

Sophie King

From: Georgina Carlisle
Sent: 19 January 2015 13:42
To: LDF
Subject: Re: PLAN Selby Comments

Dear Mr King,

Thank you very much for getting back to me. My sincere apologies, I have had real problems trying to use the form and didn't realise it didn't save my typing! Never mind here are my details and comments:

Name: Georgina Carlisle

Q1 Please let us have your comments on the objectives and approach

- Economic objectives could be more detailed.
- Where there is conflict between issues which will be given more weight/ how will these conflicts be overcome.
- SA objective 3 and 3.1 What about further education?
- SA objective 5 You need to also look at how growth will put extra strain on current policing and crime prevention.
- SA objective 7 – A range of cultural, leisure and recreation activities available to all.
- SA objective 13 – An attractive environment isn't necessarily the same as a bio-diverse and natural environment, depending on your view point.
- Otherwise I give my full support to these objectives.

Q5 b) Are there any others which should be included?

To ensure that local infrastructure, services and local amenities are updated and expanded in order to cope with growth.

Q6 a) Are these the right topics? b) Is this a comprehensive list?

I believe these could more closely link with the aim and objectives ie.

1 Live: a-Allocation of sites for homes. b-infrastructure

2 Do business: a-Economic assessment b-Allocation of sites for employment needs.

3 Enjoy life: a-town centre uses b-culture, recreation and leisure

4 Protection for the future: a – Physical: Green belts, designated safe guard land, boundaries, key assets etc.
 b-policies: climate change, environment etc.

Q7 a) Do you agree with the proposed approach to the base date? b) Do you agree with the broad principles of the calculation method?

There needs to be more flexibility in where houses are built (to accommodate for various issues that may arise), rather than having a strict number that each town/village should provide.

Q8 a) Should PLAN Selby over-allocate to allow for any non-delivery on the allocations? By what method and by how much?

Alongside providing a "buffer" by discounting the expected contributions from planning permissions by 10% for non-delivery. I believe suggestions 2 and 3 to good options for providing contingency. I don't agree with using suggestion 1. Suggestion 4 I think is a good idea anyway but not in order to provide a contingency.

Q9 a) Is a simple percentage growth across all Designated Service Villages a fair and appropriate starting point for deciding the split between the DSVs?

If this were done taking 2011 as the base point, not 2014 then yes I believe this would be a fair starting place. However using 2014 as the base point would I believe be unfair as some villages have incurred a heavy expansion within the last 3 years and local infrastructure is still trying to catch up.

b) Bearing in mind issues such as land availability, flood risk and other technical constraints (e.g. highways capacity and access) are there particular criteria that should be taken into account in assessing the final minimum target for Designated Service Villages

Recent growth in villages and SA assessments should be taken into account before setting minimum targets!

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?

In the approach to allocations I strongly believe extension to settlements on previously developed land should come above suitable greenfield land within the settlement.

Q13 a) Do you agree with the criteria used in the approach?

I do not understand why sites would need to be within 1 mile of Selby, Sherburn, Tadcaster or Brayton, Brotherton, Byram, Carlton or North Duffield? Otherwise I agree.

Q56 How should South Milford grow and Develop?

South Milford has recently undergone a big growth putting strain on current infrastructure esp. Primary School. I believe the village needs some time to adjust to this new growth, allowing for assessment and possible expansion of local infrastructure where required.

Regards

Georgina Carlisle

On 19/01/2015 13:12, LDF wrote:

Dear Ms Carlisle

Thank you for your email. Unfortunately your submitted comments form has no information included (see attached). Therefore could you resubmit your completed comments form, or alternatively provide your comments direct by email enclosing the information requested on the comments form.

If you have any queries do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards
Ryan King

-----Original Message-----

From: Georgina Carlisle [<mailto:georgina.carlisle@gmail.com>]

Sent: 18 January 2015 21:14

To: LDF

Subject: PLAN Selby Comments

To whom it make concern,

Attached are my comments on PLAN Selby.

Thank you
Georgina Carlisle