

**Further Options:  
Summary and analysis of comments received**

**Qu.1**

**Do you agree with the Council's criteria for defining Primary Villages and if so, do you agree with those 20 villages selected? If not explain why.**

1. 120 of the 176 respondents made a comment on this question. Of those 105 specifically indicated agreement or disagreement with the criteria. Respondents were roughly equally divided with 56 indicating agreement and 49 disagreement. Of the 56 agreeing by far the majority 46 were individuals or parish council/.community organisations; whilst conversely, of those disagreeing only 11 were individuals or parish council/ community organisations.

The reasons for disagreeing were varied as follows:

**Methodology**

2. There are a number of comments on the methodology although only in one case is there more than three comments on the same theme.
  - i) There were 10 comments (although 9 of these were via the same agent) suggesting that much more attention should be paid to where people wanted to live i.e. demand. People wanted to live in Selby villages and commute to surrounding cities and towns. There is no reason to change this.
  - ii) 2 respondents wished to see more attention paid to the local road network and the potential knock on effects of growth for neighbouring villages. A third respondent was concerned that some Primary Villages did not have good public transport services and this could lead to higher car usage and increases on the neighbouring Strategic Road Network.
  - iii) 2 respondents referred to the need to include environmental factors such as the character and setting and adjacent wildlife areas when considering sustainability.
  - iv) A comment was made that consideration should be given to the waste water treatment capacity available. It was noted that capacity was often limited in villages including many Primary ones.
  - v) A comment was made that the quality of services, not just the number, should be considered.
  - vi) One respondent considered Post Offices should not be a key service indicator because of the possibility of them closing.
  - vii) One respondent considered other facilities in addition to the four key ones should be taken into account.

- viii) One respondent referred to flood risk as a further factor to be taken into account.
- ix) One respondent suggested that the classification was unnecessary and that developments should be considered on their individual merits and 3 others suggested that villages shouldn't change. 2 others were concerned over the level of growth in Primary Villages because of the lack of jobs there.
- x) defining groups of villages within which One Primary Village should be defined as the main service village.

### **Development in Secondary Villages**

3. A number of people (10) linked this question to the policy of not permitting development, other than affordable housing, in Secondary Villages. This response will also appear in their answer to question 2a and is dealt with more thoroughly there, as are a limited number of responses which strayed into the issue of distribution of development.

### **Comments Relating to Specific Villages**

4. Villages suggested for upgrading to Primary Village status.
  - Whitley** 3 respondents wished to see Whitley linked to Eggborough as a Primary Village on the grounds of shared facilities and good communications.
  - Hillam** 1 respondent suggested Hillam should be linked with Monk Fryston as a Primary Village on the grounds of proximity and shared facilities.

And without being too specific on why, individual respondents suggested that the following villages should be considered as Primary Villages.

### **Appleton Roebuck, Cliffe, Drax, Hensall, North Duffield, Saxton and Stutton and Womersley**

5. Villages Suggested for downgrading to Secondary Villages
  - Wistow** 5 respondents suggested that Wistow should be a Secondary Village on the grounds it did not have adequate services, high flood risk and little or no employment. However, there was also one comment specifically supporting development in Wistow.
  - Fairburn, Brotherton and Byram** - were suggested for Secondary status on the grounds of limited local employment and poor public transport.
  - Church Fenton** considered by one respondent to have inadequate services and too much development already.

**Hemingbrough** Parish Council wish to see only development for affordable housing with a proven need permitted in Hemingbrough as infrastructure is stretched.

**Eggborough** One respondent suggested Eggborough should be downgraded.

#### **Other comments on Villages**

6. **Osgodby** 2 respondents considered that Osgodby's location within the Selby AAP area in close proximity to Barlby and Selby justified further development and therefore Primary status.

**Long Drax** One respondent suggested Long Drax be included as a Secondary Village.

#### **Qu. 2a**

**Do you agree with the overall distribution of housing as indicated in the proposed distribution in Table 1?**

1. 129 of the 176 respondents made a comment on this question. Of those 120 specifically indicate agreement or disagreement with the criteria. A larger number of respondents (69) indicated a disagreement with the distribution than those agreeing (51).

Of the 51 agreeing the majority 40 (78%) were individuals or parish council/.community organisations. However, those disagreeing were more varied in their background with 45 (65%) being individuals or parish council/ community organisations.

#### **Amendments to Distribution being sought**

2. The main changes being sought to the distribution by those that disagreed with the proposed distribution were:

<b>Change Sought</b>	<b>No of Respondents</b>
Higher concentration on Selby	5
Lesser concentration on Selby	23
Higher concentration on Sherburn*	10
Lesser concentration on Sherburn*	1
Higher concentration on Tadcaster*	8
Lesser concentration on Tadcaster*	0
Higher concentration on Primary Villages	12
Lesser concentration on Primary Villages	9
Higher concentration on Secondary Villages	18
Lesser concentration on Secondary Villages	0

\* *Qu. 2a and 2b provide a more definitive guide to aspirations for Sherburn and Tadcaster*

3. The above analysis of those responses wishing to see some change, indicates a balance in favour of more development in all the settlement categories other than Selby.

#### **Other Comments**

4. The main reasons for wanting a reduced emphasis on Selby AAP were congestion, flood risk and excessive use of greenfield land.
5. Two respondents were concerned at the potential distribution within the Selby AAP, particularly mentioning possible over-development in Brayton.
6. Two respondents were concerned that the Secondary status of Osgodby would unduly restrict development there.
7. Two respondents suggested the possibility of new settlements. One on the Wakefield/Selby border and the other at the M62/A19 junction.

#### **Qu. 2b**

**In particular, should there be more or less housing in Tadcaster?**

1. 90 of the 176 respondents made a comment on this question. Of those 74 specifically indicated a preference for 'more' or 'less' housing in Tadcaster to that being proposed. The ratio was 60/14 in favour of more housing in Tadcaster. 6 respondents indicated agreement with the level which had been proposed.

#### **Reasons for Choice**

## More Housing than proposed

2.

<b>Reason</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>
Good communications	13
Good services/infrastructure	10
Employment Opportunities	9
Support the viability of the town	8
Larger settlement [ <i>than villages</i> ]	8
Restricted recent development/ current need	6
Good commuting location	4
Less congestion than Selby/greater equality with Selby	3
Land available	2
Low flood risk (However 6 respondents, through the same agent, mentioned flood risk in Tadcaster as a reason for more development in surrounding villages in answering 'more' to this question.)	2

3. The general balance of the comments is that Tadcaster through its relative size, level of services and employment opportunities represents a preferred location for a greater amount of housing in preference to that proposed in the smaller villages.
4. There were also a number of respondents who considered there was a need for more housing in the town because of the lack of recent development and/or the need to support the viability of the town.
5. The single most popular reason quoted was the good communications generally, with other respondents specifically mentioning the attractiveness of the town as a commuting location to Leeds and York.

## 6. Less Housing than proposed

6.

<b>Reason</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>
Land ownership constraints	3
Lack of evidence of need	3
Limiting car commuting/no rail service	2
Not sufficient employment	1
Not sufficient brownfield sites	1
Landscape constraints to expansion	1
Flood risk constraint	1
Loss of character	1
Already sufficient development	1

7. Physical and ownership constraints on further development represented the main group of reasons for suggesting less development than is currently proposed. Other reasons mentioned were reliance on car commuting and lack of employment opportunities. One respondent suggested Tadcaster was already overloaded and another feared a loss of character unless future development was limited.

### **Qu. 2c**

#### **In particular, should there be more or less housing in Sherburn in Elmet?**

1. 79 of the 176 respondents made a comment on this question. Of those 64 specifically indicated a preferences for 'more' or 'less' housing in Sherburn in Elmet to that being proposed. The ratio was 42/22 in favour of more housing in Sherburn. 3 respondents indicated agreement with the level which had been proposed, whilst 6 respondents, through the same agent, balanced positive and negative factors for Sherburn without clearly indicating what level of development was being supported.

## Reasons for Choice

### More Housing than proposed

<b>Reason</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>
Employment Opportunities	10
Good communications	6
Rail services	4
Good services/infrastructure	6
Larger settlement <i>[take pressure off villages]</i>	5
Land availability/capable of expansion	4
Good commuting location	3
Local need for housing	2
Better/more sustainable location than Tadcaster	2
Low flood risk	1
Reference to including surrounding villages	1
More housing would encourage more employment opportunities	1

3. The general balance of the comments is that more development should be allocated to Sherburn. The main reason quoted was the existing employment opportunities, together with the good communications and level of services existing there. A number of respondents indicated that more development in the town would take pressure off villages. Availability of land and the good commuting location were also mentioned.

### Less Housing than proposed

4.

<b>Reason</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>
Over-development/amount of recent development	8
Current services inadequate	4
Tadcaster a more preferable location	3
Lack of evidence of need	2
Limit car commuting	2

Not sufficient brownfield sites	1
Flood risk constraint	1

- Concern over the amount of recent development and future growth within the town, coupled with the perceived inadequacy of current infrastructure and services is the main group of reasons for wanting less development than being proposed in Sherburn. 3 respondents suggested Tadcaster was a more appropriate location, whilst lack of evidence of local need and the need to limit commuting were also mentioned.

**Qu. 3**

**Please tell us whether you agree or disagree with the following options for strategic housing development on the edge of Selby (please number in preference order 1= highest , 6 lowest)**

- Site A - Cross Hills Lane**
- Site B - West of Wistow Road**
- Site C - Bondgate/Monk Lane**
- Site D - Olympia Mills**
- Site E - Baffam Lane**
- Site F - Foxhill Lane/ Brackenhill Lane**

- 128 of the 176 respondents made a comment on this question. Of those 105 gave a priority for one or more of the strategic sites.

**Highest Preferences**

- Sites are listed by the number of occasions they were given the highest preference ratings of either 1 or 2:

Site D (55)  
 Site F (33)           Most highly preferred sites  
 Site A (32)

Site C (23)  
 Site B (22)  
 Site E (22)

**Lowest Preferences**

- Sites are also listed by the number of occasions they were given the lowest preference ratings of either 5 or 6:

Site D (14)  
 Site A (20)

Site B (31)  
 Site E (35)      Least preferred sites  
 Site F (36)  
 Site C (43)

**Comment**

4. Site D and Site A come out with relatively consistent results in that they appear most in the highest ratings and least in the lowest ratings. Site F exhibits a dichotomy between those rating it highly and those rating it lowly.
5. Sites B, C and E have consistent low ratings, with Site C having the most assignments to the lowest rating.

**Comments made on Sites**

6. Overall, flooding and highway constraints were regularly recognised as the most crucial factors to be fully explored and taken into account.

**Comments on Site A**

**Positive Points**

	<b>No. of Comments</b>
1. Good Access and/or opportunity to provide better access to the north of the town	5
2. Opportunity for green infrastructure	2
3. Natural westward extension complementing developments to the east of the centre	1

**Negative Points**

1. High flood risk and associated issues	18
2. High infrastructure costs – (new bridge across Selby Dam)	11
3. Use of greenfield/countryside	5
4. Impact on biodiversity	3
5. Site too large	2
6. Impact on walks (incl. Selby Horseshoe)	1
7. Impact on agriculture	1
8. No natural limits	1

- |                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 9. Major water mains across the site | 1 |
|--------------------------------------|---|

## Comments on Site B

### Positive Points

	No. of Comments
1. Appropriate development site/natural extension	3
2. Opportunity to provide better access to the north of the town	1
2. Opportunity for green infrastructure	1
3. Close to employment	1

### Negative Points

1. High flood risk and associated issues	13
2. High infrastructure costs	9
3. Access and Highway capacity	6
4. Impact on agriculture	4
5. Use of greenfield/countryside	2
6. Impact on biodiversity	1
7. Contains toxic waste tip	1
8. Listed buildings on the site	1
9. Too close to Wistow	1
10. No natural limits	1

## Comments on Site C

### Positive Points

	No. of Comments
1. Appropriate development site/natural extension	2
2. Deliverable in ownership terms	1
2. Opportunity for green infrastructure	1
3. Proximity to the town centre	1
4. Development possible notwithstanding the flood risk	1

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 5. | No contamination issues                        | 1 |
| 6. | Man made barriers to define limits of the site | 1 |

**Negative Points**

- |    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| 1. | High flood risk and associated issues                | 26 |
| 2. | High infrastructure costs                            | 10 |
| 3. | Access and Highway capacity                          | 6  |
| 4. | Lack of sewerage capacity                            | 2  |
| 5. | Impact on biodiversity                               | 2  |
| 6. | Impact on agriculture                                | 1  |
| 7. | Use of greenfield/countryside                        | 1  |
| 8. | Impact on countryside walking and cycling activities | 1  |
| 9. | No natural limits                                    | 1  |

**Comments on Site D**

**Positive Points**

- |    |  | <b>No. of<br/>Comments</b> |
|----|--|----------------------------|
| 1. | Brownfield site  | 6                          |
| 2. | Improves visual quality  | 5                          |
| 3. | Site under-used  | 1                          |
| 4. | Good or soluble access to highway network and public transport | 4                          |
| 5. | Close to employment  | 2                          |
| 1. | Appropriate development site/natural extension                 | 2                          |
| 2. | Opportunity for green infrastructure                           | 2                          |
| 3. | Proximity to the town centre                                   | 1                          |

**Negative Points**

- |    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| 1. | High flood risk and associated issues            | 15 |
| 2. | High infrastructure costs                        | 20 |
| 3. | Industrial use preferred                         | 2  |
| 3. | Access issues                                    | 1  |
| 4. | Contribution required to capacity at Barlby WWTW | 1  |

6	Impact on recreational facilities	1
7.	Impact on Selby Conservation Area	1

## Comments on Site E

### Positive Points

		No. of Comments
1.	Good Access	4
2.	Low flood risk	3
3.	Opportunity to improve canal area	1
4.	Opportunity to provide Green Infrastructure	1
5.	Site would make efficient use of land and site has well defined boundaries.	1

### Negative Points

1.	Impact on Strategic Countryside Gap/Coalescence of Brayton and Selby	20
2.	Impact on Brayton Conservation Area and setting of the church	4
4.	Impact on green infrastructure	2
3.	Development should not be allowed close to the canal	1
4.	A lot of recent development already in Brayton	1
5.	Sewerage capacity needs upgrading	1

## Comments on Site F

### Positive Points

		No. of Comments
1.	Good Access/Well related to Selby	4
2.	Low flood risk	3

### **Negative Points**

1.	Impact on Strategic Countryside Gap/Coalescence of Brayton and Selby	16
2.	Impact on Brayton Conservation Area and setting of the church	4
3.	Poor accessibility	3
4.	Impact on green infrastructure	2
5.	Greenfield Site/ Impact on countryside	2
6.	A lot of recent development already in Brayton	1
7.	Sewerage capacity needs upgrading	1
8.	Part of the site affected by noise from the railway	1

#### **Qu. 4**

**Do you agree that market housing should only be allowed in the Principal Town (Selby); Local Service Centres (Sherburn and Tadcaster) and the Primary Villages? If not please explain why.**

1. 117 of the 176 respondents made a comment on this question. Of those 110 specifically indicate agreement or disagreement with the question. The responses were equally split (55/55) between those agreeing and those disagreeing. However, 40% of those disagreeing were landowners or had some connection with the development industry. The equivalent figure for those agreeing with the question was 13% with the majority being individuals and parish councils.

#### **Reasons for Disagreeing**

2.

<b>Reason</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>
Concern over sustainability/vitality of Secondary Villages	16
Doesn't adequately meet needs of Secondary Villages	6
May restrict reuse of PDL and other redundant agricultural buildings.	4

*Cont.*

Concern over mix of housing in Secondary Villages, if only affordable housing permitted	3
Concern over inflation of house prices in Secondary Villages	6
Concern over not meeting demand in Secondary Villages	2
Prefer to see development more dispersed	8
Too restrictive on Secondary Villages	2
Need to take pressure off other areas	6
Prefer to see development proposals dealt with on their individual merits	2
Disagree because of concern for specific villages	3
Wish to see more restriction in other areas e.g. Primary Villages (Responses duplicate Qu 2a)	3
Wish to see new category of 'ecotown' (see Qu.2a)	1

3. Of those respondents disagreeing with this question, related to the impact of not allowing market housing in Secondary Villages, 16 respondents referred to the impact on the sustainability/vitality of Secondary Villages. In a similar vein, a further 6 respondents referred to not adequately meeting the needs of these villages.
4. The potential restriction implied on the reuse of Previously Developed Land and redundant agricultural buildings was considered to be a negative impact of not allowing market housing in Secondary Villages.
5. Respondents also commented on the inequity of allowing affordable but not market housing in Secondary Villages and/or commented on the impact on the social mix if only affordable housing was permitted.
6. 2 respondents commented adversely on not meeting market *demand*(as opposed to need) in Secondary Villages.
7. 6 respondents, through the same agent, commented on the potential impact on house prices, of a restriction on market housing in Secondary Villages.

### **Reasons for Agreeing**

8. Relatively few respondents gave a reason for their agreement with the statement. However, the main reason quoted (6 respondents) referred in some way to the unsustainability of the smaller settlements. 5 respondents referred to development being subject to local need, with 2 of these suggesting all development should be subject to need.

9. 6 respondents indicated that although they were in general agreement with the statement, they were not against some development in smaller villages provided it was meeting an identified local need and/or protected the character of the village.

**Qu. 5**

**Do you agree with the different thresholds proposed for affordable housing? If not please explain why.**

1. 114 of the 176 respondents made a comment on this question. Of those 106 specifically indicate agreement or disagreement with the question. The responses were equally split (53/53) between those agreeing and those disagreeing. However, 49% of those disagreeing were landowners or had some connection with the development industry. The equivalent figure for those agreeing with the question was 6% with the majority being individuals and parish councils.

**Reasons for Disagreeing**

<b>Reason</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>
Concern over lack of evidence on need and viability to allow thresholds to be set	19
Will the recent economic downturn affect viability?	1
Ratio for affordable housing too high, e.g. should be 80/20 or 70/30	7
Thresholds outside Selby are unviable	2
Threshold for Primary Villages too low (3 to 5)	1
Selby ratio should be lower as Selby is most sustainable location	1
Lower threshold (5 to 3) should be applied in Sherburn and/or Tadcaster	5
There should be more flexibility/proposals considered on their merits	5
Don't agree with general approach to affordable housing provision	5
Don't agree with 100% affordable schemes	1
Should not mix affordable and market housing	1

2. The most quoted reason for disagreeing with the affordable housing thresholds was a perceived lack of evidence on need and viability.

respondents claim that it is not possible to accept the thresholds without a more thorough evidence base.

3. A further group of respondents considered the percentage requirements are too taxing and questioned their viability. Suggestions of 80/20 or 70/30 were proposed as an alternative to 60/40. Two respondents suggested that the thresholds outside Selby were unviable and should be higher and 1 suggested an increase from 3 to 5 for the Primary Village threshold.
4. Conversely 5 respondents suggested a lower threshold of 3 for one or both of the Local Service Centres.
5. 5 respondents sought more flexibility in the operation of the ratio and thresholds and/or considered that the affordable housing element of development proposals should be considered on individual merit.
6. 5 respondents disagreed with the whole approach of providing affordable housing in this manner and 1 objected to the principle of 100% affordable housing schemes.

**Qu. 6**

**In order to help meet the need for affordable housing, do you agree with the use of commuted sums for housing schemes below the proposed thresholds? If not please explain why.**

1. 103 of the 176 respondents made a comment on this question. Of those 84 specifically indicate agreement or disagreement with the question. The balance of the responses (55/29) was in favour of the use of commuted sums. However, 38% of those disagreeing were landowners or had some connection with the development industry. The equivalent figure for those agreeing with the question was 5% with the majority being individuals and parish councils.

**Reasons for Disagreeing**

2.

<b>Reason</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>
Need SHMA/viability results and/or other information e.g. level of contributions	8
Could jeopardise the viability of smaller developments	5
Mentioned questioned viability in the context of the current economic circumstances	4
Viability to be assessed in the context of other commuted sums being sought	2

*Cont.*

Disagree with approach to commuted sums and affordable housing	5
Only in response to an identified need	3
Will be seen as a tax on building	3
Thresholds should be established and stuck to.	1
Inequality between Selby and the remainder of the District/ Commuted sums to be introduced on 3 dwellings or more in Selby	2
No contributions sought on single dwellings	1
Affordable housing should be provided on site.	1

3. The two main themes of the reasons given for disagreeing with the commuted sums policy were the need for more information in order to take a view and the impact on the viability on development. In the former case, evidence from the SHMA and viability studies, and information on the level of contribution being sought was particularly mentioned. In the case of viability of requiring commuted sums, reference was made by a number of respondents to the current economic circumstances which was considered to be an additional threat to viability.
4. A number of respondents disagreed with this approach to providing affordable housing and some considered it would be seen as a tax on development. Alternatives such as shared ownership, costs borne by the community not by developers or house buyers, allocate more land generally and allocate more land specifically for 100% affordable housing were suggested.
5. Three respondents indicated that commuted sums should only be required if there was an identified need.
6. Other comments
  - i) Need for a policy on how the scheme would be implemented and the money used.
  - ii) Thresholds should have a safeguard to ensure that piecemeal development of sites is not used to avoid payment.
  - iii) Only use commuted sums where it is more appropriate to provide

**Qu. 7**

**If a strategic employment site is provided, which of the following do you consider is the most appropriate location?**

- **Site G Olympia Park (land adjoining Selby By-pass)**
- **Site H Burn Airfield**

**Have you any other suggestions?**

1. 118 of the 176 respondents made a comment on this question, of which 106 indicated a clear preference for one or other of the sites. Of those 88 preferred Site G- Olympia Park and 18 Site H – Burn Airfield.

### 2. Comments made on Olympia Park (Site G)

<b>Positive Comment</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>
Good access to Selby and its workforce	13
Good access to the regional highway network	8
Location well related to Selby urban area/low environmental impact	6
Opportunities for public transport use	4
Potential for rail freight	4
Only in response to an identified need	3
Utilises previously developed land	3
Promotes urban renaissance	2
<b>Negative Comments</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>
High flood risk	3
Impact on the A19 northwards which will require improvement	1
Difficult access/remote	1

### 3. Comments made on Burn Airfield (Site H)

<b>Positive Comment</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>
Use of Burn for employment would create more room for residential development in Selby to save currently proposed, greenfield strategic housing sites.	3
Low flood risk	2
Good access to regional highway network	2

Suitable for mixed development	1
Provides separation between housing and employment	1
Not too intrusive	1

<b>Negative Comments</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>
Further from Selby/less sustainable/poor public transport	6
Highway traffic problems	4
Agricultural land quality	3
Site used for gliding/leisure	3
Development would overwhelm the village	2
No rail connection	1
Open countryside	1
Impact on canal area	1
Should be reserved as a regionally significant employment site	1

#### 4. Other Suggestions for Employment Sites

The following suggestions were made.

	<b>Site Location</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>
i	Use of major redundant industrial sites within Selby.	3
ii	Continued development at Sherburn Industrial Estate.	2
iii	Development in the Eggborough/M62 area	1
iv	Redundant buildings at the northern end of Selby By-pass (opposite Hazelwood Foods)	1
v	Land at Brayton Hall Farm	1
vi	Gascoigne Wood for rail freight use	1
vii	Strategic Rail Freight Interchange at 'Darringfield' on Selby/Wakefield boundary	1
viii	Sherburn/Church Fenton and Barlow	1

	airfields	
ix	More employment in Tadcaster to cater for surrounding villages	1
xi	Encourage employment throughout the District	1
xi	Support established businesses, particularly those in the countryside and Green Belt	1
xii	International hotel and motorway service area at Hensall	1

---

**Qu. 8**

**Please tell us whether you agree or disagree with the following statements:**

- A Land Allocated for employment purposes but which is undeveloped should be considered for mixed use or possibly other uses, if there is no realistic prospect of employment development coming forward.**
- B Existing employment premises should be protected from redevelopment where there is evidence of market need.**
- C For new business development the focus should be on securing small/medium sized business space and general industrial premises in suitable locations.**
- D New housing development should be balanced with an appropriate level of business development.**

1. 123 of the 176 respondents made a comment on one or more of the four statements in this question. From those responses which clearly indicated agreement or disagreed with the statements the following results were obtained:

*Statement A*

Agreeing	84	Disagreeing	30
----------	----	-------------	----

*Statement B*

Agreeing	93	Disagreeing	25
----------	----	-------------	----

*Statement C*

Agreeing	102	Disagreeing	9
----------	-----	-------------	---

*Statement D*

Comments made on the individual statements were relatively few in number, but are summarised below.

## **2. Comments made on Statement A**

The main theme of the comments (9 comments) was that cases should be assessed on the characteristics of the site and/or the nature of the potential uses. Of these some respondents indicated that sites should be assessed on their merits or that changes should go through the normal development control process.

Yorkshire Forward indicated that any reduction in employment land supply needs to be addressed through provision of new sites that meet the needs of a modern service and knowledge economy

Another respondent indicated that a realistic timescale should be used to ensure land is not lost prematurely.

## **3. Comments made on Statement B**

Fewer comments were made directly relating to this question but 3 responses made a comment relating to the need to consider cases on their merits.

The Yorkshire Forward comment above is also relevant to this question.

A respondent with an interest in a large site with potential for redevelopment suggested policies should be flexible to allow employment to be directed to the most appropriate sites and should not sterilise existing sites if they are more suitable for other uses.

A second respondent with a similar large potential redevelopment site suggested that employment sites in predominantly residential areas should not be restricted from redevelopment taking place. Redevelopment may remove 'bad neighbour' uses and improve the environment for local residents.

## **4. Comments made on Statement C**

The main group of comments (4) suggest that the policies locating and attracting new business development should be based on the individual needs of the development and responsive to market demand.

Two respondents disagreed with the suggestion in the statement that large scale employment development would not be sought.

A further response suggested that support for existing businesses was important in encouraging new employment opportunities.

Another response recommended that evidence for the policy would need to be provided, whilst another suggested the Strategy should concentrate on providing for local needs rather than trying to attract new sectors, with the Selby area being an exception.

## **5. Comments made on Statement D**

The comments made on Statement D reflect that whilst most agree generally with the statement there are a variety of qualifications/reservations.

Two respondents agree but have reservations on how or whether a good balance between the two uses could be achieved.

Two respondents emphasise the need to keep a reasonable separation between the two uses, or at least do not try and achieve a close mix on every site; and a further two respondents note that often sites were more suited to one or other of the uses and a close balance within a small area was not realistic. A further response suggests that options for site usage should be assessed on their merits in accordance with criteria based policies.

One respondent considers housing should be the priority for development with employment following, and one advocates the reverse.

Finally, one respondent agreed with the statement, provided there was a market need for both uses.

## **6. Other Comments**

Two respondents stressed the importance of employment generation to the strategy, indicating that housing development should be employment led. 'There is no logic in allowing large scale housing development where there is no potential for employment growth.'

Two responses noted the lack of business premises within the District, one mentioning small/medium businesses and the other start-up units.

Two respondents commented on the value of business incentives paid to businesses in the form of rental discounts. However, they were also concerned that business rate remissions should be monitored to prevent firms leaving when the discount ceases.

### **Qu. 9**

**Do you agree that approximately 10% of the energy requirements of major development schemes should be produced from on-site renewables or from on-site renewables or from other decentralised renewable or low carbon supplies?**

**If not should the percentage be higher or lower?**

*Apart from the specific comments relating to the proposed 10% requirement a number of other comments relating to renewable energy were received. These are also dealt with in this section at the end. Other comments on climate change issues including reducing greenhouse gas emissions, energy efficiency, building design for example are dealt with elsewhere under 'Other Comments' later in this report.*

### **Response to 10% question**

1. There was a mix of types of respondents ranging from individuals, parish councils, landowners, developers, government departments/agencies and environmental pressure groups.
2. 121 people responded to the question.  
61 agreed.  
Only 38 of the 61 'agrees' were unconditional agrees, the rest had further caveats attached.  
57 disagreed.  
3 gave no views due to lack of information provided.

3.	<b>Comments</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>
	Want a higher percentage	25
	Want a lower percentage	2
	Want flexible targets to allow individual site circumstances/viability to be taken into account and/or different targets for different types of development.	15

### **Reasons for responses and General summary**

***Comments were grouped into the following general issues:***

4. **General** - Building more housing is the least green thing to do and should not be a priority. Technologies are not sufficiently advanced.
5. Alternative legislation - **Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Regulations are changing so this policy is not required.**
6. **Energy efficiency**
  - Should encourage higher energy efficiency instead and reduce energy wasted.
  - Should also refer to district heating, CHP, also water heating

storage, grey water recycling, higher thermal insulations in buildings, green roofs, SUDS.

- Should include a policy to reduce CO2 emissions in new development (Yorkshire Forward)

## **7. Targets**

- A lower target than 10% would not be consistent with national or regional policy. Other authorities have successfully adopted higher standards. The report gives no indication whether a higher % as an alternative option would be achievable (Yorkshire Forward).
- Support 10% and should refer to targets in Regional Spatial Strategy (YHA).
- Need to justify how 10% was derived and what the alternative, rejected percentages are.
- Need further information on how %s calculated and what the energy needs of different types of buildings are.
- Need to define which major developments to which the policy applies
- Difficult to achieve 10% targets – affects commercial viability, discourage business, concerns over feasibility. Target % should be based on evidence of what is achievable, viable.
- Need to take account of special circumstances where targets might not be appropriate or achievable such as listed buildings, conservation areas. Targets should be flexible with different %s for different developments and site-specific issues. Realistic assessments should always be made.
- Should be no set figures. Needs reviewing on a regular basis as energy requirements change Targets could rise gradually over the Plan period.
- Need to refer to Regional Spatial Strategy targets.

## **8. Other Responses relating to Renewable Energy**

The Regional Assembly note that the document should make reference to supporting renewable energy development and the renewable energy targets set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy (2008). RSS ENV5 sets targets for installed grid connected renewable energy capacity for Selby District of 14 MW 20 21010 and 32 MW to 2021.

The LDF should include a robust criteria based policy that will be used to assess all applications for renewable energy developments but recognised that would be most appropriate in a Development Control DPD.

Yorkshire Forward suggests that the Core Strategy considers those broad locations where renewable energy development would be planned.

Some respondents referred to the need to include policies, which dealt with the environmental impact of renewable energy schemes themselves. Visual amenity should not be sacrificed. If wind turbines are to be used for renewable energy the effect on wildlife should be taken into account. The policy will need to take into account of guidance provided in PPS22 that permissions for RE projects should only be granted where the objectives of Listed Building and Conservation Area designations will not be compromised.

The development plan should encourage and promote all the different renewable energy generation technologies (solar, biomass, wind, geothermal, hydro etc as well as CHP).

## Qu. 10

**The Government is introducing a Community Infrastructure Levy on new development. Please tick those that you consider to be important.**

**Broadband; Community Facilities; Cycle and walking infrastructure; Education; Green Infrastructure; Health; Public Realm; Rail and Bus Infrastructure; Recreation Open Space; Recycling; Road Infrastructure; Other (please specify)**

1 129 responses were received to this question, with 116 of the respondents having chosen one or more of the category that they consider being important.

A good range of developers, individuals and stakeholders have chosen to make a choice or comment on this question.

Below is the number of respondents who chose the categories that they considered to be important.

Broadband	31
Community Facilities	72
Cycle & walking infrastructure	68
Education	60
Green Infrastructure	53
Health	63
Public Realm	20
Rail and Bus Infrastructure	85
Recreation Open Space	61
Recycling	56
Road Infrastructure	69
Other	9

## 2. Other suggested categories

Suggestions made for other categories include

- Wildlife protection/encouragement

- Protection of Listed Buildings
  - Community Safety
  - Cycle tracks
  - Improved footpaths
  - Wind farm green energy scheme
  - Flood defences
  - Green roofs
  - Space for nature
  - Improve health and well being
  - Reduce environmental impact
  - Formal sports provision
  - Affordable Housing
  - Cultural facilities
  - Litter reduction
  - Children and young people's issues through centres, early years, youth and children's social care
3. Two respondents disagreed with the principle of the CIL and 4 planning consultants consider that the Council has misunderstood the legislation, considering it to be unsound to include aspirational choices not included in the legislation. They also note that it is not a duty on the Council to implement the CIL legislation – but to be decided upon.

Comments also made that if implemented, the CIL should be fair and ensure that it is not putting onerous financial pressure on developers. Advised to avoid any overlap with S106 obligations and consider a site size threshold. There was also concern over the how the CIL may be administered

#### **Qu. 11**

#### **Do you have any views on opportunities to enhance or create Green Infrastructure?**

1. 54 of the 176 respondents commented on this question. A number of additional comments were received on recycling, green construction techniques and some cryptic 'green' comments that seem to indicate a misunderstanding of the question.
- 14 comments include support for the principle of Green Infrastructure, with some asking for more information/consultation.
2. Of those who made relevant comments, suggestions of opportunities to enhance or create Green Infrastructure include:
- Keep villages green – build a by-pass
  - Health walks – designed and signposted
  - Improvements to cycle routes and creation of new ones (inc A19, A1041, Selby Dam)
  - Countryside, green space, green belt, greenfield sites and wildlife to be

protected from development with strengthened rules

- Strategic site F could incorporate a significant tree belt
  - Positively maintain distance between settlements
  - Protect Strategic sites 5 & 6 as within a countryside gap, which should be protected and enhanced as part of Green Infrastructure
  - Build in Green Infrastructure to new developments
  - New woodland creation may be needed to link existing sites and provide access where lacking
  - Create a linear park
  - Plant trees and hedges to replace those lost in the past
  - Link Green Infrastructure with new public transport, walking and cycling routes that link up locations people need to visit regularly
  - Increase level of well maintained ROS, sporting facilities and green space, and look after and improve the spaces that exist, together with improved access and public awareness
  - Increase level of Green Infrastructure and protect from future development
  - Comments on the mental health and well being benefits of green space
  - Developer contributions should pay towards such provision as a 'green levy'
  - Need for a policy in the core Strategy, in conjunction with stakeholders and Natural England – should help provide positive image to protect and enhance existing assets and plug deficit gaps. (Natural England)
  - Best way to enhance Green Infrastructure would be to not overdevelop Selby and preserve the nature of the rural area
  - Suggest using land with no practical use – such as flood plains.
  - Ensure decent garden space for housing
  - Carry out appraisal of existing green allocations
  - Should be used to create connectivity between nature areas – linking different habitats. 'Living Landscapes' project interested in plans for Selby (Yorkshire Wildlife Trust).
3. Natural England comments include the wish to see a Green Infrastructure policy in the Core Strategy – covering provision, protection and enhancement of Green Infrastructure including public open space, green wedges and links, wildlife corridors and stepping stones. They refer to Green Infrastructure mapping project which Selby is involved with.
4. Several respondents have concerns about how Green Infrastructure will be enhanced, but only one comment disagreed with the principle of Green Infrastructure, making the following point:
- Green Infrastructure is a paper exercise, with only lip service to green

issues – exploiting the word ‘green’

**Qu. 12**

**Do you consider that;**

- a) More housing should be in the form of small dwellings (flats and terraced housing)? or**  
**b) More housing should be in the form of 3-4 bedroom family houses?**

1. 125 people responded to this question.

33 agreed that more housing should be small dwellings.

42 said we don't need more small dwellings.

54 agreed that more housing should be 3-4 bed family houses.

26 said that we don't need more family housing

Approximately half of responses were from individuals and about a quarter from landowners/agents. The remainder were from Parish Councils and other organisations.

**2. Comments / Reasons for responses**

Should be a balance / good mix of all types. Need both. 35

Should be determined by market demand / local need / local or site circumstances. 29

Need evidence / monitoring / demographic info on which to base decision – for example, a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). 18

3. Other comments included:

- Terraced housing should be provided instead of flats in villages
- No 2.5 or 3 storey in villages
- Small dwellings and flats should be in towns near employment and away from villages otherwise would exacerbates transport problems
- Probably enough flats in Selby now
- Support affordable housing in villages
- Need more bungalows for elderly population
- Need more family homes so flat dwellers can move up

- Developments should be in keeping with the area  
Policies should ensure provision of homes for families with children, single persons, and older persons to create sustainable communities / good sociological mix.

**Qu. 13**

**In making appropriate provision for gypsies and travellers, do you agree or disagree with the following options**

- A New sites should be spread across the District.**
- B New sites should be located in or close to the towns and primary villages.**
- C Expanding the existing sites.**

1. 112 of the 176 respondents commented on this question

<b>Option</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>A</b>	36	70
<b>B</b>	27	80
<b>C</b>	69	35

2. A small number of comments have been received backing up choices made, particularly that the expansion of existing sites makes the most sense as they already exist, and that sites should be provided where most need exists.
3. Reasons for responses
- a. Three suggestions of new site locations were made – these were all town centre based.
  - b. One respondent gives the view that they do not consider that additional sites will be made use of as gypsies prefer to camp by the roadside as a part of their culture.
  - c. ‘Friends, Families and Travellers’ recommend that consultation between the Council and the Gypsy and Traveller community needs to take place, in the form of direct outreach communication, to ensure that plans meet their needs.
  - d. The Yorkshire and Humber Regional Assembly comment on the RSS policies H5 & H6, regarding the need to make pitches available to cover shortfall, and to carry out local assessments.
4. A number of responses commented on the existing Gypsy and Traveller site in Burn – unhappy with the state that site is kept in – recommend the Council to visit site before creating more.
-

**Qu. 14**

**Do you agree with the following options:**

**A - Sites should be sought that accommodate between eight and twelve pitches.**

**B – Individual pitches should be encouraged to allow flexibility and choice for gypsies and travellers distributed across the District.**

**C – A combination of A and B; one site of between eight and twelve pitches plus individual pitches.**

1. 113 of the 176 respondents commented on this question.

<b>Option</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>A</b>	58	41
<b>B</b>	14	81
<b>C</b>	24	71

Option A received the highest support, however the proportion was around 60%, so not overwhelming. Options B & C received a low level of support, peaking slightly for a mix of a larger site and individual pitches. However several comments also consider option B to be the most sustainable.

**2. Reasons for responses**

1. Few individual comments were made to this question.

- Families, friends and travellers repeated their comments that the council need to develop local consultation techniques to ensure that Gypsy and Travellers are consulted as part of the ongoing planning process.
- Questions are considered speculative, with a lack of a Gypsy Conservation Document and its findings. Gypsies should be asked what they would prefer.
- The Yorkshire and Humber Assembly repeat their comment referring to the need to make pitches available to cover a shortfall, and the need to comply with RSS policies H5 & H6.
- Support for larger sites as give more opportunity for spaces to become available – promoting gypsy nomadic lifestyle.
- Comment given that there seems to be no logical reason for the prescriptive size of communal sites.

2 *Other comments made in the FFT(Friends, Family and Travellers) response have been outlined in Part 10 of the Other Comments section below.*

**Qu. 15**

**The indications are that only limited provision is required for travelling showpeople. If provision is required, should an area of search be:**

**A – In or close to the Towns of Selby, Tadcaster or Sherburn in Elmet?**

**B – In close proximity to the strategic road network (such as M62, A1 and A64)?**

1. 111 of the 176 respondents commented on this question.

<b>Option</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>A</b>	31	67
<b>B</b>	70	32

Very few individual comments were made. Those that were made mostly fell into two camps – those who felt that no provision is required in the District and those that consider that the best location was the most sustainable location – however, there varying interpretations of ‘sustainable’.

.2 **Reasons for responses:**

- As showpeople travel with heavy transport, proximity and easy access to the primary road network is essential.
- The main towns of the District are considered to be well connected to the road network, as well as providing services unlikely to be available to sites only close to the strategic road network.
- Not convinced of a need – showpeople are capable of sorting their own needs out. A site in Burn closed down due to no longer being viable.

**Other Comments**

**This Summary relates to comments made in the questionnaire (particularly the last section which gave an opportunity for additional comment) and in other responses made through letters and e-mails, which couldn't be attributed directly to a particular question but which were nevertheless relevant to the Core Strategy process.**

**The additional comments made were many and varied which makes summary difficult. A number of the topic related comments below have been made within the questionnaire in a more specific context e.g in connection with the strategic housing sites, as a result these comments do not always represent the totality of the comments of a similar nature. However the main themes emerging from the general comments are as follows:**

1. **The Consultation Process**
  2. **General Core Strategy Issues**
- Topics not covered within Questions**
3. **Overall amount of new housing being planned**
  4. **Environment related comments**
  5. **Transport related comments**
  6. **Regeneration and Employment related comments**
  7. **Climate Change**
  8. **Infrastructure comments**
  9. **Minerals and energy related comments**
  10. **Gypsies and Travellers**
  11. **Other issues**

## **1. The Consultation Process**

Four respondents who commenting on this recent consultation process criticised the questionnaire on the basis that they found it difficult to understand and complete. Another 3 respondents also mentioned the lack of publicity given to it. One respondent considered that it should not have referred to the comments received on the Interim Housing Policy consultation and one respondent referred to the lack of previous consultation.

Two respondents, one of which is Government Office, considered that further consultation was necessary before submitting the Core Strategy.

## **2. General Core Strategy Issues**

Within their response Government Office included a raft of standard general advice on the content of Core Strategies, which is not summarised here. It is preferable that this is read as written and is attached as an appendix to this report.

With regard to the elements of the proposed strategy as contained in the consultation report, four respondents expressed regret at the lack of more contextual material e.g. vision, aims and objectives and one respondent wished to see a more place based strategy.

Another respondent wished to see the strategy adopt a more serious appreciation of the current recession and the enormous cost-challenge of global warming. Suggests a much greater emphasis on self-sufficiency, low carbon initiatives and a generally more sustainable way of life.

Government Office indicated that the Core Strategy should state that an Ecotown within the District is not currently within the Government's programme and the strategy would need to be revised if this position changed in the future. Government Office also mentioned the need to consider options for the topics included in the consultation report such as renewable energy and green infrastructure.

The need for a more comprehensive and up to date evidence base was mentioned as a general comment by three respondents. The need for a SHLAA, SHMA and an affordable housing viability study were particularly mentioned.

### **3. Overall amount and distribution of new housing being planned**

Eight respondents expressed concern over the total number of houses being proposed in the Strategy, a number citing the current economic downturn as a reason to be sceptical on the number required.

On the other hand four respondents considered that the strategy fell short of meeting the requirements being set, with two mentioning the proposed RSS review. Government Office clearly indicated that the recent high levels of house building during the first four years of the RSS period should not influence the need to demonstrate a continued delivery of the full RSS requirement in future years.

Although the issue of the distribution of new housing is covered relatively thoroughly in the questionnaire's housing section, two respondents raised concern in a general way that, in considering the role of villages, the analysis had been too theoretical and did not sufficiently take into account the individual needs and circumstances within each village.

One respondent also considered that the distribution as published did not adequately reflect the distribution sought by Policy and Resources Committee.

### **4. Affordable Housing**

Two respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the general approach used to provide affordable housing. One suggested there should be a greater role for private organisations and the other wished to see more local authority housing.

### **5. Environment related comments**

Four respondents referred in general terms to concern over the loss of greenfield land and loss of countryside and a further four referred in general terms to concern of flood risk. Both these issues were often mentioned in other parts of the questionnaire in the more specific context of the strategic sites.

On the other hand, two respondents considered that the Core Strategy should refer to a Green Belt review (with a view to development sites being made available) and a further respondent suggested an assessment of areas designated as of landscape value and or Strategic Countryside Gap

with a view to checking whether the constraint was still relevant. (Again references to Strategic Countryside Gap have also been made in connection with individual strategic housing sites.)

Protecting the rural character of villages featured in three general comments, one of which specifically referred to inappropriate high density and three storey housing in a village environment.

Other individual requests for more emphasis/policy inclusion include water quality protection, biodiversity, whilst Sport England wished to ensure that there was no loss of formal recreational facilities occurring as a result of development proposals.

The Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment included some general advice which centred on design featuring as a cross-cutting issue at all levels of LDF policy making from the strategic to the detailed, and the creation of 'hooks' in policies which enable development of other design tools e.g. design guides and codes and site briefs.

## **5. Transport related comments**

There was a request for by-passes for Hambleton and Monk Fryston from one respondent.

Two respondents mentioned the need to develop the Selby rail station area and one respondent suggested a new rail station west of Selby.

A further respondent indicated there should be an emphasis in the Core Strategy on better public transport generally.

## **6 Regeneration and Employment related comments**

The need to support regeneration and improve town centres was mentioned by seven respondents, with particular reference to Tadcaster in two cases. Three responses also mentioned a perceived threat from larger supermarkets to smaller independent traders in centres.

Two respondents mentioned a need to link the Core Strategy with the Council's Community Strategy and the Renaissance programme.

In terms of comments with regard to general employment issues, two respondents were concerned about the lack of/need for employment opportunities in the light of the amount of new housing being proposed.

Yorkshire forward raised a concern over a potential conflict between their own employment projections and those in the District Council's Employment Land Survey.

One response highlighted the need to assist and promote existing businesses and another requested that the tourism industry be given more emphasis.

The Highways Agency raised a concern over the development of B1 business uses adjacent to the Strategic Road Network.

A submission on behalf of Drax Power Ltd. wishes to see objectives/policies in Core Strategy to support the energy and infrastructure development at Drax Power Station. Objectives should not detract from

Policy EMP 10 in the Selby District Local Plan which is a permissive policy that facilitates development relative to the process of generating energy at Drax. Policies should also recognise the need to address energy provision in a regional/national context.

Respondent considers that the above objectives should be implemented through site specific policies and land use allocations for energy/infrastructure development in subsequent LDDs.

## **7 Climate Change**

- 1 In addition to comments received in response to questions about the 10% 'renewable energy' requirement raised in Question 9 of the Consultation, respondents raised related climate change issues. All renewable energy related comments are dealt with at Q9 above and all other climate change issues are dealt with below.

### **2. Energy Efficiency, Sustainable Construction and Design Techniques**

Respondents considered the Core Strategy should include a policy to reduce predicted CO2 emissions in new development.

A number of respondents suggested that the policy on renewable energy should also include requirements to reduce energy wasted and encourage higher energy efficiency and developments should be properly carbon neutral. The policy should promote use of sustainable construction and design techniques.

The policy should refer to particular means of achieving national and regional targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions through mandatory design features or encouragement of Combined Heat and Power (CHP), water heating storage, grey water recycling, higher thermal insulations in buildings, green roofs, SUDS.

Yorkshire Forward particularly highlighted that it would be helpful to highlight how the Local Development Framework would contribute towards achieving both the energy efficiency targets outlined in the Housing Green paper (July 2007) (Code for Sustainable Homes and zero carbon homes by 2016) and the government aspiration for all non-domestic buildings to be zero carbon from 2019. (YF)

The representation from the British Wind Energy Association recommends the inclusion of an over-arching climate change policy within the Core Strategy document with detail and commitment to energy efficiency, renewable energy, minimisation of waste and pollution for example and the inclusion of discreet, proactive policies on the individual topics in the Development Control DPD.

#### **Other Related Policies**

3. *One substantial submitted representation referred to the need to promote Coal*

*Bed Methane extraction and Carbon Capture technologies, especially associated with the disused mine sites within Selby District. That response has been dealt with separately in Part 8 below.*

## **7. Infrastructure related comments**

A number respondents made reference in a general way to the need to fully address the infrastructure issues associated with the scale of new development being proposed. Highway and drainage issues were particularly mentioned but capacity and provision of educational, medical and recreational facilities were also cited.

## **8. Minerals and Energy**

One respondent made a substantial submission on the need to include reference to the potential within the District to exploit coal bed methane (CBM). The respondents wish see a new section on CBM inserted in the Core Strategy and include areas on the Proposals Map to allocate areas of potential CBM development.

## **9. Gypsies and Travellers**

In addition to the response to the specific Questions 13,14 and 15, the FFT (Friends, Family and Travellers) Planning response indicates that the Core Strategy should be considering options for potential locations for sites, including urban extensions for growth in the future. However, Council need to address the issue of new pitches immediately.

Respondent indicates it is quite clear that the Core Strategy should contain a criteria based policy for other sites which come forward that have not been allocated. (see Para.31 of ODPM Circular 01/2006 and Para.25 of CLG Circular 04/2007:Planning for Travelling Showpeople) to ensure that small, private, family sized sites and unexpected demand are covered in the policy. A rural exceptions policy should also be included to ensure that affordable land can come forward to enable these sites to be delivered.

The Core Strategy should also consider mechanisms to deliver sites, including the use of Section 106 obligations, to ensure that implementation of policy is being achieved.

The GTAA evidence indicates that people's requirements are diverse. One third wanted local authority provision, One third wanted to rent from other Gypsies and Travellers and one third-wished to have self-owned and managed sites. This should be a guide to the options put forward. In FFTs view there will need to be direct and accessible communication between local Gypsies and Travellers and the local authority to ensure that plans meet people's needs. There should be outreach consultation directly with those affected. Paper based consultations with national organisations like

FFT, though useful, cannot be considered as a substitute for direct local consultation with Gypsies and Travellers.

Circular 1/2006 provides advice about the location of sites and one of the issues of importance to inhabitants of future sites is access to a range of services which the rest of the population take for granted.

## **10. Other topics**

Individual representations also referred to other topics/policy areas where more emphasis is requested. These are;

- Recycling
- Tackling crime
- Cultural facilities and provision for faith based activities.  
Prison provision