



14 January 2015

Policy and Strategy Team
 Selby District Council
 Doncaster Road
 SELBY
 YO8 9FT

Dear Sirs,

Re: Observations on PLAN Selby document submitted as part of the Initial Consultation process.

Please find below observations regarding the PLAN Selby document.

1. All new housing development should count towards the minimum target of 7,200 homes required by 2027 in Selby District. Having Designated Services Villages (DSVs) enlarged by allocation will result in them becoming more and more urbanised, resulting in them losing their rural identity, something which PLAN Selby purports to preserve over the whole District. Re: Mission Statement and the Vision of the Core Strategy.

Modifications to include Secondary Villages would ensure that a fairer balance of house building, by type and tenure, and help the achievement of building the required number of homes within the time frame is attainable. Additional information on site availability shows that Landowners within the Secondary Villages have areas they have put forward for development and these should not be totally excluded from the allocation process.

Failure to offer affordable housing in Secondary Villages, as under the present intention of PLAN Selby development within Secondary Villages would be 'windfall' and would only be in small numbers, would contradict the Vision of the Core Strategy

'Residents will have a high quality of lifeand there will be a wide range of housing.....to create socially balanced and sustainable communities which are less dependant on surrounding towns and cities.'

No development should be considered 'windfall' until the minimum target figure has been

achieved.

2. Allocations of proposed housing within the District should not be calculated by % increase alone as this would make the larger villages even larger. (See Observation 1)

Allocations should be made on individual village basis, looking at local requirements, local facilities, additional infrastructure required and the number of homes built and/or have planning application approval between 2011-2015 within that village taken into account.

Allocations for Secondary Villages should be made to assist with local facility and infrastructure development and to ensure Secondary Villages receive as much support from all Agencies to provide these additional facilities for their residents as per the Vision of the Core Strategy.

3. More housing of a variety of sizes, types and tenure will be required as the population of Selby District grows, but to propose to build large settlements over short periods of time can and does overwhelm villages and villagers when facilities and infrastructure does not keep pace with construction, creating problems within the locality.

Small housing development that easily integrate into a village community would help prevent further erosion of the ethos of living in a rural environment. Basic necessities of infrastructure should and must be available to ensure new builds do not put additional pressure on village life.

4. Business and commercial accommodation development should focus on providing employment that is of high quality, to have good access to high speed technologies and communication facilities, with long term employment prospects for the work-force of the District, within the District, and to offset the high number of commuter travelling daily to workplaces in other areas.

Transport links and the basic requirement of good transport facilities, both road and rail, are essential for rural communities to access job opportunities. At present, public transport is very restricted.

Villages, especially the larger DSVs, are becoming more and more like dormitory villages that lose community spirit, by encouraging small rural businesses to locate within villages would provide a much needed stimulus to re-invigorate community by providing employment locally, without the need to travel.

5. Provision of renewable energy within Plan Selby should ensure that such energy is derived from developments that will provide high levels of sustainable, low carbon emissions and continuity of supply of energy without the need of secondary support, whilst having a limited impact on the countryside environment and residents of the District and with the ability to provide long term employment.

The AECOM study referred to in the Draft Plan is both well out of date and possibly biased in that this company is a member of the Wind Industry association. Considerations have not been given to renewables including biomass unit conversion at Drax Powers Station, Anaerobic digesters in advanced state of construction and further digesters already in the Planning application pipeline. No targets should be set.

Any high density provision of renewable energy through wind farms and solar panel farms would not reflect the Vision of the Core Strategy that:

'By 2027 Selby District will be a distinctive rural District with an outstanding environment, a diverse economy, and attractive, vibrant towns and villages.'

6. Why should PLAN Selby micro manage such items as electric vehicle charging points provision? Should electric vehicle ownership, both public and private, increase very significantly surely National Policies would be put in place to support such requirements, that Selby District Council would automatically have to comply with.

7. SDLP - Policy T5 - Safeguarding of A63 Hambleton/Monk Fryston Bypass Corridor.

In relation to this Policy, Hambleton Bypass Line was revoked at the same time that the A63 was detrunked and is therefore no longer relevant.

Should any future Highway Surveys result in such a possibility of a Bypass for Hambleton, a new line would need to be considered as current Planning Applications and land put forward for allocation now include the old Bypass line.

8. Hambleton - Question 50

8a. Speeding traffic through Hambleton has been a major issue for many years, with little change even after traffic calming measures were installed, and as Hambleton has housing to the North and South of the A63, some type of enhanced traffic management solutions are required for the safety of pedestrians and provision should be included in PLAN Selby if Hambleton is expected to provide housing on an 'allocated' basis.

8b. Although outside the remit of Selby District Council, PLAN Selby should also support Hambleton in securing the provision of a Medical Centre/Satellite Surgery at some future time instead of residents having to travel to other destinations to see a Doctor, unlike all the other DSVs on the A63 that already have Surgery provision.

Should this much needed facility be provided as part of a housing development programme it would reduce car usage and provide a much needed facility for older and infirm residents that have to rely on a poor bus service.

8c. Any new housing development within the Parish of Hambleton should be close to the main residential centre of the village, within easy walking distance of the local Primary School and local shops, reducing the need for internal village car journeys.

Careful consideration of which sites would be most suitable for development must be taken as the majority of the sites put forward by landowners is prime agricultural land, which is irreplaceable. Brown field sites should be considered first.

8d. Village assets such as the Village Green, part of Hambleton Hough owned by the Parish, the Village Hall, Church and surrounding land, all Grade 2 listed building, the Pinfold and surrounding land, the Play Area in Garth Drive, the Cemetery and the Recreation Field in Old Lane should be protected from development and retained for the residents of Hambleton Parish.

9. SLAA Ref THORPE/010

This parcel of land lies within the Parish of Hambleton and should be marked as such to reflect its position in relation to the distance from the centre of the Village and the rest of the Parish.

10 A large number of studies required by Selby District Council to make informed policy decisions in PLAN Selby will not be available until after the second public consultation period. This information may be of value to the consultees and Parish and Town Councils to enable them also to make more informed responses within the second consultation period, and therefore this second consultation period should be delayed until all documentation is available for the consultees to view.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs. I. Millington