



Selby District Council
 Local Development Framework Response
 Policy and Strategy Team
 Selby District Council
 Doncaster Road, Selby.
 YO8 9FT.

9th. Dec. 2014

Dear Policy and Strategy Team,

I am writing in connection with correspondence recently received dated 20th. Nov. 2014, concerning the Sites and Policies Local Plan.

This would seem to be a follow up to the SADP consultations that took place in 2011.

The concerns of myself and other village residents, relate to the proposals for expanding the village of North Duffield, in terms of the building of extra houses.

More specifically, those concerns focus on the following points:

- The number, and type of dwellings to be built.
- The timeframe over which those dwellings might be built.
- The precise site location of any new dwellings.
- The impact that an increase in the local population would have on the nature and character of the village.
- The impact on the amount of traffic passing through the village.
- The strain that an increase in population would impose on local services.
- ie The time that it takes to obtain a Doctor's appointment, currently it takes on average, two weeks to get to see a doctor.

The pressure on school places, the local primary school being virtually full, with certain classes being housed in temporary accommodation at present.

The capacity of the local infrastructure to handle additional demands on those services.

Broadband speeds and bandwidth is very poor at the moment in certain areas of the village and additional users are just going to exacerbate the problem.

There have been drainage problems in the past with a number of houses, and with all the additional hard surface water run-off from additional dwellings, it is clear that the existing drainage and sewerage systems will need to be upgraded.

In addition, extra houses are going to increase the carbon footprint of the village, with the burning of increased amounts of fossil fuels in terms of heating, there is no gas in the village, so its oil, electricity or solid fuel.

There is also now no bus service in to Selby which means that more people are going to be obliged to use their cars.

In our opinion, when looking at the growth of a community, this should be organic growth, demand driven from within the community, not from outside. That tends to produce a more balanced result driven by people who have a connection to the community.

If we are looking to build additional housing as a result of targets laid down by some grand government plan, we should be considering where those occupants are going to work and play. There is no employment to speak of in North Duffield, the nearest centres of employment are Selby, very minimal, York and Leeds. These are the centres then, where the house building needs to take place, don't impose it on the countryside and destroy local communities, and their quality of life, and visual amenity in the process, at the same time as increasing global carbon emissions, where is the sense in that?

What Type of Housing is Required?

There is a tendency when any new house building is proposed to build three and four bedroomed semi detached houses with a proportion of what is termed affordable housing. Does anybody actually look at the local community, and assess what the local need for housing is?

We have in North Duffield an aging population as we do throughout the country. Many of those elderly people are often trapped in homes that are no longer suitable for their needs, but they have no where else to go because there is a shortage of single storey housing, and they do not wish to move out of their local community. Those people would benefit from the building of purpose built retirement homes, which they could move in to, so releasing family accommodation on to the market.

Looking again at numbers, this issue was looked at in 2011, as part of the SADP Consultation process, together with the allocation of sites throughout the village. At that time, a decision was made to develop land fronting Back Lane, to the North and East of Back Lane within an area that was labelled NDUF006 I believe, and it was decided that 29 houses could be built on this land if I am not mistaken. It was also proposed that a further 14 houses could be built on land fronting Green Lane, and also the development of buildings within the farm on Green Lane to provide a further seven dwellings, making in total fifty new dwellings.

It was at the time felt that 50 new dwellings built over a fifteen year period was the maximum sustainable number for a village like North Duffield, bearing in mind the scale of the development which has already taken place over the last twenty or more years. This represents approximately a ten per cent increase to the existing housing stock, probably an increase in population of one hundred and fifty to two hundred, with probably an additional one hundred or so cars.

The area labelled NDUF005, which was proposed back-land development, and against which there was considerable objection, was designated as part of the SADP review, as **Open Countryside**, and not suitable for development.

Despite this, just recently, a new proposal has been put forward for the building of 35 houses on this land by local landowners. How can this proposal be looked at seriously, when the land has already been designated as Open Countryside, and not suitable for building upon. Surely the sites with road frontage and therefore existing infrastructure to tap in to should be developed first, before even giving any consideration to further development of Back-Land.

There is strong feeling within the village against further development, particularly so, when one looks at the way the new Housing Estates have been built in past years. Any new housing needs to be well designed, so that it blends in with the village, and built according to local need. Residents do not want a massive modern housing estate with a village green in the middle being the only reminder of what the village looked like in years gone by.

Under the terms of the Localism Act I believe that there is provision for a public vote in order to approve or not, any large scale development within a community. I, and I would suggest many other residents would welcome the opportunity to exercise their right to vote on the question of further housing development within North Duffield, and we would like to be informed as to the procedure for effecting such an event. Can I suggest that you send out letters to all residents informing them of their rights and the process involved.

I also enclose for your attention, copies of an email sent to North Duffield Parish Council in March 2011, and also a letter to Andrew Mc.millan in Nov. 2011 summarising the responses to the Public Meeting held at the beginning of November 2011.

I think the overall consensus of opinion from that meeting was that if some development was inevitable, that it should be limited, and gradual, and that the sites chosen on Back Lane and Green Lane were the most acceptable since they represented In-Fill on existing road frontages.

I thank you in advance for your cooperation, and look forward to the courtesy of your reply in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Barry Volans.

Selby District Council
Planning Department
Portholme Road
Selby
YO8 4SB

3rd. Nov. 2011

FAO Andrew Mc.millan-Planning Dept.

Dear Mr. Mc.millan,

Ref. SADP – North Duffield, Response to 2nd. Stage of Consultation.

I attended the public meeting held in North Duffield village hall on Tuesday, along with about one hundred other residents, and considered the preferred options for development put forward.

Whilst it is true to say, that there are many people in the village who still do not wish to see the village expanded further, and will oppose any relatively large scale development for the reasons outlined in previous correspondence, opposition to the latest proposals, expressed at the meeting was rather muted.

However, if there is to be development, I believe that the proposals put forward, represent the least worst option, and would have a lesser impact upon a smaller number of residents and their homes, than the original proposals to the West of the village.

The rationale, that the District Council has apparently used for selecting the proposed sites, is appreciated, and I believe will find acceptance with a large number of people. It is clear that care has been taken to select sites with existing road frontage, and to avoid back land development, which is sensible, practical, and considerate. This will also mean that it will be relatively easy to extend existing infrastructure services to the new dwellings, as opposed to other sites put forward.

It is also significant that there were no major objections put forward at the meeting apart from two people with a vested interest in developing land within NDUF005. The only other objections, were in connection with heavy goods vehicles travelling down back lane, the possible allocation of a Travellers Site, and a feeling expressed by one or two residents that we were being forced to accept further housing, whether we wanted it or not, it was said that although the meeting was termed a consultation, the decisions had obviously already been made, and that that made it undemocratic.

The other point of major concern, and strong objections were raised by a number of people about this, was the suggestion that a further seventeen dwellings should be added on to our allocation, from the Cawood allocation, because they did not have the land available for development.

This was not considered to be a valid reason for residents of North Duffield to accept an increase of nearly 40% in the number of dwellings to be built, just because land was available here. If it is necessary, for this shortfall in the Designated Service Village proposed numbers to be accommodated, within the district somewhere, then it was felt that these numbers should be absorbed evenly amongst the other villages and towns in the district.

It was also pointed out that the existing infrastructure would need to be upgraded, particularly in terms of drainage and sewerage, and also in terms of internet broadband service.

I pointed out that there is insufficient band width for our household to run BBC I PLAYER and other on line video applications, and this must be the same for other people. It is therefore essential that the District Council engages in talks with BT with a view to upgrading the local exchange, in order to improve this service. The best broadband deals advertised are for £5 or £6 per month, but these are not available to people in this area. This, and the slowness of the service, is therefore a limiting factor when deciding to work from home or not.

Mobile phone service needs to be improved, in many households, including my own, we can not obtain a signal. If one has workmen working at the property they have to go out in to the road or down to the Green in order to receive a signal.

Again, concern about the schools capacity were expressed, and in answer to this the chair of the Parish Council stated that two temporary classrooms were being installed to ease this problem. The question still remains however, will this be enough to accommodate additional children from a further forty four homes or whatever the number ends up being.

In order to overcome the objections with regard to developer's heavy goods vehicles travelling through the village and along Back Lane, I suggest that a possible solution would be to put in a temporary access road entering at the northern edge of NDUF006 from the York Road. Vehicles would travel across farmland to the southern edge of the site, rather than through the village, so causing less damage to existing roads, and less disturbance to residents.

There were some residents who were disappointed that the southern end of Green Lane was to be developed, but I think that the reasons for selecting this site were recognised, and no strong objections were raised.

Apart from the objections mentioned above, there was generally, resigned acceptance of the proposals, and perhaps a recognition that development of land at the bottom of Back Lane, would have an impact on fewer residents, and would generally have a lesser impact on the village.

I have also since the meeting spoken with a number of residents living on York Road and Green Lane, and there is general agreement that this is a far more acceptable solution, rather than developing NDUF005 as previously proposed.

Highway Matters:

At our Parish Council meeting this evening, the introduction of traffic calming measures was again raised in order to reduce the speed of vehicles passing through the village, and it was mentioned by our local planning consultant, who is a neighbour, that chicanes were the current favoured option. I have written about this subject previously, and whilst chicanes may have their place, particularly in urban settings where there is relatively high traffic flows and wide roads, I do not believe that they are the answer in our situation.

The particular problem that we have on the York Road in North Duffield, is that we have vehicles travelling at excessive speeds in both directions, but not necessarily at the same time.

The disadvantage with chicanes, is that they do not necessarily slow traffic down, they only do this when there is traffic travelling in the opposite direction, and then the traffic is obliged to stop, and then start up again, when the opposing carriageway is clear, with all of the attendant exhaust and noise pollution that that involves. Bearing in mind that many of the vehicles passing through the village are large diesel tractors with powerful engines, not to mention the buses, this is not a very environmentally friendly solution, and is also relatively expensive from a construction point of view.

What happens with relatively light traffic volumes, is that the drivers tend to race in order to get through the chicane, before traffic appears in the opposite direction so defeating the object of what we are looking to achieve here, which is to reduce vehicle speed.

A better solution I believe, is the use of road cushions, in this instance, cars are obliged to slow down to around twenty miles an hour, and soon become familiar with the areas where they are positioned. Larger vehicles can straddle the cushions because of their wider wheel base, and traffic continues to flow in both directions at the same time, although more slowly. This method of traffic calming is working very successfully in Cliff, and also Barby, and I can see no reason why it should not be equally successful in North Duffield.

The centre of the village has so many vehicles parked on both sides of the road, that they effectively form a traffic calming measure themselves.

The above proposal could be combined with a twenty mile an hour speed limit through the village, as they now have universally in Germany France and Spain, in small towns and villages.

I would be obliged if you would pass on my comments in this respect to Highways for their consideration.

I look forward to the courtesy of your acknowledgement, and comments on the points raised, and remain,

Yours sincerely,

Barry Volans.

Dear Mrs. Baines-Holgate,

Thank you for your email in follow-up to the Parish Council meeting.

In order to be clear with regard to my comments about just how North Duffield has been selected as a Designated Service Village, I set out the point that I am wishing to make below.

What I am questioning is the Rational and the Methodology for this selection process. There are a number of villages that have been selected throughout the Selby District, and we are given to understand that they have been selected on the basis of the facilities that they can provide. These are; a local shop, a bus service, a primary school, perhaps a pub etc. However, if no consideration has been given to the amount of development that has already taken place within these villages, any further development in villages that have already seen considerable development, is going to produce an imbalance, with certain villages becoming unacceptably large in size with far too many residents for the facilities provided.

The historical rate of development is a significant factor, in terms of the changing nature and feel of a residential community. New dwellings, and therefore new residents I would suggest, should only be introduced in relatively small percentages per year in order to allow for gradual and sustainable assimilation within the community.

The general feeling within the village amongst existing residents is that North Duffield is big enough as a rural village, and there is strong opposition against further large scale development. The proposed development of NDUF 005 is "Back Land" development and is totally unacceptable from an environmental point of view. It would take away a wonderful visual amenity for all those residents directly affected, and replace open land, which is currently a wild life habitat for a wide range of birds and small mammals, with an unsightly concrete jungle, which would increase this village's carbon foot print by at least a third, if not more. The land is also subject to flooding, and any further development is only going to exacerbate this problem, with all the hard surface run-off going in to the drainage system.

What we should be doing as a community, and as a district, is looking at ways of reducing our carbon emissions, and these proposals fly directly in the face of that objective. A more sensible solution, in my opinion, would be to turn the land in to Woodland, this could provide an income for the land owners, which is surely what they are after at the end of the day, it would reduce the village's carbon emissions, and provide a rich habitat for wildlife. This type of investment also has tax advantages because of it's environmental benefits.

One of the land owners within the marked area on the map, which accounts for approximately one third of the total area, is apparently totally opposed to the sale of his land, and has said that it will definitely not happen within his lifetime, which could be another 25 to 30 years. The marked area therefore gives a misleading impression of what development could take place, and if these outline proposals for up to 147 houses include this land, then they are inaccurate.

I have had a meeting with a number of local residents, and we feel that this issue needs to be put to a public vote, which therefore requires to be widely publicised. Also the proposal for development put forward to Selby District Council, of which NDPC has a copy, by I believe, it is Neil Associates, in conjunction with Mrs. Hubbard, that too needs to be publicised so that all residents are aware of what is being proposed.

As this government keeps telling us, local issues now, should be decided locally, and that should mean that a District Council can not go ahead and approve housing development plans against the wishes of the local community, purely for the sake of meeting government guidelines with regard to house building numbers within a given time frame. In relation to this point, I would refer to a comment that a member of the Parish Council made last Thursday, whereby they stated that you were having to consider the building of this number of houses, because Selby District Council had a target to meet. This really is not the case, these

numbers are merely guidelines, and tends to suggest that certain members of the Parish Council have accepted these guidelines as a "fait a complit". I believe that it is important that all members of the Parish Council see their role as representing, and protecting the interests of the local community, and not as an agent of the District Council, empowered to carry out whatever the District Council may decide.

These decisions could not be more important in local community terms, they are about shaping the future of our village, about protecting our environment, controlling the mix and numbers of our residents, preserving our landscape, controlling the amount of traffic passing through the village, all for the good of the community.

Finally, I would like to raise the issue of Escrick, which is not listed as a Designated Service Village, and is within Selby District, it more than meets the criteria for selecting a DSV , and is, I would suggest, eminently better suited to accommodate additional housing, having had next to no development over the last twenty years, it being on a main road with a regular bus service between York and Selby every twenty minutes, it has a shop, a Post Office, an Hotel and Conference Centre, a multi Doctor's Practice, a Garage, a Pub and two Restaurants, a Leisure Club, Tennis Courts, Primary School, a Private Secondary School. Perhaps you could obtain an explanation from Selby District Council as to what their rational is for not including Escrick within the list.

I would like to receive information as to just how a public vote might be organised, and when that could be arranged for.

Would you please pass on my comments to Selby District Council as part of my response to SADPD.

I thank you for your cooperation, and look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Barry Volans.