

Draft First NDP Response Comments: Assessment

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK				
ref	a.Is the comment relevant to NDP planning matters?	b.Does the comment conform to basic conditions?	c.Conclusions – should the comment be accepted and considered for the new draft plan?	d.Decision and rationale
VISION				
1	No	No	No - transport	
2	Yes	Yes	Reconsider vision to take account of greenspace issue	
3	No	No	No - transport	
4	No	No	supportive	
5	Yes	Yes	Reconsider to take account of community facilities issue	
6	No	No	No - transport	
7	Yes	No	No – not relevant to vision	
8	No	No	No – transport	
9	Yes	Yes	Yes – consider enhancements to policy	
10	Yes	Yes	No – specifics in policy	
11	Yes	Yes	No – specifics in policy	
12	Yes	Yes	Supportive	
13	Yes	Yes	No – specifics in policy	
14	No	No	No - no comment made	
15	Yes	Yes	Supportive	
16	Yes	Yes	No – specifics in policy	
17	No	No	No – roads/traffic	
18	No	No	No – no comment made	
19	No	No	No – transport	
20	No	No	No –transport	
21	Yes	No	No – specifics in policy	
OBJECTIVES				

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK				
ref	a.Is the comment relevant to NDP planning matters?	b.Does the comment conform to basic conditions?	c.Conclusions – should the comment be accepted and considered for the new draft plan?	d.Decision and rationale
1	No	No	No – not relevant	
2	Yes	Yes	Yes – reconsider O3	
3	Y	Y	Y – consider revision to vision in light of O2 and 5	
4	N	N	Supportive	
5	Y	N	N – not relevant/practical	
6	Partly	Partly	N – specifics in policy	
7	N	N	Supportive	
8	Y	Y	N – specifics in policy	
9	Y	Y	Supportive	
10	Y	Y	Y – reconsider CF objective re village hall	
11	Y	Y	N – specifics in policy	
12	Y	Partly	Y – in environment and Housing need policies	
13	N	N	N – evaluation/monitoring	
14	Y	Y	Y – consider in policy	
15	Y	Y	Y – consider emphasising village character	
16	Y	Y	Supportive	
17	Y	Y	N – specifics in policy	
18	Y	Y	N – misses the point about objective	
19	N	N	Supportive	
20	Y	Y	Y – consider explanatory note or develop objective	
21	Y	Y	N – not specific	
22	Y	Y	Supportive	
23	N	N	N - Non planning	
24	N	N	N – non planning	
25	N	N	N – misses the point	
COMMUNITY FACILITIES				

Draft NDP Response Comments March 2015

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK				
ref	a.Is the comment relevant to NDP planning matters?	b.Does the comment conform to basic conditions?	c.Conclusions – should the comment be accepted and considered for the new draft plan?	d.Decision and rationale
1	N	N	N – non planning	
2	Y	Y	Supportive	
3	N	N	N – non planning	
4	Y	Y	Supportive	
5	N	N	N – non planning	
CF1				
1	N	N	No - no point made	
2	N	N	Supportive	
3	Y	Y	N – already included	
4	Y	Y	Y – consider more detail in policy	
5	Y	Y	N – no point made	
CF2				
1	N	N	N – not SD	
2	N	N	N – non planning	
3	Y	Y	Y – consider size of development re CFs	
4	Y	Y	Y – consider	
5	N	N	N – no point made	
6	Y	Y	Y – consider size of development re CF	
7	Y	Y	Supportive	
8	Y	Y	Y – clarify	
9	Y	Y	N – opinion	
10	N	N	N – not relevant here	
11	Y	Y	Y – consider size of development re CF	
12	N	N	N – not planning	
13	N	N	N – opinion	
14	Y	Y	Y – consider size of development re CF	

Draft NDP Response Comments March 2015

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK				
ref	a.Is the comment relevant to NDP planning matters?	b.Does the comment conform to basic conditions?	c.Conclusions – should the comment be accepted and considered for the new draft plan?	d.Decision and rationale
CF3				
1	Y	Y	N – misunderstanding of NDP purpose	
2	N	N	N – not NDP matter	
3	N	N	Supportive	
4	Y	Y	N – covered by other policy	
5	Y	Y	Supportive	
6	Y	Y	N – no proposal for this	
7	Y	Y	N – no proposal for this	
8	N	N	N – no proposal for this	
DESIGN OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT				
1	N	N	Supportive	
2	Y	Partly	Y - Consider linkages	
3	Partly	Partly	No - confused	
DBE1				
1	N	N	N – not planning	
2	Y	Y	Y– do they meet criteria?	
3	Y	Y	Y- do they meet criteria?	
4	N	N	Supportive	
5	N	N	N – against NPPF	
DBE2				
1	N	N	N – not planning	
2	Y	Y	Y- reconsider re modern / innovatedesign	
3	Y	Y	Y – as above	
4	N	N	Supportive	
5	Y	Y	Supportive	
6	Y	Y	Y – reconsider wording	

Draft NDP Response Comments March 2015

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK				
ref	a.Is the comment relevant to NDP planning matters?	b.Does the comment conform to basic conditions?	c.Conclusions – should the comment be accepted and considered for the new draft plan?	d.Decision and rationale
DBE3				
1	Y	Y	Y – reconsider re CA and permitted development	
2	N	N	Supportive	
3	Y	Y	N – covered by policy	
4	N	N	N – not planning	
5	N	N	N – not planning	
6	N	N	N – opinion	
7	Y	Y	Y - reconsider re CA and permitted development	
8	N	N	N – not planning	
DBE4				
1	Y	Y	Supportive	
2	N	N	Supportive	
3	N	N	N – not policy	
4	Y	Y	N - opinion	
DBE5				
1	N	N	N – non planning	
2	N	N	N – non planning	
3	N	N	N – non planning	
4	Y	Y	Y – ProW policy specific	
5	N	N	Supportive	
ENVIRONMENT LANDSCAPE AND HERITAGE				
1	N	N	N – non planning	
2	N	N	N – non planning	
3	N	N	N – no comment made	
ELH1				
1	Y	Y	Y – consider implications for new homes	

Draft NDP Response Comments March 2015

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK				
ref	a.Is the comment relevant to NDP planning matters?	b.Does the comment conform to basic conditions?	c.Conclusions – should the comment be accepted and considered for the new draft plan?	d.Decision and rationale
2	N	N	N – misunderstands purpose of NDP	
3	N	N	Supportive	
4	Y	Y	Y – consider implications for new homes	
5	Y	Y	Y – consider implications for new homes	
6	Y	Y	Supportive	
7	Y	Y	N – confused point	
8	N	N	N – opinion	
ELH2				
1	Y	Y	Supportive	
2	N	N	Supportive	
3	N	N	Y – consider retention vs replacement	
4	N	N	Supportive	
5	N	N	Non planning	
6	N	N	Non planning	
7	Y	Y	Supportive	
ELH3				
1	Y	Y	Y – consider impacts on landscape,character, etc	
2	Y	Y	N – already the case	
3	N	N	Supportive	
4	N	N	N – nimby	
5	N	N	N – no point made	
6	N	N	N – opinion	
7	Y	Y	Supportive	
8	Y	Y	Y – consider revision	
ELH4				
1	N	N	Supportive	

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK				
ref	a.Is the comment relevant to NDP planning matters?	b.Does the comment conform to basic conditions?	c.Conclusions – should the comment be accepted and considered for the new draft plan?	d.Decision and rationale
2	Y	Y	Supportive	
ELH5				
1	Y	Y	Supportive	
2	N	N	N – nimby	
3	N	N	Supportive	
4	Y	Y	Y – consider wording	
5	Y	Y	Supportive	
6	N	N	Supportive	
7	Y	Y	Supportive	
8	Y	Y	Y – consider policy re development limits	
HOUSING				
1	N	N	Supportive	
2	Y	Y	N – covered in other policy	
3	Y	Y	Supportive	
4	Y	Y	Supportive	
5	N	N	N – not planning	
6	Y	Y	Supportive	
7	Y	Y	Supportive	
8	Y	Y	Supportive	
9	Y	Y	Supportive	
10	N	N	N – no point made	
11	N	N	N – no point made	
12	Y	Y	Supportive	
13	Y	Y	Supportive	
H1				
1	Y	Y	Y – consider revise wording	

Draft NDP Response Comments March 2015

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK				
ref	a.Is the comment relevant to NDP planning matters?	b.Does the comment conform to basic conditions?	c.Conclusions – should the comment be accepted and considered for the new draft plan?	d.Decision and rationale
2	Y	Y	Y – as above	
3	Y	Y	N – no site allocation or numbers	
4	Y	Y	N – as above	
5	Y	Y	Supportive	
6	Y	Y	Supportive	
7	Y	Y	Supportive	
8	N	N	N – personal statement	
H2				
1	Y	N	N – not strategic	
2	Y	Y	Supportive – but state levels of past house building	
3	Y	N	N – against Core Strategy	
4	Y	Y	Y – check policy wording	
5	Y	Y	Y – check policy wording	
6	Y	N	N – no housing for young families?	
7	Y	Y	Supportive	
8	N	N	N – no comment	
9	Y	Y	Supportive	
10	N	N	N – comment only	
H3				
1	N	N	N – comment only	
2	N	N	N – enforcement	
3	N	N	N – not planning	
4	Y	Y	Supportive	
5	N	N	N – not planning	
6	Y	Y	Y – consider policy wording	
7	N	N	N – not planning	

Draft NDP Response Comments March 2015

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK				
ref	a.Is the comment relevant to NDP planning matters?	b.Does the comment conform to basic conditions?	c.Conclusions – should the comment be accepted and considered for the new draft plan?	d.Decision and rationale
8	N	N	N – not planning	
9	N	N	N – not planning	
10	Y	Y	Y – consider policy wording	
11	N	N	N – no comment	
H4				
1	Y	Y	Supportive	
2	Y	Y	Y – question for clarification in text	
3	Y	Y	Supportive	
H5				
1	Y	Y	N – not policy related	
2	Y	Y	Y – consider policy	
3	Y	Y	Supportive	
4	Y	Y	N – supports our policy	
5	Y	Y	Supportive	
6	Y	Y	Y – evidence base	
7	Y	Y	Y – as above	
8	Y	Y	Y –as above	
9	Y	Y	N – not planning/relevant	
WORK AND BUSINESS				
1	N	N	Supportive	
2	N	N	N – not NDP	
3	N	N	N – not policy	
4	Y	Y	Supportive	
5	N	N	Supportive	
WB1				
1	Y	Y	Y – consider impact of policy	

Draft NDP Response Comments March 2015

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK				
ref	a.Is the comment relevant to NDP planning matters?	b.Does the comment conform to basic conditions?	c.Conclusions – should the comment be accepted and considered for the new draft plan?	d.Decision and rationale
2	Y	Y	N – previous policy	
3	N	N	Supportive	
4	N	N	N – opinion	
5	Y	Y	Supportive	
6	N	N	N – opinion	
7	Y	Y	Y – consider rewording	
WB2				
1	Y	Y	Y – consider rewording	
2	N	N	Supportive	
3	Y	Y	Y – consider implications	
4	Y	Y	Supportive	
WB3				
1	N	N	N – not policy	
2	N	N	N – not policy	
3	N	N	N – no comments	
4	N	N	Supportive	
5	Y	Y	Y – consider implications	
6	Y	Y	Y – consider implications	
7	Y	Y	Supportive	
8	Y	Y	Y – consider PDR	

VISION

1. Do children of secondary school age have access to secondary schools in other towns? Will there be easy access to other towns eg bus service?
2. Lack of link with objectives 2 & 5. Without wanting to lengthen the vision is there a place to add importance of retaining the green spaces in the villages?
3. Can't see how access to Tadcaster & Sherburn without a bus service.
4. Agree in general.
5. Vision should stress the need for more new community facilities to be developed.
6. For working people car is essential. No direct transport to Tadcaster, Sherburn or Leeds. Your vision ignores transport services.
7. Micro enterprises should not be allowed to turn garages into warehouses and developing into retail outlets.
8. No mention of public transport. Access to secondary education may well depend on education policies of the government at the time.
9. Don't agree with the need for starter housing units within the village. Also would wish for more emphasis on protecting the natural environment, improving health & well-being of local community as well as supporting local wildlife.
10. As a broad aim it's fine, but the stated recreational facilities and community facilities should be more specific. Also the absence of a reference to transport to access local towns is disappointing.
11. Any development must be of small scale and limited to either the existing village envelope or immediately adjacent to the boundary of the village envelope. The number of new houses should be limited in scale in keeping with the existing village.
12. Pleased to note "smaller homes for the elderly".
13. Other than referring to "smaller homes for the elderly" no other comment is made about providing amenities for older residents.
14. What vision.
15. Agree generally. Village doesn't at present have excellent out of school play & recreational facilities - no playground, no sports field!
16. As elderly people we would prefer some shops.
17. There needs to be speed control - I leave my car on the road on purpose to slow traffic down and many have thanked me.
18. (Don't agree) You don't listen to other people's views.
19. But the council's "easy access" in a community probably dependant on the private car & its implications especially for young married & the elderly & their particular needs.
20. There are factors outside the control of the PC such as transport.
21. What's new? Fibre internet is here! We purchased our property in a small quiet village and are totally against big developments.

OBJECTIVES

1. Not sure on **Obj 1** - will the continued active support be there?
2. Would amend **Obj 3** to "supporting sustainable levels and range of new homes "in order to deliver vision.
3. No reference in the vision to the built environment/heritage assets & yet they're included in **Objs 2 & 5** - would add something like "our villages will retain their vernacular character through conservation and good new build design."
4. Agree in general terms; not so sure about business growth and leisure facilities eg Ibbotsons - terrible blot on the landscape & traffic problems horrendous!
5. **Obj 3** - far too broad. Any new homes should be proposed individually and a decision made on its own basis.
6. **Obj 3** - when supporting levels of new homes there should be a mandatory requirement to upgrade existing infrastructure, particularly drainage and the introduction of natural gas.
7. All good objectives.
8. Parking spaces per house should reflect no. of bedrooms.
9. (Agree with objectives) but any new development MUST be supported by new facilities - larger village hall children's playground.
10. Following the loss by the villagers of the Nun Appleton theatre a new purpose built Village Hall surely ought to feature in any village expansion plans. I cannot see any specific mention of this idea in the statement headed "OUR OBJECTIVES". To the best of my knowledge the Parish Room has been in poor condition for the past 50 years and does not meet the needs of some existing village groups never mind new ones!!
11. Reservation regarding "small business growth etc" need examples.
12. These are very broad - so don't disagree in general. However, would wish to have a higher priority and more specific mention of protecting the natural environment. Again would challenge the need for new houses in the village (although people may want them). Need be careful of how we define "need".
13. Again these are broad aims, measurable milestones and specific success criteria need to be included in order to monitor progress to delivering objectives.
14. A footpath from Ebor Park is needed into the village - a very dangerous corner.
15. I would have liked more emphasis on protecting the character of the village.
16. Increase in population size and housing will need to be supported by improved village amenities, including a more frequent bus service, a village shop, GP surgery, Post Office etc.
17. A balance of mixed property types is essential.
18. Not clear what Objective 5 means - not all the "built environment" is high quality at present.

19. Agree - provided your objectives are well managed and controlled.
20. There is no mention of Designated Service Village and what it might mean.
21. Concerned about the number of new homes - will lose the "village" aspect.
22. Agree - but I would not like to see the village grow too much though.
23. But need to be self-funding eg sports facilities not dependent on expensive maintenance or strictures.
24. Very diverse promoting business growth will increase traffic if done by building premises. Business will flourish anyway where conditions are right for it.
25. Your overarching objective is to build many houses which we disagree with.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

1. It would be good to have the Parish Rooms car park tarmaced to encourage use.
2. Good to see reference to specific number in CF2, all of these need developing.
3. Unable to cope at present.
4. It is vital that the school progresses with the resultant new recreation facilities and key facilities and key services are maintained.
5. In terms of the growing population are there plans to attract a shop business incorporating diverse sales products? Will the 21 bus service cease and if so will there be an alternative transport for elderly people with no cars for access to doctors etc.

CF1 Retention of Key Services & Facilities

1. I do not believe there is enough substance behind the points stated to make an informed decision on this point, further work to be carried out, then re-pose the question, so I hope the majority of answers will be no as additional details are required.
2. Good.
3. Additional community facilities should also be encouraged for every age group.
4. Needs to be expanded or explained.
5. Facilities are good for a rural village.

CF2 New Recreational Facilities

1. Not sure we need these: village green is surely adequate.
2. Must ensure that such new recreational facilities do not infringe on the serenity of the community.
3. On a development of 4 houses? This sounds a small number but then it would depend on what sort of "recreational facility" was proposed.
4. This point is covered in the 278 paid within each new build, why state 4? - I make the point that Appleton should purchase a piece of land for recreational use, especially as a children's play area, then over time through lottery, donations and 278 contributions the master plan for the scheme would be completed.
5. Difficult to follow.
6. How can a rec facility be incorporated into mini estates - people won't go to a cul-de-sac as it will look private - where would they be built? For every development? We're trying to reduce development limit.
7. Strongly support.
8. I think would require clarification of what "recreational facilities" meant. Is this taking up more land or is this lawns / grass etc incorporated in the design of the build?
9. Only a large scale development can hope to create new recreational facilities.
10. Not sure this is very meaningful. Would rather focus on whether development is appropriate in the first place.
11. Agreed but where will recreation facilities be? The responsibility for recreation facilities should be shared between all developers in the village to make meaningful facilities, not just gestures.
12. The support cannot just be financial, it must be practical - otherwise we end up with a lot of money and nowhere to spend it.
13. In the past new developments have rarely supported recreational facilities (old or new).
14. Is 4 homes too small an amount to require new recreational facilities? Might 6 - 8 be better? Or could there be a requirement to provide some funding for the parish council (rather than Selby Council) to use in this way?

CF3 Appleton Roebuck Primary School

1. Again this is a 278 planning matter. 278 planning matters should not be used to get a yes decision on a neighbourhood plan, if the parish will have no future say on the matter as this is a local district planning matter.
2. Increased traffic at certain times of the day!
3. Good.

4. There is a need for some sustainable community facilities not all of which can be based around the school.
5. No capacity in current building for more kids but does fluctuate year on year.
6. Just to emphasise that the school playing fields should not be used for any building.
7. With regard to CF3 - the school will need to grow and this should be supported - no land should be allowed to be taken from the school grounds to build.
8. Please do not mess with such a wonderful school!

DESIGN of the BUILT ENVIRONMENT

1. Very good.
2. Any future housing developments on the fringes of the village should be capable of access from the village by new footpaths, accompanied by the installation of street lighting. The 30 mph speed limit on the Broad Lane side of the village should be re-sited closer to the village boundary sign.
3. I am concerned that the local green spaces are to be protected. The mix of housing is essential using solar equipment and other environmental systems. I am concerned at present some of the paths are not walkable.

DBE1 Local Green Spaces

1. Trimming hedges overhanging and restricting width of footpaths on Main St should be enforceable.
2. The green and wooded areas of Acaster Selby should be included and protected.
3. **No** green space **can** be compromised. We hope this includes the field (all of it) that runs from the church & behind Holly Bank to the road at Chapel Green.
4. Good.
5. Although these areas should be available to be used for recreational facilities.

DBE2 Respecting Traditional Building Design and Scale

1. Where new housing has designated off-street parking why isn't it enforced? Viz Grayson Cottages, Villa Farm etc.
2. I do not believe that only traditional building designs are correct for the area ... I believe the designs should be of high quality but why not allow modern designs to be integrated with the existing?
3. Building design should be innovative and not restrictive.
4. Good.
5. As mentioned in H1 density is so important. We need to protect the village environment with very careful management to resist garden development/infill.
6. Wording - "Proposals should respect" might this be too open to being ignored/bypassed? Would the words - "Proposals need to respect" be slightly stronger as a requirement

DBE3 Integrating Modern Design

1. Integrated design, solar panels need to be south facing, so to state that should avoid street front elevation will just lead to the Parish saying no, then the applicant stating south facing requirements. Similar point to DBE2, I believe we should embrace high quality modern design as well as period design.
2. Good.
3. Air source pumps must be adequately housed to avoid noise pollution.
4. Needs very careful monitoring.
5. Key issue is these should be implemented in practice. Recent developments on large back garden sites have not always done this - resulting in overcrowded highly dense developments.
6. Solar equipment and especially air-driven heat exchange pumps always adversely affect the environment / appearance and for negligible net contribution to unsubsidised energy usage, and certainly offer no overall carbon gain over their lifetime.
7. Solar panels avoiding street front elevations will greatly restrict the ability of houses on the northern sides of any roads to utilise this renewable source of energy. I think instead of "avoiding street front elevations wherever practicable" would be better written as "preferably avoiding street front elevations".
8. Traditional is good. Please leave Appleton Roebuck alone!

DBE4 Green Infrastructure

1. Strongly agree = trees, hedgerows etc
2. Good.
3. Plans may say that existing hedgerows and trees will be kept, but unless it becomes a condition of "approval", then there is nothing to stop the builder removing hedges/trees either during the build or after completion - as at Ash Tree Gardens.
4. Once again small developments have not improved the infrastructure, particularly drainage.

DBE5 Streets and Street Scene

1. Does it need something about cutting down on on-street parking?
2. Textured crossing can be difficult for prams and wheelchairs.
3. Limit street lighting to necessity.
4. A pavement to Ebor Park.
5. Agree but care needed re: light pollution to housing

ENVIRONMENT, LANDSCAPE & HERITAGE

1. The roads feeding A/R are in severe disrepair. What lies in the future for this matter?
2. **Must** have surveys
3. No.

ELH1 Maintaining Agricultural Land

1. But where are the new housing developments going to be? They can't **all** be infill - so some existing farm land would have to be used - somewhat of a dilemma!!

2. I do not see how any development would ever be supported in the area apart from infilling as all the land around the parish is agricultural. This Parish council and any future council by presumption will not be in favour of any development, which I believe will then lose any meaning to this plan.
3. Good.
4. Where is the building land coming from if you do not use agricultural land?
5. Agreed but village character must be maintained. If necessary develop new builds outside current boundary to ensure the rural nature of AR is protected.
6. I agree with ELH1 in particular the optimum use of land changed from agricultural use.
7. By offering an area of land for community use opens up opportunities to develop further areas of farm land thus contradicting H1 which states these developments should be small in number - one field offered for development would be suitable for a small village!
8. Aye but you build on Green Belt when it suits, look at West End.

ELH2 Enhancing Biodiversity

1. Provided no adverse visual impact.
2. Who will determine what is included in "trees of good arboricultural & amenity value". Trees in conservation areas already need consent for works. Understand the intention but ? the practicality. Do we understand what is important re biodiversity in the village?
3. We should enhance biodiversity, but that should not mean that retention is always necessary, as this retention may lead to huge increase in costs or sub-optimum design, if ancient trees are required to be removed then by planting the right species, density and age of trees comments should be added - would be an improved policy point, rather than a blanket no.
4. Good.
5. Hedges to be cut down round main roads.
6. Needs to be enforced. Developers have no regard for wildlife habitat (in recent village developments).
7. Similarly the ancient trees should be maintained.

ELH3 Renewable Energy

1. Am concerned that bullet point 2 refers only to public safety and bullet point 1 refers only to scale of existing buildings - I think this is missing something about impact on landscape / views & wildlife / village character.
2. Opens up a possibility of wind turbines etc?

3. Good.
4. No wind farms.
5. Great care needed here.
6. Domestic renewable energy sources harm the environment - appearance, noise etc - ad for no overall carbon gain.
7. We have had solar heating for many years and consider this should be extended.
8. For ELH3 I think it is fine to comment on the noise of the ASHPs etc but it is reasonable to say that they should be no louder than what is currently in place either in the property or in the surrounds. Our ASHP does make a noise but is quieter than a neighbouring oil fired boiler.

ELH4 Rights of Way

1. Good.
2. As a former footpath officer for NYCC I am appalled at some of the Rights of Way.

ELH5 Historic Rural Environment

1. We should allow movement with the times, embracing the future whilst protecting our heritage.
2. There should be nothing that impacts on the rural and historic character of the parish.
3. Good.
4. Need to know what "modest" means.
5. Agree with the overall objective but do not support development outside current limits and esp. not on green belt land.
6. Strong agreement.
7. I agree that any new build must not have a detrimental effect on the historic character of the Parish.
8. There are many landowners just waiting for the development limits to be increased to make yet more money. This is for their profit - not the sake of the village. - not increase the current development limits.

HOUSING

1. Good.
2. Lack of children's playground. Will this be considered?
3. No more garden grabbing please.
4. Only small scale development within the form and character of the existing village and infrastructure should be allowed. Small scale should include small starter homes for young people and smaller houses for existing elderly people who wish to downsize.
5. What provision for car parking like in the Main Street. Yorkshire Water and EA useless (flooding sewerage)
6. I believe that dwellings should be built on the boundary of the village, thus increasing the area of the village - otherwise all we get is "infill" and houses on top of each other.
7. Development needs to be situated adjacent to existing development, so that it does not add to urban sprawl.
8. A plan must be created to deal with both foul and surface water drainage which all developers must subscribe and contribute to. Car parking needs enforcing in a "gentle" way!
9. Any developments large enough to require affordable housing provision should be built where occupants are able to walk on existing (or newly built) footpaths to the villages. It seems unreasonable to build affordable housing away from the village and with no direct means of getting into the village other than walking on roads with high hedges and restricted visibility.
10. Is there any point as the development behind Northfield went ahead even though most of the village was against it.
11. Whilst agreeing with the policies I doubt they will be adhered to. Far too many already existing "new" developments have led to far too much on street parking even where residents have ample private parking but choose not to use it 1) Main St Villa Farm 2) Grayson Cottages
12. H1 H2 Over the past 30 years we have seen some very respectable and traditional family homes ruined / demolished - this should not be allowed to continue under new legislation / proposals.
13. No. Please do not build many houses.

H1 Housing Density and Scale

1. How many houses constitute a small development?
2. The design of the house to integrate etc is stated in this policy. What is classed as a small development?
3. We need a minimum of 50 new private dwellings and one purpose built house & shop & a new all purpose village hall. Therefore a one off all inclusive design plan is essential. A village shop is not sustainable on present population numbers.
4. May well need larger housing developments to sustain "Objectives" and overall "Vision".

5. Agree in theory with wording. In practice, this has resulted in highly dense, inappropriate developments as "infill", which have a negative impact on residents' health and well-being, and make the village a less attractive place to live and raise a family. We need to do everything possible to preserve and protect the assets of the village - as a safe and rural community.
6. Emphasis on density issue.
7. Have no objection to one single large development if property sited & planned and provides playing field.
8. Yes but you do not follow it, look at Villa Farm, what you allowed them to build, blocking all my afternoon sun out of my garden and for Villa Fm house to end up with no parking, if that's good planning God help us.

H2 Housing Mix

1. Each development should be able to make its case based on the NPPF.
2. The village is an affluent area that attracts people in the first place. Caution should be taken and consultation - so as not to deter the people it currently attracts. Is it being taken into consideration the number of properties built in the village over the last 12/24 months?
3. There should be no social housing provision.
4. New housing for elderly a bit puzzling. We are OAPs and will move out of this village in time to a more suitable location within walking distance of shops etc.
5. New developments should NOT be required to mix these. The priorities are separate. 1 should be for young families. 2 for the elderly and general development should be allowed ONLY when 1 & 2 have been proven to have been met.
6. Wholly disagree with the need to provide homes for young families within the village. Many affordable areas within reasonable distance.
7. Would provision for young families support more Housing Association building? West End Ave was very successful - can see need for more if existing occupants at Broadacres development don't move.
8. **
9. H2 with a ? over mobility & ability to access services eg shops, surgery etc
10. You cannot predict housing need, it will depend on success of other issues.

H3 Car Parking

1. Is only any good if off-street parking can be enforced otherwise lazy drivers will park where it best suits them.
2. Many houses that have parking spaces do not use them. You need to be able to enforce that parking - but I doubt it. Many people who are able to park their cars off the street don't bother and perhaps can't be legally forced to do so.
3. But no repetition of selfish on-road parking as seen at Grayson Cottages and Villa Farm.
4. For larger houses it should be enforced by the builders to have suitable parking off-road.
5. Parking on Main St already a problem.
6. Car parking must reflect number of bedrooms - 2 spaces for 4 & 5 bed house is inadequate & will result in congestion.
7. No development that needs on street parking will be permitted. Owners of cars parked on Main Street at present should be encouraged to find alternative parking sites.
8. I think care needs to be exercised with "alternative car parking" as can be seen by the large number of on road parked cars on the main street. Do many of these have car parking spaces off the road which are not used?
9. Parking generally needs to be monitored.
10. Min 2 spaces per house but proportionate to size of dwelling.
11. ***

H4 Conversion of Redundant Buildings

1. Strongly support development of existing redundant buildings.
2. Will such developments count in the total development total imposed on AR?
3. A derelict site is a sad sight and should be utilised.

H5 Drainage and Flood Prevention

1. Surface water and drainage needs to be sorted before any major development.
2. No mention of flood protection for Acaster Selby (why not?)
3. There should be no housing permitted on existing farmland or where there is a risk of flooding.
4. Selby DC **must** take YW advice & not ignore it to meet their own housing target.

5. Massive issue. Developers must be held accountable for this & be instructed to be totally responsible.
6. Point 4: **statement is incorrect - sewerage capacity already insufficient in times of heavy rain.**
7. Existing capacity in local sewerage system is already insufficient.
8. It is absolutely vital that plans are put into effect to prevent floods and improve drainage.
9. Don't understand the last point - YW's problem not developers.

WORK and BUSINESS

1. Good.
2. A policy to improve local public transport is needed for the benefit of present and future employment prospects.
3. Too many HGVs at the moment
4. A shop is needed especially for elderly people with no cars if the bus service is pulled.
5. This is acceptable.

WB1 Re-use of Redundant Buildings

1. We do not agree with diversification where it increases industrialization & increased HGV, as seen with the increase of potato wagons through the village in recent years.
2. Main point here is that it refers to DBE2.
3. Good.
4. There are wonderful properties derelict due to seemingly selfish reasons by certain landowners.
5. The re-use redundant buildings is preferable to new build.
6. This is a nonsense question. If there is a redundant building and it is brought back into use, then that will add to traffic. Redundant buildings do need to be brought back into a use that allows reasonable traffic movement.
7. For WB1 a & b I would suggest using the word "significant increases". As it is currently written 1 additional lorry or road traffic would fall foul of this and could adversely impact the re-use of redundant buildings.

WB2 Farm Diversification

1. Point B - not sure how any development apart from infilling will then be deemed acceptable in the Parish is this what we want? Loss of agricultural land could / should be softened to "detrimental" loss of agricultural land.
2. Good.
3. This policy is far too vague and open-ended, could let in many types of agri - business, including a small abattoir.
4. I agree strongly with farm diversification as it provides jobs for local people.

WB3 Small Business Development

1. Noise levels and untidiness should be considered.
2. Small business development in the home could be disastrous for people around them in many ways.
3. Badly worded and too broad a statement.
4. Good.
5. Businesses run from home should be contained within the home. No external storage facilities, large vehicle parking should be allowed. A limit should be set to size of lorries driving through the village.
 - a) "Small business development" very grey area. b) How do you monitor this?
6. Noise pollution important.
7. Small business development as this also provides jobs for local people
8. Homeworking doesn't require any support for conversion unless it is major with large impact.

General Comments

1) Thank you to you and your colleagues for taking so much time on the Neighbourhood Plan, I can only imagine the time the effort you are all putting into this exercise for the good of our Parish.

I personally agree with the Vision and Objectives in outline, but have various comments on the policies proposed which the current and any future Parish Councillors will be guided by when making informed decisions on planning matters.

In summary,

I believe there are more young families moving into the village that are more willing to see some modern architecture which enhances the village. Beauty is in the eye of the beholder I agree, but there are numerous modernisation designs in the surrounding villages that in my opinion add character and interest. On a grander scale, buildings like the Shard and the pompadour centre add real character to old cities.

I do not believe the neighbourhood plan will allow the council to say yes to any development in Appleton unless it is infilling of gardens with a similar design to the existing houses, this is certainly not the direction I think the village should move in. We have seen far too much infilling, the time is right to be brave and set aside areas of land for a children's play area, a small business office space and a small scale housing development of up to 50 houses, which should be drawn down upon every 5 years for the housing demand in the area. This way everybody will know the direction of travel for Appleton Roebuck, we can make informed decisions when selling or buying in Appleton and respect/embrace the next 15 years' worth of houses needed to meet District council demands in the area.

The plan should set out the strategy on utility and general services including communications, drainage, gas connection? Most of which are mentioned in the proposed policies.

I would prefer to take the correct amount of time to deliver a real meaningful directional neighbourhood plan.

I would not like to be part of a neighbourhood plan that shows Appleton villagers as NIMBYs who are not embracing the future.

Once again thank you for taking your personal time and efforts into this very worthy activity. I hope you embrace my comments above and give them suitable airtime especially as I give an opposing view to some of the current policy positions.

2) The whole format is not beneficial to the process. Each point is so general that it cannot be taken on its own - as too many points/questions are raised by agreeing or disagreeing.