

Let's Talk

PLAN SELBY

ANSWERS

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

7th July 2015 Revision J

Introduction

This Answers Booklet provide a record of the issues raised in response to the questions as discussed with invited representatives at both the Community and Technical Workshops that were held at the start of the focused engagement (Round 1). They are the views of the attendees and not views of the Council or Spawforth who have been appointed as facilitators and engagement consultants. They are the groups' views and not attributed to individuals. The answers will feed into the wider PLAN Selby process and will form the basis of developing key objectives for the Towns for discussion at follow up workshops for invited representatives (Round 2). The answers to the questions posed for the Community Workshops are at the front, followed by the ones from the Technical Workshop. The questions for the Round 2 workshops, where both groups will get together into a single discussion forum are placed at the back of this booklet.

Round I

Community Group Answers

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

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 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 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 through many of the adjacent villages. The following villages were specifically referred to: South Milford, Fairburn, Lumby, Saxton
- "Rat running" of traffic through many of the housing estates in Sherburn
- Lack of leisure facilities in the village.

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 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 approaches to Sherburn in Elmet)
- Improvements to the wider strategic road network
- Development briefs to guide the content and form of larger development sites
- Changing facilities and a 3G pitch
- 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

Community Group: First 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 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 some 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
- 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 significant concerns 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 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
- 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 OUT 14 OUT 15	Selby Tadcaster 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. 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.

Community Groups: Second Session

FEEDBACK SESSION ALL GROUPS TECHNICAL ISSUES / OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 25 OUT 26 OUT 27	Selby Tadcaster 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 I

Technical Group Questions

Technical Group First Session

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 Leeds 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 existing 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/MI link
- There are no purpose built youth facilities in Sherburn 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
- 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

DISCUSSION GROUPS TECHNICAL ISSUES – ALL THREE THEMES

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

DISCUSSION GROUPS OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS – ALL THREE THEMES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 46	Sherburn	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 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

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 numbers 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.

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 53 OUT 54 OUT 55	Selby Tadcaster 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 Answers

Combined Groups First Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS REVIEW OF ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES

Up to six separate working groups of around 10 people per group

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 60 OUT 61 OUT 62	Selby Tadcaster 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?

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?

QUESTION

NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

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?

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

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

QUESTION

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

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?

Combined Groups First Session

FEEDBACK SESSION REVIEW OF ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES

All groups come together for a general feedback session

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 63 OUT 64 OUT 65	Selby Tadcaster Sherburn	Community	Round 2

QUESTION

Where are the areas of general agreement?

Are there any areas of significant disagreement?

Are there any key actions or investigations required before the next round of consultation later in the year?

Combined Group Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS REVIEW OF TECHNICAL ISSUES

Up to six separate working groups of around 10 people per group

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 66 OUT 67 OUT 68	Selby Tadcaster 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?

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?

NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

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?

Combined Group Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS REVIEW OF OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Up to six separate working groups of around 10 people per group

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 69 OUT 70 OUT 71	Selby Tadcaster 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?

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?

NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

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?

Combined Groups Second Session

FEEDBACK SESSION TECHNICAL ISSUES PLUS OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

All groups come together for a general feedback session

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 72 OUT 73 OUT 74	Selby Tadcaster Sherburn	Community	Round 1

Technical Issues

QUESTION
Where are the areas of general agreement?
Are there any areas of significant disagreement?
Are there any key actions or investigations required before the next round of consultation later in the year?

Options and Implications

QUESTION
<p>Where are the areas of general agreement?</p>
<p>Are there any areas of significant disagreement?</p>
<p>Are there any new Options that have been raised by the groups that were not previously considered in the earlier sessions?</p>
<p>Are there any key actions or investigations required before the next round of consultation later in the year?</p>

