Jayne Darley

From: Sent: Michael Outlook

To:

13 January 2015 13:00

Subject:

PLAN Selby consultation - Question number

Name

Michael Hewan

Address

Postcode

Telephone no

Please ensure you provide reference to the Question and Topic area for each comment you wish to make. Topic / Chapter

Question no. Q20 Do you have any particular views at this stage on these issues or how each of the 3 town centres should be developed?

Comments

Selby Town already suffers severe congestion should any distribution happen to the roads within the town centre itself, or the radial roads into town.

Consider the recent congestion caused by the roadworks on Scott Road (readiness for the Pelican Crossing**), and re-surfacing of of Leeds Road.

Any further increase in population in or around Selby will lead to an increase in vehicular traffic. So, an improved traffic management system / routes into and within Selby are necessary to support the Plan, infact they are needed now.

I can also see mention in the Plan regarding Selby Town centre roads as to the traffic lights at the junction of Scott Road and Gowthorpe.

Will traffic management in Selby be addressed as a priority before any other schemes within the Plan are initiated?

example: the narrow road at Church Hill, with large vehicular usage and existing priority flow of traffic needs to be improved.

** supplimental query: why has the said pelican crossing been sited at the far end of Scott Road? this will inevitably cause a backlog onto Flaxley Road wheras a siting nearer to the new leisure centre will most likely have more pedestrian usage.

Jayne Darley

From:

Michael Outlook

Sent:

13 January 2015 13:11

To:

LDF

Subject:

PLAN Selby consultation - Question number 20

Name

Michael Hewan

Address

Postcode

Telephone no

Please ensure you provide reference to the Question and Topic area for each comment you wish to make. Topic / Chapter

Question no. Q20 Do you have any particular views at this stage on these issues or how each of the 3 town centres should be developed?

Comments

Selby Town already suffers severe congestion should any distribution happen to the roads within the town centre itself, or the radial roads into town.

Consider the recent congestion caused by the roadworks on Scott Road (readiness for the Pelican Crossing**), and re-surfacing of Leeds Road.

Any further increase in population in or around Selby will lead to an increase in vehicular traffic.

So, an improved traffic management system / routes into and within Selby are necessary to support the Plan, infact they are needed now.

I can also see mention in the Plan regarding Selby Town centre roads as to the traffic lights at the junction of Scott Road and Gowthorpe.

-Will traffic management in Selby be addressed as a priority before any other schemes within the Plan are initiated?

example: the narrow road at Church Hill, with large vehicular usage and existing priority flow of traffic needs to be improved.

** supplimental query: why has the said pelican crossing been sited at the far end of Scott Road? this will inevitably cause a backlog onto Flaxley Road wheras a siting nearer to the new leisure centre will most likely have more pedestrian usage.

47 (3>

Jayne Darley

From:

Michael Outlook

Sent:

13 January 2015 13:13

To:

LDF

Subject:

PLAN Selby consultation - Question number Table 8 Public Rights of Way and

cycle/bridleways

Name

Michael Hewan

Address

Postcode

Telephone no.

Please ensure you provide reference to the Question and Topic area for each comment you wish to make. Topic / Chapter

Question no. Table 8 Public Rights of Way and cycle/bridleways

Comments

Although this is mentioned as an environmental issue, will it be ensured that no existing Footpaths, Cycle Paths, or Bridelways are lost?

In fact, an increase in population would indicate a requirement for an increase of those paths and should be a designated requirement to any developers.

47 (4 >

Jayne Darley

From:

Michael Outlook

Sent:

13 January 2015 13:28

To:

LDF

Subject:

PLAN Selby consultation - Question number 12 Gypsy and, Traveller Sites , and Q13

Approach

Name

Michael Hewan

Address

Postcode

Telephone no.

Please ensure you provide reference to the Question and Topic area for each comment you wish to make. Topic / Chapter

Question no. Question number 12 Gypsy and, Traveller Sites, and Q13 Approach

Comments

A founding approach should be that Traveller sites are spread throughout the district and not concentrated in localised sites.

Since by definition these sites are for peopel who "travel", then they do need to be where thoes people travel and not in limited locations.

Also, spreading the sites reduces the burden on local towns to solely support them.

Existing sites should not be expanded so as to enable this equal spread.

47 (5)

Jayne Darley

From: Michael Outlook
Sent: 13 January 2015 13:38

To: LDF

Subject: Q18 Do we need any Development Management policies particular to the,rural

areas to expand on the requirements set out in Core Strategy?

Name Michael Hewan

Address

Postcode

Telephone no

Please ensure you provide reference to the Question and Topic area for each comment you wish to make. Topic / Chapter

Question no. Q18 Do we need any Development Management policies particular to the, rural areas to expand on the requirements set out in Core Strategy?

Comments

A review of the speed limits on rural roads should be made.

Any increase in population and subsequent increase in car / lorry traffic will lead to an increase in rural routes usage as that traffic interlinks between the major routes and any new population sites. National speed limits apply to most country roads which is questionably OK for a small volume of traffic, but not so for higher volumes of traffic.

Where a country road shortcut is known there should be a development policy for its improvement or curtailed usage.

47(6>

Jayne Darley

From: Michael Outlook
Sent: 13 January 2015 13:48

To: LDF

Subject: Q8 How should PLAN Selby seek to allocate sites in such a way as to, secure

delivery over the whole plan period?

Name Michael Hewan

Address

Postcode

Telephone no

Please ensure you provide reference to the Question and Topic area for each comment you wish to make. Topic / Chapter

Question no. Q8 How should PLAN Selby seek to allocate sites in such a way as to, secure delivery over the whole plan period?

Comments

Q8 includes reference to building on flood risk areas.

Whereas the developers must take risk of flooding into account and provide mitigating infrastructures, it should also be encumbant upon them to extend those facilities to the surrounding areas that will affected by those infrastructures.

The Plan does mention the need to extend the Selby Pumping Station, or a new one, and this is paramount. In the last floods, when the Pumping Station was switched off, all the feeder dykes then filled up and caused flooding "upstream" - Selby Plan developments with flood mitgation should also include "upstream" locations.

1

Jayne Darley

From:

Michael Outlook

Sent:

13 January 2015 14:01

To:

LDF

Subject:

Q26 Is it necessary for PLAN Selby to consider, a) Providing a revised target for the

plan period to 2027 for, installed renewable energy?,

Name

Michael Hewan

Address

Postcode

Telephone no

Please ensure you provide reference to the Question and Topic area for each comment you wish to make.

Topic / Chapter

Question no. Q26 Is it necessary for PLAN Selby to consider:,a) Providing a revised target for the plan period to 2027 for,installed renewable energy?,

Comments

Selby District already has a plethora of Wind Farms, any further plans for expansion of Wind Farms, Solar Panel Farms, or other "Green Enery" provisions should place a higher consideration as to:

- the need itself for the enery requirement of the District i.e. why not generate the energy elsewhere more locally to where it is used
- the negative impact on the local population who suffer various impacts and no positive gains with compensation for anyone so affected
- limiting the distance between an energy facility and local housing, e.g. not within visible site from a ground floor room or within hearing distance.

1

47 (8>

Jayne Darley

From:

Michael Outlook

Sent:

13 January 2015 14:06

To:

LDF

Subject:

Q32 a) Should PLAN Selby include further policies for any of the,following?,, car

parking

Name

Michael Hewan

Address

Postcode

Telephone no.

Please ensure you provide reference to the Question and Topic area for each comment you wish to make. Topic / Chapter

Question no. Q32 a) Should PLAN Selby include further policies for any of the, following?,, • car parking

Comments

Before any housing development is permitted in any location, the devloper should first develop additional car parking facilities in the local town to cater for the increase in traffic that will occur.

Housing development should not proceed unless the local towns are first developed to support it, with the costs of such borne by the developers.

47 (9)

Jayne Darley

From:

Michael Outlook

Sent:

13 January 2015 14:13

To:

Subject:

Q42 a) How should Barlby & Osgodby grow and develop?

Name

Michael Hewan

Address

Postcode

Telephone no.

Please ensure you provide reference to the Question and Topic area for each comment you wish to make. Topic / Chapter

Question no. Q42 a) How should Barlby & Osgodby grow and develop??

Comments

The primary access route into Selby for any developments on the Olympia site, Barlby, and Osgodby is the Selby "Toll" Bridge.

This bridge is already a traffic bottleneck and even more so when any other road around Selby has problems pushing more traffic towards the bridge.

An infrastructure review is necessitated to derive an alternate routeto the bridge, or expanding the bridge in some way.

The Selby Bypass does not cater for traffic using Selby Town itself since it has limited access from the town.