

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

14<sup>th</sup> January 2015.

Dear Sir/Madam,

### Plan Selby

In response to your request for interest in Plan Selby, below is my response. Living in Tadcaster I obviously have a greater interest in the town and its surroundings than the rest of the plan although I am interested in the greater environment. I have therefore limited my responses more to the needs of Tadcaster. The documents do appear to be very comprehensive but to a lay person such as myself with limited time available do make for some heavy reading.

I am pleased to see that areas such as educational and need for the elderly are being taken into consideration. I am also pleased to see that the Environment Agency have a flood defence scheme for the town, but I am concerned by the final comment on this issue regarding the risk.

Q5. This does seem to be a reasonable general aim.

Q6. Again these do seem to be reasonable topics.

Q7. I am not in a position to know the requirements but it would seem to me that if we have so many unoccupied properties in Tadcaster for so long, one has to pose the question, why is there a need to build new? Should long term vacant properties be investigated in this equation?

Q8. This seems a little of a defeatist attitude. If the plan is solid and robust there should not be a need for over allocation or non delivery. I agree that there should be a contingency plan but this should only be used as a last resort and as an emergency measure.

Q10. I am unclear as to what is being said about Tadcaster in relation to this question. I am against building on good agricultural land around the peripheral of the town when there are sites and long term empty properties within the town. I think it is essential that the centre of the town is developed in keeping with its tradition before any other development takes place. You say in this document that Tadcaster is a commuter town for Leeds and York. The more building that takes place on the peripheries the more people living on these sites will commute and not contribute to the local community or economy in any way. Developing the town centre would help to regenerate a community environment and bring prosperity to the town. Building on the outskirts will only lead to more transport, parking and pollution problems.

Q11. Developers will obviously favour larger sites where development cost are lower. However this should not be satisfying developer's needs, we should be satisfying the needs of the community. With increasing population and the need to reduce carbon levels we will require more farm land to feed the growing populations of the future. This should be our concern for today rather than meeting targets and interest in financial gain.

Q15. As the document says the prime employers in Tadcaster are the breweries. Consideration does need to be given to providing increased local employment within the town. This is a need if more housing is going to be available, to try to reduce the current level of commuting from the town thus reducing emissions and encouraging more local community activity.

Q20. Tadcaster does have a range of very good shops; however there are a number of empty properties within the town which detract from the good appearance of the rest of the town. I appreciate that the council may have some issues with landowners, however these need to be resolved and a solution found. This should not be an excuse to doing nothing. Councils are in place to develop the needs of the community they represent. Developing these properties in keeping with the town would make it a far more pleasant area to live and work in. Tadcaster is ideally situated for people travelling to coast etc. and could be made into a thriving little town in the same way that neighbouring towns have been developed.

Q22. We moved into the area 22 years ago from the South of England and one of the attractions was that towns did not sprawl into the countryside in this area. It is pleasant to have a definite gap and this should be maintained.

Q25. There should be access to the A64 towards Leeds from Tadcaster on the A162 towards Sherburn in Elmet. There is only access to the A64 Eastbound at this point. This would drastically reduce heavy vehicle access to the town and to other roads in the area.

Consideration should also be given to the dangerous junction at Union corner between Station Road, A659 and Garnet Lane. The highways agency agreed to install a roundabout at this junction at a public enquiry some years ago but nothing has ever been done.

Q26. I would have thought that Tadcaster on the banks of the river Wharfe and having a weir would lend itself very well to a small hydro scheme which I feel should be included within the plan. I would have thought that there must be other sites along the length of the river which could also be used.

Having a great deal of open flat land susceptible to wind there must be a number of sites that could be considered for wind turbines.

Perhaps the council should also look at the possibility of the use of solar farms and encouraging people to install solar panels.

Q30. I am not sure how you encourage people not to use their cars for even the shortest journeys. Despite the major works that have been undertaken on the car park in Tadcaster there is still a parking problem. If the population is to increase there will be a need for further parking in the town and at local schools in particular.

Q31. Needs to address the requirements for an ageing population.

Q32. As addressed in Q. 30.

Q33. Development needs to be in keeping with current architecture and environment. Density and general appearance need to blend and be of the same nature of adjoining properties. Developers will naturally want to put as many houses on a plot of land as possible to get the highest financial gains however this should be avoided.

Q34. The plan should be restrictive and the test should be what enhancement it is going to make to the local community and its economy, without destroying the environment. Financial cost should not be part of the equation if it is to the detriment of the future of the local community.

Q40. Please refer to my previous comments in particular my response to Q10.

I hope that this is the type response that you were looking for and hope it might be of some help. I look forward to seeing the next step of the plan.

Yours faithfully,

*Stuart Raggett.*