

Selby District Council Responses to Inspector's Request for Submissions / Comments in Procedural Matters note

28 October 2011

Paragraph 7

- An agreed statement between Selby DC and Fairburn representatives regarding bus services and other services and facilities at Fairburn.

Provided 14 October 2011

- An agreed statement between Selby DC and Tadcaster/Sherburn-in-Elmet representatives regarding bus and train services at the two towns.

Provided 17 October 2011

- SSOBT and the Council's agreed statement regarding the Interim Housing Policies Statement.

SDC sent first Draft SCG to Cunnane Town Planning (CTP) 30 September 2011.

SDC received CTP comments 20 October 2011.

SDC comments sent to CTP 26 October 2011.

SDC are still awaiting CTP final comments.

Paragraph 9

SDC/3 – Yorkshire Water. Request for information on Waste Water & Sewerage Infrastructure. (28.9.2011).

No further comments.

SDC/5 – Position Statement: Treatment of Barlby/Osgodby, Brayton & Thorpe Willoughby in the Settlement Hierarchy. (28.9.2011).

No further comments.

SDC/10 – Further Information on Matter 5: Specific Housing Needs (30.9.2011).

No further comments

SSOB/2 – Summary of background & history of Samuel Smith Old Brewery (Tadcaster)'s action to implement the "Vision of Tadcaster" and Volume of Appendices. (28.9.2011)

The purpose of the Examination in Public is for the Planning Inspector to assess whether or not the Council's Core Strategy is sound and representations at the inquiry were made from a number of parties. It is not a legal examination of past events in respect of the past history of Tadcaster and the Council is not making any comment in respect of the history relating to the redevelopment of Tadcaster over a number of years. The "Vision of Tadcaster" was discussed at the Examination in Public and the Council has published a suggested change to the Core Strategy (ref PC4.26)

SSOB/3 – Statement of Common Ground between TTHC/Cunnane Town Planning on behalf of Samuel Smith Old Brewery & Selby District Council in connection with the bus services between Appleton Roebuck and York.

Provided 14 October

PHRH/1 – Sherburn in Elmet – Proposed additional Residential Development Off-site Highway Capacity Statement. (21.9.2011).

Please find attached copy of email from the NYCC Highways Authority. This highlights that there are capacity issues at the specific junctions to be resolved if 900 dwellings were being proposed in Sherburn in Elmet but indicates that 480 dwellings can be accommodated.

EA/1 – Environment Agency Position Statement. (27.9.2011).
No further comments

IH/2 – E-mail and map of Barlby Bridge. (27.9.2011)
No further comments

BOCM/3 – Olympia Park Strategic Development site – cost and valuation clarification. (28.9.2011)
No further comments

GPE/1 – E-mail from Carter Jonas and Schedule listing the principal scheduled services available to/ from higher order centres from the main transport nodes. (29.9.2011)
Provided 17 October

Copy of comments from NYCC re PHRH/1

From: Martin Parker [mailto:Martin.Parker@northyorks.gov.uk]

Sent: 18 October 2011 15:34

To: ryan king

Subject: Re: Sherburn Highway Capacity Study

Ryan,

I have now looked at the information submitted by Persimmon / Redrow. My colleague Tim Coyne is currently dealing with an application for a development of 480 houses on the same site.

I have taken the information provided within the TA for this proposal and looked at capacity at the Kirkgate / Moor Lane traffic signal junction for the increased housing numbers.

The TA for 480 houses shows that:-

- 1) AM Peak - Low Street to Finkle Hill - 195 movements - junction operating at 84% of capacity.
- 2) PM Peak - Finkle Hill to Low Street - 224 movements - junction operating at 84% of capacity.

Using the figures for the same movements and recalculating the capacity for 900 houses this shows:-

- 1) AM Peak - Low Street to Finkle Hill - 303 movements - junction operating at 121% of capacity.
- 2) PM Peak - Finkle Hill to Low Street - 333 movements - junction operating at 125% of capacity.

Based on the above basic comparison the network, at this junction, can not sustain this level of development without suitable mitigating (if deliverable). The documents submitted by Persimmon / Redrow make no reference to any mitigation proposals. Therefore, unless they can demonstrate that the impact can be mitigated, at this junction and any others affected by the increased housing numbers, the proposed increase in the scale of development from 480 houses to 900 houses is not sustainable and would not be supported by the Highway Authority.

If you need any further information please let me know.

Regards

Martin Parker