownfield site is the Rhubarb Sheds on Whitefield Lane, but the site is actually outside the village envelope and this might be the only site to consider for further housing development.

b) Until quite recently there was no ROS in Whitley. The parish council has managed to buy a small area of land and convert this into a small ROS & park. The problem they have is that landowners are reluctant to sell land for ROS or allotments at agricultural values. They anticipate that greenbelt land just outside the village envelope will sooner or later be given planning permission, so the landowners will not sell farmland at farmland prices. Whitley needs more ROS and Allotment land.

In the period from 2000 to 2014 the number of dwellings has increased from 233 in 2000 to 422 in 2014, an increase of 81.1%. Four large developments have taken place since 2000, the Barratt estate, the Persimon estate, the Bovis estate and the Harron Homes estate. These developments have not added any improvements to the infrastructure or community facilities in Whitley. What they have done is to reduce the number of trees in Whitley, degraded the habitat for wildlife and increased vehicle movements on and around the already over-used and busy A19.

Whitley does not need any more large-scale housing developments.

Whitley needs – improvements to pavements on the A19, a light controlled pedestrian crossing on the A19, traffic engineering on the A19 to slow down speeding cars and HGVs, ROS and allotments and access to high-speed broadband.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs Pauline Leppingwell

Date 18th January 2015

To
The Policy & Strategy Team
Selby District Council

Civic Centre

