



Ref 243

10th August 2015

Dear Ms Atkinson,

Plan Selby Consultation

Firstly a few general points on the consultation:-

- 1) While the consultation period was more sensible it is still almost impossible to locate what is most relevant, and to link it with other matter on the same subject, often in different reports. I suggest that in the next phase of consultation all the relevant reports are listed under Plan Selby with a brief summary of the contents sufficient to guide to the relevant sections, criteria, questions, tables etc
- 2) There should also be a glossary of all abbreviations as these crop up randomly and if not remembered can be difficult to re-identify when going backwards and forwards.
- 3) I strongly suggested that the DSV report upon which I do not recall any consultation is now a very lame policy to be given the weight it has to bear. This is born out by the vastly different results reached for individual villages under the different options suggested.
- 4) I am pleased for this reason to see that you intend to consider the use of derelict sites (including airfields) and former mines, and believe that these should be considered on a site by site basis to reduce the use of agricultural land for building. In addition other villages should be assessed to see if they are more suitable than the DSVs. If the destruction of agricultural land was given a significant weighting as a

factor it might demonstrate the need to look for more suitable development sites than the DSVs.

Initial Consultations Summary of representations

Table 1

ix &x Safeguarded Land and Development limits These reports are said to be produced during the 'summers focussed engagement'. I have not found these reports unless they have been hidden under different titles, and cannot comment on them. I assume I will be able to do this in the 1916 consultation. I still don't know what safeguarded land means.

x Infra Structure Needs The same applies here.

Q8a) Overallocation Apart from the discount for non-delivery there was an over allocation because casual approvals which you stated to achieve about 50% of the annual target were discounted. There seems to be considerable excess allocation already and this should be reduced not increased.

Q8b Plan Period Brown field sites should be large and developed through the period in tandem with the infrastructure. Green field development should be small. This would reduce the loss of agricultural land.

Q8c) Contingency Sites Every effort should be made to locate development where demand is. It is a negation of planning to build houses in places they are not wanted because of failures to build them where they are required.

Q17 Employment Poor access to the transport networks to sites should generally militate against ad hoc development which should generally have easy access to the motorway and main road network.

Q25 Infrastructure On the response received from the Gas Company I note that they state that all DSVs have a good gas supply. As far as I am aware this is not true in North Duffield. In addition the electricity supply has more planned and unplanned cuts of varying lengths than anywhere else I have lived. If development is to take place in North

Duffield the Water Company will certainly need to implement its scheme as the recent works have not been entirely satisfactory in coping with the present situation.

Q37 The DSV policy is out of date. There are constraints in so many cases that additional alternative sites need to be found if the proposed levels of housing are really needed.

Q54 North Duffield I agree with the comments supporting only very limited if any growth. I don't know anything about Burn Airfield, but it is stated to be in a Secondary Village, and therefore not relevant to North Duffield. I have suggested that other villages than DSVs should be considered, as well as former airfields. I do not understand why changes made as a result of consultation demonstrate that the process is unsound.

Plan Selby Site Allocation B14 North Duffield

B14.1 The Derwent crossing is inadequate for a heavy traffic load.

B14.2 Population Church Fenton? North Duffield figure missing.

Transport The A19 junctions with the A163 and at Escrick, particularly the right hand turns are already causes of delay and increased use will exacerbate the situation. The Bus service to Selby is useless for getting to and from work or shops; that to York no better for jobs with an early start or late finish, and barely adequate for shopping. The only realistic transport is by private car.

Access to Employment. Distance seems to be the only criterion – nowhere is realistically accessible except by private car.

Services. I understand that the school is already operating at capacity. The surgery while a useful and appreciated facility is only part time and often fully booked necessitating a visit (by car) to Escrick.

Landscape Appraisal. Church Fenton re-appears. How much of this section relates in fact to Church Fenton and not North Duffield? Sensitivity -A Moderate B Low- They appear to be the same to me. How are these sweeping judgements made? What implications result from the judgement? The A163 does not provide the southern boundary to nearly ^{the} extent shown after recent development. Suggesting development to

the North East of York Road's acceptable sounds rather like someone looking at the village from outside , some of us in the village would look at the landscape from the village.

Countryside The Countryside begins at the edge of currently developed sites ,if this is different from development limits

Land Supply I assume that since only 10 sites are stated to be in the SHLAA and listed that Sites ND11&12 although still on the plan have been discounted and are no longer the subject of consultation.

Options for allocation between DSVs

I dont think the DSV policy is cuurenty useful – if it was there would be a simple numerical allocation, ^{which} would be appropriate.

Generally housing requires access to employment –this seems to be the most relevant of the methods .

The Green Belt is in need of revision particularly in areas that could be made accesible to motorways and trunk roads.

Yours Faithfully