



ARAS Parish Council response to SDC Regulation 16 representations February 2017

Ref	Comments	Should it be considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
NYCC	<p>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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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 &amp; East Yorkshire Ecological Data Centre.</p> <p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p>Generally, it is considered that this is a good neighbourhood plan.</p> <p><u>Terminology</u> On page 13 in Objective 2 the term “<i>countryside character</i>” could be changed to ‘landscape character’ to more explicitly include the whole plan area.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Explanation is provided in the preamble to policy ELH3.</p> <p>Adopt the correction.</p> <p>Adopt the correction to the Ings at Acaster Selby as a SINC.</p> <p>Part one of Objective 2 is about protecting and enhancing the countryside element of our local landscape.</p>

ARAS Parish Council response to SDC Regulation 16 representations February 2017

Ref	Comments	Should it be considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
NYCC	<p><u>Employment development in the landscape</u>                      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.</p> <p><i>‘ 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’.</i>                      Inclusion of the airfield or other current industrial sites on proposals maps would be helpful.</p> <p><u>Landscape character</u>                      On page 22 “the wider Vale of York regional character area” should be ‘national character area’ (the NCA profiles are published by Natural England).</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Adopt the proposed paragraph.</p> <p>Adopt the correction.</p>



ARAS Parish Council response to SDC Regulation 16 representations February 2017

Ref	Comments	Should it be considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
NYCC	<p><b>Policy ref – H3 Car Parking</b>                      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.</p> <p><b>Policy ref – WB1 Re-Use of Redundant Buildings</b>                      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.</p>	No	<p>Comment noted. But reference to the size of parking spaces is in response to inadequate sized spaces provided on previous developments. This has resulted in problematic ‘on street’ parking. This policy adds to and does not conflict with the NPPF.</p> <p>Comment noted. However, re-wording would simply repeat the NPPF in terms of speaking about minimising conflict between traffic, cyclists and pedestrians / avoiding street clutter.</p>

ARAS Parish Council response to SDC Regulation 16 representations February 2017

Ref	Comments	Should it be considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
<p><b>NFU</b></p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment further on the Appleton Roebuck and Acaster Selby Neighbourhood Development Plan. I write in the capacity of local representative of the National Farmers' Union in the North East Region with particular interest in planning and economic development in rural areas.</p> <p>In order to encourage growth and enterprise within the village suitable conditions should be placed on occupancy of a proportion of residential dwellings. Such conditions should be used to ensure accommodation is available within the community for local businesses, such as agricultural enterprise. Not only to ensure a reliable source of labour it also encourages workers to integrate into the community within which they work.</p> <p>3.1 Vision for the Future</p> <p>Whilst small enterprises may flourish in the parish it is important that high speed broadband coverage is uniform across the parish and rural businesses are able to diversify utilising high speed communications. As highlighted by your survey, adequate broadband and mobile phone coverage were</p>		<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Since the initial questionnaire high speed broadband has been installed in the parish.</p>

ARAS Parish Council response to SDC Regulation 16 representations February 2017

Ref	Comments	Should it be considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
NFU	<p>highlighted as major constraints on businesses, alongside transport, premises and planning policy.</p> <p>Farm Diversification We welcome the objective to support farm diversification as this helps improve the long term viability of agricultural businesses whilst also having wider benefits for the local economy. Furthermore, through allowing re-use of existing farm buildings as part of diversification it enables preservation of the rural landscape avoiding the new for new build. However, modern farming practices necessitate a certain amount of new development which should be looked upon favourably if justified as part of the existing business.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure With regards to flood alleviation strategies, natural flood management can be incorporated into wider schemes to help reduce flood risk though this should be seen as a method of supplementing more traditional hard engineering structures. If Natural Flood Management methods are to be used, early engagement with relevant land owners is to be encouraged. The long term implications also need to be considered in terms of maintenance and liabilities.</p>		<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

ARAS Parish Council response to SDC Regulation 16 representations February 2017

Ref	Comments	Should it be considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
NFU	<p>Maintaining Agricultural Land</p> <p>We note the importance placed on Best and Most Versatile agricultural land. We would hope that this is of paramount importance when assessing the feasibility of any development. The preservation of rural land is vital in ensuring the sustainability of the rural economy and therefore the economy of the area as a whole. Great importance should be placed on securing the long term security of best and most versatile agricultural land as such land is not only an asset for the landowner but also the wider economy in meeting food production needs.</p>		Comments noted.
<b>Samuel Smiths Old Brewery</b>	<p>Page 29, para 4.5.1</p> <p>I note that the definition of ‘small scale development’ is proposed to be adopted from Selby District Council as being under 10 units. This is in the face of the residents expressing an overwhelming preference within the Residential Survey, for housing schemes to be limited to 5 units or less, and no apparent policy basis for such a threshold.</p> <p>I object to the adoption of the 10 unit threshold for the following reasons.</p> <p>Firstly, definition of 10 units or fewer which appears to be used by Selby District Council is not, as far as I am aware, defined within either the</p>		



ARAS Parish Council response to SDC Regulation 16 representations February 2017

Ref	Comments	Should it be considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
SSOB	<p>adopted Development Plan policy or any relevant Glossary of Terms. The conformity of references cited below policy H1 have been assessed in this regard.</p> <p>Whilst the definition of ‘major’ and ‘minor’ applications for development management purposes is set nationally at 10 dwellings, this has little bearing on the proper planning of small rural settlements such as Appleton Roebuck. This definition is an administrative tool for the development management process, rather than having any relevance to the neighbourhood planning process.</p> <p>I am aware that a 10 unit threshold is used in the calculation of affordable housing contributions, and has been used in the assessment of allocated and committed residential sites, however these neither prevent sites smaller than 10 units coming forward in locations such as Appleton Roebuck. They are District wide tools which have limited relevance to the issues raised in creating a Neighbourhood Plan for a small rural settlement. Whilst policies dealing with DSV status provide for ‘limited growth’ of these settlements, those policies apply to 18 separate DSV settlements throughout the District, each with their own character sustainability characteristics and physical ability to support development. The definition of ‘limited growth’ is not set out in the Core Strategy Local Plan and therefore the NDP cannot be in conflict with it.</p> <p>Consequently, the arbitrary adoption of the 10 dwelling threshold is inappropriate.</p> <p>Secondly, the survey data collected at page 60 of the NDP shows that there are very strong views expressed from local residents in support of a threshold of less than 5 dwellings. The NDP itself acknowledges that this</p>		<p>The Reg14 draft was amended from 5 to 10 units on advice from SDC prior to the Reg14 consultation. We would be more than happy to have the original figure of 5 units re-instated, if that is appropriate, and does not conflict (as is suggested) with SDC or national policy. This would be in line with residents’ wishes as expressed through consultation and engagement prior to the Reg14 consultation."</p>

ARAS Parish Council response to SDC Regulation 16 representations February 2017

Ref	Comments	Should it be considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
SSOB	<p>preference is 'overwhelming' however appears to adopt the 10 dwelling threshold 'in order to comply with SDC policy.'</p> <p>The underlying purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan process is to provide tailored and locally supported policies, which seek to guide and shape development within the Neighbourhood Plan area. Policy SP2 of the Core Strategy provides for: <i>'some scope for additional residential and small scale employment growth to support rural sustainability.'</i></p> <p>The overwhelming locally expressed preference for defining '<i>additional residential</i>' for these purposes is well evidenced within the Residents Survey at a level below 5 dwellings.</p> <p>One of the fundamental requirements of the neighbourhood planning process is that the policies and plans are required to secure the support of the wider community and reflect their concerns and ambitions for the area. They are also required not to conflict with the Local Plan however, in this case, the only component of the Local Plan that is adopted is the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The clearly expressed and recorded views of the overwhelming majority of the residents in the area, have been set aside in order to comply with an unreferenced Selby District Council's 'definition' and policy. The NDP is intended to reflect and express the views of the local population, garner their support and provide a robust and lawful basis upon which to assess proposals. The policy, as currently drafted does not achieve these aims and requirements.</p>		

ARAS Parish Council response to SDC Regulation 16 representations February 2017

Ref	Comments	Should it be considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
SSOB	<p>Lastly, the adoption of a 10 dwelling threshold appears to have been purely in order to comply with SDC policy. There is no evidence available to show that this threshold has been tested as appropriate for the neighbourhood area, that it will not the key characteristics of the area, or that it would result in a sustainable pattern of development. Without this the policy cannot profess to be evidence led, or in compliance with the ‘golden thread’ of NPPF.</p> <p>In summary, and having regard to the above, evidence within the Residential Survey clearly indicates that the threshold considered to provide an appropriate level of growth for the settlement and for the settlement to fulfil its role within the wider District is at a level of less than 5 dwellings. There is no issue of non-compliance with Local Plan policy, and no requirement for the NDP to adopt the 10 dwelling threshold currently used by Selby District Council.</p>		
<b>Internal Drainage Board</b>	<p>Many thanks for the opportunity for the Internal Drainage Board to participate in this consultation process.</p> <p>The Board’s position is that it is always seeking that, wherever possible, the risk of flooding should be reduced and that, as far as is practicable, surface water arising from a developed site should be managed in a sustainable manner to mimic the surface water flows arising from the site prior to the proposed development. This should be considered whether the surface water arrangements from the site are to connect to a public or private asset (watercourse or sewer) before out-falling into a watercourse or, to outfall directly into a watercourse in the Board’s area.</p> <p>The Board believes that, in an area where drainage problems could exist,</p>		Comments noted.

ARAS Parish Council response to SDC Regulation 16 representations February 2017

Ref	Comments	Should it be considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
IDB	<p>development should not be allowed at any location until the Authority is satisfied that surface water drainage has been satisfactorily provided for. And any approved development should not adversely affect the surface water drainage of the area and amenity of adjacent properties.</p> <p>In addition the Board does not consider that development within Flood Zone 3 is desirable or sustainable in the longer term.</p> <p>The Board normally focuses on providing responses on individual developments that are either within the Board's drainage district, or are likely to impact on its activities. However, if you would like to provide details of the areas selected for development, that fall within the Board's drainage district, the Board would be happy to consider them and provide comments as appropriate.</p>		
<b>Network Rail</b>	<p><b>Across the country Network Rail is currently carrying out the biggest investment in the railway for over a century. This is to modernise the network in line with increasing demand. Passenger numbers have doubled over the past 20 years, and continue to grow.</b></p> <p><b>Our railway upgrade plan will deliver improvements to manage and deliver predicted future growth in both passenger and freight traffic, and move us towards our vision of a better railway for better Britain. A key element of this is working closely with our neighbours and communities.</b></p> <p><b>At this time there are no specific plans for the section of track identified within the Appleton Roebuck with Acaster Selby Neighbourhood Development Plan.</b></p> <p><b>We are committed to engaging with all stakeholders should that change in the future and to ensure the views of all parties are heard.</b></p>		Comments noted.

ARAS Parish Council response to SDC Regulation 16 representations February 2017

Ref	Comments	Should it be considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
<b>Wakefield Council</b>	<p><b>Thank you for consulting Wakefield Council on this Neighbourhood Plan.</b></p> <p><b>I can confirm that the Council has no comments with regard to the plan.</b></p>		Comments noted.
<b>Highways England</b>	<p>Many thanks for having sent through the latest consultation regarding the Neighbourhood Development Plan for Appleton Roebuck with Acaster.</p> <p>As you will be aware, we continue to work closely with the Local Authority in regards to potential future development and growth in Selby District, and I remained engaged closely in the emerging Local plan consultation process.</p> <p>Whilst I have no formal comments at this point in specific regard to the Appleton Roebuck with Acaster proportion of the wider picture on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport, I would like to offer my thanks again for sending this through and keeping in touch.</p> <p>All the best with the consultation rounds and please don't hesitate to contact me personally in the future.</p> <p>Kindest regards</p> <p><b>Simon Jones, Asset Development Manager</b> Highways England  </p>		Comments noted.

ARAS Parish Council response to SDC Regulation 16 representations February 2017

Ref	Comments	Should it be considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
<b>Historic England</b>	<p><b>Appleton Roebuck &amp; Acaster Selby Neighbourhood Development Plan for Appleton Roebuck &amp; Acaster Parish Council Regulation 16, Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 Neighbourhood Plan Submission Consultation</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the Appleton Roebuck &amp; Acaster Selby Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We responded to the Pre-submission Consultation for Appleton Roebuck &amp; Acaster Selby Neighbourhood Plan in our letter of 22 July 2016, in which we stated that did not wish to provide comments upon the Plan.</p> <p>We do not therefore wish to offer any further comments on the Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		Comments noted.
<b>National Grid</b>	<p><b>Appleton Roebuck Neighbourhood Plan Consultation SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL GRID</b></p> <p>National Grid has appointed Amec Foster Wheeler to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the above Neighbourhood Plan consultation.</p> <p><b>Specific Comments</b></p> <p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate and High Pressure apparatus.</p>		Comments noted.

ARAS Parish Council response to SDC Regulation 16 representations February 2017

Ref	Comments	Should it be considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
National Grid	National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.		
<b>Coal Authority</b>	<p><b><u>Appleton Roebuck with Acaster Selby Neighbourhood Plan – Submission</u></b></p> <p>Thank you for the notification of the 21 December 2016 consulting The Coal Authority on the above NDP.</p> <p>The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body which works to protect the public and the environment in coal mining areas. Our statutory role in the planning system is to provide advice about new development in the coalfield areas and also protect coal resources from unnecessary sterilisation by encouraging their extraction, where practical, prior to the permanent surface development commencing.</p> <p>As you will be aware the Neighbourhood Plan area lies within the current defined deep coalfield. This part of the coalfield contains an access agreement from the Coal Authority to extract Coal Bed Methane granted in 2008.</p>		Comments noted.

ARAS Parish Council response to SDC Regulation 16 representations February 2017

Ref	Comments	Should it be considered for the draft plan?	Decision and rationale
Coal Authority	<p>However the plan area contains no surface coal resource and is not located within the Coal Authority defined Development High Risk Area. Consequently the Coal Authority has <b>no specific comments</b> to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>In the spirit of ensuring efficiency of resources and proportionality it will not be necessary for you to provide The Coal Authority with any future drafts or updates to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. This letter can be used as evidence for the legal and procedural consultation requirements.</p> <p>The Coal Authority wishes the Neighbourhood Plan team every success with the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		