

Sophie King

From: Amy Rostron
Sent: 19 January 2015 13:56
To: LDF
Subject: PLAN Selby comments

PLAN Selby comments
 Contact details
 Amy Wadsworth

Q5

A Yes a good start

B Build homes where people want to live

Q7 The completions to date include many windfalls, these should be removed from the amount allocated. Allocations should be made in secondary villages.

Q8 a Yes over allocations should be made if there is suitable land

C Yes contingency sites are available in secondary villages and should be released if there is a shortfall of completions

Q9 a Yes b Yes all local factors should be taken into account such as flood risk etc

Q10 Each potential location should be judged on its own merits

Q11 Allocate to villages in the west of the district

Q12 Hillcrest cafe and lorry park at side of Old A1

Q13 No take each site on its own merits

Q14 No each site should be judged on its own merits in favour not prejudiced against.

Q17 Employment land and sites for tourism in the countryside and green belt should all be judged on their own merit

Q18 Less policies not more are what is needed and encourage proactively development

Q19 The former Selby mine sites are suitable for engineering associated with agriculture, Kellingley Mine could become a residential village after it closes as there is a loose village around it.

Q20 Keep retail in the centres not outskirts and provide more leisure facilities in Sherburn

Q22 Loosely around settlements to allow for growth beyond the plan period.

This needs to be a comprehensive change to all green belt settlements not just a shift to the west of Tadcaster and Sherburn in Elmet!

There is no development land left in most green belt villages, time for change, these are special circumstances!

Q23 Keep the boundaries between Selby and Thorpe Willoughby as they are, looks like pp will be given off Leeds Road Thorpe that will narrow this gap before PLAN is written!!!!

Q24 enough for next 25-30 years

Q25 Leisure facilities in Sherburn, car parking in Fairburn,

Q27 No more needed

Q30 No more please NPPF covers all

Q31 No its down to the landowners and or developers to do that if they want as long as at least 20% is available for self build or custom build

Q32 No less not more please

Q33 No these are not planning issues they are building control issues

Q34c Designate enough land for it instead of blocking it

Q35 No

Q36 Judge each site on its own merits

Q37 Get rid of them all, less not more!!!!

Q39 Leisure facilities

Q40 Tadcaster can only grow and develop if there is land available if landowners choose not to develop land that is their freedom of choice!!!!

Q41 to Q58 Limited growth for local needs

Sent from my iPhone