

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	Leeds Road	<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.</p> <p>Page 33 view 28 photo has a description referring to further along the river.</p> <p>Page 45 describes the junction of Park Street and The Crescent.</p>
6	22.01.2021	James Langer	Historic England	<p>Langer, James <James.Langer@HistoricEngland.org.uk></p>		<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>

Tadcaster CAA Comments Database

Rep.No	Date Received	Name	Organisation	Email	Con Area	Comment
1	15/03/21	CR Burton	resident	crburt@btinternet.com	Tadcaster	The only comment I would make is that the whole plan seems to be aimed at reducing car parking in the town centre which in my view would be counterproductive in the development and wellbeing of the town. Over the last few years, the council have been trying to encourage people to come to the town for the beach, walks etc so without central car parking this will have been in vain. Also where will visitors park to access eating establishments, functions at the Riley Smith Hall, Church School rooms, church services and funerals, meetings at Council Offices.
2	21/03/21	Caroline Wyatt	resident	carolinewyatt69@hotmail.com	Tadcaster	<p>I welcome much of what is said in this Appraisal. Tadcaster has for too long been left to decline. The amount of empty/derelict buildings of historic importance is a disgrace. I just hope that you have the influence to make these changes.</p> <p>My property backs on to Robin Hoods Yard, our only access is across this Yard. As you can see posts were put up to prevent any parking in this area.</p> <p>We had a long, very expensive legal battle to guarantee an access route as SSOB stated they owned RHY. We eventually signed an agreement with clauses such as - not objecting to any planning application made for the land, not running a business from our</p>

Tadcaster CAA Comments Database

						<p>homes, following the route down Pegg Lane and round the posts, (although they couldn't determine the ownership of Pegg Lane). Our Historic access from Kirkgate (identified on various conveyances) is down the cobbled route by No 24, this has been altered to make it impossible for vehicular access.</p> <p>The Maintenance of RHY is a constant irritant and numerous requests by residents have fallen on deaf ears!</p> <p>We welcome the proposed change to RHY but need assurance that parking for residents and visitors and access for all vehicles can be maintained.</p>
3	21/03/21	Gary Lee Wigley	resident	wigleygary@yahoo.co.uk	Tadcaster	<p>I have lived in Tadcaster for 9 years, having lived and being brought up in Leeds. The people are friendly, and many are proud of Tadcaster. However, the way that Humphrey Smith has been allowed to control Tadcaster is unbelievable. If he does not like anything it does not happen, the farce with the footbridge is one example, he has values that come from the early 1900's.</p> <p>The amount of derelict buildings that are owned by him is many. When you look at historic places like Otley and Ilkley, that attracts thousands of visitors each year, then you look at Tadcaster that reminds me of estates in Leeds like Halton Moor with its many</p>

Tadcaster CAA Comments Database

						<p>empty homes. I strongly welcome any work in Tadcaster that improves it and keeps the history of Tadcaster, but while ever you allow Humphrey Smith to control what happens in Tadcaster it will be a waste of money. He even controls what business can operate in Tadcaster. I have friends that ask me ' why are the Council not repairing all these empty properties when we have so many homeless'. We have a democratically council in place to ensure the will of the people is followed, but we have an individual that has the final say on anything Tadcaster. It reminds me of an American movie where the whole small town is controlled by one rich person.</p> <p>Tadcaster is a lovely place to live, because of its people, it could be a fantastic place to visit if someone had the courage to stand against Humphrey.</p>
4	21/03/21	Holly Hemsworth	resident	holly545@hotmail.co.uk	Tadcaster	<p>I disagree strongly with the plans to build on the central car park. There will not be adequate parking for residents or visitors without this. The proposed new area for car park development is much smaller and liable to flooding making it not fit for a replacement car park. The argument that this was once a site for housing is irrelevant given there was not the need for substantial car parking at that time. The focus should be on developing the derelict and dilapidated buildings all around that area. This would not only provide extra housing but also improve the street scene.</p>

Tadcaster CAA Comments Database

5	08/04/21	Craig Broadwith	Historic England	Craig.Broadwith@HistoricEngland.org.uk	Tadcaster	See PDF
6	21/04/21	Julie Askham	resident	Julie.askham@gmail.com	Tadcaster	I grew up in Tadcaster and my parents still live in the town. The documents seem to be suggesting that the main car park in the centre of Tadcaster will be reduced/removed. I do NOT think that this is a good idea. Having a car park in the centre of town means that people are able to park to visit the local shops in the towable centre. Removing/reducing this facility will kill the town centre! The suggested replacement will not be large enough to accommodate the number of cars that use the car park now.
7	21/03/21	Julie Hornshaw	resident	julie.hornshaw@gmail.com	Tadcaster	<p>I think the derelict unused buildings in Tadcaster need to be renovated and used for housing rather than building more new housing in the town centre.</p> <p>The central car park needs to be retained but the surface needs to be improved and laid out with markings as usually seen in car parks.</p> <p>The former vicarage gardens should be turned into a park/gardens for the town which would be beneficial for the community and would improve the area for visitors.</p> <p>The traditional shop fronts need to be maintained and independent businesses given some sort of grant to encourage them to set up in the unused shops.</p>

Tadcaster CAA Comments Database

8	21/03/21	Katrina Tempest	resident	tina_lally@hormail.co.uk	Tadcaster	There is so many empty buildings in Tadcaster, and business premises that could bring money into Tadcaster and rejuvenate the area, also there is nothing for the younger children to do, there is only one park which is not fit for purpose and not any good for very young children, Tadcaster is a shell of what it could be and other villages have so much more to offer. Also, the riverbank could have picnic benches and a safe route down to the beach area.
9	21/03/21	Lewis Buckle	resident	gsk0001@gmail.com	Tadcaster	I think the main focus must be the renovation of derelict buildings and the addition of new build housing developments as the housing situation in Tadcaster is horrendous compared to surrounding areas. If local landowners don't comply legal powers must be used for the future survival of Tadcaster.
10	21/03/21	Louise Parkinson	resident	lparkins7547@sky.com	Tadcaster	I was wondering if there are plans to improve the appearance of the walkway over the top of the viaduct? If this area was regenerated and planted with lots of beautiful flowers and plants, it could be a huge pull for walkers and tourists.
11	08/03/21	Paul Bissett	resident	pb15ett@gmail.com	Tadcaster	I very much agree with the proposals made in this document. In particular I feel that it is important to use quality materials - not pvc within the Conservation area. I feel particularly strongly that all derelict properties, whether shops residential must be renovated and put back into everyday use. The town

Tadcaster CAA Comments Database

						has had a rundown atmosphere for far too long which results in reduced commerce and reduced tax revenue. We need a nice place to live.
12	14/04/21	Peter Rowe	NYCC	peter.rowe1@northyorks.gov.uk	Tadcaster	<p>I am just reading through the Tadcaster appraisal and enjoying the layout and interactive map. I'd better make some comments as I read through:-</p> <p>1.6 – Special mention of the chimneys being a particularly dominant landscape feature in distant views?</p> <p>2.0 – You could push the origins of Tadcaster back a bit if you wanted to reference the following which sounds like a prehistoric inhumation:-</p> <p>In around 1886, during extension to John Smith's Brewery, alongside Centre Lane, the skeleton of an adult male was unearthed, together with a blue stone axe, chisel-shaped stones and flint arrowhead(s) (1).</p> <p><1> Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 1977 - 1980, Yorkshire Studies Card, SE44SE 2523 (Card Index). SNY2.</p> <p>in this section I might include a statement that the High Street with its long narrow properties on either side is likely to be the result of the Norman reorganisation of the town in the later 11th century.</p>

Tadcaster CAA Comments Database

						<p>The less structured, curving, streets to the north, may represent earlier organic, and less formal growth of the settlement.</p> <p>The bit about the earthwork on the first edition map is very interesting and I have added this to the HER. It's perhaps a bit unfair to single out the MAP report here as there have been a number of other organisations who have worked in this part of the town.</p> <p>6.2.1& 6.2.5 – Good to see archaeological potential mentioned here and this will help greatly should the sites progress. Pleased to see community archaeology included.</p> <p>Recommendation 3 – You have my support here.</p> <p>Overall, I think it is very good and doesn't get bogged down in detail but makes recommendations for further work. I think the reason many local authorities get behind on their appraisals is that they are too detailed, so I think this is a good way forward.</p>
13	16/04/21	Kate Martyn	Donald Insall Associates obo SSOBT	kate.martyn@insall-architects.co.uk	Tadcaster	See PDF

Tadcaster CAA Comments Database

14	16/04/21	Stephanie Dick	SDC	sdick@selby.gov.uk	Tadcaster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why does the north-eastern boundary of the proposed conservation area cut in to hug the river? Surely anything that is proposed between the river and the road in this location will have a significant effect on the setting of a large swathe of the conservation area. Would it not be better to just include it, to ensure a consistent approach and safeguards for the historic river corridor? (Using the same rationale for inclusion that's been used for the John Smith's and the Riverside Public Car Parks later in the document). This is assuming the land is not protected by other means (e.g., environmental designation). • p9 – "Small alleyways survive between buildings leading to dwellings, outbuildings and yards within rear plots." <p>Are these culturally/traditionally the same as the Snickleways of York? And is there a local word or reference for these which is worth recording here?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.2 [p10] – "Medieval burgage plot boundaries are difficult to read in the historic townscape possibly because many may date back to a pre-conquest (Late Saxon) land ownership." <p>How does this follow? Does this statement make sense?</p>
----	----------	----------------	-----	--	-----------	--

					<ul style="list-style-type: none">• p14 – “Reconstructions and replacement shop fronts that reflect a traditional style should be avoided. Contemporary design may be appropriate where it results in enhancement.” <p>I categorically and fundamentally disagree with the first statement, and equally strongly support the second.</p> <p>Surely the critical reinstatement of a lost shopfront would also constitute an enhancement of the historic environment, so why should this be avoided? Design decisions should be responsive to context (cultural/historic/environmental/etc), based on variety of factors, and be allowed to draw upon the rich canon of existing and emerging design excellence, coupled with an informed understanding of place. (Article 9 notwithstanding, for reasons I’d be happy to discuss further.)</p> <p>By definition ‘contemporary’ includes anything built now, irrespective of stylistic influences.</p> <p>At the same time, this advice seems to run contrary to the spirit, intent, and purpose of Conservation Areas as spelt out on p35, which “exist to protect the features and the characteristics that make a historic place unique and distinctive.”</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>[p15] cites the damage done to Tadcaster by unsympathetic alterations such as ‘modern’ shopfronts, but which were presumably ‘contemporary’ when they were created.</p> <p>Pastiche and poor quality ‘faux’ traditional shop fronts should be avoided, but the sentence has other meaning. In comparison the Selby CAA recommends a shop front and window/door replacement design guide “to improve the quality of existing and proposed shop fronts” and recommends “the restoration of the original frontage” of some of the modern buildings on Gowthorpe.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 6.2.5 Former Vicarage Garden ‘grassed area with no known use’ ... Shouldn’t we find out if it has a use, rather than put that in print?• p30 – Recommendation 2 – How much weight or importance are we giving to maintaining the backland character and appearance of Robin Hood’s Yard, given that it is inextricably linked to the successful delivery of a scheme on the Central Area Car Park, and some development might be useful to achieve that objective?• p34 – Architectural Periods/Styles – The definition of Vernacular should pertain to Tadcaster, not Selby.
--	--	--	--	--	--

Tadcaster CAA Comments Database

15	21/03/21	Sue Lawrie	resident	Susan.elcock@ hotmail.co.uk	Tadcaster	Please provide comments here on the Conservation Area Appraisal document: I am not disagreeing with the new proposal all I want to know is if houses are built on main carpark where do myself and husband park where we live on westgate it has a 2hr restriction of parking I am a caseworker around tad and Sherburn so in and out most of day we both need car parking spaces.
16	23/03/21	Susan Tennant	resident	sue_tennant@hotmail.com	Tadcaster	The document certainly shows that there is a lot of scope for improvement in the Tadcaster Conservation Area!! As a resident of Tadcaster the improvements that would provide the most immediate benefit would be if the derelict and dilapidated buildings were brought up to an acceptable standard and if empty buildings, both residential and commercial, were occupied. The current impression is overwhelmingly of a run-downtown with few reasons to visit or linger very long. Post pandemic planning provides a unique opportunity to prioritise boosting the local economy by providing and enhancing existing local facilities at a time when people are more likely to be needing these as commuting becomes less prevalent. Any improvements that would encourage residents to shop, socialise and exercise locally and encourage visitors to the town are to be encouraged.

Tadcaster CAA Comments Database

17	15/04/21	Delton Jackson	SDC	djackson@selby.gov.uk	Tadcaster	<p>Comments & Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why does the northeastern boundary of the proposed conservation area cut in to hug the river? Surely anything that is proposed between the river and the road in this location will have a significant effect on the setting of a large swathe of the conservation area... Would it not be better to just include it, to ensure a consistent approach and safeguards for the historic river corridor? (Using the same rationale for inclusion that's been used for the John Smith's and the Riverside Public Car Parks later in the same document...) • p9 – “Small alleyways survive between buildings leading to dwellings, outbuildings and yards within rear plots.” <p>Are these culturally/traditionally the same as the Snickleways of York? And is there a local word or reference for these which is worth recording?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.2 [p10] – “Medieval burgage plot boundaries are difficult to read in the historic townscape possibly because many may date back to a pre-conquest (Late Saxon) land ownership.” <p>How does this follow? Does this statement make sense?</p>
----	----------	----------------	-----	--	-----------	--

					<ul style="list-style-type: none">• p14 – “Reconstructions and replacement shop fronts that reflect a traditional style should be avoided. Contemporary design may be appropriate where it results in enhancement.” <p>I categorically and fundamentally disagree with the first statement, and equally strongly support the second.</p> <p>Surely the critical reinstatement of a lost shopfront would also constitute an enhancement of the historic environment, so why should this be avoided? Design decisions should be responsive to context (cultural/historic/environmental/etc), based on variety of factors, and be allowed to draw upon the rich canon of existing and emerging design excellence, coupled with an informed understanding of place. (Article 9 notwithstanding, for reasons I’d be happy to discuss further.)</p> <p>To do otherwise is like telling a musician that they can only play one style of music, or an artist how to do ‘art’... Equally, by definition ‘contemporary’ includes anything built now, irrespective of stylistic influences.</p> <p>At the same time, this advice seems to run contrary to the spirit, intent, and purpose of Conservation Areas as spelt out on p35, which “exist to protect the features and the characteristics that make a historic place</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Tadcaster CAA Comments Database

						<p>unique and distinctive.”</p> <p>A final point: Literally, the very next page [p15] cites the damage done to Tadcaster by unsympathetic alterations such as ‘modern’ shopfronts, but which were presumably ‘contemporary’ when they were created. The old saying that “the only thing we learn from history is that we never learn anything from history” suddenly springs to mind...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.2.5 Former Vicarage Garden ‘grassed area with no known use’ ... Shouldn’t we find out if it has a use, rather than put that in print? • p30 – Recommendation 2 – How much weight or importance are we giving to maintaining the backland character and appearance of Robin Hood’s Yard, given that it is inextricably linked to the successful delivery of a scheme on the Central Area Car Park, and some development might be useful to achieve that objective? • p34 – Architectural Periods/Styles – The definition of Vernacular should pertain to Tadcaster, not Selby.
18	07/04/21	Jane Crowther	Tadcaster Town Council	clerk@tadcastertowncouncil.gov.uk	Tadcaster	see PDF

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.
				<u>Headline views:</u>

Village Document Consultation Responses

				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;
				21 st century infill.

Village Document Consultation Responses

				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>
				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.

Village Document Consultation Responses

				<p>Page 33 / Recommendation 5: “<i>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>” 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>
				<u>Detailed feedback:</u>
				<i>General</i>
				<p>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.</p>
				<i>Map – Historic Development Analysis:</i>

Village Document Consultation Responses

				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 ?)
				Map – Archaeology:
				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)
				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

Village Document Consultation Responses

				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:
				<i>“...the home of the private Queen Margaret School since 1949. Previously the school was housed in the Grade II listed Parsonage.”</i> Incorrect – previously the school was in Scarborough, then briefly Castle Howard during the war, prior to moving into Escrick in 1949. The school subsequently occupied many buildings in the village, including the now Parsonage and Dower House (but not prior to 1949).
				St <u>Mary’s</u> Church – 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’ survived at the Hall until then.”</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.

Village Document Consultation Responses

				<p><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.</p>
				<p><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.</p>
				<p><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.</p>
				<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>

Village Document Consultation Responses

				The author appears to have chosen unrepresentative negative pictures to illustrate 20 th 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.
				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.
				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.

Village Document Consultation Responses

				<p>Page 11 – “<i>The low concrete posts apparently removed in 2015 better reflected the character and appearance, particularly in terms of scale.</i>” 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 – “<i>Note use of block paving and entrance splay, both of which introduce negative designs into the conservation area.</i>” – 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>
				<p>Page 20 – “<i>Incorporates a number of nineteenth-century park features including a fish pond</i>” – 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)</p>
				<p>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’</p>

Village Document Consultation Responses

				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)
				<u>Areas not covered but worth considering:</u>
				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.
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.

Village Document Consultation Responses

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.
				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.
				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.

Village Document Consultation Responses

				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.
				I would be grateful if this could at least be considered.
Thomas Morris		Prospect House, Main Steet, Hillam, North Yorks, LS25 5HG	Monk Fryston	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.
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.

Village Document Consultation Responses

				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
				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.

Village Document Consultation Responses

Jan Reczkowski		2 Kelfield Close, Riccall, YO19 6PY	Riccall	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 !
David Turner		40 Main Street, Riccall, York, YO19 6QA	Riccall	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

Village Document Consultation Responses

				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
--	--	--	--	--