

Rep.No	Date Received	Name	Organisation	Email	Con Area	Comment
1.	18.12.2020	Tom Beharrell	Selby Civic Society	tom@beharrell.com	Millgate	<p>Millgate CA Draft Feedback</p> <p>Flaxley Road mistyped as Flaxby Road on page 5, 6 [x2] and 15, and the key on the interactive map.</p> <p>B1223 mistyped as B12234 page 6.</p> <p>Left hand photo on page 6 shows new houses completed in 2019 on the site of the Friendship pub, not the adjacent 1979-approved Friendship Court development.</p> <p>Interactive map historic development analysis mid-20th century should be late 20th century. Friendship Court is late 20c rather than 21st.</p> <p>86-90 Millgate are a terrace of three, not four houses, page 10.</p> <p>On page 10 Dobson's Row is stated to have all replacement doors and windows, with the photo caption stating uPVC replacements. The terrace doesn't have uPVC windows; all windows are timber casements and doors are wooden. Most of the row are single glazed timber windows, number 2 and 7 had their windows replaced with new timber double glazing in the same style in 2016. At the time, the heritage statement noted that front and back of number 7 has 19th century three and four plank doors.</p> <p>Page 11 states that redevelopment of former public house and Friendship Court are still ongoing – for clarification, Friendship Court was approved in 1979 on 66 Millgate's land. Next door the Friendship pub development phase I was completed in 2019. There is ongoing phase II development next door at 54 Millgate.</p>

					<p>The second paragraph for Negative on page 11 refers to Millgate Mews being replacement terraces on Millgate not incorporating chimneys, I believe this is Firth Mews, as pictured bottom left on page 12, built 1993-94.</p> <p>Top photo on page 12 shows Friendship Court and the projecting bay on Millgate, which went through planning in 1979 rather than being early 21st century. The photo below of 21 Millgate is the terrace previously mentioned as part of Firth Mews, not Friendship Court, on the opposite side of Millgate and dates from 1993-94.</p> <p>Page 16 refers to the Millennium Green in view 4, I think this is the Spagnum. View 14 of the Maltings should be 34.</p> <p>Page 17 has Spagnum mistyped, I'm also missing views 8, 29 and 34 in the document.</p> <p>Page 18 refers to the recent Friendship Court development, should be Friendship pub (both under 6.1 and 6.2.)</p>
2	21.12.2020	John Wetherell	Resident	jmgwetherell@gmail.com	<p>Leeds Road</p> <p>The report is somewhat superficial, inconsistent in at least one respect. ie page 5 says 'The Croft' is late 19th century but on page 8 it is an example of 1920/30's building!</p> <p>Otherwise, as probably the longest resident on the road I support the proposals.</p> <p>In view of the importance of 'streetscape' it is a pity the council did not use the powers when, several years ago, they allowed a hedge to be ripped up and replaced by a very much out of character wall.</p> <p>The whole thing is pointless if not followed up!</p>

3	14.01.2020	Tania Weston	SDC Economic Regeneration	Tweston@selby.gov.uk	<p>General</p> <p>This is a good appraisal document that highlights the key heritage issues of Selby Town centre, as well as the challenges and opportunities. It is good to see that there is clear alignment with the Economic Development & Regeneration team's pipeline of projects to improve the town centre in line with the Council Plan. The recognition of 'a sense of place' is welcomed, and we support the focus on a more people-centred approach to traffic management and infrastructure. It is good to see recognition of opportunities for regeneration and development, such as infill, renovation of run-down buildings and replacement of inappropriate buildings. However, there could be more, and more positive, reference to the Council's previous and current work, and strategic ambitions for Selby Town. There have been positive changes, such as the Water Lane and Town Hall public realm enhancements, previous CARS/HERS scheme improvements on New Street, new residential development on Park Row and Audus Street/Douglas Street. The HAZ, town centres work and Transforming Cities Fund projects should have positive impacts in the near future (2024 at the latest), while longer-term strategic projects (the Places and Movement Strategy and station quarter masterplan) will also help deliver people-centred improvements. These projects will address some of the negatives identified in the draft CAA, such as car dominance, the poor setting of the listed current and former railway stations, the entrance into Selby Park and opportunities for tree management in the park.</p> <p>The ED&R team generally agree with the risks, opportunities and recommendations set out in section 6. However, we have a concern that there is the potential for a difference in corporate priorities relating to the old Maltings (6.2.1). We would argue that while it has the potential to make a positive contribution to the</p>
---	------------	--------------	---------------------------------	--	--

					<p>conservation area, the CAA needs to recognise that it is in incredibly poor condition which has considerably worsened since its de-listing 16 years ago. Conversion of the building would require substantial investment given the conservation deficit. This makes it unviable for private development, even enabling development, and also unviable for public funding; as an unlisted asset there will be other buildings considered much higher priorities for investment (such as Abbot's Staith). The ED&R team is currently developing a proposal for quality new development including the demolition of this building that would enhance the conservation area, and which has Executive member support. This raises the prospect of a Council policy document in conflict with a Council proposal for improvement of the area.</p> <p>Specific comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agree with the suggestions about de-designation and re-drawing of the boundary; all seem sensible. The CAA will therefore need to be slightly re-written to reflect this change.• We agree about the opportunity for redevelopment of the WH Smith and 9 Day Lewis Pharmacy sites. However, we suggest that good quality, sensitively designed contemporary design might be more appropriate. Unless there is evidence of the former buildings, any frontage 'restoration' would be conjectural. Should the former Bargain World also be included as a potential development opportunity? Any view of the merits or otherwise of the carpet shop building on the Scott Rd/Leeds Rd junction?• We do not necessarily agree that the Park Row/Thornden Buildings development constitute an exception to defined character.• Should there be more mention of the need to improve the setting of the listed buildings and park along Station Road (i.e., the impact of the current station car parking and Selby Business Centre on the conservation area)?
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Could there be more said about Selby Park, and potential opportunities for improvement, such as better links with the Abbey, better visibility and lighting, removing car parking, improving direct access and enhancing feelings of safety?• There is good alignment with the Places and Movement strategy relating to the environments at New St / Park St junction, The Crescent and Water Lane.• The suggested improvements to cycle infrastructure for Micklegate and Gowthorpe are welcomed. Any proposals should link with other infrastructure developments, especially those relating to the station (TCF) and LCWIP proposals.• It is good to see acknowledgement of the town's industrial significance.• Can you introduce an Article 4 Direction outside a conservation area? It's suggested for Armoury Road and Brook Street, but these are also proposed for de-designation. A blanket Article 4 Direction would need considerable consultation – it has potentially significant implications for homeowners and businesses. We suggest should be specific engagement with businesses to build engagement and support for any changes..• Welcome suggestion of working with identified groups, but local groups should also be included (e.g. Selby College, Town Council, Civic Trust, other local groups)• Is there alignment between the CAA's proposals for car parking with the Council's car parking strategy, that of the County Council? The district's poor provision of EV charging points is readily acknowledged, however, it would be unfortunate if traffic volumes increased from local residents driving across town to charge their cars (e.g. Back Micklegate).• The reference to refreshing design guidance is welcomed. This fits well with the proposed HAZ design guide for Selby. Perhaps reference to other design guides in development (Delton's residential design guide).
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sure 115-121 Millgate (1167502) and 123 & 125 Millgate (1132553) still exist?? • Format • Leeds Rd: typo p.6 • Selby Town: p.24 pictures need switching around. Section from p.27-30 text doesn't correspond with images. • 6.2.10 Milton Place car park is actually called Audus Street car park (link to prominent historic family/architect)
4	18.01.2021	Tom Beharrell obo Selby Civic Society	Selby Civic Society		<p>Selby Conservation Areas Appraisal feedback</p> <p>Selby Civic Society's response to the request for comments on the Conservation Area Appraisal is as follows. Selby Civic Society supports the recommendations outlined in the appraisal documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resolve the lack of full-time conservation adviser. • Ensure that planning proposals always take account of the impact on the character and appearance of the conservation areas. • Create a more people-centred approach to traffic management and infrastructure. We agree street signage and other clutter tends to be poorly positioned within the conservation areas. • Support an appropriate conservation-related evidence-base to inform development management decision making. • Prioritise the preparation and adoption of guidance for householders and businesses regarding conservation issues, including issuing up-to-date shopfront and window & door replacement design guides. We agree that shopfronts are often heavily branded and unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the conservation areas, and that uPVC replacements of doors and windows common throughout the conservation areas do not respect the character and appearance of traditional timber sashes.

					<p>Changes to the conservation area boundaries</p> <p>We agree the Selby Town Conservation Area boundary should be extended to take account of “View 2” on the Barlby riverbank and to be extended south-east to incorporate more of the River Ouse south bank and Grade II listed 121-122 Ousegate. We further believe it should be extended to the end of this block to incorporate the Grade II listed Nelson public house. This creates a natural boundary to the Selby Town Conservation Area at the end of Ousegate.</p> <p>We agree with de-designating “Upper Millgate”. The condition of the buildings is poor with a couple of exceptions – 129 and 131 Millgate have original windows and are in great condition though are non-designated; Dobson’s Row is also in good condition and contain lots of original character and is Grade II listed. Other listed buildings at 115 to 125 Millgate appear to have been demolished probably for Ebor Court. If conservation area status is lost, we would like to see alternative provision to ensure more sympathetic alterations in the future.</p> <p>We disagree that the impact of changes on the character of Armoury Road and Brook Street are enough to de-designate this conservation area. There are just six front walls that have been taken down to ground level on Armoury Road to provide car parking. Boundary loss to the rear of Brook Street properties is visible on Armoury Road and is limited to the terrace of 3-storey houses numbers 64-82 (pictured on page 9 photo 2.)</p> <p>There need to be protections and/or enforcements to reinstate and prevent further similar works. Most styles of house have at least one example with original windows and doors still present, and several houses on</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Armoury Road including the terrace 47-51 have original windows, doors and tiles, and contribute very positively to the area. There are similar well-preserved houses on Brook Street around and including Beech Grove and others.</p> <p>The impact of the negative new developments on the corner of Gowthorpe and Brook Street are limited to the edge of the conservation area. The loss of original doors & windows and insensitive development is arguably less damaging than that within Millgate Conservation Area and to a large extent Selby Town Conservation Area.</p> <p>Selby Town Conservation Area</p> <p>We would like to add to the summary of special interest the extensive number of "Yards" throughout Selby Town and Millgate within the medieval burgage plots. There are numerous examples of surviving Yards that consist of doorways or carriage entrances from a street-front property through to terraces of cottages or workshops built behind: Hope Yard, Conway's Yard, Preston's Yard, Simpson's Yard, Pitt's Yard and Dobson's Yard. Over 50 Yards were listed in the Rimmington's Directory of 1931. Robert Street is a great example of how new, sensitive development can be married in with these original terraces to enhance and increase housing stock within the town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We agree the Ousegate Maltings requires urgent conservation.• We support the upgrading of the listing for the Old Railway Station and enhanced status within the town due to the significance of the building; to ensure its conservation and re-use such as being a publicly accessible part of the new Station Quarter development.• Prioritise saving the Abbot's Staith, currently in a
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>perilous state and in danger of being lost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Enhance the pedestrian and cycling accessibility of Water Lane and improve the appearance of the pumping station and railings.• Support the pedestrianisation of Finkle Street and Micklegate, to design out cars.• We agree the park and Stagnum are poorly managed and would like to see an increase in the level of tree cover throughout the conservation areas, especially in Micklegate, The Stagnum, Selby Park and riverbank in response to the climate emergency. These should enhance and not obstruct key views.• Re-design Back Micklegate car park on a smaller footprint, allowing for new housing to extend along the existing burgage plots along the lines of the Robert Street development.• Redevelopment of the Royal Mail site on Micklegate would be encouraged with a scheme that would contribute to the character of the area if Royal Mail would relocate. <p>Millgate Conservation Area</p> <p>We agree that “Lower Millgate” has been significantly compromised by the loss of most timber windows and doors (in both listed and non-listed buildings) and is further impacted by over 30 satellite dishes which detract from its character. One listed building at 38 Millgate appears to have been lost probably to create the road to New Millgate, which looks out of character being so wide.</p> <p>We agree that specific design guidance should be prepared for Millgate to try and bring doors, windows, roofs and rainwater goods back to appropriate conservation area standards during future refurbishments, and to engage with owners/landlords as we suspect most residents do not know they live in a</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>conservation area. We also suspect that many listed building owners do not know what is or is not permitted.</p> <p>We strongly agree that Article 4 Directions need to be strengthened and enforced by Selby District Council.</p> <p>Leeds Road Conservation Area</p> <p>We agree with other recommendations to allow greater control over property boundaries and infilling of existing plots, to increase the spread of TPOs to all trees and to ensure the careful management of surviving grass verges.</p> <p>Armoury Road and Brook Street Conservation Area We agree that future loss of front gardens and windows & doors must be avoided by tighter restrictions and/or enforcement by Selby District Council, including the use of Article 4 Directions.</p> <p>With stronger conservation area protections and an invigorated planning department, in the future we think there is a case for extending the conservation area down the east side of Doncaster Road, to contain 1 to 105 Doncaster Road and incorporating the Victorian Cemetery and other side streets where appropriate. Selby Civic Society are happy to work in conjunction with the council on the initiatives, and we strongly recommend the measures are adopted and enforced as necessary.</p>
5	18.01.2021	Tom Beherrel	Selby Civic Society	tom@beharrell.com	<p>Leeds Road</p> <p>Page 8 photograph 3 is of The Croft but description doesn't match. Page 11 photograph described as being a mid-20th century terrace, looks Edwardian and is present in 1930s photographs. Page 12 Flaxby Road -> Flaxley Road typo (x2 plus photo.)</p>

					<p>Page 15 map doesn't show boundary of Leeds Road CA with Selby Town CA.</p> <p>Armoury Road and Brook Street</p> <p>Page 8 says there's controlled on-street parking on the west side of Brook Street, however parking is on the east side of Brook Street.</p> <p>Page 9 photo 1 labelled as 160-162 Brook Street, should be 60-62.</p> <p>Page 14 says front boundary walls and gardens have been removed on both Armoury Road and Brook Street for parking. There are six houses on Armoury Road that have lost their front wall and garden, but none on Brook Street.</p> <p>Selby Town</p> <p>Page 1 dates the A19 swing bridge as early 20th century; it dates from late 18th century but was renewed in the mid-20th.</p> <p>Page 1 & 6, 30 & 31, 36 Ousegate Road is just Ousegate.</p> <p>Page 8 Broad Street should be Brook Street.</p> <p>Page 9 photo three shows Church Hill.</p> <p>Page 10 photo one shows a late 19th Century terrace rather than 20th (built 1895/96.)</p> <p>Page 14 Market Place photograph mislabelled, not a view towards St Mary's Church.</p> <p>Page 14, 15 & 17 Selby Dyke is Selby Dam.</p> <p>Page 16 Abbey Staithe is the Abbot's Staith.</p> <p>Page 18 Cholera burial ground is mid-19C.</p> <p>Page 19 first bullet point has New Road which should be New Street. Last bullet point: Part Street should be Park Street.</p> <p>Page 20 dates the first railway station as 1835, it was built between 1830 and 1834 opening on 22/09/1834.</p> <p>Page 30 Flaxby Road -> Flaxley Road (x2.) Page 31 Trees along Station Road should be Portholme Road.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>4.2.2 "Strong Contribution" duplicated in title. Page 33 view 28 photo has a description referring to further along the river. Page 45 describes the junction of Park Street and The Crescent.</p>
6	22.01.2021	James Langler	Historic England	Langler, James <James.Langler@HistoricEngland.org.uk>		<p>Lower Millgate Conservation Area – no objection to the proposed boundary revision.</p> <p>Selby Town Conservation Area – no objection to the proposed boundary revision along the banks of the River Ouse.</p> <p>Armoury Road and Brook Street Conservation Area – whilst regrettable, we would not object to this decision provided that suitable safeguards are put in place to conserve remaining heritage assets/character elements.</p> <p>Proposal to amalgamate the Leeds Road and Lower Millgate Conservation Areas into the Selby Town CA, whilst it would be preferable to keep distinct areas separate, we would not object to this proposal provided that the Conservation Area Appraisal for the amalgamated Conservation Area includes distinct and clearly identifiable character areas with separate management recommendations.</p>