

Let's Talk

# PLAN SELBY

## ANSWERS

TOWN	FACILITATOR/PARTICIPANT
SELBY	SPAWFORTHS
DATE OF ENGAGEMENT WORKSHOP: 30 <sup>th</sup> JUNE 2015	

7th July 2015 Revision C

## 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 1

## Community Group Answers

## Community Group: First Session

### DISCUSSION GROUP DEFICITS NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 1	Selby	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?**

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

**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 cinema 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
- 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 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 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 should become more of a focus for activity and become more accessible with more bridleways and footpaths
- A tidal dam should 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
- Greater efforts need to be made to make the abbey more attractive as a destination – e.g. visitor centre/facilities
- 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 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

## Community Group: Second Session

### 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 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 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)



**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
- 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
- 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 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 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?**

- No 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 Questions



## 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 to provide greater connectivity with the town centre
- 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 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. 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 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 to long term opportunity to build an urban extension to the north west of the town but this would require a northern bypass 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 technically lying in Barby. 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.

**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?**

- 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 Crosshills 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 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

Where are the areas of general agreement?

Are there any areas of significant disagreement?

Are there any new Options that have been raised by the groups that were not previously considered in the earlier sessions?

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

