

BOLTON PERCY, COLTON & STEETON PARISH COUNCIL**COMMENTS ON PLAN SELBY CONSULTATION**

(Note: Due to the lack of Superfast Broadband we have based our comments on hard copy versions kindly provided by our District Councillor.

Unfortunately we have discovered that the copies we have are different to each other with the main difference being the question numbering. We have been able to check with the on line version and believe we are now using the latest numbering)

Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4 We cannot respond to these questions at this stage due to the deadline constraint. There are very complicated matters involved and perhaps some of these reports should be handled as separate consultations albeit with sensible deadlines. We will address these points at the next consultation stage.

Q5 It might be helpful to adopt the more usual business terms of 'Objectives' and 'Strategy'?

This might help to emphasise the difference between 'Aims' and 'Objectives'?

'Aims' seems a very half- hearted word implying no importance if the 'Aim' is faulty?

The Aims and Objectives mentioned are supported but we feel that the 'people' element is missing. Perhaps some wording is needed to promote the idea that the 'Plan' is to be developed with local support rather than imposed as appears at present? Clearly there will be many local differences of thought on planning and other matters and it is important that local opinions are respected wherever possible.

Q6 We think the 'Key Issues' do represent a sensible approach.

They do appear to all be interlinked and so equally important but perhaps the 'Climate Change and Renewable Energy' section is not as important as the others?

Q7 & Q7b Yes. We basically oppose over allocation as this could result in over development in the smaller communities where the developer will see a larger profit.

Q8a, b & c We feel that non-delivery should be minimised by changes to the local planning process whereby speculative planning applications should be discouraged and penalties imposed on non-delivery. Difficult to achieve we appreciate but surely some changes to the system could be beneficial.

It would be nice to avoid contingency sites as their establishment causes uncertainty and the potential decay of sites that may not in reality ever be developed.

Q9 Yes essentially a straight percentage growth seems a reasonable starting point. However we would suggest that the availability of non-greenbelt land and the infrastructure spare capacity should also be factors that might distort the straight percentage approach.

Q10 Some villages in the District are on a knife edge regarding essential services. In Bolton Percy and Colton we have major concerns with foul water drainage. There are also serious concerns regarding the electricity and mains water supply to some properties. We do urge that any site selection criteria must include a study of the impact of the development on other local villages.

As an example any development in Appleton Roebuck (our nearest DSV) will have a serious impact on several local villages including Bolton Percy and Ulleskelf because of the capacity and routing of the current foul water drainage system.

Q11 No comments

Q12 No

Q13 Yes

Q14 Yes

Q15, Q16 & Q17 In reality we think it is relatively difficult for SDC to plan in too much detail regarding employment sites. Ultimately the 'market' will decide if new employment situations arise in the Selby District. There may be no relationship between new housing and employment. As will be appreciated many workers want to live in SDC but are employed many miles away. With improvements to road and rail networks it does seem that employment within SDC could stagnate but at the same time resident numbers will increase.

The large growth in employment does seem to be in rural areas where many are now either working from home on a full time or part time basis. The lack of superfast broadband in some areas is we know now causing some residents to consider relocating to enable homeworking to be accommodated.

It does seem that a requirement does exist for small office and workshop developments within DSVs.

Q18 Yes

Q19 Yes

Q20 We are not sure that some of these issues can be influenced by the District Council role.

SDC must have a firm well understood planning policy which could lead to the towns being developed along required lines. However the overall economy and business situation will be the determining factor and trying to promote ideas contrary to the real world could be counterproductive.

However car parking and public transport could be improved in the 3 towns to help business development. A more sympathetic approach to business rates will also be beneficial.

Q21 Yes – Protecting the rural environment and public amenity.

Q22 The Development Limits should be drawn tightly. They can then always be relaxed if required in the long term.

Q23a No comment

Q23b Yes as far as we are aware.

Q24 We would discourage the encroachment onto safeguarded land.

Q25 As mentioned before we are very concerned at the lack of understanding within SDC about the effect of development in one location on the utility service provision in a neighbouring village.

Apart from the long running unacceptable foul water situation locally we also have flooding issues. The long term solution in Bolton Percy is the re-routing of some existing land drainage so that it flows directly into a river rather than through the village.

In Colton the Bilborough Village and Bilborough Top developments have led to serious foul water flooding in the village during heavy rain. This seems to be caused by a basic failure of SDC planning department to understand how a development can cause major problems some distance away. Yorkshire Water is refusing to accept that the system is trying to operate beyond its capacity.

Lack of Superfast Broadband makes modern life difficult as witnessed by our problems in responding to this consultation!!

The weakness generally of the utility supply in some villages needs complete understanding before any future development outside the towns is contemplated.

Q26 Unfortunately it is difficult for many to understand the implications of climate change when its existence and effects are disputed by different 'experts'. Perhaps the sensible course is to ignore the debate on the subject and assume the worse? The Plan should assume that any climate change would alter the nature of the flooding prevalent in some parts of the District. This should be acknowledged within a new planning process. Equally important is that the Plan should ensure that river modifications and flood prevention schemes outside the District must be monitored and when necessary challenged to avoid a flood problem merely being moved up or downstream. Un-coordinated management of the River Wharfe seems to be the cause of some new local problems which will only be made worse by a heavier rainfall.

The value or otherwise of some forms of renewable energy are currently distorted by various government schemes to promote their use to meet EU targets. It is important for the Plan to recognise this and so only support the renewable energy sources that are really viable. Wind turbines should be resisted but heat pumps encouraged in new developments. Combined Heat and Power and Community Heating Projects are certainly worth considering but do not have unblemished track records so should not be automatically considered to be 'good things'. Local biomass can of course be very damaging to the local environment and if introduced on any significant scale could be catastrophic.

Is it possible to increase the insulation requirements of new builds within the District? At present many home owners do not have mains gas available. In the long term would a widespread provision of gas be a good thing environmentally? Lower cost, more controllable and many less truck movements?

In conclusion we believe that renewable energy and reduction in energy consumption should be encouraged but this must not be at the expense of visual or other damage to the environment.

Q27 We think the list is comprehensive enough and we think that the Core Strategy does provide enough protection. However it is absolutely imperative that the policies are understood both within SDC and the District and so treated with respect by all. The need to engage with local communities is important with these policies that must not appear to be imposed on reluctant residents.

Q28 Yes

Q29 Yes because this would help preserve characteristics of areas valued by the local community.

Q30 Table 8 seems to cover the topics well but we would suggest that utility infrastructure should be an additional topic.

Q31 We agree with this suggestion but are not sure how this policy could be put in practise. Ultimately we are reliant on business decisions by builders rather than expecting them to become future 'welfare' providers.

Q32 It is important that we don't get bogged down in using terms incorrectly. Perhaps the word 'sustainable' could be banned from the Plan! Public transport is certainly to be supported but it can never be 'sustainable'. We have very different situations within the District. Within the towns a good public transport system allows access to York, Leeds and hence the world. However away from the towns there is a very restrictive public transport system that means out of necessity a car must be used. Once in a car it is difficult to persuade a user to switch to public transport. The only local success story seems to be the well-used 'Park and Ride Scheme' for York. Unfortunately this has a restriction on hours of use that render it unsuitable for getting to York Station for a day trip to London for example. It's the usual problem of no integration between different forms of transport which are considered as competing when they could be complimentary.

Within the District we don't seem to have a traffic capacity problem except during short peak time periods.

Certainly all new builds should need to assume an off road parking capacity for a minimum of 3 cars. It is not difficult to find new estates with narrow streets and blocked pavements because no constraints have been applied to eliminate this problem.

We would not especially support the provision of electric vehicle charging points. It's at least debateable whether whole life cycle analysis actually proves this type of vehicle to be more environmentally friendly than a small car. Assuming that the problem is pollution in the towns then it seems to be accepted that buses and trucks are the problem rather than cars. We therefore suggest that this topic should not feature in the Plan.

Cycle routes should be an important item in the Plan. Suggestions are needed on how existing footpaths in rural areas could be upgraded so that cyclists could be provided with safe routes off of narrow lanes.

We suggest the many problems associated with the lack of public transport provision be addressed by the Plan

Q33 We strongly support the importance of the aesthetic design of new developments. However we recognise that the sites involved in new developments will need different design parameters applied. Bearing this in mind it does seem difficult to have a detailed overall policy. Really all new developments need to be sympathetic to the existing environment regarding materials used, density of habitation and the other usual considerations.

Q34 Of course for many rural communities the village shop, pub, post office and local garage have long gone. This basically for no other reason than they were unprofitable ventures. These facilities must not be encouraged without there being a sound business reason. In reality rural living is completely different to that enjoyed 30 or 40 years ago with now a negligible percentage engaged in agriculture. This does mean that local facilities are not really needed these days when larger facilities are available within a few miles. However it should be important to include a 'gathering place' where ever possible. This can be a traditional village hall or a sports club but must be capable of use for a wide range of activities.

It is important that the local community is consulted when planning applications relating to the encouragement of tourism are being processed.

Q35 Essentially we believe the flexibility within the Core Strategy should be retained. We do support the replacement of existing derelict or unwanted farm buildings by new housing but this must be sympathetic to the site location. This should apply both in the Green Belt as well as within a village curtilage.

Q36 Previously developed large sites need special consideration and as they are small in number should be treated on an individual basis. The previous use of the site may well dictate its forward use. We do not think it is possible to formulate a general policy in this area except to allow development when the balance of benefit to the area outweighs the objections.

Q37 To answer this question requires a considerable amount of work. We would suggest that obtaining the documents and then reading and commenting could take around 2 working weeks. This is simply not possible within the time constraints provided. Therefore we suggest that they all are scrapped.

Q38 As you will understand Selby Town because of its location is not apparently frequently visited from our Parish therefore we have no comments.

Q39 Again we have little knowledge of Sherburn so prefer not to comment.

Q40 We entirely support the regeneration of Tadcaster town centre. It is a pleasant town that is declining because of several reasons. Visually little progress seems to have been made in replacing or renovating derelict buildings. There is an opinion that despite 2 car parks in the main part of the

town easier parking could help. There does seem to be unnecessary roadside parking restrictions that discourage the casual small item purchaser aimed at by the current range of businesses. The main car park does seem to be used for essential all day parking for the breweries, other businesses in the town centre and for commuters travelling to Leeds and York. Altogether it seems that the 'pop in' type of customer may be being discouraged from shopping in Tadcaster.

There does seem to be plenty of scope for Tadcaster to grow both from a housing and business point of view to the benefit of those in the town and the town's ability to provide the services needed by the surrounding villages.

Q41 Our main concern about any development in Appleton Roebuck is its impact on other villages. The current foul water from AR is piped to Bolton Percy and other villages before being pumped to the treatment works just south of Tadcaster. There is a history of problems with this system in Bolton Percy and it seems unwise to contemplate any further development in AR before an acceptable foul water system is in place. We do suggest that all utility services in the area shared by Appleton Roebuck and surrounding villages are near or beyond capacity and so any development in Appleton Roebuck will have a detrimental effect on life in neighbouring villages.

Perhaps improved community facilities and infrastructure are needed if a significant increase in population is envisaged. These facilities may be of value to other neighbouring villages as well where it is not practicable to provide community centres.

Q42 to Q57 No comments

Q58 Ulleskelf is similar to Bolton Percy in that flooding from the River Wharfe is not uncommon. Our concern on any development in Ulleskelf is that it does not make worse the flooding situation in that village or indeed in Bolton Percy. Ulleskelf is similar to Bolton Percy in that it is on the same foul water system originating in Appleton Roebuck so the comments about under capacity apply.

Chairman: Stewart Steele

Clerk: Joyce Collier