

Village Document Consultation Responses

Name	Organisation	Email Address / Address	Conservation Area	Comment
Judith Bellamy		2 Turton Square, Brayton, Selby	Brayton	I have read through the Brayton document to the point where there are two recommendations. The first suggests that the conservation area is only in place to preserve a gap between Brayton and Selby which is no longer required. I disagree, the fact that there is a commitment to preserving the views of the church and trying to maintain Brayton as a village with fields still being actively farmed is essential to the character of the village as a whole. Downgrading the status is just one step closer to multiple houses being built in this area. The second recommendation relates to Hemingbrough which makes me wonder if anyone at the council has actually read the proposals, which is of greater concern.
David Hull		9 Northfield Lane Riccall YO19 6QF	Riccall	Which ill informed moron wrote this "appraisal"??? Most of what they have written is factually incorrect. The buildings that they mention being of historical importance are generally absolute eyesores that need restoring. The buildings they are moaning about generally fit very well in the village. You can clearly see their surroundings have been very well considered in the designing stage. I could go on and on but I feel I would be wasting my time.
Caroline Wandless		25 Skipwith Road, Escrick	Escrick	Escrick Church is St Helen's. Incorrectly refered to as St Mary's under one of the view photos. Please could it be amended. Thank you.

Village Document Consultation Responses

Glen Hopkinson		Glebe Cottage, Escrick YO19 6LN	Escrick	"Recommendation 7 In particular, the local bus company should be encouraged to use the Main Street as a pick up and drop off to avoid residents having to use the A19". I totally disagree with this recommendation. The buses should stay on the A19. The recent introduction of laybys for the bus stop has improved traffic flow. I really can't see how buses should be routing down essentially a side road not built for such traffic and the detour will necessitate the bus pulling out of a busy junction back onto the A19 which as busy times might hold the bus up. The old bus stop on main street regularly has school drop off cars along one side of the street and is less than 100 yards from the current A19 bus stop. I assume in the past the bus did detour off the A19 down Main Street and this proposal is a retrograde step.
Sarah Force		7 Bedfords Fold, Hillam LS25 5HZ	Monk Fryston	20 mph or crossing needs to be implemented. As an adult it is hard to cross that road, I wouldn't allow a child to do so. Also if a reduced speed was considered it would make the turning into Water Lane safer.
Robert Jackson		2 West view, Bettarashill Road, Hillam	Monk Fryston	Traffic through monk Fryston and Hillam is extremely heavy and we have noticed an increase in traffic coming through hillam as a cut through from
				the A162 down betterashill road. The group of houses at the end of
				betterashillroad are just within the 30 zone coming in to hillam and monk frystone and the signs that indicate this coming from the national speed limit are not adequate. Speed bumps would be sufficient.
Henry James Mellard		22 Chapel Walk, Riccall	Riccall	As such I have little comment on your document.
				Riccall is my home i oppose any more building because the population density is already obscene for a village.
				The fields of riccall make no home for birds and hedgehogs forced into the village there is precious little habitat as it is. The tamwood site is critical to various ecological systems and must NOT be destroyed. People above money, peace .

Village Document Consultation Responses

Joanna Comerford		7 Station Rise, Riccall	Riccall	I believe that the conservation area within Riccall should extend within the centre of Riccall village, along Station Road and include the 'orchard'
				area behind Tamwood, which houses a large number of wildlife and plant species. We believe that this includes bats as we see them flying into the garden from our neighbouring property.
				Station Road houses historical buildings including station house and the old railway line, and I believe that this should be protected.
				Riccall is already becoming a densely Pilates area and we believe that extensive additional dwellings within the village centre should be avoided at all costs.
Benjamin Comerford		7 Station Rise, Riccall	Riccall	It is my opinion that the conservation area within Riccall should extend within the centre of Riccall village, along Station Road and include the 'orchard' area behind Tamwood, which houses a large number of wildlife and plant species. We believe that this includes bats as we see them flying into the garden from our neighbouring property.
				Station Road houses historical buildings including station house and the old railway line, and I believe that this should be protected.
				Riccall is already becoming a densely populated area and we believe that extensive additional dwellings within the village centre should be avoided at all costs.
David Kendrew		Hawthorn Farm, Kelfield Road, Riccall, York, YO19 6PQ	Riccall	
Amanda Kendrew		Hawthorn Farm, Kelfield Road, Riccall, York, YO19 6PQ	Riccall	

Village Document Consultation Responses

Mrs Barbara Jean Bennett		5 Ash Grove, Riccall, York, YO19 6NW	Riccall	I am commenting about the property known as Tamwood in Station Road Riccall and would urge the council to reconsider their decision regarding demolition of this property. I was horrified when I learned of this decision. I had known Mr Clark all my life (I am 70) Mr Clark was a family friend and Tamwood was built on behalf of his parents. It is part of the history of Riccall, in keeping with the other properties of Station Road and should be left so. I know that a lot of Riccall residents have the same opinion as me and would hope that our combined opinions would help to save the property to be enjoyed by future generations.
Mark Glover		9 The Meadows, Riccall, York, YO19 6RR	Riccall	We love our village and want to keep it as it is, so NO MORE HOUSES BUILT please
Richard Rowson		1 Carrs Meadow, Escrick, YO19 6JZ	Escrick	<u>Context:</u>
				I am responding to this consultation in a personal capacity, albeit no doubt my views have been shaped through 6 years as a Parish Councillor, and contributor to Escrick's Neighbourhood Plan project.
				I have tried to approach this consultation positively, and in a constructive manner. However, this is set against the context that the quality of this review is disappointing, and not to the standard that we are used to seeing from SDC.
				The review also contains numerous factual errors, and basic errors such as mis-spelling street names and getting the name of the church wrong. None of which helps its credibility, nor implies attention to detail.
				It is further disappointing that it appears to be being rushed through at a time when SDC are well aware that Escrick is developing a neighbourhood plan and design code, which, unlike this document, have been based on over 2 years of extensive community engagement.

Village Document Consultation Responses

				Headline views:
				The review appears to take a very narrow view on what is 'good' and 'bad'. It seems to be based purely on the opinions of the author, without taking into account views of local residents.
				The review seems to take the stance that anything from the Victorian/Edwardian era is good; anything that emulates it is ok; and anything else is a problem.
				The overall tone comes across as rather derogatory and of aloof. Whilst the village may not be to the personal tastes of the individual conducting the review, this seems to have clouded objective opinion, and as a result the review does not appear to be balanced nor objective.
				An alternative view could be that Escrick provides a varied collection of styles representative of the times at which they were built, intertwined with the socio-economic history of the time, the variety of which very much define the character of the village.
				Variety that includes:
				the historic manor house, with its stables, gardens and outbuildings;
				the Victorian/Edwardian era of workers cottages, social housing of the Alms Houses, alongside grand buildings such as the rectory, Dower house and church;
				the absence of significant development in the early 20 th century as residents moved away to industrial towns;
				the rapid growth of the 1960s/1970s (as private car ownership established commuting), bringing whole new roads of bungalows and houses with their driveways and garages;
				1980s 'executive home' cul-de-sacs – some with a nod to the architecture of the Dower House they sit alongside;
				1990s developments incorporating affordable housing and shared ownership;

Village Document Consultation Responses

				21 st century infill.
				Had the Victorian's taken the view that all buildings should resemble the styles of 150 years previously, we'd have had none of the architecture that the author now appears to value so much.
				Whilst some styles will inevitably be more popular than others, I do not share the author's view that architecture of certain eras is automatically better or worse than others. A 1960s bungalow may not be the current flavour of the month, but it is nonetheless part of our architectural and socio-economic heritage, and its role therein should be respected.
				Personally I feel that the review is so narrowminded, and so misses the very ethos of Escrick, that it should be withdrawn and redone with a fresh pair of eyes that are more receptive to a wider range of styles and views. Nonetheless as I suspect this is unlikely, I have set out some specific thoughts below for consideration.
				<u>Specific objections:</u>

Village Document Consultation Responses

				<p>Page 32 / Recommendation 3: “Article 4 Directions or similar mechanisms are adopted to remove current permitted development rights for the control of boundaries, windows and doors, rear yards and shop fronts within the conservation area.” I can see this may be appropriate for some prominent aspects of the conservation area or buildings of specific historic importance. However, many of the buildings within the conservation area, such as Carrs Meadow or Escrick Park Gardens are modern developments which SDC themselves describe as ‘exceptions to defined character’ and ‘neutral areas that do not add to the character of the conservation area’. It would seem ironic on one hand to be quite dismissive about the value of these developments, and on the other hand burden residents with article 4 directions to preserve features that the report states are of no value.</p>
				<p>Page 33 / Recommendation 5: “Recommendation 5: Development Management Any future development of the slaughterhouse site off the Main Street will need to ensure that every effort is made to incorporate the historic farm out-buildings into development and that views from the Main Street are maintained and enhanced including around Carr Meadows.” I strongly object to this recommendation. This is a working abattoir site, with all the blood, gore, and odour that goes with it. Residents of Carrs Meadow fought to get the screening put in place to shield Carrs Meadow from the sights and sounds of the abattoir and I would strongly object to having these reinstated, as I believe would be widely the case of other residents.</p>

Village Document Consultation Responses

				<u>Detailed feedback:</u>
				<i>General</i>
				I recognise that this is specifically a review of the conservation area, rather than the village has a whole, and therefore legitimately omits the north and east of the village. However, the review seems to give very little consideration to the conservation area within the boundary of Queen Margaret’s school. This has a number of significant buildings, gardens, and settings. Whilst recognising this is largely private property, as the historic heart of the settlement, it should nonetheless form part of the review.
				<i>Map – Historic Development Analysis:</i>
				I think the key may have ‘mid 20 th century’ and ‘late 20 th century’ transposed, or some areas may simply be miscategorised? For example Carrs Meadow is shown as ‘mid 20 th ’ (but dates from 1996), Farriers Close is early 21 st century, but shown as mid 19 th ; Dower Park and Escrick Park Gardens are both 1980s, but shown as mid-20 th (shouldn’t that be late 20 th ?)
				<i>Map – Archaeology:</i>
				1. The site of the medieval village is generally regarded to have been south of the hall, not to the north as shown
				2. The map refers to ‘St Mary’s Church’ – I think this should be ‘St Helen’s and the location was further south than shown
				3. I’ve always been led to believe that the current hall sits on the same site as the medieval hall that stood before it (you’ve shown the medieval hall as further north)

Village Document Consultation Responses

				Map – Historic routes:
				I've always been led to believe that the historic east-west route followed roughly the ridge of high land along what is now Cawood Road, then south of the Manor House, and then along what is now the driveway and Wheldrake Lane. This is substantiated by historic records referring to the road following the high ground.
				Section 1.2: Escrick is a largely 'no through' village off the A19
				What does this mean? A key issue for local residents is the very opposite of this – i.e. that the busy A19 and Skipwith Road both slice through the village, significantly influencing the built form, and the flow/movement around the village. The village history is from being at the junction of the Riccall – Stamford Bridge and Selby – York 'roads'.
				Section 1.4:
				No mention is made of the 2003 review, nor do its findings/conclusions appear to have been considered in this review.
				Page 5 / Section 2.0: Historical Development
				There are numerous bits of this narrative that are different to my understanding through Parish Council records, Estate records, and Escrick Heritage project. It may be that the author is correct, and others are wrong, but for example:
				"...the home of the private Queen Margaret School since 1949. <u>Previously the school was housed in the Grade II listed Parsonage.</u> " Incorrect – previously the school was in Scarborough, then briefly Castle Howard during the war, prior to moving into Escrick in 1949. The school <u>subsequently</u> occupied many buildings in the village, including the now Parsonage and Dower House (but not prior to 1949).

Village Document Consultation Responses

				<i>St Mary's Church</i> – incorrect, it is St Helen's
				<i>"The present church, the Grade II* listed St Helen's, dates to 1857 implying that the original church or a replacement 'chapel of ease' <u>survived at the Hall until then.</u>"</i> This is different to local records, which record that the church was consecrated in the current location in 1783. It was rebuilt at the same location in 1856-7, and then restored following a devastating fire in 1923.
				My understanding is that the medieval village lined the west-east route from Riccall to Stamford Bridge.
				<i>"to re-route the main road from Selby to York to the west, <u>the modern A19</u>"</i> - The act of parliament in 1781 diverted the north-south road slightly west of the village (following the course of 'Old Road Plantation' and the historic wall currently forming the boundary of the primary school grounds) but it wasn't until the 1820s that it was diverted yet further west to the current course of the A19.
				<i>"Earlier developments such as the 1970s development of the 'Villa' grounds (the Dower House) off Skipwith Road have very little in common with the estate village theme and reflect suburban style designs."</i> Dower Park actually dates from the 1980s, and the style of the properties are intended to reflect the architecture of the neighbouring Dower House. So whilst true they don't reflect the Estate Village, it is not a generic suburban style either.
				<i>"The earlier medieval village lay to the south of Carr Lane and comprised Main Street and the immediate grounds of the present hall."</i> – local records suggest the medieval village was south of the hall, and not the area now known as Main st.

Village Document Consultation Responses

				<p>Page 6 - <i>“Black Bull Public House and the village hall continue to provide a community focal point”</i> – This is not the case. In reality the main community focal points are the Escrick & Deighton Club, Church, Village Hall and Village Green. The Black Bull has been a chain pub since 2006, with notable periods of closure, or focus on tourist markets from outside the village.</p>
				<p>Page 9 – <i>“Negative : There is a significant amount of late twentieth-century and early twenty-first-century development around the peripheries of the conservation area”</i>. Why is this negative? This appears to be purely a prejudice on the part of the author against certain design styles vs others. Whilst some of the development is negative, it is not all the case, and the fact it is late 20th century doesn’t automatically make it a negative.</p>
				<p>The author appears to have chosen unrepresentative negative pictures to illustrate 20th Century development. Selecting a picture of a building site with a skip can surely not be regarded as objective and balanced, but comes across as a deliberate attempt by the author to present certain areas negatively.</p>
				<p>Page 9 – <i>“Although later twentieth-century developments such as Carr Meadow pay some regard to local character in some architectural detailing, the design and layout reflects late twentieth-century suburban forms and site designs.”</i> – It surprising to see a development such as Carrs Meadow, where a mixed development of housing, including affordable homes and shared ownership, set as a cul-de-sac around a village green is highlighted as a ‘negative’ feature of the village.</p>

Village Document Consultation Responses

				<p>Page 11 – “Negative: Gates to the main house are a barrier to movement but have been there since the early twentieth century.” – I’m surprised to see the historic gates called out as a negative feature (Indeed I thought they were listed?). Given their tenure and historic significant I would have thought that from a heritage/architectural perspective we’d want them preserved. Calling them out as a negative almost implies we’d be happy if the scrap metal man came and took them away.</p>
				<p>Page 11 – “The low concrete posts apparently removed in 2015 better reflected the character and appearance, particularly in terms of scale.” I’m surprised to see that 1980s concrete street lamps are called out as a positive feature of the conservation area. In my personal opinion the low concrete posts, with significant ‘arm’ overhang were quite imposing on the streetscape, cutting into the views down the streets, and gave out a lot of light pollution. Whereas the simple dark steel posts with no arm overhang are far less imposing on the streetscape and don’t cut into the views down the streets. The LED lights give far less backscatter and associated light pollution. I guess this serves to illustrate that there can be a variety of opinions on such topics. NB: I’d agree that urban lighting density in the modern developments is excessive for the rural context.</p>
				<p>Page 13 – “Note use of block paving and entrance splay, both of which introduce negative designs into the conservation area.” – I’m a little bit baffled as to what is negative about block paving, but no reference made to tarmac and concrete drives elsewhere in the village being negative, so presumably tarmac now our preferred driveway material of choice? I thought generally that tarmac and concrete driveways were frowned upon because of their permeability and that block paving had better ‘soak away’ characteristics.</p>

Village Document Consultation Responses

				Page 20 – “Incorporates a number of nineteenth-century park features including a fish pond” – Incorrect - The fish pond is long since gone, now just the historic Duck Decoy (which has been split by Skipwith Road being built over it)
				Page 23 –the Village Hall and the Escrick and Deighton Club are two separate buildings/facilities, so would be best to make the title ‘4.2.7 – Village Hall, Escrick & Deighton Club, Alms Houses and bowling green’
				Page 24 – 4.2.8 should refer to the grounds of Escrick and Deighton Club (the village hall doesn’t have any grounds, it sits in the grounds of Escrick and Deighton club)
				Areas not covered but worth considering:
				The report does not look forward at some of the emerging challenges and considerations, for example:
				Solar panels – are these to be supported within the conservation area? – the balance between ecological conservation, and architectural conservation.
				Heat pump equipment – is guidance needed on the siting of heat pump equipment? – a number of units have been installed on prominent front wall locations within the conservation area
				Similarly, we’re likely to need a plethora of electric vehicle charging infrastructure over the next decade. Is there any guidance how best to incorporate this into the conservation area? (particularly those areas that rely upon on-street parking)
Chris Shepherd		no addresss	Cawood	I fully support that the school playing fields, Kensbury and the former ferry landing area should be included in the conservation area as per the recommendation within the appraisal.

Village Document Consultation Responses

Mrs Pauline Cogan		11 Northfield Lane, Riccall, YO19 6QF	Riccall	My comment is in relation to item 4.0 Landscape character in the Riccall Conservation Area Appraisal.
				I would suggest that in terms of open space outside of the conservation area, the farmland and allotments to the north west of the said area, adjacent to the school playing fields and accessible from the end of Northfield Lane (marked as a historic route), should also be considered as making some contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
Eric Hardy		27 Carrs Meadow, Escrick, YO19 6JZ	Escrick	From this open space, views are afforded of the historic manor house and its location to the settlement as a whole, which, although it is not in the marked conservation area, is a significant part of the village's heritage.
				Also, when villagers return from visiting the allotments or enjoying a countryside walk (as many do!) and head back down Northfield Lane towards the junction with the Main Street/York Road (site of the historic pinfold) they directly pass and view historic farm workers cottages (7 and 9 Northfield
				Lane) which serve to remind villagers of the strong past and present agricultural heritage, whilst reinforcing the relationship of the historic settlement to the surrounding fields and countryside.
Antoni Janik		100 Main Street, Monk Fryston, LS25 5DU	Monk Fryston	If this greenbelt land was to be developed for more residential housing under proposals that have been made and rejected by SDC, I sincerely believe this would further undermine and negatively impact how we preserve Riccall's conservation area and it's special connections with the landscape from which it originated.

Village Document Consultation Responses

				<p>You comment that there are "no traffic calming measures" along the A63. I find this an interesting comment as many years ago (probably 10 +) a consultation took place regarding traffic calming in Monk Fryston. After several years it was decided that the double white lines which ran down the centre of the road through the village would be erased. We were told at the time that this was a "traffic calming measure". I am happy to see that this ridiculous suggestion has now been discredited.</p>
				<p>The biggest contribution to traffic calming and slowing traffic through the village would be to re introduce the double white lines as this gives a visible indicator to drivers that caution is needed and would prevent drivers overtaking and straight lining the double bend near the junction near the Post Office.</p>
				<p>I did contact the highways department at the time of the white line removal to comment on the potential danger of their actions but was told that there was no intention to replace them.</p>
				<p>I would be grateful if this could at least be considered.</p>
Thomas Morris		Prospect House, Main Steet, Hillam, North Yorks, LS25 5HG	Monk Fryston	<p>In relation to recommendation 7: imposing a 20mph speed limit on Monk Fryston Main Street - I would strongly support this. However, I would ask that the limit be extended through Lumby Hill and the main road through Hillam. It would seem bizarre not to have this continuity, effectively encouraging drivers to 'speed up' as they leave the A63 and pass Monk Fryston Primary School on Lumby Hill and into the narrow corners and blind summits of Hillam Main Street, which would have higher speed limits. The two communities effectively act as one and a single safe speed limit would benefit both. This would also deter any drivers who get frustrated with 20mph zones from seeking to circumvent the situation by detouring through Hillam.</p>

Village Document Consultation Responses

Matthew Blackburn		56 Main Street, Riccall, YO19 6QD	Riccall	I'm writing to put forward my opposition to any extensive further development in Riccall, at least without significant investment in local infrastructure and education in the village.
				Infrastructure specifically includes faster broadband to keep pace with work pattern changes as we move out of the covid pandemic and to facilitate local business innovation. Additionally, I don't believe the current electricity infrastructure is sufficient for the village as it currently is; adding more demand to the system will only exacerbate the regular power cuts we experience.
				I'm aware of plans to demolish Tamwood house on Station Rd and build several new houses on the site. In addition to the concerns outlined above; there are already several recent property developments on Station Rd that, in my opinion, do not meet the aesthetic character of the village. Tamworth is an historic building with, I am told, a large picturesque garden that provides a pleasant view for many residents of the area. It is an enviable family property that should be put to use in its current state.
				I hope my comments contribute to the discussion of the Riccall conservation area, and that the council support the people and history of Riccall.
Janis Keys		5 The Hollies, Riccall	Riccall	We have been advised that there has been a proposal for planning permission for a proposed housing development by Barrett/David Wilson homes for 80 properties at end of York Road junction of A19. How can this be approved

Village Document Consultation Responses

				<p>when: 1. The water tower is almost at capacity in provision as it stands at the present 2. Access on to York Road/junction A19 the proposal is almost on top of the junction to the A19 where this would lead to road issues on accessing and negotiating at such a busy and dangerous junction. Already accidents at this point are a regular occurrence 3. Amenities such as electricity where we already have regular power cuts, what will happen with further properties being built and impacting on what is already a burden on provision 4. Lastly we were advised that no further housing developments would take place due to the above issues and the heavy load this would place on what was already over loaded utilities provision and road capacity within the village. Lastly your aim was to ensure the conservation of what is a beautiful village why destroy the aspect of what you are trying to protect.</p>
Jan Reczkowski		2 Kelfield Close, Riccall, YO19 6PY	Riccall	<p>Tamwood is a building which was left to charity by its's last owners and I believe the last thing they would have imagined would be that the charity would sell it for it to be knocked down and other properties developed. It needs to stay ! We need to conserve more historical things as we have too many houses and cars in an already saturated village. The A19 already struggles with traffic flow at peak times so more housing development is a bad idea! Keep villages small !</p>

Village Document Consultation Responses

David Turner		40 Main Street, Riccall, York, YO19 6QA	Riccall	<p>looking at the plans for riccall, i would like to comment on this page, living in the village for nearly 40 years and in the conservation area, i feel that even this part of the village has not been dealt with sympathetically to keep what is supposed to be the old part of riccall, areas that need adding are station road and to be honest, the larger the village gets the more it effects this conservation area in the village, 400 year old buildings take the brunt of modern day pollution and you can see this in the houses themselves, i would like to propose that the whole of riccall be given conservation status to protect the area of conservation and the rest of the village so that riccall does not become overwhelmed with housing that the village cannot sustain and also to protect surrounding areas of flood wash and greenbelt land, like most people who buy homes in villages it is for that reason we do, i do not want the village to become one huge estate that will effect house prices here and also the areas we love, there are plenty of brown field areas that are available that would clear many eye sore ares and make them habital with new homes schools and shops to accomodate. i feel like the heart is being ripped out of many villages around us and a full village conservation area would protect us from becoming just another huge village with no heart. conservation is also about protecting village life as well as its designated buildings something that modern day planners often forget as all they want is huge profits and walk away thank you for allowing us to make our suggestions to you and i sincerely hope that they are listened to and this is not just another pr stunt. if you want to see how much the conservation area has been diminished then put a todays map and one from 50 years ago you will see the demise of this area even today houses like tamwood are homes that want to be arazed from menory riccall needs to be a full conservation area to protect it as a village</p>
--------------	--	--	---------	--