

Questions and answers from the Live Public online event 9 April 2024

Topic	Question	Answer	Response Type
Eggborough sites	Why is NYCC persisting in developing Eggborough into a town when it is a Village and previous applications that have been declined stated that Eggborough was at its limit of development and couldn't expand any more without adversely changing its character?	<p>Planning permissions have been determined in accordance with the adopted 2005 Local Plan which allocated a distribution of development for the time period covered by that plan.</p> <p>We are now consulting on a new local plan which looks to allocate new development locations to enable growth within the district over the next 15 year period. The location of the new housing allocations - including at Eggborough, has been determined by the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy to support the emerging plan we are consulting on.</p> <p>Although currently a Tier 1 village, Eggborough is located in close proximity to the former Kellingley Colliery and former Eggborough Power Station, which have recently been granted permission for employment use. The village has good access to the strategic highway network and to Whitley station and there is potential to increase local rail services. For this reason, the urban extension is considered to be a sustainable opportunity, which will deliver new housing in association with local facilities including the provision of a new primary school, whilst linking with existing communities.</p>	Answered by text in Q&A chat during presentation
Sherburn in Elmet sites and the current planning application	The Local Plan for Sherburn in Elmet covers part of land currently under consideration (of planning application) ref ZG2023/0774/FULM. How does this work moving forward?	<p>In relation to the Sherburn in Elmet question, planning law requires that we determine planning applications in accordance with the adopted development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</p> <p>We are preparing a new local plan, so local planning authorities can give some weight to emerging plan policies, but that's dependent on the position that has been reached in the local plan preparation. The more advanced the local plan becomes, the more weight can be given to emerging local plan policies, but that is also dependent on the level of unresolved objections and how consistent the planning application proposal is with national policy.</p> <p>So in short, each individual planning application will need to be dealt with on its own merits in accordance with the wider national policy guidance on that matter.</p>	Answered orally in Q&A session at end of presentation

Topic	Question	Answer	Response Type
Eggborough sites	<p>Eggborough Power Station will be fully employed by the time the 1500 homes site in Eggborough is operational, so there's no employment facilities available there.</p> <p>Kellingley Colliery site is not generating any employment and is not going to provide over 1500 jobs.</p> <p>Wakefield has cancelled the link road to Knottingley and there is minimal infrastructure available in Eggborough. Both buses and rail with one train a day. There is no extra capacity on the line and it is mainly used by Drax Freight.</p> <p>Also, you are proposing using Greenbelt agricultural land that the Prime Minister has categorically said should not be used for housing, contrary to your statements</p>	<p>The agricultural land is not identified as Green Belt land which is protected by national planning policies. The land is green land, which has a much lower definition.</p> <p>When we've looked at the strategy, we've looked at things such as the employment available and employment provision. The development will support new infrastructure coming into the area. A new school will be provided on the large Eggborough site for 1500 dwellings. That level of development helps to provide new infrastructure moving forward and we're also hoping that it'll provide an impetus to improve the rail linkages as well.</p>	Answered orally in Q&A session at end of presentation
Comments from the previous Publication consultation	Will the comments made for the original 2020 publication be considered in this revision?	<p>Yes, but I would suggest that everybody resubmits comments in relation to this local plan consultation in line with where we've got to now.</p> <p>But we will be submitting all of the comments received to both consultations that we've had to the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p><i>(note: the submitted comments referred to are those from both the 2022 Publication and 2024 Revised Publication (Regulation 19) stages)</i></p>	Answered orally in Q&A session at end of presentation
Housing sites in Tadcaster	Can you be more specific about where the housing numbers will be allocated in Tadcaster apart from the town centre car park site.	<p>For Tadcaster, the central area car park is allocated for 43 dwellings.</p> <p>The other sites around the town include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Hillcrest Court for 30 dwellings • Land north of Station Road for 104 dwellings • Land at Mill Lane is a large site allocated for 180 dwellings 	Answered orally in Q&A session at end of presentation

Topic	Question	Answer	Response Type
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The former Barnardo’s home on Wighill Lane, is allocated for 5 dwellings This is a reuse of the existing buildings that are on that site • And 10 dwellings are allocated on a site further towards the town centre on Wighill Lane, which is a former coal yard and some derelict cottages. <p>The total of these allocated sites for Tadcaster is 372 dwellings, but there's also a special policy area identified in the plan which covers the whole of the town centre. This policy sets out that some derelict properties and sites will be brought back into use which will be about another 30 dwellings.</p> <p>So, the total allocation for Tadcaster is about 400 dwellings.</p>	
Appleton Roebuck sites	Why is the council including 68 proposed properties in Appleton Roebuck? This is the smallest of the Tier 2 villages with just 344 properties. This is surely unsustainable overdevelopment taking into account the lack of local services and infrastructure.	<p>We've looked at the spatial strategy in accordance with the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>The settlement hierarchy looks at the facilities and the services in each individual settlement. The site allocations have been shared out depending on that, but also in terms of the sites that have come forward to us, the site availability, deliverability. And we've also had to exclude sites within the Green Belt, for example, and sites within high flood risk areas.</p> <p>So, it's spreading the development across the most sustainable locations.</p>	Answered orally in Q&A session at end of presentation
North Duffield sites	<p>The North Duffield sites are both very close to a nationally recognised nature reserve. In all the documentation wildlife habitat is stated to be avoided.</p> <p>How can a village boundary be changed without any consultation?</p> <p>The plan states that the village has a GP surgery, this is currently open on two mornings a week.</p> <p>The plan regularly discussed the sites having good bus links - there are 3 buses a day into York and no buses into Selby.</p>	<p>This is the same answer as to the question in relation to Appleton Roebuck.</p> <p>It stems from the settlement hierarchy, and we have looked at services. There are clauses within the policy in terms of wildlife habitat. But it's very much in terms of spreading that development across the most sustainable locations.</p> <p><i>There have been several consultations on the changes to the village boundary. Consultation on the approach to development limits was undertaken as part of the Issues and Options stage in 2020 and the Preferred Options stage in 2021.</i></p> <p><i>Consultation on proposed site allocations and associated changes to development limits was also undertaken at the Preferred Options stage in 2021 (including site references NDUF-D and NDUF-L).</i></p> <p><i>Consultation on additional sites was undertaken in 2021 (including NDUF-O). Subsequently, the 2022 Publication consultation included NDUF-O (incorporating</i></p>	<p>Answered orally in Q&A session at end of presentation.</p> <p><i>Further information to that which was provided at the online event is provided here to fully answer the 'consultation' question.</i></p>

Topic	Question	Answer	Response Type
		<p><i>NDUF-L) but not NDUF-D (which had been rejected due to lack of safe pedestrian access to the village at that time).</i></p> <p><i>The current, 2024 Revised Publication Plan consultation includes both NDUF-O and NDUF-D (with a revised new safe link to the village centre for pedestrians and cyclists).</i></p> <p><i>Further information about the methodology and review of development limits can be found in Background Papers 5a and 5b.</i></p> <p><i>This current consultation provides a further opportunity to submit comments, focussing on the soundness of the Plan's approach.</i></p>	
Consultation deadline	Given the size of the documents to be reviewed can the deadline be extended?	The deadline is 4:30pm on 19 April 2024. The consultation period began on the 8 March and will have been for six weeks.	This question was submitted as the online event closed and was unseen. It is answered here.