

Sophie King

From: Tom Ridley
Sent: 29 January 2015 09:40
To: LDF
Subject: FW: PLAN Selby - Cliffe Parish Council

Late rep

Tom Ridley
 Policy Officer

From:
Sent: 28 January 2015 16:16
To: Tom Ridley
Subject: Fw: PLAN Selby - Cliffe Parish Council

Dear Tom,

As it has not been possible to discuss 'PLAN' Selby at a Parish Council meeting I emailed all councillors for their comments and please find below a response received from Councillor David McSherry, unfortunately this was the only comment received.

Yours Sincerely

Mrs Julie Leighton-Eshelby
 Clerk to Cliffe Parish Council

1) The SDADP has been shelved but SDC reps state that subject matter disclosed will not be cancelled off in this new consultation but whilst this is a new consultation previous matter will still be considered. An example of this is that whilst Cliffe and Hemingbrough were given a categorical statement that NO TRAVELLERS SITES will in future be considered for those two communities, the new SELBY Plan will once more take the two villages into account. The parishes may well consider that this goes against SDCs decision in 2009 (?).

2) Due to Government budgetary constraints over the next 4 - 8 years, local, District and County will be unable to support the changes envisaged in infrastructure, education etc. Most certainly new build will be forced upon major towns and villages because of the existing roads and services. Most certainly the majority of the new build will be at BOCM, Flaxley Golf Course, Staynor Hall area, Tadcaster and Sherburn. At this early stage I would think this might amount to 4,000 out of the 7,000 over the next 10 years. Service villages might be another 500 houses along the A63 including windfall sites. It would appear that developments are to be based on Developer funding as against Government assisted. The funding of education should be carefully looked at.

David McSherry.



Sophie King

From: Tom Ridley
Sent: 29 January 2015 13:39
To: LDF
Subject: FW: 'PLAN Selby Response
Attachments: David McSherry Plan Selby Response.docx

Late rep

Further to one sent earlier.

Tom Ridley
Policy Officer

From:
Sent: 29 January 2015 13:23
To: Tom Ridley
Subject: 'PLAN Selby Response

Dear Tom,

Following on from my email yesterday I have received a further response from Councillor David McSherry and please find this attached.

Yours Sincerely

Mrs Julie Leighton-Eshelby
Clerk to Cliffe Parish Council

Plan Selby – The Sites and Policies Local Plan

Providing Homes

Proportional Increase in Development – Service Villages

This is not feasible nor environmentally correct and indeed, as was seen in the 'Kay' development in Osgodby some years ago, the facilities put forward by the developers were exceeded so far beyond fact that their projections became a debit point. It is vital that a community assessment is taken individually with regard to current and projected infrastructure, education and maintenance of the environment. Questions have to be asked as to the ability of North Yorkshire Education to provide school transport – particularly at a time of current constraints and most certainly cut backs in the county budgets in the next eight years. Whilst planning is essential, logics must prevail and funding cannot be guaranteed for school/class extensions. This cannot be over ridden as an unknown factor.

I will summarise this as follows:-

Olympia Park, Flaxley Golf Course potential, Burn, Cross Hills and Brackenhill Lane plus land in the Service Villages will provide the new build required. The rural environment must be protected.

The Jacobs Consultancy Plan 2009 (local transport plan) with its projection to 2026 for North Yorkshire County Council shows that the ring road and roundabouts are underutilised and can accommodate increased traffic flow. Also it is logical to avoid overlap between new build housing and industrial development but, it is more important to plan community infrastructure BEFORE any implementation of the Plan Selby.

Plan Selby – Industrial Development

Industrial Development

There is an unavoidable logic with regard to this matter. Firstly, existing industrial areas must be expanded no matter what form of 'industry' is involved. The infrastructure is in place and should be compartmentalised from housing and schools. This is mostly in the towns and larger villages (Sherburn). Secondly, there is an increase in self employment which is based in the larger and service villages. These businesses are the stepping stones for the Districts future. The planning of such communities should start NOW. Not within the turmoil of 'consultation'.

Plan Selby – The Sites and Policies Local Plan

Travellers Sites

This subject was raised in the SDAPD (superseded by PLAN Selby) and it is to be hoped some lessons were learned from the furore. All those sites which were rejected subsequently should be confirmed as current and, although Government dictates allocate the number of sites and pitches, it should be remembered that unrest can leach into Housing and Industrial matters.

I will only summarise this as being: any sites within an acceptable infrastructure, controlled and in agreement with any adjoining communities. Full and proper consultation with ALL parties. Adequate schooling and education, shops and nationwide road networks, and medical services.

I personally would not welcome traveller's caravans and trade vehicles travelling through community main routes.

Temporary school placing must NOT be imposed upon local education. An assessment of this must be based on a realistic and not optimistic prior forecasts. In service villages where a % new build is forecast that will be problem enough. NYCC has not the money for District wide expansion and any travel costs imposed on pupils and families must surely be open to legal contest.

David McSherry