Questions and Responses

Prior to the first round of engagement activities, each participant was provided with a summary of the key questions that would be explored during the workshops along with the format and structure of the events.

Let's Talk PLAN SELBY

QUESTIONS & RESPONSES

TOWN	FACILITATOR/PARTICIPANT
SELBY	SPAWFORTHS

DATE OF ENGAGEMENT WORKSHOP 1: 30th JUNE 2015
DATE OF ENGAGEMENT WORKSHOP 2: 14th JULY 2015

24th November   Revision M

Introduction

This Answers Booklet provides a record of the responses from both the Community and Technical Workshop participants at both the Round 1 and Round 2 engagement events.

All responses are those of the attendees and should not be regarded as being the views of either Selby District Council or the facilitators and engagement consultants. Please note that all the views included here are a distillation of comments made by the groups during the events and no comments should be attributed to any particular participant or organisation.

The Round 2 workshops provided an opportunity for attendees to agree the wording of the answers recorded by the facilitators during Round 1. The groups attending Round 2 subsequently requested that a number of the points recorded in the answers booklet for Round 1 should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate reflection of the sentiment of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in Round 1 have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

Round 1

Community Group Responses

Community Group: First Session

DISCUSSION GROUP
DEFICITS NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT I	Selby	Community	Round I

QUESTION
Are the town's existing deficiencies (i.e. areas where services and/or facilities have been identified as possibly lacking) as shown in the Fact Sheets for this session recognised by the group?

- Yes, but with the caveats set out below

Are there any deficiencies that are not regarded as deficiencies by the group or missing?

- Some members of the group felt that that car parking was not a major issue with adequate parking capacity distributed around the town but with better signage

Are there any that are not identified that ought to be added?

- The market is no longer the destination it once was and more could be done to reinvent/reinvigorate it

- Some group members felt that there was a lack of "pride" in the appearance of some of the shops and that more could be done to improve shop frontages and signage

- There are only a limited number of quality independent traders in the town centre

- There is no main stream cinema, no quality chain hotels or other leisure destination in the town centre and a very limited night time economy

- There is a lack of housing in the town centre, including living above the shop (needs further investigation)

- There is a lack of lifetime homes in the town

- There is a lack of new housing designed for older people

- There is a lack of primary school places at the "better situated" schools in the town resulting in an increasing number of children being sent to parents' second choice schools resulting in more children being driven to school due to the increased distances

- There was a perception that new housing developments were being located in areas where primary schools are already under pressure (further investigation is needed to understand how significant this issue is)

- Traffic management within the town centre needs further investment

Are the identified needs for the town over the next 15 years as shown on the Fact Sheets, recognised by the group?

- Yes, but with the caveats set out below

Are any of the identified "needs" being challenged by the group and what are their concerns?

- The Street Audit by STEP (available on the Town Council website) that was undertaken needs to inform the baseline needs assessment

- Some members of the group believed that greater efforts should be made to identify a new industry for the town following the demise of the mines and efforts should be made to attract a major inward investor

Which (if any) of the Renaissance Projects identified in the Fact Sheet are still supported by the community? Are there any additional projects that the group believe ought to be added to the list for further exploration and discussion?

- Attention should be given to the creation of a leisure corridor that follows the canal

- The river environs should become more of a focus for activity and become more accessible with more bridleways and footpaths

- A tidal dam scould be introduced down river to improve the quality of the river corridor and embankments close to the town

- More town centre leisure activities should be introduced (e.g. Cinema) to stimulate the night time economy

- Better quality eateries, dual use theatre, with car parking

- Greater efforts need to be made to make the town, particularly the abbey more attractive as a destination – e.g. visitor centre/facilities and tourist information centre and industrial museum

- Pedestrianisation of part of the town centre to create more pedestrian friendly areas that restaurants and shops can expand into

Community Group: First Session

| FEEDBACK SESSION |
| DEFICITS NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS |

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 4	Selby	Community	Round 1

QUESTION
Where are the areas of general agreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any areas of significant disagreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any key actions or investigations required before the Round 2 engagement? • Investigation into primary school places and the link with the timing of the delivery of new homes

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP
SPATIAL
TECHNICAL ISSUES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 7	Selby	Community	Round 1

QUESTION
Are the technical constraints shown in the Fact Sheet and drawing recognised and understood by the group?   • The technical constraints were discussed and the terminology was explained and clarified. The group noted that Selby (town) was surrounded by green fields but not green belt. The strategic gaps were also explained
Are there any technical constraints that the group does not believe to be particularly relevant?   • All the constraints were regarded as being relevant although there was a range of views expressed about the significance of the strategic gaps. Some regarded the gaps as being "functionally important" while others felt their role was more "emotional"
Are there any technical issues that are not identified on the list that the group believes to be relevant and given further consideration?   • No additional constraints were added by the group.
Are any of the identified "edges" such as major highways, rivers and/or railway embankments regarded as being more/less significant than the others? Should these edges be regarded as defining the extent of the settlement forever or in what circumstances could crossing this edge" be regarded as being acceptable?   • The southern bypass to the town (A63) was not regarded as being a barrier to future expansion of the town by many of the group members given the limited options available if the town was to try and expand in other directions. It was regarded as being potentially the "least worst" option although connections across the bypass and distance from the town centre were cited by some people as possible issues. <u>The Brayton Barff was recognised as important woodland area, therefore any development should be careful not to diminish this site. The A63 to the south of Selby was not considered as a barrier, although options to extend "south of the A63 and east of the A19" would be preferred to extending "south of the A63 and to the west of the A19".</u>

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP
DISCUSSION GROUP **SPATIAL** **OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS**

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 16	Selby	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Where should the identified growth be located given the known technical issues?

- The longer term expansion of the town to the south of the bypass was seen as more preferable than the option of expanding into the strategic gaps and merging the town with Thorpe Willoughby to the west. Opportunities to expand to the east of the river beyond Olympia Park were also recognised as being technically challenging with limited connectivity back into the town centre

- The expansion of the town north-west was discussed but there was an expectation that this would require a new northern bypass that may prove technically/financially difficult to deliver

- The former Council Offices and Tesco Depot site was identified as a preferable location for any new development and growth of the town. This option would also be consistent with the "brownfield" before greenfield approach

- The possible contraction of the town centre to make a tighter retail and hospitality core was also discussed along with the reintroduction of more housing into the town starting with Gowthorpe to the west which had historically been a residential area

If landowners do not make their land available during the plan period, how can the identified growth be accommodated and what are the implications for the rest of the Selby District?

- It was recognised that there are a significant number of technical constraints around Selby and additional "easy win" sites were hard to identify. It was confirmed however that the sites currently being promoted by landowners appeared to be well supported by interest from developers and that landowners appeared to be very willing to include their land in the proposals

- Identification of additional housing land to accommodate any shortfalls in land coming forward from other parts of the district was discussed. The general sentiment was that each settlement should be seeking to meet its own needs and that each of the three principal settlements in Selby District appealed to different housing markets and therefore should not be viewed as wholly interchangeable.

What are the implications of the growth options on say infrastructure and local existing services and facilities?

- The bypass was regarded as having the greatest capacity to take new housing growth.

- Any expansion of the town to the north would require significant new highway infrastructure (e.g. a new northern bypass) and may also require crossing points over the river. Any crossing point or bypass route should be safeguarded as part of PLAN Selby

Are there any potential benefits of developing in a particular location

- Development to the south of the bypass would not impact on areas prone to flooding, highway capacity was perceived to already exist and there would be no impact on any strategic gaps. There would be no coalescence of Brayton and Selby or Thorpe Willoughby

- Any development of the Cross Hills Lane site to the west of the town would be within walking distance of the town centre

- Development along the canal could also include creation of a marina and be linked back into the town centre with a new green corridor with pedestrian and cycle routes

- Developing more housing in the town centre (with specific provision for older people) would encourage more town centre activity, retailing and leisure/hospitality facilities - especially during the day

Community Group: Second Session

> **DISCUSSION GROUP**
> **TOWN CENTRE**
> **TECHNICAL ISSUES**

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 10	Selby	Community	Round 1

QUESTION
Are the technical issues shown in the Fact Sheet and drawing recognised and understood by the group?   • The technical issues shown on the drawings and in the fact sheets were recognised by the group. Some verbal explanation was provided regarding some of the terminology used in the key
Are there any technical issues that the group does not believe to be particularly relevant?   • All the technical issues shown on the drawings and in the accompanying fact sheets were regarded as being relevant by the group
Are there any technical issues that are not identified on the list that the group believes to be relevant and given further consideration?   • No additional technical constraints were added by the group

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP
TOWN CENTRE
OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 19	Selby	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Taking into account the earlier technical issues discussion and the findings of the retail study as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, are there any obvious areas where the town centre should be contracted or expanded?

- Contraction of the town centre from the western end of Gowthorpe was discussed with more housing being introduced if the retail area contracts

- Greater attention could be given to linking the town centre with the river and making the river corridor a key element of the town centre visitor "offer"

What are the consequences of a "do nothing option"?

- The Selby discussions were very similar to the debates held with the other focus groups. There was discussion regarding the changing nature of town centres due to changes in shopping patterns, internet retailing and the growth in the "hospitality" sector and recognition that Selby, although larger than both Tadcaster and Sherburn, was not immune from these changes and would need to consider how it could adapt.

- There was recognition that to "do nothing" was not an option and that this would lead to further decline if new initiatives, projects and new forms of development were not introduced into the town centre.

Based on the findings of the retail study as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, where might new town centre businesses be encouraged to locate and what might be preventing them from currently being attracted to these locations?

- There was some concern that other towns of a similar size across the region were starting to redefine themselves and find a changed role. The towns that were cited as having made (or were currently making) a successful transition were Pickering, Beverley, Helmsley, Hexham and Skipton although it was recognised that each had its own special set of circumstances and that Selby could not simply try and replicate the solutions adopted by other settlements

Based on the observations and experiences of the group members, what may be done to make the town centre more attractive to customers, increase footfall and town centre prosperity?

Not all the following options were supported by all of the group:

- Pedestrianisation of Finkle Street and James Street

- Make New Street a one-way street (as proposed in the STEP Street Audit)

- More external seating and meeting places

- Increase housing in the town centre

- Contract the town centre – i.e. concentrate the businesses in a smaller area

- Stimulate the night time economy by introducing other activities/facilities and trying to attract "branded" restaurants to site alongside the independent businesses

- Improvements to public realm, street furniture and possible clustering of cafes and restaurants closer to the Abbey to encourage visitors to stay in the town longer and the proprietors to stay open longer and open on a Sunday

- A Heritage Museum to draw attention to Selby's long history

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP NATURAL & HERITAGE ENVIRONMENT TECHNICAL ISSUES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 13	Selby	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Are the technical issues shown in the Fact Sheet and drawing recognised and understood by the group?

- The technical issues shown on the drawings and in the fact sheets were recognised by the group

Are there any technical issues that the group does not believe to be particularly relevant?

- All the technical issues shown on the drawings and fact sheets were regarded as still being relevant

Are there any technical issues that are not identified on the list that the group believes to be relevant and given further consideration?

- Staynor Wood should be added to the drawings

- Brayton Barff should be given greater emphasis and prominence in any subsequent masterplanning/ spatial planning

- The Goods Yard at the back of the railway station is a heritage asset that should be identified as such on the drawings and fact sheets

- Greater distinction should be shown on the drawings between Flood Zone classifications – in particular between Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3A/B

Community Group: Second Session

**DISCUSSION GROUP
NATURAL & HERITAGE ENVIRONMENT
OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS**

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 24	Selby	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Taking into account the earlier technical issues and subsequent discussion as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, are there any obvious areas where the town could be expanded without adversely impacting on the built and natural environment?

- The land to the south of the bypass and to the north west of the town were regarded as being more preferable than going west towards Thorpe Willoughby or south-west into the Brayton strategic gap

---

If there needs to be expansion into the previously undeveloped land within and to the perimeter of the town, are there any areas where the impacts can be minimised, i.e. which are more acceptable than others? What might the implications be of developing in these areas?

- Any major expansion of the town to the north west would require significant environmental assessment and is likely to require major infrastructure if long term growth is to be accommodated in this area

---

Are there any areas of the natural environment that are of lesser quality that may be enhanced or positively transformed through enabling development on or near these areas?

- Expansion of the town to the south of the bypass might provide an opportunity to create green corridors back into the town (enhancing existing routes and potentially creating new ones) although no specific suggestions were made as to how this might be achieved and further consideration would need to be given to this idea during future masterplanning exercises

---

Are there any areas within the built environment, where new development could be sensitively accommodated and the land is available and not technically constrained?

If these are within the conservation areas or near listed buildings, are the sites appropriate or of sufficient scale to accommodate that type of development?

- The empty Kwik Save supermarket site was identified as a potential development site

- No other major sites were identified within the town centre and it was recognised that the historic nature of Selby Town Centre, the high number of listed buildings and the historic environment placed significant constraints on assembling larger sites

---

Community Groups: Second Session

> **FEEDBACK SESSION**
> **ALL GROUPS**
> **TECHNICAL ISSUES / OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS**

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 25	Selby	Community	Round 1

QUESTION
Where are the areas of general agreement?
• A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any areas of significant disagreement?
• A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any key actions or investigations required before the Round 2 engagement?
• None identified

Round 1

Technical Group Responses

Technical Group First Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS
DEFICITS NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT	SESSION
OUT 29	Selby	Technical	Round 1	Deficits Needs and Aspirations

QUESTION

The group comprised site promoters who were less familiar with the town than local residents and businesses. Consequently there were only limited views expressed based on feedback obtained from community engagement events held by some of the consultants.

Are the town's existing deficiencies as shown in the Fact Sheet for this session recognised by the group?

- Yes

Are there any deficiencies that are not regarded as deficiencies by the group?

- None identified

Are there any deficiencies that are not identified that ought to be added?

- Engagement by the site promoters had identified elderly housing and bungalows as areas of deficiency in the town

- Some of the town centre roads are narrow and there was the perception that they are close or at capacity

- Agents and landowners were struggling to get the community along to engagement events and there was a suggestion that this may be due to either consultation fatigue or the way the events had been promoted and timed

Are the identified needs for the town over the next 15 years as shown on the Fact Sheet, recognised by the group?

- Yes but with the caveats set out below

QUESTION

Are any of the identified "needs" being challenged by the group and what are their concerns?

- A requirement for custom build plots was challenged and there was a request for further evidence of consumer demand in Selby

- The "deallocating" of existing employment sites was challenged as this may incentivise existing landowners to redevelop them for housing

- None of the promoters had incorporated specific provision for older persons' accommodation, extra care or custom build into their current thinking although two promoters did not rule out the possibility if there was evidence of demand

Are there any aspirations beyond the identified deficiencies and needs?

- There is an opportunity to open up the river and canal for walks and greater connectivity and waterside activities

- Forward planning of green and blue infrastructure should be built into current strategic thinking so that appropriate measures can start to be considered regarding climate change adaptation for the next plan period (i.e. don't plan any strategic growth for the next 15 years around Selby that does not anticipate or prevent what may need to happen in 15+ years' time)

- Consider animating the river by encouraging more development overlooking the river corridor

- Encourage bigger picture thinking and the attraction of one or more major leisure attractions to the Selby District given its connectivity, location in the region and access to large areas of green space

- Upgrade river defences to safeguard future development opportunities

- Open up views of the river by careful landscape design

- Create a marina on the canal for leisure craft

- Create a canal footbridge near to the Industrial Chemicals site to provide greater connectivity with the town centre

- Make provision for more cycle ways, footpaths and bridleways

- Introduce natural play spaces rather than equipped play spaces

- Make Selby Town Centre more attractive as a destination to encourage greater inward investment (e.g. festivals, pedestrianisation, cinema, shopfront improvement schemes)

Technical Groups First Session

FEEDBACK SESSION
ALL GROUPS
DEFICITS NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 32	Selby	Technical	Round 1

- A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group

Technical Group Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS
TECHNICAL ISSUES – ALL THREE THEMES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 35	Selby	Technical	Round I

QUESTION

Referring to the baseline information provided as well as their own information prepared to support their own sites or assessment work, are the technical issues shown in the Fact Sheet and drawing recognised and understood by the group?

- The attendees did not require any clarification on the land use designations, facts sheet content or drawing annotations. They did request that greater colour distinction be given to the different classes of Flood Zone around Selby

Referring to the baseline information provided as well as their own information prepared to support their own sites or assessment work, are there any technical issues that the group does not believe to be particularly relevant?

- None identified

Referring to the baseline information provided as well as their own information prepared to support their own sites or assessment work, are there any technical issues that are not identified on the list that the group believes to be relevant and given further consideration?

- There is a <u>Source Protection</u> ~~soil protection~~ Zone to the west of Thorpe Willoughby

- Further detail on the strategic highway network and priority junction improvements for the town would have been helpful

- Confirmation of existing cycle routes and bus routes /services would be helpful to inform future spatial planning and masterplanning work

- Additional flood defence annotation along the river would be helpful for people to understand where the "defended" sites are

Are any of the identified "edges" such as major highways, rivers and/or railway embankments regarded as being more/less significant than the others? Should these edges be regarded as defining the extent of the settlement forever or in what circumstances could crossing this edge" be regarded as being acceptable?

- The bypass was regarded as being a logical southern boundary, although all the land being promoted by the attendees within the group lay inside the current alignment or to the north of the town

- There is a medium term opportunity to build to the north west of the town. It was recognised that any major urban extension would require a northern bypass which was considered a longer term aspiration, which may face significant technical and funding issues

Technical Group Second Session

| DISCUSSION GROUPS |
| OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS – ALL THREE THEMES |

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 44	Selby	Technical	Round 1

Spatial Theme

QUESTION

Where should the identified growth be located given the known technical issues?

- The attendees were promoting specific sites therefore the primary focus was on the land that was in their clients' ownerships.

- The land to the north and west of the town was seen as a logical long term area of expansion as it did not impact on the Brayton strategic gap but this area needs a more comprehensive assessment if it is to avoid coming forward in a piecemeal fashion. Appropriate infrastructure, flood mitigation/defences etc. would need to be planned into any long term aspirations for this area

- The river forms a natural eastern boundary for the town with Olympia Park and lies in Barlby. Much of the land to the east of Selby is in flood plain/has a high flood risk

- There is no green belt immediately to the west of Selby and no immediately apparent long term western boundary for the town

- It was suggested by the agents/promoters that Selby is becoming more attractive as a housing location as York and Leeds struggle to meet their housing needs within their own districts. It was also suggested that in Tadcaster the market emphasis seemed to be providing homes and services for people working in York, while Sherburn seemed to provide homes and services for people working in Leeds. Selby appeared to serve both plus Castleford and other towns to the south in Wakefield Doncaster and East Yorkshire. All these assertions need further verification.

- Any land within any of the Strategic Countryside Gaps should not be dismissed without further assessment and consideration against any Site Selection Methodology adopted by the Council

If landowners do not make their land available during the plan period, how can the identified growth be accommodated and what are the implications for the rest of the Selby District?

- It was recognised that Tadcaster had failed to deliver its housing numbers during the last plan period and may struggle to meet its housing needs over the next 15 years. It was suggested by some attendees that Sherburn tends to serve people working in Leeds, whereas Tadcaster and Selby are more York focused

What are the implications of the growth options identified earlier in the discussion, on say infrastructure and local existing services and facilities?

- Although some land could come forward without major infrastructure improvements, larger scale expansion of the town to the North and west is likely to require new highways (a northern bypass?) and utilities infrastructure as well as trigger a requirement for additional primary school places, primary care and other local services. A smaller scale first phase of development in this location may not require the same level of infrastructure investment

- Expansion to the south of the bypass is likely to trigger a need for additional local services but new highway infrastructure may not be needed if the existing bypass has the capacity to take more development

- The expansion of the town to the west at Cross Hills Lane would make many of the town centre shops and services within walking distance of the new development although highway improvements on key junctions are still likely to be required

Are there any potential benefits of developing in a particular location

- The Cross Hills Lane site and other land to the north that is being promoted, could be linked through green and blue corridors to the town centre

Town Centre

QUESTION

Taking into account the earlier technical issues discussion and the findings of the retail study as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, are there any obvious areas where the town centre should be contracted or expanded?

- There was no representation from town centre developers and promoters and landowners at this session. However it was noted by those present (who were promoting housing sites around Selby) that the existing Selby Park could be drawn into the town with better signage and connections. It was not felt that the town centre needed to grow and that contraction and greater vitality and quality were needed rather than necessarily increased floorspace.

- The former Civic Centre site was recognised as a preferable site in which to deliver any further retail uses in Selby

Based on the observations and experiences of the group members, what may be done to make the town centre more attractive to customers, increase footfall and town centre prosperity?

Although there were no specific landowners/developers at the meeting with interests in the town centre, a number of observations were made by the group:

- Create an environment that supports the development of more high quality independent traders

- Create an area where cafés, bars and restaurants can be clustered together to stimulate a safe, higher quality night time economy (as well as a daytime food and drink "offer")

- Selby needs to develop one or more unique selling points (USPs) to attract more people and businesses to the town centre

- Increase the amount of housing in the town centre to create a "buzz" during the day

- Use Selby Park as an evening venue for festivals and events which would then (hopefully) encourage people to use the town centre restaurants, bars and cafes

Natural and Built Environment

QUESTION

Taking into account the earlier technical issues and subsequent discussion as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, are there any obvious areas where the town could be expanded without adversely impacting on the built and natural environment?

- No additional comments.

If there needs to be expansion into the previously undeveloped land within and to the perimeter of the town, are there any areas where the impacts can be minimised, i.e. which are more acceptable than others? What might the implications be of developing in these areas?

- No additional comments

Are there any areas of the natural environment that are of lesser quality that may be enhanced or positively transformed through enabling development on or near these areas?

- The canal corridor could be enhanced as part of a wider development initiative to build housing on redundant employment land

Are there any areas of the natural environment that are highly valued and/or well used by the community that they would wish to see retained and potentially enhanced going forwards?

- No additional comments

QUESTION

Are there any areas within the built environment, where new development could be sensitively accommodated and the land is available and not technically constrained?

- Housing could be reintroduced into the town without adversely affecting the character of the conservation area. However locations would need to be carefully selected so that the core retail and hospitality offer was not split or diluted

If these are within the conservation areas or near listed buildings, are the sites appropriate of sufficient scale to accommodate that type of development?

- Not applicable

Technical Groups Second Session

FEEDBACK SESSION
TECHNICAL ISSUES / OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 53	Selby	Community	Round 1

- A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group

Round 2

Combined Technical & Community Groups Responses

Combined Groups First Session

> **DISCUSSION GROUPS**
> **REVIEW OF ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES**

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 60	Selby	Community and Technical	Round 2

QUESTION

SPATIAL
Does the summary of issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any "deficits, needs and aspirations" need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

- The group requested that number of the points recorded in the Deficits, Needs and Aspirations section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: First Session has been highlighted in red on page 4-6 so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

TOWN CENTRE
Does the summary of issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any "deficits, needs and aspirations" need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

- The group requested that number of the points recorded in the Deficits, Needs and Aspirations section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: First Session has been highlighted in red on page 4-6 so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMEN|T
Does the summary of issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any "deficits, needs and aspirations" need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

- The group requested that number of the points recorded in the Deficits, Needs and Aspirations section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: First Session has been highlighted in red on page 4-6 so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

Do the objectives relating to the towns existing <u>deficits</u> reflect the discussions of the community and technical meetings?

- No comments were made

QUESTION
Do the objectives relating to the towns future <u>needs</u> reflect the discussions of the community and technical meetings? • No comments were made
Are the aspirational objectives reflective of the Round One discussions? Are they too aspirational or not ambitious enough? • No comments were made
Is there any additional community or technical feedback on the original Round One questions that has not been captured during the Round Two debate that requires further consideration? • No comments were made

Combined Groups First Session

| FEEDBACK SESSION |
| REVIEW OF ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES |

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 63	Selby	Community	Round 2

QUESTION
Where are the areas of general agreement?   • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any areas of significant disagreement?   • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any key actions or investigations required before the next round of consultation later in the year?   • No requirements were identified

Combined Group Second Session

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">DISCUSSION GROUPS
REVIEW OF TECHNICAL ISSUES</td></tr>
</table>

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 66	Selby	Community and Technical	Round 2

QUESTION

SPATIAL
Does the summary of TECHNICAL issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any technical matters need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

- The group requested that a number of the points recorded in the Technical Issues section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: Second Session have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

TOWN CENTRE
Does the summary of TECHNICAL issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any technical matters need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

- The group requested that a number of the points recorded in the Technical Issues section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: Second Session have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMEN|T
Does the summary of TECHNICAL issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any technical matters need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

- The group requested that a number of the points recorded in the Technical Issues section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: Second Session have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

Combined Group Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS
REVIEW OF OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 69	Selby	Community and Technical	Round 2

QUESTION

SPATIAL

Do the spatial options set out in the summary document reflect the groups' discussions and concerns from Round One and are there any areas that have been missed or require amendment?

- The group requested that number of the points recorded in the Option section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: Second Session have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

TOWN CENTRE

Do the town centre options set out in the summary document reflect the groups' discussions and concerns from Round One and are there any areas that have been missed or require amendment?

- The group requested that number of the points recorded in the Option section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: Second Session have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMEN|T

Do the Natural and Built Environment options set out in the summary document reflect the groups' discussions and concerns from Round One and are there any areas that have been missed or require amendment?

- The group requested that number of the points recorded in the Option section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: Second Session have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

Combined Groups Second Session

FEEDBACK SESSION
TECHNICAL ISSUES PLUS OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 72	Selby	Community	Round 1

Technical Issues

QUESTION
Where are the areas of general agreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any areas of significant disagreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any key actions or investigations required before the next round of consultation later in the year? • No requirements were identified

Options and Implications

QUESTION
Where are the areas of general agreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any areas of significant disagreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any new Options that have been raised by the groups that were not previously considered in the earlier sessions? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group

QUESTION
Are there any key actions or investigations required before the next round of consultation later in the year?
• No requirements were identified

Let's Talk

PLAN SELBY

QUESTIONS & RESPONSES

TOWN	FACILITATOR/PARTICIPANT
SHERBURN IN ELMET	SPAWFORTHS
DATE OF ENGAGEMENT WORKSHOP 1: 29th JUNE 2015 DATE OF ENGAGEMENT WORKSHOP 2: 16th JULY 2015	

24th November 2015   Revision M

Introduction

This Answers Booklet provides a record of the responses from both the Community and Technical Workshop participants at both the Round 1 and Round 2 engagement events.

All responses are those of the attendees and should not be regarded as being the views of either Selby District Council or the facilitators and engagement consultants. Please note that all the views included here are a distillation of comments made by the groups during the events and no comments should be attributed to any particular participant or organisation.

The Round 2 workshops provided an opportunity for attendees to agree the wording of the answers recorded by the facilitators during Round 1. The groups attending Round 2 subsequently requested that a number of the points recorded in the answers booklet for Round 1 should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate reflection of the sentiment of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in Round 1 have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

Round 1

Community Group Responses

Community Group: First Session

DISCUSSION GROUP
DEFICITS NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 3	Sherburn	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Are the town's existing deficiencies (i.e. areas where services and/or facilities have been identified as possibly lacking) as shown in the Fact Sheets for this session recognised by the group?

- Yes, but with the caveats set out below

Are there any deficiencies that are not regarded as deficiencies by the group or missing?

- A "poor choice of shops" is not recognised as being a significant issue for the community. They regard the town as meeting their convenience goods requirements and this is well catered for. The group wished to clarify that these comments were made based on the new Aldi and Marks and Spencer's (South Milford) retail stores, which have not yet opened.

Are there any that are not identified that ought to be added?

- The "dogleg" crossroads at the centre of the town can cause significant peak hour queuing with waiting times of up to 20 minutes to get through the lights

- There are parking issues, particularly on market day although Aldi car park may assist when it opens later in the year

- More signage for car parks could help direct visitors to the car parks that are not visible from Low Street

- Public realm is in a poor state of repair and boundaries, signage and shop fronts could do with some improvement

- The existing drainage at the southern end of Low Street where two six inch drains meet one eight inch drain overflows periodically. This is a combined sewer

- High school building fabric requires significant investment

- The village centre attractiveness is "poor" although there are multiple ownerships with many landlords being remote

- Parking on verges in village centre opposite the Surgery on Beech Grove while people make quick purchases from local shops

- A western bypass to the town that would allow commuting traffic to/from Leeds to avoid passing through the town centre

- "Rat running" of traffic to industrial estate to Leeds and the M1 / A1 link road through many of the adjacent villages. The following villages were specifically referred to: South Milford, Fairburn, Lumby, Saxton and Monk Fryston

- "Rat running" of traffic through many of the housing estates in Sherburn

- Lack of leisure facilities in the village.

- The roundabout between the A63 and A162 (Battersby Roundabout) is used excessively by HGV traffic

- Linked to the excessive use of these roads, is HGV overnight parking in laybys within the local area

Are the identified needs for the town over the next 15 years as shown on the Fact Sheets, recognised by the group?

- Yes, but with caveats set out below

Are any of the identified "needs" being challenged by the group and what are their concerns?

- The need for more housing in Sherburn was challenged by some members of the group. There was concern that the safeguarded land above the currently consented residential schemes could provide significantly more new homes than the figure in the housing market assessment is suggesting is needed during the plan period and that, if this safeguarded land was developed for housing, this would have a major impact on other infrastructure of the town, including primary school capacity

- There was concern that Sherburn would be asked to meet Tadcaster's housing requirement if the Tadcaster sites do not come forward which would put greater strains on the local highway network and in particular Low Street, the crossroads in the town centre, the primary schools and the medical centre

- There is a perception with some members of the community that Sherburn is getting a greater proportion of affordable housing than other settlements. This needs checking

- It was suggested by some members of the group that the housing that is being planned is only catering for a certain part of the market and provision for other forms of housing such as custom build, senior living and extra care should be incorporated into proposals as well as other building forms such as bungalows. It was suggested that extra care facilities should be located in close proximity to the centre

- There is a need to ensure that the level of housing growth recently granted planning permission is supported by the necessary infrastructure improvements

Which (if any) of the Renaissance Projects identified in the Fact Sheet are still supported by the community? Are there any additional projects that the group believe ought to be added to the list for further exploration and discussion?

- Leisure facilities are needed and the expansion of the schools existing facilities to meet this need may not be achievable

- A HGV Park on the industrial estate (due to the current problem of HGV parking on the road side in the local area)

- Traffic in the district needs to be considered holistically with improvements to the wider strategic road network between the principal settlements

- Development briefs to guide the content and form of larger development sites

- Changing facilities and a 3G pitch at the High School

- The relocation of Mytum and Selby Waste Recycling Ltd to allow the development of leisure facilities next to the High School

- The creation of a Sherburn in Elmet subgroup of the Chamber of Commerce to ensure the village traders have the ability to speak with a single voice

- Public realm improvements to the village centre

- A new household waste recycling centre

Community Group: First Session

FEEDBACK SESSION
FEEDBACK SESSION **DEFICITS NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS**

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 6	Sherburn	Community	Round 1

QUESTION
Where are the areas of general agreement?
• A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any areas of significant disagreement?
• A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any key actions or investigations required before the Round 2 engagement?
• Investigation of affordable housing numbers delivered in Sherburn during the last plan period. How did this compare with the Selby District average and the delivery in Tadcaster and Selby? How does it compare with the percentage of new homes that should have been delivered in Sherburn? • An investigation of the likely housing capacity of all the safeguarded sites identified the drawings was requested. How many houses could be built on these sites if they all were developed?

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP
SPATIAL
TECHNICAL ISSUES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 9	Sherburn	Community	Round 1

QUESTION
Are the technical constraints shown in the Fact Sheet and drawing recognised and understood by the group?   • The technical constraints were discussed and the terminology was explained and clarified. The difference between "green belt" and "green field" was also clarified with a small number of attendees.
Are there any technical constraints that the group does not believe to be particularly relevant?   • All the constraints were regarded as being significant although differing degrees of weight/importance were given to the green belt to the west of the town by some members of the group as a result of a discussion about how housing growth with a bypass to the west of the town may assist in solving some of the town centre traffic issues.
Are there any technical issues that are not identified on the list that the group believes to be relevant and given further consideration?   • No additional constraints were added by the group.
Are any of the identified "edges" such as major highways, rivers and/or railway embankments regarded as being more/less significant than the others? Should these edges be regarded as defining the extent of the settlement forever or in what circumstances could crossing this edge" be regarded as being acceptable?   • The general view was that the eastern bypass to the town formed a natural boundary to the settlement and that there was sufficient land identified within this line within the safeguarded sites to meet the town's housing needs over the next 15 years. No case was made by the group to develop beyond the line of the bypass to the north or east

Community Group: Second Session

**DISCUSSION GROUP
SPATIAL
OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS**

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 18	Sherburn	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Where should the identified growth be located given the known technical issues?

- A number of long term options were discussed by the group.

- A western bypass would create access to new housing land to the west of the town which could help traffic avoid the town centre and reduce commuter traffic using the Low Street / Kirkgate / Moor Lane junction. It was recognised however that the land is green belt and this is a significant constraint and that there were other locations that avoided green belt that could be developed first

- Gascoigne Wood was suggested as a long term location for further housing growth, but it was also recognised that this was a good strategic rail location for logistics, was being promoted as an employment site at the moment and any housing would be remote from Sherburn services and shops. It was also noted that this site is not in the green belt.

If landowners do not make their land available during the plan period, how can the identified growth be accommodated and what are the implications for the rest of the Selby District?

- It was recognised by the group that the safeguarded sites appear to deliver considerably more housing land than is necessary to meet Sherburn's identified needs for the plan period (this is subject to checking with the landowners along with the associated technical constraints). The technical meeting earlier in the day had confirmed that the key safeguarded sites were being actively promoted by the landowners and most had engaged consultants and agents to act on their behalf. There appeared to be market interest in the sites and it appeared that the majority of the land would be available for development if it was confirmed in the development plan.

- Significant concern was raised about the implications of Tadcaster not meeting its housing needs and what this might mean for Sherburn. There was considerable anxiety that Sherburn may have to grow beyond its own identified needs to meet a potential shortfall in Tadcaster and that this may require additional land to be released around the town and that this would place additional pressure on local infrastructure and schools and exacerbate congestion and traffic issues in the town centre. There was recognition however that Selby District needed to plan to meet its own housing needs within its own boundaries and that if any settlement was unable to meet their needs locally, other locations within the district would need to be considered. It was also generally recognised by many people in the group that there were very limited alternative settlements within the Selby District where growth could be accommodated whilst still providing access to essential services such as medical and education facilities.

What are the implications of the growth options on say infrastructure and local existing services and facilities?

- A northern and western bypass to the town may ease traffic and congestion issues in the town centre but would impact on green belt and landscape quality to the west of Sherburn

- If ALL the safeguarded sites to the east and south of the town were to be developed, concerns were raised about impacts on the town centre and how Sherburn's increasing appeal as a commuter settlement for Leeds would encourage traffic to pass through the centre and along the B1222 and Sir Johns Lane

- Longer term development of Gascoigne Wood as a new village at the edge of Sherburn raised concerns about access to services and loss of this location for rail related employment activities

Are there any potential benefits of developing in a particular location

- It was recognised that new development could deliver a range of benefits such as highway, school and other infrastructure enhancements, however there was a perception from some members of the group about whether Selby District Council has adequate resources to secure the highest / most appropriate levels of planning gain (Section 106) from developers

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP
TOWN CENTRE
TECHNICAL ISSUES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 12	Sherburn	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Are the technical issues shown in the Fact Sheet and drawing recognised and understood by the group?

- The technical issues shown on the drawings and in the fact sheets were recognised by the group. Some verbal explanation was provided regarding some of the terminology used in the key

Are there any technical issues that the group does not believe to be particularly relevant?

- All the technical issues shown on the drawings and in the accompanying fact sheets were regarded as being relevant by the group

Are there any technical issues that are not identified on the list that the group believes to be relevant and given further consideration?

- No additional technical constraints were added by the group although the issue of the town centre being in multiple ownerships with many landlords not living in the town was raised. it was recognised that that is was not uncommon but that landlord engagement would be necessary if some of the emerging ideas were to be implemented

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP
TOWN CENTRE
OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 21	Sherburn	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Taking into account the earlier technical issues discussion and the findings of the retail study as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, are there any obvious areas where the town centre should be contracted or expanded?

- It was recognised that the town centre is highly constrained with very little land available for new development. It was also recognised that the opening of Aldi to the south of the town would move the centre of gravity in that direction although the new supermarket would also provide some additional town centre car parking that may serve the town centre

- It was generally felt that any additional development/expansion of the town centre would need to address the Low Street /B1222 junction issue and town centre parking "challenge"

What are the consequences of a "do nothing option"?

- The changing nature of town centres due to changes in shopping patterns, internet retailing and the growth in the "hospitality" sector was discussed and that Sherburn would need to consider how it could adapt to these changes. The "do nothing" scenario was therefore regarded as potentially leading to further decline in the quality and vibrancy of the town centre and further initiatives and projects needed to be identified.

Based on the findings of the retail study as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, where might new town centre businesses be encouraged to locate and what might be preventing them from currently being attracted to these locations?

- There was some concern about the general attractiveness of the town centre and its appeal to independent businesses who may wish to open new businesses such as restaurants and other forms of convenience shopping. There was general recognition that the comparison goods shopping in the centre would be limited going forwards as larger centres in Leeds and York were the destinations of choice. The general message coming from the group was that the town centre did not need to increase in size, but the quality could be improved and greater emphasis and support could be given to independent traders who often offered a higher quality of service. A number of suggestions were made about what improvements could be made and these are covered in a later section.

Based on the observations and experiences of the group members, what may be done to make the town centre more attractive to customers, increase footfall and town centre prosperity?

- General improvements to shop fronts and signage. There was general discussion about how a shop frontage and signage design guide and; or planning policy might be developed with the support of the local traders to ensure a greater quality and consistency of appearance.

- Boundary treatments to shop plots, pavement and public realm treatments including boundaries, street furniture (lights and waste bins etc.) were all identified as areas where quality could be improved

- The centre would benefit from a focal / meeting point. Public art or a sculpture or statue in conjunction with seating was suggested on the site of the former public convenience, which could reflect Sherburn's village identity, history and culture

- There was discussion and recognition that some of the Renaissance projects identified at the start of the recession had not come forward for a variety of funding and land ownership reasons (some of which were related to the recession and changed economic environment) but that the projects still remained valid, were still supported by the community and should be retained in any forward planning

- Street trees were identified as a possible "early win" that would help define the line of Low Street and provide a green and attractive village centre

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP
NATURAL & BUILT ENVIRONMENT
TECHNICAL ISSUES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 13	Selby	Community	Round 1
OUT 14	Tadcaster		
OUT 15	Sherburn		

QUESTION

Are the technical issues shown in the Fact Sheet and drawing recognised and understood by the group?

- The technical issues shown on the drawings and in the fact sheets were recognised by the group. Some verbal explanation was provided regarding some of the terminology used in the key. The landscape quality designation to the west of Sherburn (in addition to the green belt designation) were drawn to the group's attention. There was general recognition (consistent with both the Tadcaster and Selby focus groups) that there were very few easy ways to reconcile the natural and heritage environment issues/constraints with the need to accommodate growth and changes in lifestyles.

Are there any technical issues that the group does not believe to be particularly relevant?

- All the technical issues shown on the drawings and fact sheets were regarded as still being relevant.

Are there any technical issues that are not identified on the list that the group believes to be relevant and given further consideration?

- No additional constraints or issues were added by the group

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP NATURAL & HERITAGE ENVIRONMENT OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 24	Sherburn	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Taking into account the earlier technical issues and subsequent discussion as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, are there any obvious areas where the town could be expanded without adversely impacting on the built and natural environment?

- It was recognised by the group that further growth in Sherburn would involve developing green field and/or green belt land. Expanding westwards would impact on the area of landscape quality, SSSI and green belt but, if a bypass was built, may improve traffic flows through the town centre. Expanding east and south up to the bypass would avoid incursion into the green belt but may create higher levels of traffic through the town as people commuted to and from Leeds along the B1222.

If there needs to be expansion into the previously undeveloped land within and to the perimeter of the town, are there any areas where the impacts can be minimised, i.e. which are more acceptable than others? What might the implications be of developing in these areas?

- See above

Are there any areas of the natural environment that are of lesser quality that may be enhanced or positively transformed through enabling development on or near these areas?

- The land to the west of Sherburn that is accessed off Church Hill and stretches down to Sherburn High School and Mytum and Selby Waste Recycling Ltd was discussed as a possible area where new housing development could facilitate the relocation of Mytum and Selby which would in turn enable greater environmental improvements along the western boundary of Sherburn. Multiple land ownerships and potential incursion into the green belt west of Sherburn were both cited as possible significant challenges to be overcome

QUESTION

Are there any areas within the built environment, where new development could be sensitively accommodated and the land is available and not technically constrained?

If these are within the conservation areas or near listed buildings, are the sites appropriate of sufficient scale to accommodate that type of development?

- No sites were identified within the town centre or within the wider built up area of Sherburn although there was some general discussion about existing privately owned car parks that are within the town centre that could potentially be managed/coordinated to free up and/or other enable a more comprehensive masterplan of the town centre to be considered.

- A number of participants informally advised the facilitators at the end of the meeting of small areas of land within the town centre that may be important in helping to resolve highway and/or development and/or public realm issues in the town but the landowners would need to be approached to understand their willingness to get involved in any future masterplanning work. The group specifically discussed the potential to partially pedestrianise parts of Low Street to improve the public realm and that any subsequent masterplanning undertaken by the Council should consider the feasibility of this.

- The group also identified the Social Club site as key site within the village centre and whether this could be relocated to alternative premises to make this site available. This would need further dialogue and discussion with the landowners who were not present and have never previously been approached with any such proposal.

Community Groups: Second Session

FEEDBACK SESSION
ALL GROUPS
TECHNICAL ISSUES / OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 27	Sherburn	Community	Round 1

QUESTION
Where are the areas of general agreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any areas of significant disagreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any key actions or investigations required before the Round 2 engagement? • Calculation of maximum development potential of the identified safeguarded sites

Round 1

Technical Group Responses

Technical Group First Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS
DISCUSSION GROUPS **DEFICITS NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS**

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT	SESSION
OUT 31	Sherburn	Technical	Round 1	Deficits Needs and Aspirations

QUESTION

The group comprised site promoters who were less familiar with the town than local residents and businesses with the exception of a landowner who also lived in the village and was promoting his own land. Consequently there were only limited views expressed based on feedback obtained from community engagement events held by some of the consultants.

Are the town's existing deficiencies as shown in the Fact Sheet for this session recognised by the group?

- Yes (see caveat above)

Are there any deficiencies that are not regarded as deficiencies by the group?

- The expectation is that the new Aldi store would meet the remaining need in the town and that most people used Castleford and/or Colton for their weekly shopping

Are there any deficiencies that are not identified that ought to be added?

- The junction of Low Street and the B1222 was regarded as being particularly problematic and needing attention at the earliest opportunity

- The community believe they need a leisure centre

- There had been feedback from the community about healthcare provision and access to GPs but it was unclear if this was a local capacity issue, a reflection of the size of the exiting premises and/or a reflection of a wider issues with national primary care provision

- The high school building fabric is apparently in need of some significant investment

- The town is a "rat run" to the A1/M1 link

- There are no purpose built youth facilities in Sherburn that the group were aware of, although no evidence of need or the scale of the demand was available

QUESTION
Are the identified needs for the town over the next 15 years as shown on the Fact Sheet, recognised by the group?   • There was concern about the "time lag" implications of the current planning policy regarding housing provision in Tadcaster. Concerns were raised that if it becomes apparent that Tadcaster is not meeting its identified housing need, the lead time for mobilising and delivering other sites in Sherburn and other parts of the district would mean that any potential shortfall may not be capable of being met during the plan period.   • If the Olympia Park employment site does not come forward in the anticipated timescale, its scale and significance within the development plan would mean that Selby would fail to deliver adequate supply of employment land
Are any of the identified "needs" being challenged by the group and what are their concerns?   • The community perception that more affordable housing is going into Sherburn than other parts of the district was raised and this requires further investigation
Are there any aspirations beyond the identified deficiencies and needs?   • Improve the swimming pool at the High School for use by the School and local community.   • Integrate lifetime homes into new developments   • Include more bungalows and housing for older population into developments   • When prompted, it was confirmed that the land that was being currently being promoted around Sherburn did not currently make any provision for extra care, senior living and/or custom build

Technical Groups First Session

FEEDBACK SESSION
ALL GROUPS
DEFICITS NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 34	Sherburn	Technical	Round 1

- A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group

Technical Group Second Session

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">DISCUSSION GROUPS
TECHNICAL ISSUES – ALL THREE THEMES</td></tr>
</table>

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 37	Sherburn	Technical	Round 1

QUESTION

Referring to the baseline information provided as well as their own information prepared to support their own sites or assessment work, are the technical issues shown in the Fact Sheet and drawing recognised and understood by the group?

- The attendees did not require any clarification on the land use designations, facts sheet content or drawing annotations

Referring to the baseline information provided as well as their own information prepared to support their own sites or assessment work, are there any technical issues that the group does not believe to be particularly relevant?

- The flood risk mapping may not be as accurate as the more detailed modelling that has now been undertaken by some of the land promoters for some of safeguarded land. The assertion from one of the promoters is that some of the flood risk areas shown on the EA mapping may be reduced

Referring to the baseline information provided as well as their own information prepared to support their own sites or assessment work, are there any technical issues that are not identified on the list that the group believes to be relevant and given further consideration?

- There is a medium pressure gas main running through one of the safeguarded sites. This has been factored into the density calculations of the promoters along with the easement required either side of it

- Green spaces that form part of the consented (but not yet implemented) planning permissions should be shown on the plans

- Any development limitations associated with the aerodrome should be shown on the mapping

Are any of the identified "edges" such as major highways, rivers and/or railway embankments regarded as being more/less significant than the others? Should these edges be regarded as defining the extent of the settlement forever or in what circumstances could crossing this edge" be regarded as being acceptable?

- The group, which was comprised principally of land promoters/agents did not have any strong views

Technical Group Second Session

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">DISCUSSION GROUPS
OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS – ALL THREE THEMES</td></tr>
</table>

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 46	Sherburn	Technical	Round 1

Spatial Theme

<table>
<tr><td>QUESTION</td></tr>
<tr><td>

Where should the identified growth be located given the known technical issues?

- The attendees were promoting specific sites therefore the primary focus was on the land that is currently identified as safeguarded. It is perhaps not surprising therefore that there was strong support for the land within the line of the current eastern bypass, however it was pointed out by some of the group this is all safeguarded land and the bypass forms a natural long term settlement boundary.

- An alternative view was presented by a landowner/promoter who owns land to the west of Sherburn that growth should be accommodated on the western part of the town to serve residents who commute. The pros/cons of a western bypass was also discussed as a possible benefit of developing on this side of the town in the longer term although the green belt and landscape impacts were also acknowledged during the discussion

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

If landowners do not make their land available during the plan period, how can the identified growth be accommodated and what are the implications for the rest of the Selby District?

- It was noted that Sherburn had significant land available within the bypass and this is identified as safeguarded land in the current plan. The capacity of these sites to "absorb" any shortfall in Tadcaster's housing number needs to be assessed in more detail

What are the implications of the growth options identified earlier in the discussion, on say infrastructure and local existing services and facilities?

- It was suggested by the promoters of the safeguarded sites that greater housing growth in Sherburn would help support the existing retail offer in the town centre as well as support other local services. Significant increases in housing numbers could also bring additional infrastructure such as new roads and schools.

</td></tr>
</table>

Are there any potential benefits of developing in a particular location

- The promoters pointed out that greater development in Sherburn, Tadcaster and Selby would take pressure off the other smaller settlements (DSVs) to accommodate more housing growth

- The promoters advised that the land in Sherburn is available and there are willing developers and willing landowners. Other parts of the district may not have the same level of market interest and/or landowner support which makes Sherburn well placed to meet Selby's housing growth

Town Centre

QUESTION

Taking into account the earlier technical issues discussion and the findings of the retail study as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, are there any obvious areas where the town centre should be contracted or expanded?

- There was no representation from town centre developers and promoters and landowners therefore there was no specific feedback at this session. Please refer to Community feedback in earlier notes as this was more comprehensively covered at that workshop

Based on the observations and experiences of the group members, what may be done to make the town centre more attractive to customers, increase footfall and town centre prosperity?

- Although there were specific landowners/developers at the meeting with interests in the town centre, a number of observations were made by the group.

- Leisure facilities would increase the appeal of the town to house purchasers

- There were no obvious town centre development sites

- The town centre is not large enough to function as a viable comparison goods shopping destination and could therefore only ever cater for very local needs

Natural and Built Environment

QUESTION

Taking into account the earlier technical issues and subsequent discussion as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, are there any obvious areas where the town could be expanded without adversely impacting on the built and natural environment?

- Any land released outside the bypass to the east of the town would have an impact on existing infrastructure and town centre traffic. Any land released to the west of the town may assist in highway mitigation in the town centre, deliver a bypass but would impact on green belt and landscape quality.

QUESTION
If there needs to be expansion into the previously undeveloped land within and to the perimeter of the town, are there any areas where the impacts can be minimised, i.e. which are more acceptable than others? What might the implications be of developing in these areas? • The general consensus was that the current safeguarded sites were logical but that any further development would require some difficult issues to be resolved
Are there any areas of the natural environment that are of lesser quality that may be enhanced or positively transformed through enabling development on or near these areas? • The development of housing to the south of Church Hill and the west of Garden Lane would potentially allow the relocation of Mytum and Selby Ltd which would facilitate the environmental enhancement along the western boundary of the town.
Are there any areas of the natural environment that are highly valued and/or well used by the community that they would wish to see retained and potentially enhanced going forwards? • The community had advised that one of the safeguarded sites has an important dog walking route within it and this had been recognised by the promoters and incorporated in to their proposals • No other views were offered
Are there any areas within the built environment, where new development could be sensitively accommodated and the land is available and not technically constrained? • None were identified over and above those sites already identified and safeguarded. **If these are within the conservation areas or near listed buildings, are the sites appropriate of sufficient scale to accommodate that type of development?** • Not applicable

Technical Groups Second Session

FEEDBACK SESSION
TECHNICAL ISSUES / OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 55	Sherburn	Community	Round 1

- A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group

Round 2

Combined Technical & Community Groups Responses

Combined Groups First Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS REVIEW OF ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 62	Sherburn	Community and Technical	Round 2

QUESTION

SPATIAL
Does the summary of issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any "deficits, needs and aspirations" need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

- The group requested that number of the points recorded in the Deficits, Needs and Aspirations section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: First Session has been highlighted in red on page 4-6 so these can be read in the context of the complete statement

TOWN CENTRE
Does the summary of issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any "deficits, needs and aspirations" need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

- The group requested that number of the points recorded in the Deficits, Needs and Aspirations section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: First Session has been highlighted in red on page 4-6 so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMEN|T
Does the summary of issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any "deficits, needs and aspirations" need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

- The group requested that number of the points recorded in the Deficits, Needs and Aspirations section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: First Session has been highlighted in red on page 4-6 so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

QUESTION
Do the objectives relating to the towns existing <u>deficits</u> reflect the discussions of the community and technical meetings? • The group requested that number of the points recorded in the Deficits, Needs and Aspirations section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: First Session has been highlighted in red on page 4-6 so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.
Do the objectives relating to the towns future <u>needs</u> reflect the discussions of the community and technical meetings? • No additional comments were made
Are the aspirational objectives reflective of the Round One discussions? Are they too aspirational or not ambitious enough? • No additional comments were made
Is there any additional community or technical feedback on the original Round One questions that has not been captured during the Round Two debate that requires further consideration? • No additional requirements were identified

Combined Groups First Session

**FEEDBACK SESSION
REVIEW OF ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES**

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 65	Sherburn	Community	Round 2

QUESTION
Where are the areas of general agreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any areas of significant disagreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any key actions or investigations required before the next round of consultation later in the year? • No additional requirements were identified

Combined Group Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS
REVIEW OF TECHNICAL ISSUES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 68	Sherburn	Community and Technical	Round 2

QUESTION

SPATIAL
Does the summary of TECHNICAL issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any technical matters need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

- The group requested that a number of the points recorded in the Technical Issues section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: Second Session have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

TOWN CENTRE
Does the summary of TECHNICAL issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any technical matters need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

- The group requested that a number of the points recorded in the Technical Issues section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: Second Session have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMEN|T
Does the summary of TECHNICAL issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any technical matters need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

- The group requested that a number of the points recorded in the Technical Issues section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: Second Session have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

Combined Group Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS
REVIEW OF OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 71	Sherburn	Community and Technical	Round 2

QUESTION
SPATIAL **Do the spatial options set out in the summary document reflect the groups' discussions and concerns from Round One and are there any areas that have been missed or require amendment?** • The group requested that a number of the points recorded in the Option section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: Second Session have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.
TOWN CENTRE **Do the town centre options set out in the summary document reflect the groups' discussions and concerns from Round One and are there any areas that have been missed or require amendment?** • The group requested that a number of the points recorded in the Option section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: Second Session have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.
NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMEN|T **Do the Natural and Built Environment options set out in the summary document reflect the groups' discussions and concerns from Round One and are there any areas that have been missed or require amendment?** • The group requested that a number of the points recorded in the Option section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: Second Session have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

Combined Groups Second Session

| FEEDBACK SESSION |
| TECHNICAL ISSUES PLUS OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS |

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 74	Sherburn	Community	Round 1

Technical Issues

QUESTION
Where are the areas of general agreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any areas of significant disagreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any key actions or investigations required before the next round of consultation later in the year? • No additional requirements were identified

Options and Implications

QUESTION
Where are the areas of general agreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any areas of significant disagreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any new Options that have been raised by the groups that were not previously considered in the earlier sessions? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group

QUESTION
Are there any key actions or investigations required before the next round of consultation later in the year?
•   No additional requirements were identified

Let's Talk PLAN SELBY

QUESTIONS & RESPONSES

TOWN	FACILITATOR/PARTICIPANT
TADCASTER	SPAWFORTHS

DATE OF ENGAGEMENT WORKSHOP 1: 1ST JULY 2015
DATE OF ENGAGEMENT WORKSHOP 2: 15th JULY 2015

24th November 2015   Revision M

Introduction

This Answers Booklet provides a record of the responses from both the Community and Technical Workshop participants at both the Round 1 and Round 2 engagement events.

All responses are those of the attendees and should not be regarded as being the views of either Selby District Council or the facilitators and engagement consultants. Please note that all the views included here are a distillation of comments made by the groups during the events and no comments should be attributed to any particular participant or organisation.

The Round 2 workshops provided an opportunity for attendees to agree the wording of the answers recorded by the facilitators during Round 1. The groups attending Round 2 subsequently requested that a number of the points recorded in the answers booklet for Round 1 should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate reflection of the sentiment of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in Round 1 have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

Round 1

Community Group Responses

Community Group: First Session

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">DISCUSSION GROUP
DEFICITS NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS</td></tr>
</table>

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 2	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

<table>
<tr><td>QUESTION</td></tr>
</table>

Are the town's existing deficiencies (i.e. areas where services and/or facilities have been identified as possibly lacking) as shown in the Fact Sheets for this session recognised by the group?

- Yes, but with the caveats set out below

Are there any deficiencies that are not regarded as deficiencies by the group or missing?

- None identified

Are there any that are not identified that ought to be added?

- There is a lack of choice of stores in the town and many of the stores lack "depth" in the goods they stock

- No children's equipped play areas within the town centre

- The town does not have sufficient diversity in its shops and services to act as a destination

- It was suggested that the lack of new family housing in the town was resulting in diminishing demand for school places in the local primary schools and concerns were expressed that if more family housing is not built, there could be serious implications for the long term sustainability of Tadcaster East and St Joseph's primary schools (this needs further investigation)

- Local people were finding it increasingly hard to stay in Tadcaster as the housing market has stagnated and there has been no "churn" with there were neither no appropriate houses available, with a particular lack of social housing or house prices in the town were no longer affordable for many people

- Older people in Tadcaster are struggling to find appropriate accommodation in the town to downsize into resulting in larger properties with low occupancy, that could otherwise be made available for families

- Younger people are struggling to find houses/accommodation in the town and are having to move out of Tadcaster and there was concern about the implications this may have over the longer term

- The group wished to stress that "There is a deficit of housing across the spectrum"

Are the identified needs for the town over the next 15 years as shown on the Fact Sheets, recognised by the group?

- Yes, but with caveats set out below

Are any of the identified "needs" being challenged by the group and what are their concerns?

- The "need" for a new convenience store was qualified by the group who regarded the lack of depth and choice as more significant than the overall amount of floorspace that is currently available

- The "need" for housing should include providing housing in the right locations for the intended occupants. It was suggested that the older persons' bungalows to the west of the town were too far from the town centre to walk in, and that any housing designed for older people should be closer/within the town centre

Which (if any) of the Renaissance Projects identified in the Fact Sheet are still supported by the community? Are there any additional projects that the group believe ought to be added to the list for further exploration and discussion?

- A bandstand was suggested as a way of providing a community focus/meeting place and attracting events and activities that would appeal to people from inside and outside the town and local people. The village green / old Regal Cinema site was identified as a preferable location for a community focus/meeting place

- Initiatives to encourage a greater range of high quality, independent traders with local sourcing of food to differentiate the convenience food "offer" from that of other towns or that of the major supermarkets. A more affordable convenience retail offer would also be supported in the town by local people

- Initiatives to change the current atmosphere in the town centre which was described by various members of the group as "depressing", "frustrating" and with a sense of "lack of [community] control". Others articulated a "sense of loss" "dereliction", "general neglect" and "grieving" for what Tadcaster once was and would like to create initiatives that draw the community back into the town. The recent openings of Costa and Cooplands in the town have already begun to have a positive effect

- Public realm investment to encourage greater sense of community/landlord ownership/care of the town centre environment

- To create a role and identity for the town that allows it to compete/perform alongside other similar towns in the region such as Wetherby

Community Group: First Session

FEEDBACK SESSION
DEFICITS NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 17	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

QUESTION
Where are the areas of general agreement?
• A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single group
Are there any areas of significant disagreement?
• A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single group
Are there any key actions or investigations required before the Round 2 engagement?
• Assessment of projected primary school places for the town to verify/challenge the assertion that the lack of new housing was starting to have an impact on education provision in the town

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP
SPATIAL
TECHNICAL ISSUES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 8	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

QUESTION
Are the technical constraints shown in the Fact Sheet and drawing recognised and understood by the group?
• The technical constraints were discussed and the terminology was explained and clarified. The difference between "green belt" and "green field" was also clarified.
Are there any technical constraints that the group does not believe to be particularly relevant?
• All the constraints were regarded as being significant although less weight/importance were given to the green belt to the north of Tadcaster by some members of the group
Are there any technical issues that are not identified on the list that the group believes to be relevant and given further consideration?
• No additional constraints were added by the group.
Are any of the identified "edges" such as major highways, rivers and/or railway embankments regarded as being more/less significant than the others? Should these edges be regarded as defining the extent of the settlement forever or in what circumstances could crossing this edge" be regarded as being acceptable?
• The general view was that the southern bypass to the town formed a natural boundary to the settlement and there was little enthusiasm to expand beyond it. Specific concerns were raised about how connectivity to the town centre could be achieved across the bypass and this lack of connectivity would make any housing to the south a "commuter" location for Leeds and York and would be unlikely to have a positive impact on the town centre
• The river was regarded as being a significant edge and the lack of crossings and the substandard width of the paths on the main bridge were identified as key considerations when identifying potential housing developments that could have a positive impact on the town centre

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP SPATIAL OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 17	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Where should the identified growth be located given the known technical issues?

- It was recognised that there were no "easy" options and there was some discussion regarding which areas of green belt the town could expand into as well as a discussion of possible town centre sites

- The area of green belt to the north of the town was recognised as being in walking distance of the town centre and adjacent to a primary school. It was confirmed at the earlier "technical" group meeting that the site was available (i.e. the landowner was prepared to sell it) and there was significant market interest from housing developers who wished to develop it for a range of housing

- The area of land to the north east of the town that lies outside the green belt was also discussed but it was not clear that the landowner wished to make it available for development. It was also suggested that this location was somewhat remote from the town centre, the "wrong side" of the bridge and may bring limited benefits to the town centre. The landowners or their representatives did not attend either workshop and their views were not presented to the group.

- The central car park was discussed as a possible location for new housing. There was some discussion about the suitability about this location for older person's accommodation and it was generally felt that older people would be more inclined to use the town centre shops and services during the day. It was confirmed that Selby District Council own the site and it could be made available for housing if alternative provision for the existing parking could be made. There was some concern however about where the alternative parking could be located as it is well used by the community.

- The land to the rear of Sainsbury's was briefly discussed but it was unclear if there is any landowner willingness to make the site available or if there is any developer interest in purchasing the site and developing it at the densities that are being suggested for this location. No comments were made by the landowner's agent who attended the meeting.

- The allocated employment site to the south west of the town was regarded as a good location for employment uses but there was concern that if this was developed for housing it would appeal to Leeds commuters. It was not clear who owned the site and whether the land was available for development for either employment or housing uses.

If landowners do not make their land available during the plan period, how can the identified growth be accommodated and what are the implications for the rest of the Selby District?

- The only significant site that is currently being promoted in Tadcaster where there is confirmation of landowner willingness to sell plus evidence of developer interest is the land to the north of Tadcaster which currently lies within the green belt. It is understood that this site is potentially large enough to meet a significant proportion of Tadcaster's identified housing needs but its green belt location is a significant issue that would need to be addressed.

- If an alternative location for public parking cannot be identified, then the central car park may not be available for housing development

- It was recognised by the group that if Tadcaster did not identify sufficient housing land, then other settlements would need to make up any shortfall

What are the implications of the growth options on say infrastructure and local existing services and facilities?

- It was suggested that the land to the north of Tadcaster could support the local primary school that is adjacent to the site and provide improvements to pupil drop-off and collection arrangements. It was recognised that there would be impacts on local junctions within the town and that these would need to be assessed. It was also suggested that development in this location would be able to use/support town centre shops and services

- It was recognised that the land to the north east of the town could also support local schools but the distance to the town centre was more significant and this may discourage residents in this location from using the shops and services to the west of the bridge

Are there any potential benefits of developing in a particular location

- It was recognised that all the suggested/proposed sites had their challenges but that Tadcaster needed to find land for new homes to allow it to retain/attract a wide range of age groups and families. Were it not for its green belt designation this area was emerging as the preferred location given its links/proximity with the town centre and school

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP
TOWN CENTRE
TECHNICAL ISSUES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 11	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Are the technical issues shown in the Fact Sheet and drawing recognised and understood by the group?

- The technical issues shown on the drawings and in the fact sheets were recognised by the group. Some verbal explanation was provided regarding some of the terminology used in the key.

Are there any technical issues that the group does not believe to be particularly relevant?

- All the technical issues shown on the drawings and in the accompanying fact sheets were regarded as being relevant by the group

Are there any technical issues that are not identified on the list that the group believes to be relevant and given further consideration?

- No additional technical constraints were added by the group although concern was raised about the limited number of land and property owners in the town and it was suggested that this was limiting the opportunities for new and/or expanding businesses

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP TOWN CENTRE OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 20	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Taking into account the earlier technical issues discussion and the findings of the retail study as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, are there any obvious areas where the town centre should be contracted or expanded?

- The suggested expansion of the town centre boundary to the east of the town around the existing bus station was discussed and the issue of pedestrian connectivity to the west of the town was raised again. There were no strong views for or against this proposed change

What are the consequences of a "do nothing option"?

- The general sentiment was that the "do nothing" option was "not an option" as the lack of development and growth over many years was having an adverse impact on the town centre

Based on the findings of the retail study as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, where might new town centre businesses be encouraged to locate and what might be preventing them from currently being attracted to these locations?

- There was concern about the quality of the public realm and shop fronts. It was felt that there were enough vacant shops in the town to accommodate future growth and that future growth ought to be focused on the existing historic town centre

Based on the observations and experiences of the group members, what may be done to make the town centre more attractive to customers, increase footfall and town centre prosperity?

- A new "Millennium" foot bridge to link the east and west of the town

- Development of Robin Hood Yard

- Creation of a bandstand and a "green lung" next to the vicarage, making it a more accessible space

- Investment in public realm, shop fronts and initiatives to encourage more independent traders to locate their businesses in Tadcaster

Community Group: Second Session

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">DISCUSSION GROUP
NATURAL & BUILT ENVIRONMENT
TECHNICAL ISSUES</td></tr>
</table>

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 14	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

<table>
<tr><td>QUESTION</td></tr>
<tr><td>

Are the technical issues shown in the Fact Sheet and drawing recognised and understood by the group?

- The technical issues shown on the drawings and in the fact sheets were recognised by the group. Some verbal explanation was provided regarding some of the terminology used in the key. The distinction between green belt and green field was explained to some members of the group and the flood zone classifications were discussed along with their implications

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

Are there any technical issues that the group does not believe to be particularly relevant?

- All the technical issues shown on the drawings and fact sheets were regarded as still being relevant.

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

Are there any technical issues that are not identified on the list that the group believes to be relevant and given further consideration?

- No additional constraints or issues were added by the group

</td></tr>
</table>

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP
NATURAL & HERITAGE ENVIRONMENT
OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 23	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Taking into account the earlier technical issues and subsequent discussion as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, are there any obvious areas where the town could be expanded without adversely impacting on the built and natural environment?

- It was recognised that all the potential housing sites at the periphery of the town would start to encroach into either greenbelt and/or previously undeveloped land. The "brownfield" land first approach was supported, however it was also recognised that there were limited opportunities to meet all the identified housing need for Tadcaster within the urban area unless more landowners were to make it available and it was to be built to higher densities e.g. apartments

If there needs to be expansion into the previously undeveloped land within and to the perimeter of the town, are there any areas where the impacts can be minimised, i.e. which are more acceptable than others? What might the implications be of developing in these areas?

- No additional comments were made

Are there any areas of the natural environment that are of lesser quality that may be enhanced or positively transformed through enabling development on or near these areas?

- No additional comments were made

Are there any areas within the built environment, where new development could be sensitively accommodated and the land is available and not technically constrained?

If these are within the conservation areas or near listed buildings, are the sites appropriate of sufficient scale to accommodate that type of development?

- The land to the rear of Sainsbury's (Mill Lane) and the central car park were both referred to. Confirmation of landowner willingness to sell, market interest in developing the sites and the need to identify replacement car parking locations were all discussed

Community Groups: Second Session

FEEDBACK SESSION
ALL GROUPS
TECHNICAL ISSUES / OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 26	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

QUESTION
Where are the areas of general agreement?
• A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single group
Are there any areas of significant disagreement?
• A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single group
Are there any key actions or investigations required before the Round 2 engagement?
• Calculation of maximum development potential of the identified safeguarded sites

Round 1

Technical Group Responses

Technical Group First Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS
DEFICITS NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT	SESSION
OUT 30	Tadcaster	Technical	Round 1	Deficits Needs and Aspirations

QUESTION

The group comprised representatives of one of the large sites currently being promoted and an agent for another major landowner that was attending in an observational capacity only and did not wish to pass any comments. Consequently there were only limited views expressed about Tadcaster's deficits needs and aspirations.

Are the town's existing deficiencies as shown in the Fact Sheet for this session recognised by the group?

- Yes (see caveat above)

Are there any deficiencies that are not regarded as deficiencies by the group?

- None identified

Are there any deficiencies that are not identified that ought to be added?

- None identified

Are the identified needs for the town over the next 15 years as shown on the Fact Sheet, recognised by the group?

- Yes

Are any of the identified "needs" being challenged by the group and what are their concerns?

- It was suggested that there is an additional "need" to bring the existing vacant town centre buildings back into commercial and residential use

QUESTION

Are there any aspirations beyond the identified deficiencies and needs?

- It was suggested a linear park running north and south of the bridge had been discussed by some members of the community and would help attract people to the town

Technical Groups First Session

<table>
<tr><td>

FEEDBACK SESSION
ALL GROUPS
DEFICITS NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS

</td></tr>
</table>

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 33	Tadcaster	Technical	Round 1

- A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single group

Technical Group Second Session

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">DISCUSSION GROUPS
TECHNICAL ISSUES – ALL THREE THEMES</td></tr>
</table>

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 36	Tadcaster	Technical	Round 1

QUESTION

Referring to the baseline information provided as well as their own information prepared to support their own sites or assessment work, are the technical issues shown in the Fact Sheet and drawing recognised and understood by the group?

- The attendees did not require any clarification on the land use designations, facts sheet content or drawing annotations

Referring to the baseline information provided as well as their own information prepared to support their own sites or assessment work, are there any technical issues that the group does not believe to be particularly relevant?

- None identified

Referring to the baseline information provided as well as their own information prepared to support their own sites or assessment work, are there any technical issues that are not identified on the list that the group believes to be relevant and given further consideration?

- The suitability of town centre buildings to be economically developed to new forms of housing/apartments etc. was questioned

- The "market appeal" of the town centre to businesses and developers was questioned and there was concern that the town had now reached a point where it may no longer be "marketable"

- One of the attendees asked for clarification regarding what work had been done to assess the capacity of the existing housing stock in the town to be brought back into residential use

Are any of the identified "edges" such as major highways, rivers and/or railway embankments regarded as being more/less significant than the others? Should these edges be regarded as defining the extent of the settlement forever or in what circumstances could crossing this edge" be regarded as being acceptable?

- The bypass was regarded as forming an appropriate southern boundary to the town, although the expansion of the existing grade separated interchange with the A162 to allow additional access and egress onto the A64 was suggested as a way of creating better access to the town

Technical Group Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS
OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS – ALL THREE THEMES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 45	Tadcaster	Technical	Round 1

Spatial Theme

QUESTION

Where should the identified growth be located given the known technical issues?

The only input into this session was from the agent and owner of the land to the north of Tadcaster who identified the following reasons for expansion into this part of the town:

- Good pedestrian links into the town centre along the river

- Ability to support the adjacent primary school with the construction of new family housing

- Ability to provide drop-off and collection area for the school and improve the current arrangements

- Ability to deliver around 550 new homes in a variety of tenures and housing types

- Significant market interest in developing the site from major house builders

If landowners do not make their land available during the plan period, how can the identified growth be accommodated and what are the implications for the rest of the Selby District?

- It was noted that if Tadcaster did not identify sufficient land to meet its housing needs, either other settlements would need to increase their provision of housing and/or this could strengthen the case for the proposed new settlement at Headley Hall to the west of Tadcaster

What are the implications of the growth options identified earlier in the discussion, on say infrastructure and local existing services and facilities?

- None identified

Are there any potential benefits of developing in a particular location

- Please refer to earlier response to first question from the landowner/promoter

Town Centre

QUESTION
Taking into account the earlier technical issues discussion and the findings of the retail study as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, are there any obvious areas where the town centre should be contracted or expanded? • There was no representation from town centre developers and promoters and landowners therefore there was no specific feedback at this session other than a general query as to what the rationale was for the bus station area now proposed for inclusion in the new town centre boundary as recommended by GVA Grimley in the Retail & Leisure Study (May 2015). Please also refer to Community feedback in earlier notes as this was more comprehensively covered at that workshop
Based on the observations and experiences of the group members, what may be done to make the town centre more attractive to customers, increase footfall and town centre prosperity? • A public park or town green was suggested

Natural and Built Environment

QUESTION
Taking into account the earlier technical issues and subsequent discussion as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, are there any obvious areas where the town could be expanded without adversely impacting on the built and natural environment? • None identified
If there needs to be expansion into the previously undeveloped land within and to the perimeter of the town, are there any areas where the impacts can be minimised, i.e. which are more acceptable than others? What might the implications be of developing in these areas? • No additional matters were raised
Are there any areas of the natural environment that are of lesser quality that may be enhanced or positively transformed through enabling development on or near these areas? • None identified
Are there any areas of the natural environment that are highly valued and/or well used by the community that they would wish to see retained and potentially enhanced going forwards? • None identified

QUESTION
Are there any areas within the built environment, where new development could be sensitively accommodated and the land is available and not technically constrained? • None identified **If these are within the conservation areas or near listed buildings, are the sites appropriate of sufficient scale to accommodate that type of development?** • Further work is required to understand the capacity of the central car park. Spawforths confirmed that an initial capacity study of the site confirmed that the site could accommodate up to 40 dwellings

Technical Groups Second Session

FEEDBACK SESSION
TECHNICAL ISSUES / OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 54	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

- A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group

Round 2

Combined Technical & Community Groups Responses

Combined Groups First Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS
REVIEW OF ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 61	Tadcaster	Community and Technical	Round 2

QUESTION

SPATIAL
Does the summary of issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any "deficits, needs and aspirations" need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

- The group requested that number of the points recorded in the Deficits, Needs and Aspirations section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: First Session has been highlighted in red in the relevant sections so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

TOWN CENTRE
Does the summary of issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any "deficits, needs and aspirations" need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

- The group requested that number of the points recorded in the Deficits, Needs and Aspirations section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: First Session has been highlighted in red in the relevant sections so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMEN|T
Does the summary of issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any "deficits, needs and aspirations" need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

- The group requested that number of the points recorded in the Deficits, Needs and Aspirations section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: First Session has been highlighted in red in the relevant sections so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

QUESTION

Do the objectives relating to the towns existing <u>deficits</u> reflect the discussions of the community and technical meetings?

- The group requested that a number of the points recorded in the Deficits, Needs and Aspirations section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: First Session has been highlighted in red in the relevant sections so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

Do the objectives relating to the towns future <u>needs</u> reflect the discussions of the community and technical meetings?

- No additional comments were made

Are the aspirational objectives reflective of the Round One discussions? Are they too aspirational or not ambitious enough?

- No additional comments were made

Is there any additional community or technical feedback on the original Round One questions that has not been captured during the Round Two debate that requires further consideration?

- No additional comments were made

Combined Groups First Session

FEEDBACK SESSION REVIEW OF ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 64	Tadcaster	Community	Round 2

QUESTION
Where are the areas of general agreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any areas of significant disagreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any key actions or investigations required before the next round of consultation later in the year? • No requirements for further investigation were identified

Combined Group Second Session

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">**DISCUSSION GROUPS**
REVIEW OF TECHNICAL ISSUES</td></tr>
</table>

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 67	Tadcaster	Community and Technical	Round 2

<table>
<tr><td>**QUESTION**</td></tr>
<tr><td>

SPATIAL
Does the summary of TECHNICAL issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any technical matters need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

- The group requested that a number of the points recorded in the Technical Issues section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: Second Session have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

TOWN CENTRE
Does the summary of TECHNICAL issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any technical matters need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

- The group requested that a number of the points recorded in the Technical Issues section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: Second Session have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMEN|T
Does the summary of TECHNICAL issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any technical matters need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

- The group requested that a number of the points recorded in the Technical Issues section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: Second Session have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

</td></tr>
</table>

Combined Group Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS
REVIEW OF OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 70	Tadcaster	Community and Technical	Round 2

QUESTION

SPATIAL
Do the spatial options set out in the summary document reflect the groups' discussions and concerns from Round One and are there any areas that have been missed or require amendment?

- The group requested that number of the points recorded in the Option section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: Second Session have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

TOWN CENTRE
Do the town centre options set out in the summary document reflect the groups' discussions and concerns from Round One and are there any areas that have been missed or require amendment?

- The group requested that number of the points recorded in the Option section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: Second Session have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMEN|T
Do the Natural and Built Environment options set out in the summary document reflect the groups' discussions and concerns from Round One and are there any areas that have been missed or require amendment?

- The group requested that number of the points recorded in the Option section, should be clarified and or amended to ensure each point was an accurate interpretation of those issues discussed. Amendments to the issues raised and recorded in the Community Group: Second Session have been highlighted in red so these can be read in the context of the complete statement.

Combined Groups Second Session

FEEDBACK SESSION TECHNICAL ISSUES PLUS OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 73	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

Technical Issues

QUESTION
Where are the areas of general agreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any areas of significant disagreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any key actions or investigations required before the next round of consultation later in the year? • No requirements for further investigation were identified

Options and Implications

QUESTION
Where are the areas of general agreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any areas of significant disagreement? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group
Are there any new Options that have been raised by the groups that were not previously considered in the earlier sessions? • A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group

QUESTION
Are there any key actions or investigations required before the next round of consultation later in the year?
• No requirements for further investigation were identified