

Appleton Roebuck with Acaster Selby Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation Response Form

Personal Information

Title

First Name

Last Name

Address:

Line 1

Line 2

Line 3

Line 4

Post Code

Telephone Number

Email address

Section /Page

Please indicate which section, page and paragraph your comments relate to.

Comment type

Please indicate whether your comment is in **support of**, **objection to**, or is a **general comment on** the Neighbourhood Plan. *(please mark the appropriate box with an 'x')*

Support	x
Object	
General / Neutral	x

Notification

Please indicate with an 'x' in the box if you would like to be notified of the local planning authority's decision under Regulation 19 in relation to the neighbourhood development plan, to make (or adopt) the plan under section 38A(6) of the 2004 Act.

Comment & proposed changes to the Plan:

(continue on a separate page if necessary)

Please see attached letter dated 31/01/2017

Your ref: Tel: 01609 532428
Our ref: Fax:
Contact: Michael Reynolds Email: michael.reynolds@northyorks.gov.uk
Date: 31 January 2017 Web: www.northyorks.gov.uk

Dear Mr Broadbent

Draft Appleton Roebuck with Acaster Selby Neighbourhood Plan

Thank you for consulting North Yorkshire County Council on the draft Appleton Roebuck with Acaster Selby Neighbourhood Development Plan. This is a Council wide response endorsed by the Business and Environmental Service Executive Members. The County Council's service areas have reviewed the documentation and have the following comments:

Strategic Policy & Economic Growth:

In our response to your consultation on the earlier draft of the Neighbourhood Plan we commented that it would be desirable for plan to be able to demonstrate consistency with the broader strategic plans for the area. These include the North Yorkshire Council Plan, the North Yorkshire Community Plan, the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Economic Partnership's (LEP) Strategic Economic Plan and the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Housing Strategy.

Children and Young People Service:

We note with thanks that our previous comments made during the previous consultation have been reflected in the current draft. We have no further comment to make on the plan.

Heritage Services:

Ecology

The Background to the NDP (section 1.1) describes the parish as being "dominated by largely arable farmland" but in fact there are substantial areas of floodplain grassland around the confluence of the rivers Wharfe and Ouse. This includes at least some traditionally-managed, species-rich floodplain meadow on Lord's Ings: although this has no conservation designation, it is an example of a rare habitat with a strong connection to the local landscape. The great 17th century poet Andrew Marvell described the floodplain

James Broadbent
Assistant Policy Officer

meadows around Wharfe Mouth in *Upon Appleton House* and other works. The historic management of these meadows is also referred to in Marjorie Harrison's *History of Acaster Selby in the Parish of Stillingfleet, 1066-1875*.

While section 4.4 of the Plan recognises the importance of the Ouse and Wharfe floodplains as 'green infrastructure corridors', these are mentioned only generically and more explanation of their specific value would be welcome.

Policy ELH2 (Biodiversity) is welcome but I would suggest a minor change of wording. The paragraph beginning "Proposals for development which would...", item (c) should simply say "Ancient Woodland and Ancient/Veteran Trees" (i.e. the words "Other types of" are superfluous because woodland has not been itemised elsewhere).

In Appendix A1 (Green Spaces), the Ings at Acaster Selby are mentioned but are referred to incorrectly as a Site of Special Scientific Interest; they are not. Wharfe Ings is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), but Lord's Ings to the north has no designation. There is one other SINC in the Parish, at Brockett Wood while Sicklebit Wood is a potential SINC. Details of the site boundaries should be available from Selby District Council or can be provided by North & East Yorkshire Ecological Data Centre.

Landscape

Generally, it is considered that this is a good neighbourhood plan

Terminology

On page 13 in Objective 2 the term "*countryside character*" could be changed to 'landscape character' to more explicitly include the whole plan area.

Employment development in the landscape

In relation to text on development on page 13 Objective 4 and page 61 the addition of some positive guidance could be helpful. Overall, employment development is a low key aspect of the plan, with small scale development preferred, but proposals that have greater impact on the plan area could come up in future, or undesirable cumulative effects could result from small scale ad hoc development. A masterplan for the airfield, where there could be particular issues, was previously suggested, but alternatively text could be inserted to generally promote sustainable employment development and associated enhancement on the former airfield or elsewhere e.g.

'Sustainable development proposals will be welcomed that demonstrate high quality design sensitive to the landscape character of the area such as; retention of significant landscape features or restoration of lost features, multifunctional green infrastructure mindful of ecological and sustainable transport connectivity across the site to surrounding areas, structure planting, appropriate plant choice using native plants from local provenance where specified, and general use of recessive colours and non-reflective surface finishes for buildings and structures to increase integration with local landscape'.

Inclusion of the airfield or other current industrial sites on proposals maps would be helpful.

Landscape character

On page 22 "*the wider Vale of York regional character area*" should be 'national character area' (the NCA profiles are published by Natural England).

On page 43 the character of other parts of the village is not shown i.e. where they are not 'Main Street' or 'The Greens' – all areas have character.

Local Highway Authority Response:

The Local Highway Authority had requested engagement with the Neighbourhood Plan team within its consultation response to the Appleton Roebuck with Acaster Selby Neighbourhood Development Draft Plan. This was to have enabled detailed discussions over any policies which have highway and transportation considerations. To my knowledge no discussions have taken place.

Policy ref – ELH 3 Green Corridors

Policy ELH 3 identifies local green corridors, which give specific mention to roadside grass verges. The policy needs to acknowledge the need for highway infrastructure within the green corridors and the potential for future amendments to the highway which can, in most circumstances, be delivered using the LHA's powers.

Policy ref – H1 New Housing Development Design and Scale

Policy H1 identifies that new developments are located to minimise through traffic in Appleton Roebuck village. It should be noted in terms of capacity the scale of development proposed is small and therefore will have little impact on the capacity of the surrounding road network. It is unclear how this is justified by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Policy ref – H3 Car Parking

Policy H3 identifies minimum levels of onsite parking for new developments which is in line with the Local Highways Authorities parking standards. Policy H3 also identifies that car parking spaces must be suitable for the average family size car, the LHA would not be able to support car parking dimensional requirements that are not in accordance with its parking standards.

Policy ref – WB1 Re-Use of Redundant Buildings

The Local Highway Authority would request that "Increases in the levels of road traffic which can be demonstrated to cause disruption to neighbouring properties" be reworded to reflect NPPF.

We are happy to discuss any of the issues raised.

Yours sincerely

Michael Reynolds
Project Manager Level 1 (Infrastructure)