

**Sophie King**

---

**From:** Church Fenton Parish  
**Sent:** 16 January 2015 15:51  
**To:** LDF  
**Cc:** Andrew Mason; Jo Mason; Craig Blakey; Sarah Chester; Nick Mossman; Helen Mizon; Samantha Laslett  
**Subject:** PLAN Selby

The Consultation document was considered by Church Fenton Parish Council at its meeting of 15th January 2015. The Parish Council agreed the following comments:

1. The village has received more than its fair share of development in recent years. According to figures included in planning documents the number of dwellings has increased from 325 to 525 since 1997, a 62% increase, which is higher than comparable areas.
2. The designation of Church Fenton as a "Service Village" is becoming less appropriate. There has been a significant reduction in both bus and rail services over the last 12 months.
3. The Council considers that the housing allocation mechanism suggested in in the document is satisfactory in principle. The recent approvals for an additional 65 dwellings on the Airfield site should be taken into account when allocations for Church Fenton and Ulleskelf are considered so a lower figure that the indicated allocation would be appropriate.
4. There have been issues over flooding in recent years. It is noted that this issue is identified in the Infrastructure Plan. Any allocations in Church Fenton must be on the basis that the flooding issue is addressed, and that developments do not cause additional flood issues for current residents.
5. Small scale development on small infill type sites is more in keeping with the character of the village than the large developments that have been allowed, particularly at the west end. In many cases this could be managed through the Development Control process without requiring a specific site allocation, especially when in the past this has led to site cramming. This could be achieved by identifying a village boundary within which small scale development (say up to 3 dwellings) could be permitted subject to meeting the village design statement and other development control criteria.
6. Objections will be raised to proposals for large sites in Church Fenton. In addition the setting of the Parish Church should be protected.
7. Amendments to the Green Belt boundary in the Sandwath Lane/ Drive areas would be accepted in the light of the previously approved development. The "Strategic Countryside Gap" alongside Carr Dyke is less important than the development principles indicated above.
8. The lack of any comment in the current document with regard to HS2 is disappointing, and will need to be addressed in the next phase of consultation.
9. There is a need to identify land for additional Station parking.

Jeremy

--  
Jeremy Sherlock,  
Clerk Church Fenton Parish Council,

