

**Sophie King**

---

**From:** Brian Bartle <bb@bartles.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 19 January 2015 12:30  
**To:** LDF  
**Subject:** Plan Selby Consultation  
**Attachments:** Plan Selby Comments 2015.xlsx

See attached. Hopefully a format that can be utilized.

Yours

*Brian Bartle*

Bartles Ltd - Chartered Surveyors  
1 Bridge Street, Tadcaster, North Yorks LS24 9AW  
Tel: 01937 835303  
Mob: 07836 653936  
Company No. 08511234 Registered in England & Wales  
Directors P J Bartle & B N Bartle

Bartle & Son is the trading name of Bartles Ltd.

Q6	Yes, comprehensive topics list and generally all equally relevant in their own respect fields.
Q7	a) Base date acceptable. b) Broad principles accepted given review of date but needs greater flexibility to review as the plan period evolves with potential diversion of numbers eg from Selby Town to Sherburn or DSVs
Q8	a) The expectation is of non delivery in respect of Tadcaster & Selby with reliance on Olympia Park thus over allocation is suggested and or phasing considered. c) contingency sites need identifying and released on basis of 5 year supply.
Q9	a) % growth inappropriate as various DSV's have varying capacity and constraints b) Physical constraints need examining and locational advantages considered as a primary selection feature.
Q10	There are a number of non DSV's which could accommodate modest development by way of infill and should be determined on a criteria based policy.
Q11	Seems appropriate to re consider any allocations to Tadcaster and review the possibility of expanding Sherburn & local DSV's to accommodate the housing need.
Q12	Suggest the possibility of the LA being proactive in identifying sites to meet criteria. Site at Cliffe has already been presented to SHLLA.
Q13	All the criteria are relevant except Flooding where travellers can move if needed and not considered that a 1 mile distance is appropriate as by definition they travel.
Q15	The Core strategy is not helpful as the Table 5 is hardly likely to reflect what may be available in Tadcaster & the distribution needs amending to add that allocation to Sherburn a) No necessity to consider established employment sites. b) No detailed policy is favoured as the site selection should be market/user lead without prescription except for special use classes.
Q16	Can not determine uses. The choice needs to be market lead.
Q17	Criteria based policy required so as not to restrict emerging opportunities
Q18	No development management - take each case on its merits.
Q19	Each has its own characteristics but ultimately market opportunities can not be foreseen - just need to be receptive to market or end user needs so criteria based policy would be more appropriate.
Q21	Keep out of special policy designations as they are invariably wrong for various reasons.
Q22	Development limits already frustrate development and need reviewing to accommodate sympathetic development.
Q23	Strategic gaps are fundamental and should be held where they are now.
Q24	The answer available in respect of resolving Q8

Q25	Review A63/A162 capacity and roundabout at JP Plant Hire. Provide/promote car parking opportunities at rail stations
Q26	All these need supporting and notably not interfering with d) site selection, as more dependent on specific local constraints such as grid capacity which is outside the knowledge. Also factor in the amount of land being taken from food production with passive use eg wheat,sugar beet and maize for digesters, power station use.
Q30	Development management plans are not favoured and projects and proposals need to be market led.
Q31	Market to determine house types.
Q32	Secure/promote car parking options at the rail stations
Q33	a) Should be market led.
	b) Probably so but not convinced that earlier attempts have been too successful.
Q35	Incorporate former PPS7 into code to give some resilience for determining applications.
Q36	Each site must be considered on its merits as a policy is unwieldy and policy too prescriptive
Q39	a) Sherburn: review village centre and consider northern expansion to include shopping/supermarket location access to northern section of village between present developed form and by pass, currently constrained for access and which will need Green Belt adjustment.
Q39	b) Review and promote southerly extension of the Industrial Estate to make use of the existing rail siding for intermodal rail connection.
Q40	Tadcaster - Employment allocation wherever possible.
Q40	Review of the affect of the Leeds City Council proposal for New Town at Headley Hall University Farm site and impact on the town which should be resisted comprehensively.
Q43	Thorpe Willoughby: Capacity of the village to develop westwards without infringing on the 'Gap' should be recognised.
Q46	Church Fenton - seek to promote and provide for comprehensive development in region of the Station to include/enable car parking provision.
Q50	Hambleton: Remove the By pass protected route as extremely unlikely to ever emerge
Q53	Remove the By pass protected route as extremely unlikely to ever emerge and which would release development land to meet needs without significant adjustment to the Green Belt.
Q57	Thorpe Willoughby can develop westwards up to the positive by pass barrier and without intruding into the Selby Gap.
Q60	The extent to which affordable housing is genuinley required with an overly unrealistic eccessive target which fails to deliver in the areas where the greater need for housing is required - for instance Olympia Park and Rigid Paper sites where nothing is being delivered in the Selby town.