

ASPECT OF PID COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
Tadcaster in 2040	<p>SSOB – 1) I note reference to the River Wharfe ‘no longer being an underused and forgotten resource but instead the green centrepiece of a bold new Riverside Park’. There is no evidence cited to support the underlying contention in this statement, that the River is in anyway ‘forgotten’ or ‘underused’. In my opinion the River and the surrounding 2 grassed areas represent a significant natural asset to this settlement, as recognised by the District Council’s identification of these areas as Amenity Open Space. I am familiar with the settlement and the levels of recreational activity that occur along the River frontage during a typical day. I consider that this statement is inaccurate and not supported by evidence. 2) In addition, the Town’s existing connections to the A64 are perfectly adequate for current and future needs of the settlement. There is no compelling evidence to show that the town would benefit from additional access to the A64.</p> <p>GPE - It is considered that the vision is sufficiently aspirational, to involve the entire population of the town,</p>	<p>1) DISAGREE – the exact reference is in fact “will no longer be an underused and not fully realised resource...”. SDC’s Amenity Open Space designation is acknowledged, but this does not in itself conflict with the reference. Only 2 areas of the west bank – town-council owned - are open to the public, offering only grassed areas, occasional benches and planting damaged by flooding. The river itself is never used. It is considered that there is huge potential to strengthen the protection for these areas and to significantly improve their appearance and offer to visitors.</p> <p>2) DISAGREE – it is considered that the currently inadequate A64 connections result in town centre traffic congestion, noise and air pollution that could be alleviated. Improved connections would also increase the town’s resilience at times of flooding when the town is cut in half. SDC has considered junction improvements in the past and indeed they are referenced in the latest Preferred Options Local Plan (ref Land at London Road TADC-M).</p> <p>NOTED – the length of the statement is consistent with ‘vision statements’ in other made NDPs. It is considered</p>	<p>1) ACTION – assess 2 areas as candidate Local Green Space, include a NP policy proposing creation of new riverside park and a complementary non-planning community action addressing non-planning policy matters such as potential community involvement.</p> <p>2) ACTION – compile further evidence in support of improved connections, including existing SDC work.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>and environs. As always it would be welcomed if such statements were more concise.</p> <p>not while smiths have control</p> <p>although without the support of humphrey smith you have no chance</p> <p>vision depends on what humphrey smith agrees to</p> <p>cafe culture street scene suggests pedestrian areas. where will disabled residents who need vehicular access feature in this?</p> <p>its a dream and will never happen</p> <p>It sounds wonderful but unachievable</p> <p>vision is all very well but everyone's vision is different.</p> <p>Not if it means the central car park being development</p>	<p>proportionate to the range of issues that need to be addressed in the town.</p> <p>NOTED – the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowning breweries and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.</p> <p>NOTED – the 2 are not inconsistent. Disabled parking provision/access are routinely incorporated into pedestrianised areas.</p> <p>DISAGREE – it is considered a challenging but achievable aspirational 'vision'. Better to aim high and achieve something than accept the status quo.</p> <p>NOTED – this and future consultations are designed to work towards community consensus on what a vision should contain. This 1st iteration was supported by 76% of respondents, with only 17.33% disagreeing. The town council welcomes other views on what the vision should be.</p> <p>NOTED – the vision statement makes no mention of the central car park. The central car park development is not a NDP proposal – it is an SDC Local Plan proposal which, if ultimately adopted, the NDP cannot oppose as NDPs must be in general conformity with Local</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

		Plans. The NDP is looking to have influence over the shape of such a development in the event it comes to pass which is considered preferable to it having no influence. This does not constitute agreement with the proposed development.	
	At last! Fabulous	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Providing the government have the finances	NOTED – while Government finances may have some bearing on the delivery of the NDP vision, it is essentially a planning-based document, the delivery of which will rest largely with SDC's implementation of the plan's policies, together with the actions of a range of partners in respect of the delivery of the plan's non-planning community actions.	NO ACTION
	wonderful but unacheivable	DISAGREE – it is considered a challenging but achievable aspirational 'vision'. Better to aim high and achieve something than accept the status quo.	NO ACTION
	I would like Tadcaster to be a small picturesque town not massively changed.	NOTED – the vision does not aspire to a substantially changed town; rather it seeks to maintain and improve what is good about it – including its picturesqueness – while managing the changes which will inevitably be brought about as a result of SDC policies with which the NDP cannot be in conflict.	NO ACTION

	<p>With some revisions</p> <p>There should be a vision for at most 10 years. A 20 year vision is too far ahead as there are many external factors which may need to be taken into account, for example measures to reduce global heating and deal with the impact of it.</p> <p>This seems to be a set of constraints beyond normal Planning Rules</p> <p>Tad is a hidden gem , which deserves to be vibrant and energetic , like the surrounding communities</p> <p>I'd like to see it earlier than 2040</p> <p>This question is phrased in a difficult way. If somebody has a vision of Tadcaster in 2040 as outlined in the document, then of course I can agree with the "vision" - it's somebody's vision. I think the question is trying to find out whether it is my "vision", and that's a tough one - for a first, and key, question, I think a different question should have been asked here.</p> <p>I agree with the vision in the main. One part of what drew me to Tadcaster was the quaintness and quietness of the</p>	<p>NOTED – it would have been helpful for suggestions re revisions to have been made.</p> <p>NOTED – the NDP time horizon has been set in order to be consistent with the Local Plan time horizon. There is scope to review/update the NDP if/as considered necessary I order to keep up with changing external factors.</p> <p>DISAGREE – there is nothing in the 'vision' which either sets constraints or is beyond normal planning rules. Indeed this is also true of the planning intentions. Examples of specific instances where this is deemed to be the case would have been helpful.</p> <p>NOTED – the plan vision seeks to deliver on this.</p> <p>NOTED – the 2040 time horizon is set by the SDC Local Plan time horizon.</p> <p>NOTED – the question is asked first, because the plan's vision comes first, setting the context from which the plan's aims, policies and actions all then flow. The town council welcomes other views on what the vision should be.</p> <p>NOTED – the town council considers that the town (NB not village) has a</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>place. I fear that additional housing developments would take this element of the village away however.</p> <p>this seems very reminiscent of the proposals put forward by Sam Smiths Old Brewery some time back</p> <p>Some of the sentiments I would agree with, but the inclusion of a riverside park makes me totally opposed. I strongly disagree that the riverside is “underused and not fully realised resource” I would suggest that the natural environs of such a beautiful & historic area should be protected from being irreversible damage that playground equipment and other installations would bring. This is quite aside from the significant dangers from placing play equipment adjacent to an area frequently in flood.</p> <p>I completely agree with it, I agree that this town does have major potential both culturally and economically, but also</p>	<p>housing need. It is also one of Selby’s 3 main settlements. That said, the NDP is not proposing any specific housing sites but will develop policies to guide development on sites likely to be allocated by SDC.</p> <p>NOTED – the vision reflects previous community feedback and the brainstorming of the NDP steering group. The policy intentions are set within the context of the emerging local plan proposals – the NDP must be in general conformity, not conflict, with the adopted Local Plan – it is likely it will be adopted before the NDP. If not, it would override the NDP where there are conflicts.</p> <p>DISAGREE – only 2 areas of the west bank – town-council owned - are open to the public, offering only grassed areas, occasional benches and planting damaged by flooding. The river itself is never used. It is considered that there is huge potential to strengthen the protection for these areas and to significantly improve their appearance and offer to visitors, including a playground. This is no way incompatible with a riverside location – ref Otley’s Riverside Park which floods often.</p> <p>NOTED – the flooding issue is already in hand – the NDP will address it directly only if it can add value to existing SDC</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – assess 2 areas as candidate Local Green Space, include a NP policy proposing creation of new riverside park and a complementary non-planning community action addressing non-planning policy matters such as potential community involvement.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>that we need to tackle major threats to these such as flooding and housing/commercial abandonment.</p> <p>slightly worried we just dont want the town to loose its character with too many new houses</p> <p>No mention of schools, doctors surgeries, new shops and the ability of current access roads to cope with additional traffic from new housing</p> <p>I think it should go much further to help attract young people to stay and work here. Tadcaster has become so expensive to rent housing that no-one on an average local wage can afford to live here.</p> <p>I like what I read but I'm not confident it will be achieved. We've seen something like this in the mid-1980's called 'The vision of Tadcaster'. The cynic in me thinks this will</p>	<p>Local Plan provisions. The NDP includes policy intentions in respect of empty properties.</p> <p>NOTED – the NDP aims to conserve existing character. The amount and location of new housing will be determined by SDC not the NDP – the NDP will work to shape all new housing development such that it fits the local character.</p> <p>NOTED – as the new housing is proposed by SDC in its emerging Local Plan and not in the NDP, it is the role of SDC to address the associated infrastructure issues referred to. That said, the NDP's 'Traffic Transport Travel' section does address highway improvements. The town's primary schools are severely under-capacity and will remain so even allowing for SDC proposed housing. Acknowledged that more could be done to encourage more shops into the town. Evidence on the current capacity of doctors' and dental surgeries would be useful.</p> <p>NOTED – The commissioning of a Housing Needs Assessment will provide evidence re the need for more rented accommodation at affordable cost.</p> <p>NOTED - it is considered a challenging but achievable aspirational 'vision'. The town council has been and will continue</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action re encouraging more shop traders into the town. Contact doctors'/dental surgeries re their current/future patient capacity.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>achieve the same very limited levels of success whilst SSOB Tadcaster, a key landowner, continue to oppose anything synonymous with progress.</p> <p>The aspiration for better road links to the A64 must include support for construction of the Tadcaster Bar Interchange at the eastern end of the Tadcaster ByPass. See further comment under Traffic, transport and travel.</p> <p>It is clear that this has not been looked at in a practical way and is "pie in the sky" no thought or back up plans for when the major landowner says no</p> <p>Only because we have been here many times before and most of your vision is stopped by one man.</p> <p>It is a brilliant vision and let's get started ASAP</p> <p>It has the potential of the right people are involved and the whole community gets behind it</p> <p>Particularly with regard to the numerous unoccupied houses and shops.</p> <p>These changes need to happen sooner rather than later. Tadcaster desperately needs change now. I understand this is a long term plan but this needs to happen before 2040.</p> <p>Would be very interested in seeing the vision and how things will look. Tadcaster is very depressed and tired looking and over the years has got progressively worse</p>	<p>to be in discussion with the town's landowning breweries and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.</p> <p>DISAGREE – it is considered that A64 junction improvement is .realistically, an either/or situation and that A64/A162 improvement is on balance the better option.</p> <p>DISAGREE - it is considered a challenging but achievable aspirational 'vision'. The town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowning breweries and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the plan's time horizon, i.e. end date, is 2040. But it will begin to be implemented as soon as it is 'made', i.e. adopted.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>with the lack of investment and foresight. The town lacks so much and desperately needs this developing.</p> <p>Unsure how you will achieve this, a large number of properties and land in Tadcaster is held by Samual Smiths / Humphrey Smith , who then dictate how things progress , ie large number of empty properties etc</p> <p>The vision statement is clearly aspirational and highlights the key areas for change between now and 2040.</p> <p>There is no need for any new housing in Tadcaster what so ever, we moved to Tadcaster because of its quiet and friendly nature, this was its main strong point for us, if this was not the case we would not have bothered even looking here. Introducing new housing risks disrupting this quiet haven. although this being said what really needs to happen is to bring back the derelict properties within Tadcaster, what is the point in spending money on new housing that nobody wants in the first place when theres many run down, empty, discarded historical buildings in dire need of restoration that could be used as housing without destroying the entire look and feel of this town not to mention its major "draw" for potential home owners like us and that is the peace and quiet.</p> <p>Really happy to see that the town we moved to only a few years ago will have more services we can use</p> <p>Absolutely thrilled that this is taking shape and I and my family fully suport it. A little curious as to the 20 yeae time frame given as it could be detrimental to the town to take this long</p>	<p>NOTED - the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowning breweries and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the town council considers that there is a housing need and this is supported by SDC assessments. The town council is commissioning its own Housing Needs Assessment to ascertain the local nature of the need. The amount of and sites for new housing will be determined by SDC's Local Plan not this NDP – the NDP cannot oppose this. The plan's 'Town Centre' section indicates the intention to tackle empty properties.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the 2040 time horizon is in line with SDC's Local Plan time horizon. Plan implementation will commence as soon as final plan is 'made' i.e. adopted.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>Yes critical is to rejuvenate derelict and abandoned heritage assets in the centre</p> <p>Tadcaster is a town in its own right with a proud heritage. Over development of the housing market will lead to a loss of identity becoming another dormitory of Leeds. Expansion of the road network is to be welcomed to reduce the amount of HGV traffic passing through Leeds Road</p> <p>I believe it would be more pragmatic if you focused on the key areas with so many areas identified you will not achieve them all and a wider focus will dilute the effort and thus impact</p> <p>There seem to be plenty of aspirations but there is little detail of how the Development Plan will be reached.</p> <p>Excellent</p> <p>Theoretically Tadcaster could attract the same level and type of visitors as Wensleydale or Helmsley, but would require investment in developing the river, walks up and down the river , over the viaduct and cafe's on the riverside itself as well as sam smiths offering heritage brewery tours and of course bringing ALL the underutilised property back into use.</p> <p>About time the vacant boarded up buildings owned mainly by Sam Smiths, are renovated for public use..</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - the amount of and sites for new housing will be determined by SDC's Local Plan not this NDP – the NDP cannot oppose this.</p> <p>NOTED – as the NDP is a planning policy based document, all its policies carry equal weight and will be applied equally once the plan is 'made', i.e. adopted. There is however scope to prioritise the non-planning community actions.</p> <p>NOTED – as made clear, this is an 'Early Draft Policy Intentions Document' with the aim of getting the community's response to its proposed broad direction of travel. The detail will follow in a fully worked-up draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE – this is in line with the plan's 'vision'.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>Especially the repurposing of vacant properties into housing, cafes and shops.</p> <p>Hopefully all of this is not just on paper and will happen</p> <p>I agree with the vision overall but cannot see it being achieved until there is someone at Samuel Smiths Brewery who will not stand in the way of progress</p> <p>I think you need more shops so people will go in to Tadcaster instead of having to go into York or Leeds. All pubs need to be open and music playing to bring the money in.</p> <p>The current run-down state cannot be allowed to continue.</p> <p>The run down, tired and dilapidated state of many of the buildings renders Tadcaster as an unattractive town with no appeal.</p> <p>Disagree with your claim that we need better town centre traffic routing and flow: the only time this is an issue is when the A64 is closed causing all traffic to re-route through Tadcaster town centre. The issue with accidents on the A64 should be dealt with by Highways England and then Tadcaster wouldn't regularly see queues of vehicles backed up through from one end of the town to the other.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – once the plan is ‘made’, i.e. adopted, its implementation will commence – estimated sometime in 2023.</p> <p>NOTED - the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town’s landowning breweries and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.</p> <p>NOTED - acknowledged that more could be done to encourage more shops into the town.</p> <p>NOTED – NDP seeks to address this.</p> <p>NOTED – NDP seeks to address this.</p> <p>DISAGREE – it is considered that current A64 junctions are inadequate and result in problems with HGV brewery lorries in the town centre.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action re encouraging more shop traders into the town. Contact doctors'/dental surgeries re their current/future patient capacity.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>Disagree with your proposals for a cafe culture/street scene....please be careful when considering this idea. You will simply be encouraging noise pollution, more waste. it would be nice to have an improvement in the type of shops on the high street e.g. bakery/fishmonger etc but I certainly don't want to see cafe bars there are enough pubs and eateries in Tadcaster already. Certainly it would be a preference to see local producers being able to sell there goods but please NO MORE Costa's.</p> <p>Before any plans you should repair and rent all empty properties all empty properties regardless if SSOB own them</p> <p>It's a dream, will never happen, it should have been done thirty years ago</p> <p>Getting traffic out of town on which much depends is not adequately addressed.</p> <p>It's fantastic you're planning to regenerate Tadcaster.</p> <p>At last! Fabulous!</p> <p>Not if it means the central car park being developed.</p>	<p>NOTED – waste and noise can be managed. The benefits of fostering a café culture approach are considered to be beneficial to reinvigorating the town centre. Acknowledged that more could be done to encourage more shops into the town.</p> <p>NOTED – this is not in the gift of the NP/town council.</p> <p>DISAGREE – as stated, it is aspirational and challenging but considered achievable. The NP can only deal with the here and now and address the future, not the past.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the NP's pedestrianisation and highways improvement proposals address these issues. The comment fails to suggest what else could be done – ideas welcome.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – this is an SDC Local Plan proposal which the NP/TC cannot oppose.</p>	<p>ACTION – add new community action re encouraging more shop traders into the town. Contact doctors'/dental surgeries re their current/future patient capacity.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>Yes but i have some reservations about car parking, housing and things to do to improve air quality.</p> <p>No new houses, Tadcaster will be spoiled just like Sherburn in Elmet – facilities are nowhere near enough there and won't be here in Tadcaster (schools, doctors, etc)</p> <p>I support that you're maintaining our heritage and modernising it where (very much) needed</p> <p>This will (<i>not?</i>) happen if the obstacles which have been put in previous visions are not removed.</p>	<p>NOTED – cannot respond meaningful without understanding the reservations.</p> <p>NOTED – the town councils considers that new housing is needed. The detailed plans for housing and associated infrastructure rest with the SDC Local Plan. As a point of fact, Tadcaster's schools are well below capacity and will still be so with the level of housing proposed by SDC.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – unclear as to what is actually meant here.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Aim 1	<p>NYCC - Could this be changed to 'By identifying and conserving the town's built and archaeological heritage assets'?</p> <p>Yes by identifying buildings in need of repair and renovating them with or without the owners permission.</p> <p>Surely the town's existing built heritage assets are already identified?</p>	<p>AGREE – this would be a sensible broadening of the aim.</p> <p>NOTED – agreed that heritage buildings needing repair should be identified but renovation without the owner's permission is not within the NDP's scope.</p> <p>NOTED – listed buildings and scheduled monuments are already identified by Historic England, but no 'Non-Designated Heritage Assets.</p>	<p>ACTION – amend aim as indicated.</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re compiling list of heritage buildings in need of repair. Also research past SDC work on a Heritage Action Zone for Tadcaster.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Aim 2	<p>Very aspirational. No proper thought given to transport/congestion and the strain on the town, schools,</p>	<p>NOTED – the amount of new housing and its location will be determined by</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>medical centre, infrastructure. Tadcaster doesn't need new housing developments, new housing developments are never in keeping with the "historical and architectural quality" and they would put a huge strain on the infrastructure and resources which are needed by existing residents.</p> <p>It may be essential to design buildings such that they address issues of global heating - low carbon input, solar panels on the roof, extensive insulation, and so forth. These features need to be applied to existing buildings.</p> <p>the one that concerns me slightly is "By ensuring that all new development is in keeping with existing historical and architectural quality". I prefer older houses, to new, but I do not care for new houses that are merely carbon copies of period houses. They aim to look like the older ones, but of course they are far from it, New, interesting design can sit next to older houses and a good example of this in Tadcaster is the mixing of the modern with the historical in the swimming pool development. I live in and Edwardian terrace and the only houses extant when ours was built were Georgian - the Edwardians did not copy the Georgian design, they "moved things on".</p> <p>I disagree with point 2. Whilst I absolutely agree that there needs to be clear and well defined standards of build and redevelopment and that this should be contained within an advisory framework open to prospective redevelopers, I also think we should consider our ability to transform our town centre whilst adhering to historical architectural design. Climate change is impacting the way we build homes of the future and we shouldn't let design of the past impact our ability to build for the future. This is particularly relevant of the dilapidated buildings in the</p>	<p>the SDC Local Plan not the NDP. Associated infrastructure needs are also the responsibility of SDC. NDP policies will seek to ensure that any such development is in keeping. NDP policies will also seek to address traffic/ congestion.</p> <p>NOTED – these issues lie largely beyond the remit of NDP planning policies.</p> <p>NOTED – the built environment policies that flow from this aim will recognise the potential for innovative modern design.</p> <p>NOTED – the built environment policies that flow from this aim will recognise the potential for innovative modern design. At the same time, there is little which the NDP can add in terms of 'green design' policies which would not duplicate emerging SDC Local Plan policy. The type of investment is suggested is beyond the scope of the NDP and town council.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>town centre. Consider investing in local architects to co plan redevelopment with home owners or developers to offer sustainable, green housing that still preserves the spirit of the town.</p> <p>Why do buildings need to be 'in-keeping' it is such a wooly term and leads to the sort of bland stone and pantile pastiche and stifles architectural innovation. Why not ask for new development to be of a high-quality architectural design while respecting the historic fabric and scale of the settlement.</p>	<p>NOTED – an aim is necessarily quite broad brush. The suggested re-wording is no better or worse than the existing. It could be argued that use of the word 'respecting' is just as 'woolly' as 'in keeping'. The built environment policies which flow from the aim will be more specific and detailed.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
Aim 3	<p>Who judges these criteria ?</p>	<p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan will set out criteria, based on recommendations from the town council's consultants. The community and stakeholders will have various opportunities to comment and then vote at a referendum before they come into force. Once in force, they will be applied to planning applications by SDC planners and its successor planning authority.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
Aim 4	<p>NYCC – support in principle.</p> <p>Apart from the river footpaths where is the existing green space network? Many of the existing important routes lie outside the Tadcaster boundary and not covered by this plan.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the network is far from confined to footpaths/routes. The network within the parish will be shown on the map which will accompany the next stage draft plan. The plan cannot look outside its boundaries.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>We like them. Especially the idea of more parks as we think this is something the area is lacking at the moment.</p> <p>I personally just want to make sure we still have lots of green spaces</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the plan will seek to ensure this is the case.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Aim 5	<p>NYCC – support in principle.</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>I agree with every single one. The idea of a fully functioning high street, that is accessible and places for families - excellent</p> <p>I will be thrilled to see the run down centre revitalised and empty properties brought back to create new homes.</p> <p>Fine especially creating a vibrant town centre. The promotion of independent shops in the town centre and reducing traffic on Kirkgate and Westgate</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - acknowledged that more could be done to encourage more shops into the town.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action re encouraging more shop traders into the town. Contact doctors'/dental surgeries re their current/future patient capacity.</p>
Aim 6	<p>NYCC – support in principle.</p> <p>There are major gaps in existing provision, especially in West Tadcaster.</p> <p>They are broadly holistic and realistic yet make no explicit inclusion of digitising Tadcaster to make homes and business as connected as nearby York, with high-speed fibre and 5G connectivity making moving into both</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – while provision west of the river is considered to be reasonable, it is agreed that provision of both community and recreational facilities on the estates (between Leeds Rd/Stutton Rd) is lacking.</p> <p>NOTED –this is not considered to be a particularly pressing issue for Tadcaster. Equally, it is not an issue can be effectively addressed via a NP planning policy.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – NP policy to highlight the need in the identified area.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>residential and commercial properties more accessible and attractive.</p> <p>I agree with them- but feel there is need to highlight Sport and sporting facilities as a way of achieving the vision</p>	<p>NOTED – it is considered that sport is encompassed within recreational facilities and then specifically picked up in policy intention CFS2.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
Aim 7	<p>NYCC – support in principle.</p> <p>Mostly good, but I don't want Tadcaster to become a huge town with lots of new housing development and housing estates. It needs to meet the needs of current residents.</p> <p>Disagree, new homes need to address the needs of people from outside the town. The population needs to grow to increase the use of shops and businesses in the town.</p> <p>not at all sure about the concept of the 'right' type of housing.</p> <p>Building of homes to meet the needs of local people, this needs to be carefully considered so there is a balance of homes to attract both the higher end homes and homes for first time buyers.</p> <p>New homes - will this include bungalow builds? If more homes are on the cards, we need the infrastructure to be in place to fulfil the increase in population.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the amount and location of new housing will be determined by SDC's Local Plan, not the NDP. The NDP will seek to ensure that the houses built meet local as well as wider needs.</p> <p>NOTED – the amount and location of new housing will be determined by SDC's Local Plan, not the NDP. The NDP will seek to ensure that the houses built meet local as well as wider needs.</p> <p>NOTED – this means the type/size of homes that will meet local housing needs.</p> <p>NOTED – the balance which the plan will aspire to will be based on a local housing needs assessment to be commissioned by the town council.</p> <p>NOTED – the mix will be based on a local housing needs assessment to be commissioned by the town council. Meeting infrastructure needs associated with new housing will largely</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>I don't agree with building more homes, There's no need to make Tadcaster a busy area like towns and cities. It's nice being quiet and out the way of the rushed places</p> <p>There is no point in building new houses when there are plenty of houses in Tadcaster that need refurbishing and need to be offered first as accommodation. Too many stores are vacant and existing businesses are closing down due to terms from landlords that are unacceptable.</p> <p>The aspiration to "build homes of the right type..." requires that people from all economic backgrounds have a say and are listened to - the poorest people have the greatest need but their voices are seldom heard.</p>	<p>be the responsibility of SDC, which will determine the number and location of new homes.</p> <p>NOTED – the amount and location of new housing will be determined by SDC's Local Plan, not the NDP.</p> <p>NOTED – decisions re new house building, taking account of existing empty properties rests with SDC not the town council. NDP policy seeks to address empty properties generally in its 'Town Centre' section.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy re housing mix will be based on a local housing needs assessment to be commissioned shortly by the town council. This will involve a survey of all households including those highlighted.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Aim 8	<p>NYCC – support in principle.</p> <p>Agree. It will become increasingly important that people can live close to their place of work.</p> <p>Strongly agree with all of them, especially growing local employment opportunities.</p> <p>I'm also not sure about developing local employment opportunities. Where this is directed towards tourism I am very supportive as Tadcaster has a rich history that would be interesting to visitors akin to Ripon or Boston Spa and we should gear future employment opportunities to the service sector rather than industry which will become less</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered important to plan for a sustainable town where people have the opportunity to live and work. The focus will be on protecting the existing employment sites and supporting new suitable sites of</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	significant in a decade (furtherance of AI automating manual low skilled jobs).	whatever sector. Tourism will be part of this.	
Aim 9	<p>Agree with improving the tourism offer, but planning needs to balance the number of properties used for self-catering accommodation (e.g. AirBnB) and the local requirement for housing.</p> <p>The tourism offer should also make more use of towns closeness to last bloody battle in the UK at Towton.</p> <p>Definitely NO to a hotel anywhere in Tadcaster. I can see that SDC may be interested in doing this as then they can use it as an overflow for social housing.</p>	<p>NOTED – the plan’s policies will focus on encouraging new-build/change of use hotel and other visitor accommodation. Use of properties for AirBnB lies outside the scope of planning policy. As there are currently only a tiny number of AirBnB properties in Tadcaster, they are highly unlikely to be an issue in respect of meeting the local housing requirement.</p> <p>NOTED – as the battle site lies outside the Neighbourhood Area, the NDP can only relate to Towton through its Non-Planning Community Actions.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the idea has nothing to do with SDC. The idea is well supported by the community and considered to be an important part of improving the town’s tourism offer.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add Battle of Towton to existing promote tourism action.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Aim 10	<p>NYCC – support in principle.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>How are proposals for better routes for public rights of way users to be achieved ? The public's support for a ROW across a well established pedestrian route across the former Barnardo's site on Wighill Lane was defeated by the landowner in 2015 following two public inquiries.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the plan will include a planning policy identifying and supporting the provision of new proposed routes. This will be subject to full consultation, including with landowners, with an independent examiner and then a community</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

		referendum deciding on whether the policy is adopted. This will then set the context for attempted implementation which may or may not come to fruition in the plan period.	
Aim 11	The most important aim for me is the regeneration of derelict or vacant sites and buildings in the town. They are a blight on the town and if further development is planned the town needs to be capable of meeting the needs of the residents.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	sort out eyesores	NOTED	NO ACTION
	empty houses that are derelict needs dealing with and turning into homes before new build takes place	NOTED – it is not in either the NDP’s or town council’s gift to make this happen.	NO ACTION
	all appear fine except there are plenty of empty buildings which should be renovated before new build.	NOTED – it is not in either the NDP’s or town council’s gift to make this happen.	NO ACTION
	good luck with humphrey smith re derelict sites	NOTED – the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town’s landowning breweries and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.	NO ACTION
	repair and reuse ssob properties first	NOTED – it is not in either the NDP’s or town council’s gift to make this happen.	NO ACTION
	disused buildings first before any new build	NOTED – it is not in either the NDP’s or town council’s gift to make this happen.	NO ACTION
	disused buildings first before any new build	NOTED – it is not in either the NDP’s or town council’s gift to make this happen.	NO ACTION

	<p>I would like to see empty shops and houses put into use.</p> <p>Yes by identifying buildings in need of repair and renovating them with or without the owners permission.</p> <p>Why do we have to wait for the regeneration of derelict and vacant sites - why can't that be done now?</p> <p>All needed. Regeneration of buildings should be priority.</p> <p>Derelict or vacant sites - does this include Humphrey Smiths derelict and vacant properties?</p> <p>I will be thrilled to see the run down centre revitalised and empty properties brought back to create new homes.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – agreed that heritage buildings needing repair should be identified but renovation without the owner’s permission is not within the NDP’s scope.</p> <p>NOTED – the NDP takes time to put in place and has a necessarily long time horizon in line with the Local Plan. This does not preclude action now, but only providing landowners are willing to take action.</p> <p>NOTED – regeneration timescales are landowner dependent.</p> <p>NOTED – it relates to all derelict/vacant sites.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re compiling list of heritage buildings in need of repair. Also research past SDC work on a Heritage Action Zone for Tadcaster.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Aim 12	Agree.	NOTED	NO ACTION
Aims - General	<p>NYCC - There are a number of aims and policy intentions that we would support in principle, as they all contribute in some way to creating healthy inclusive communities. We will keep a watching brief on how they develop and make additional comments at appropriate stages of development.</p> <p>GPE - Generally, the twelve aims are supported as high-level statements.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	Agree with all but can't see how they would be achieved	NOTED – the plan's planning policies and Non-Planning Community Actions will be the vehicles aimed at delivery.	NO ACTION
	Okay	NOTED	NO ACTION
	agree with all	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I agree with all , Tadcaster needs to develop much more as a village and attracts interest from visitors, politics, economy so it can grow	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Yes	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I like all of the aims and think the vision for Tadcaster is excellent. I don't disagree with any but just wonder how achievable they are and if everyone who has a say is on board with your vision, in particular, the owner of the Brewery.	NOTED – the plan's planning policies and Non-Planning Community Actions will be the vehicles aimed at delivery. The town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowning breweries and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process to try to ensure everyone is on board.	NO ACTION
	I broadly agree with the 12 aims.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	too broad a question. Need to address each aim separately	NOTED – other people have managed to do this by commenting separately on each aim. That said, the question can be dis-aggregated in the next consultation.	ACTION – disaggregate aims question on next consultation questionnaire.
	Agree with them	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I agree with all 12 aims	NOTED	NO ACTION

	All good	NOTED	NO ACTION
	They are good.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Great plans	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Good aims but will be hard to achieve	NOTED – acknowledged - the plan’s planning policies and Non-Planning Community Actions will be the vehicles aimed at delivery.	NO ACTION
	Good. More affordable houses and to see disused houses/ shops is a positive step forward. To have a green approach is equally positive.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	All the aims are surely laudable	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Agree with them	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Agree	NOTED	NO ACTION
	if you mean page 8 - they are mostly good ideas;	NOTED – yes, P8.	NO ACTION
	Would broadly agree in principle but find them ambiguous & subjective	NOTED – by the nature of aims, they are quite broad. The policies and actions which will flow from them will be specific and detailed.	NO ACTION
	The aims are good. I hope that the Samuel Smiths stranglehold on the property in Tadcaster will not frustrate progress.	NOTED –the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town’s landowning breweries and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.	NO ACTION
	What is being done with the major local landowner who owns most of the town centre properties that are empty?		

	Happy with the 12 aims, not happy with the means of achieving them.	NOTED – unclear as to why happy with means of achievement and no other means suggested. The plan’s planning policies and Non-Planning Community Actions will be the vehicles aimed at delivery.	NO ACTION
	Yes they seem good	NOTED	NO ACTION
	In general the plans are a good starting point	NOTED	NO ACTION
	The aims are ok but again lack focus on young adults that would make the town vibrant	NOTED – the plan supports the idea of the Tadcaster Sports Park & Community Hub. The town is felt to have generally good young people sports facilities, plus uniform groups & The Barn, but maybe does not cater enough for 16+. Would be beneficial to consult this group directly.	ACTION – consult young people via grammar school.
	AGREE WITH ALL	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I agree with and support the aims.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Broadly agree with the aims	NOTED	NO ACTION
	All of the aims are good and will benefit and improve the community	NOTED	NO ACTION
	OK	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I don't agree with any of them, these are not practical solutions, most people i believe would like to see an accountable dedicated police presence, development to the shops i.e lower rents, enforcement action on property owners who fail to rent shops, cafe and restaurant	NOTED – some of the issues raised, i.e. police, lower shop rents, enforcement, are beyond the scope of the NDP which is essentially a planning policy based document. Flood defences are already	ACTION – add community action re pressing SDC for more/better CCTV.

	<p>facilities. CCTV better flood defences for the town. Introduce parking charges for over 2 hour stays as people are parking in the car parks reducing visitors parking. they use car parks for working where car parking is not available or parking and getting the bus to wherever not bringing anything into the town economy</p>	<p>in hand and nothing the NDP says will make it happen any faster, particularly given the necessary timescale for production/adoption. Parking charges would be very unpopular and the pandemic has eased the problem highlighted with more people now homeworking. It is agreed that the CCTV situation could be greatly improved.</p>	
	Good aims.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Great if it comes off	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Appropriate to Tadcaster	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Seem to cover what is needed. Maybe include support other agencies who are working to help better the town.	NOTED – the idea is considered too vague to respond to in any meaningful or practical way. More thoughts re what could actually be done would be helpful.	NO ACTION
	The 12 aims are probably not in order of priority, but I would move the 11th aim to position 3 or 4.	NOTED – there is no priority order and no value in prioritising. Non-planning community actions may be subject to prioritisation.	NO ACTION
	Good, cover all aspects of social, economic & environmental needs of the population	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Anything to improve the area is a plus	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I don't want Tadcaster to sprawl outwards with large-scale new housing on greenfield sites	NOTED – the amount and location of new housing will be determined by the	NO ACTION

	<p>What are the priorities and what will come first?</p> <p>Agree with aims would like to know more about how these will be achieved</p> <p>I like them.</p> <p>1) Let's be honest here all you want to do is build houses. its plain as day. New houses are NOT what Tadcaster needs. What it needs is rennovation of existing buildings. 2) I 100% agree with Protecting greenspace and Wildlife. 3) If you want to support the growth of employment, talk to the breweries, they are the ones who can support that the most. 4) By all means improve toursim but please make sure Tadcaster does not become an overcrowded cesspit like other nearby towns (Boston Spa, Wetherby). Tadcaster is not a town made for tourism, its a place where we live, and we live in peace, what you want to do is disrupt that haven of peace. 5) The only way you can place a "Green, Environmentally-concious ethos" is by</p>	<p>SDC Local Plan not the NDP/town council.</p> <p>NOTED – an NDP is essentially a planning policy, i.e. land use based document – all of its policies will therefore carry equal weight and be implemented evenly in relation to any new planning applications. The plan’s Non-Planning Community Actions, i.e. those dependent on the actions/ spending of the town council and/or other partners will most likely be subject to prioritisation.</p> <p>NOTED - the plan’s planning policies and Non-Planning Community Actions will be the vehicles aimed at delivery. These will be set out in the next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>1) DISAGREE – the town council and community see the need for new housing. The extent and location of new housing will be determined by SDC’s Local Plan not the NDP/town council. The NDP seeks to address the empty properties issue. 2) NOTED 3) NOTED - the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town’s breweries and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process. The</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) NO ACTION 4) NO ACTION 5) NO ACTION 6) NO ACTION 7) NO ACTION 8) NO ACTION 9) NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>talking to the breweries. do not blame the residents for this when you know full well what those breweries are doing and so do we! 6) Again, new houses is NOT what Tadcaster needs or wants. 7) As for "Transport and Infrastructure" Tadcaster's bus routes are fine and the tadcaster interchange/bus station is fine also, its location is perfect, dropping people off in the center without causing disruption to a main road. 8) there is no real need to create a new link to the A64 as there is already links in both directions though i will say the link towards Leeds is a bit lengthy, if you wanted to fix that just add a slip road at Cock Bridge as there is no way to join the A64 towards Leeds from there so you have to go down the a659 instead. Joining the A64 to york could not be easier and just doesn't need changing at all. 9) I don't think any new building should take place until all the derelict buildings empty in the town are brought back into use.</p>	<p>breweries are however not the only route to securing/growing local employment.</p> <p>4) DISAGREE – it is not the intention to disrupt the town as alledged and the descriptions of Boston and Wetherby are totally unfounded. The town has much to attract the short stay/day tripper type of tourist in particular but more can be made of its tourist offer without disrupting the town as a place to live. Otley is an example of this.</p> <p>5) DISAGREE – nowhere are the residents blamed as suggested. Neither is it accepted that the breweries are the only way to place 'green' at the NDP's heart. A green approach is everybody's responsibility.</p> <p>6) DISAGREE – see 1) above.</p> <p>7) NOTED – there is no mention of the bus services/station and no suggestion that they are in any way a problem.</p> <p>8) NOTED – there is no mention of a new link road to the A64, only junctions improvement along the lines suggested.</p> <p>9) NOTED – this is not in the gift of the NDP/town council.</p>	
	Not bad	NOTED	NO ACTION
	They are great	NOTED	NO ACTION
	All good.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Good	NOTED	NO ACTION

	Ambitious but the potential is there	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Great	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Visionary and sets the right tone for the town.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Agree	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Aims for housing development and extended green space are at odds. Tadcaster benefits from green space to all sides. New housing development would seriously compromise that.	NOTED – the proposed housing sites are determined by SDC’s Local Plan not by the NDP. Outside of these imposed sites, the NDP will seek to identify and protect as best it can a network of green space within the Neighbourhood Area.	NO ACTION
	Too many	DISAGREE – the number is considered proportionate to the vision and the scope of the plan’s policies.	NO ACTION
	Sites for new housing	NOTED – it is not clear what point is being made here. As such it is not possible to give a meaningful response.	NO ACTION
	Not one aim that actually concerns itself with inward investment. Surely the council should "Incentivise investment by ... "	DISAGREE – the NDP is essentially a planning policy based document that sets out the basis on which planning applications for new development will be accepted and shaped. As such, it is setting the context within which new inward investment – e.g. for housing, employment etc. – will be delivered to the town.	NO ACTION
	Very naive. Ignoring the elephant in the room and the MP in his pocket.	DISAGREE – the plan’s intentions are reasonable and realistic. The town	NO ACTION

		council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's breweries and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.	
	As above	NOTED	NO ACTION
	The aims are progressive & bold, let's see if the Council is willing to take on Sam's, because they won't give in without a fight....	NOTED - The town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's breweries and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.	NO ACTION
	Long needed	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I am totally in favour of Tadcaster development. However, there are already green areas in the town which cannot be utilised. Sam Smiths Brewery owns most of the derelict or empty properties and as history shows, would not even temporary release land for a footbridge when our bridge collapsed.	NOTED - The town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's breweries and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.	NO ACTION
	Agree with all	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I do apart from the car parking	NOTED – the central car park proposal is an SDC Local Plan proposal not an NDP proposal. The NDP will simply seek to shape any development on the site should it be allocated. The NDP cannot oppose the development.	NO ACTION
	They are ambitious, necessary and valid. BUT have you allowed for the Humphrey factor?	NOTED - The town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's breweries and indeed all	NO ACTION

		other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.	
	Great	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I support that you're maintaining our heritage and modernising it where (very much) needed	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Buildings in need of "enhancement" need legal backing - ref main street of shops, Tadcaster High Street etc	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I don't agree with the central car park housing - we need central car parking	NOTED – this is an SDC Local Plan proposal which the NP cannot oppose.	NO ACTION
	I think that you'll struggle to create a "cafe culture" in Tad. We could do with an independent cafes and food outlets on an improved high street, but at the end of the day it's a working town	NOTED – proposed pedestrianisation will be key to this.	NO ACTION
	All good however regeneration of vacant buildings need to be prioritised before new builds otherwise how can you truly access the need?	NOTED – it is not within the NP's gift to prioritise in this way.	NO ACTION
	Agree with all the aims, would like to see specific mention of children in the aims (child friendly Tadcaster)	NOTED – the aims have been kept deliberately broad in order to embrace all/exclude none.	NO ACTION
	But 2040 is way too long before these actions	NOTED – the NP is a statutory planning document so it shares a 2040 time horizon with the SDC Local Plan with which it must conform. It's policies will hopefully come into force by the end of 2023, i.e. once formally adopted.	NO ACTION
	I would like to see empty shops and houses put into use. Don't take away the central car park.	NOTED – NP addresses this. Central car park development proposals are down	NO ACTION

		to SDC/the Local Plan not the NP. The NP cannot oppose them.	
Built Environment: Heritage Development & Design - Preamble	NYCC - could a minor change be made to add archaeology into the equation e.g. 'Tadcaster has a rich archaeological and built heritage...'	AGREE – this would be a sensible broadening of the statement.	ACTION – amend preamble as indicated.
PI BE1	<p>Historic England - Although the Tadcaster Conservation Area has not (at the time of writing) been formally designated, consideration should be given to amending the Conservation Area boundary, and/or the designation of new Conservation Areas.</p> <p>Recommendations:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify Areas of Local Historic Interest, using the guidance set out in Historic England Guidance Note 1 Conservation Area Appraisal, Designation and Management (2nd Edition, 2019). • Develop polices to support these designations. • Recommend to Selby District Council the amendment of the Tadcaster Conservation Area boundary, and the designation of new Conservation Areas, as appropriate. <p>SSOB - Reference here and within other policy intentions to 'documented characteristics' is unclear and requires explanation. Heritage assets can be made up of a wide range of valuable characteristics whether specifically documented or not. Whilst documented characteristics are clearly likely to be of value, this should not be at the expense of characteristics which haven't been formally documented.</p>	<p>NOTED – the powers to vary the existing boundary and to designate new conservation areas obviously rests with SDC and not the town council/the NDP. PI BE2 and its preamble already set out the intention to identify 'Local Heritage Areas' adjacent to the conservation area with a view to pressing the case with SDC for their future conservation area designation. This would be in accordance with HE's recommendations.</p> <p>NOTED – policy will draw on the conservation area's characteristics as documented in the soon to be approved SDC conservation area appraisal, together with any additional evidence contained in the soon to be complete Design Codes study commissioned by the town council. The characteristics of other non-designated heritage assets will be identified in documents assessing those assets, e.g. Local Heritage Areas (ref PI BE2) which will be done in line with HE guidance. It is readily acknowledged that such</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

		assessments will not necessarily capture all the characteristics of all assets or indeed all assets, but then neither are they required to.	
	GPE – Yes agree. Any reference to the town’s conservation area must have regard to and be led by the relevant Conservation Area Appraisal and any associated Management Plan and recommendations.	NOTED – it will be.	NO ACTION
	unused buildings made fit for use	NOTED – this will be addressed through the plan’s empty properties policy and non-planning community actions.	NO ACTION
	You need to provide much more detail about what you mean. There is a severe lack of evidence, information, detail, impact or risk assessments for most of what is written in this document. It feels like a waste of time and money that could have been better spent supporting existing residents who have been short changed by Selby District Council for far too long. This statement applies to many of the questions you are asking so you will see this statement a number of times as it is relevant throughout.	NOTED – it is explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents ‘Policy Intentions’ section that this document sets out only the “basic intentions of policies and proposals” and that “final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail, will be presented in the final draft plan”. This is in order to check that the community is on board with the broad thrust of policies and overall direction of travel before doing what may be extensive detailed work that may then prove to be abortive.	NO ACTION
	There are some beautiful buildings in Tadcaster which are in desperate need of enhancement.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	However, the existing Conservation Area Document needs review and amendment as it presents a single, biased view of development. A new conservation area needs to be established covering the Woodlands Avenue area as this	NOTED – SDC’s conservation area review is underway and will shortly be completed. The Woodlands Avenue area can be assessed against	ACTION – assess Woodlands Avenue area as candidate Local Heritage Area.

	<p>represents an outstanding example of that type of development. Part of this area is in Stutton.</p> <p>I agree that development should respect the existing character of the town and that clear design criteria should be outlined. However, this should also be in balance with the ability to live a modern life in Tadcaster. For example: a homeowner in the centre of town (if the property has the space to do so respectfully) should be able to make reasonable adjustment to their property such as removing a wall at the front of their property to allow space for a driveway.</p> <p>Ignores any problems about ownership of property and cannot be enforced (or even welcomed) in adjacent Parishes</p> <p>Get real you have very little control over the major landowner</p> <p>I hope that we can police this better than has previously been the case in the conservation area</p>	<p>conservation area criteria with a view to possible Local Heritage Area (LHA) status in this plan and subsequent lobbying of SDC re conservation area status if warranted. The LHA could however only apply within the Tadcaster Neighbourhood Area/parish, although lobbying could relate to an extended area, with the agreement of Stutton PC.</p> <p>NOTED – this policy intention relates specifically to the town centre based conservation area which is a statutory designation already in place. The plan policy will be based on the guidance to be set out in the conservation area appraisal shortly to be published by SDC.</p> <p>NOTED – all landowners are required to comply with adopted planning policy whether they like it or not, whether SDC Local Plan or ultimately Tadcaster NDP. NDP provisions will only apply within the Tadcaster Neighbourhood Area/parish.</p> <p>NOTED – formal ‘policing’ will be the job of SDC/its successor planning authority planners, although the town council will have an informal ‘policing’ role as now.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>Architectural and historical landscape is what makes Tadcaster. To retain this whilst developing the area is an excellent approach.</p> <p>I agree with this, with the proviso detailed above - let's move design forward on Tadcaster, not get stuck in a "mock past".</p> <p>In principle</p> <p>I agree that we need conservation but at what cost will these measures have our local investment and development, if there is too much red tape it might deter development.</p> <p>Help regenerate but respect the history</p> <p>Particularly using various vacant plots in the town centre.</p> <p>As long as the new builds if any, do tie in with our historic buildings.</p> <p>As per my comments above. BE1 needs to support redevelopment and should go further than restrictive guidance. Policy ought to include design examples and choose particular characteristics to preserve. It also MUST put cost effective green building first and so materials of stone and sash windows etc should be less relevant than good insulation, led lighting and renewable heating.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – plan policy will allow for the potential of modern design.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the conservation area, which is a statutory designation, is in place already. The NDP policy will give expression to guidance to be set out in the soon to be published SDC conservation area appraisal.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – that is the aim of the policy intention.</p> <p>NOTED – the particular characteristics to preserve will be based on guidance in SDC's soon to be published conservation area appraisal. Policy will also include design codes based on a town council commissioned study. The green building issues highlighted lie largely beyond the remit of NDP planning policies and fall into the realm of building regulations.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>I agree with enhancing existing buildings and land but don't waste your money on new housing that will bring anger and upset to our community.</p> <p>It's really important to respect the distinctive character of Tadcaster.</p> <p>If an area's character is of sufficient heritage significance then it should be capable of inclusion in the formal conservation area. If it isn't then it shouldn't receive enhanced protection. Designation of non-statutory heritage areas is unjustified and will stifle development in the town.</p> <p>Why do you feel the need to set out design criteria, have you or anyone writing this experience in design or architecture to qualify you? Design is very subjective and prescribing what people can and cannot do is stifling innovation and inventive ways of responding to architectural heritage and local distinctiveness.</p> <p>Last thing we need is more red tape to stop development</p> <p>If all development adjacent to the Conservation Area is required to meet design criteria related to its location</p>	<p>NOTED – the amount and location of new housing will be determined by the SDC Local Plan not this NDP/the town council. No council money will be 'wasted' on housing.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – national planning policy clearly allows for the identification of non-designated heritage assets, which can be area-based or individual assets. Any such identification will be based on assessment in accordance with Historic England guidance in order to properly justify any identified assets. There is no evidence that identifying such assets stifles development. It will however help to conserve what makes the town special over and above pure statutory designations.</p> <p>NOTED – the statutory conservation area has long been in place. The design criteria will be based on design guidance in the soon to be published SDC conservation area appraisal (produced by SDC conservation staff) and on design code work commissioned from specialist consultants by the town council. The plan policy will allow for the role of modern design innovation.</p> <p>NOTED – this is not the case. National planning policy/guidance and historic</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>then this hints that the Conservation Area is intended to expand. That is a laudable aspiration, but may cause additional expense to investors and make development uneconomic.</p> <p>Important to preserve the town</p> <p>Identifying land and buildings in need of enhancement and getting the owner's consent to do so is where the obstacles will arise.</p> <p>Yes but there is also a lot of bungalows that haven't been modernised in years.</p> <p>Good idea</p> <p>Please put into action the fact that run down and derelict houses need refurbishing first!</p> <p>Important to maintain character of town</p>	<p>England are clear that conservation area policies should relate to not only the area itself but also its setting, i.e. to adjacent areas.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – consultation with landowners whose property/land is identified will be undertaken.</p> <p>NOTED – unclear how this specifically relates to the conservation area. Conservation area status and design criteria would not preclude modernisation of bungalows (if any exist in the CA) or indeed any other properties, provided the plans were acceptable in design policy terms.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – this kind of prioritisation is beyond the scope of the NDP/town council to deliver.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI BE2	<p>Historic England - Although the Tadcaster Conservation Area has not (at the time of writing) been formally designated, consideration should be given to amending the Conservation Area boundary, and/or the designation of new Conservation Areas.</p> <p>Recommendations:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify Areas of Local Historic Interest, using the guidance set out in Historic England Guidance Note 1 	<p>NOTED – PI BE2 and its preamble already set out the intention to identify 'Local Heritage Areas' adjacent to the conservation area with a view to pressing the case with SDC for their future conservation area designation. This would be in accordance with HE's recommendations.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Conservation Area Appraisal, Designation and Management (2 nd Edition, 2019).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop polices to support these designations. • Recommend to Selby District Council the amendment of the Tadcaster Conservation Area boundary, and the designation of new Conservation Areas, as appropriate. <p>SSOB - The intention of the policy is unclear. There is no indication what layout and design criteria are intended to be put in place that do not already exist. The ability to review these criteria and ensure that they are appropriate is critical to the ability to support or object to this policy intention.</p> <p>GPE – Yes agree. In bringing forward this approach it would be appropriate for the evidence base to demonstrate the characteristics and important features of the LHA's and what distinguishes them other parts of the Plan area.</p>	<p>NOTED – it is considered that the intention as set out in BE1 and the preamble is sufficiently clear at this stage. It is explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents 'Policy Intentions' section that this document sets out only the "basic intentions of policies and proposals" and that "final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail, will be presented in the final draft plan". Layout and design criteria will be based on assessment, in line with HE guidelines, of proposed LHAs. This approach is in order to check that the community is on board with the broad thrust of policies and overall direction of travel before doing what may be extensive detailed work that may then prove to be abortive. A detailed draft plan will be available for full consultation at Regulation 14 stage.</p> <p>NOTED – this is the intention.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	-----------------------------------

	<p>You need to provide much more detail about what you mean. There is a severe lack of evidence, information, detail, impact or risk assessments for most of what is written in this document. It feels like a waste of time and money that could have been better spent supporting existing residents who have been short changed by Selby District Council for far too long. This statement applies to many of the questions you are asking so you will see this statement a number of times as it is relevant throughout.</p>	<p>NOTED – it is explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents ‘Policy Intentions’ section that this document sets out only the “basic intentions of policies and proposals” and that “final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail, will be presented in the final draft plan”. This is in order to check that the community is on board with the broad thrust of policies and overall direction of travel before doing what may be extensive detailed work that may then prove to be abortive.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>The conservation area should be extended if necessary.</p>	<p>NOTED – any case for such extension will be put to SDC/its successor authority, as it is they who have the requisite conservation area powers.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>We have very little architectural Heritage and we need to create one - not restrict enterprise activity</p>	<p>DISAGREE – an extant conservation area plus over 50 listed buildings and a scheduled monument (as stated in the BE2 preamble) already constitutes a very significant architectural heritage. A heritage setting is just as likely to encourage enterprise as to restrict it. It is important to conserve heritage as once it is gone, it is gone forever.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>It's not clear what you are trying to say but I think I agree.</p>	<p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan will provide more detail and greater clarity.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Same comment as in previous section.</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>In principle</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>I think it's vital that we get people's input from the town but I also think we shouldn't slow down development too much. This might have negative affects on local economy.</p> <p>Haven't seen the map so cannot comment</p> <p>We need visitor development / attractions</p> <p>Absolutely agree.</p> <p>See my comments against Policy Intention BE1.</p> <p>Again as my objection to BE2 what right do local councillors and stakeholders have to prescribe layout and design criteria. The result of so many neighbourhood plans prescribing design criteria is that they end up encouraging the sort of bland developer pastiche of a historic building that erodes any special historic character of the original buildings. Why not encourage architectural design and innovation where it respects the scale and order of the existing settlement and fabric.</p> <p>We have a failing town and you want to increase red tape</p>	<p>NOTED - a heritage setting is just as likely to encourage enterprise as to restrict it. It is important to conserve heritage as once it is gone, it is gone forever. The extent of LHAs will be small and effects therefore minimal if any.</p> <p>NOTED – a map will be available as part of next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED – this policy intention is not going to prevent this, indeed a heritage setting is just as likely to encourage enterprise as to restrict it.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – NDPs enshrine the legal right for town councils and their communities to set planning policies to help shape their local area. Recently updated national planning policy (paras 127-9) strengthens the role of NDPs in preparing design guides/codes. These can also recognise the potential for innovative modern design. No evidence is presented in support of the assertion that NDPs encourage bland pastiche development.</p> <p>NOTED – the encouragement of high quality development in keeping with existing heritage is more likely to</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>As BE1</p> <p>Makes sense</p> <p>We do not need new developments of expensive housing until the existing buildings are made aesthetically pleasing attracting people to local facilities and a market.</p> <p>Important to maintain character of town</p>	<p>contribute to a thriving town. The extent of LHAs will be small. It is important to conserve what exists as once it is gone, it is gone forever.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the amount and location of new housing will be determined by the SDC Local Plan not this NDP/the town council. The power to require action on existing buildings before any new build is beyond the scope of the NDP/town council.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI BE3	<p>Historic England:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The title of the Policy refers to non-designated heritage areas whilst the text refers to Non-Designated Local Heritage Assets • Non-Designated heritage assets can be areas, places, landscapes, monuments or routes, and do not have to be limited to buildings. <p>Recommendations:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify title and subject of Policy • Identify Non-Designated Local Heritage Assets, using the guidance set out in Historic England Advice Note 7 Local Heritage Listing (2 nd Edition, 2021) • Develop polices to support these designations. • Recommend to Selby District Council the creation of a Local List, to include all Non-Designated Local Heritage Assets identified in the Neighbourhood Plan, or add them to the existing Local List, as appropriate. 	<p>NOTED – the title/subject confusion is down to a typo and nothing more. Projected next steps are already in line with the recommendations made, with the exception of ‘Local list’ creation, which can be added to the draft plan as a non-planning community action.</p>	<p>ACTION – add non-planning community action as indicated.</p>

	<p>NYCC - There is quite a lot of debate at the moment about what a non-designated heritage asset is. I would certainly support the creation of a 'local list' of sites and buildings of special interest that are not listed, scheduled or otherwise officially designated.</p> <p>SSOB - There are many more non-designated heritage assets within the settlement than just 'The Barn' and 'Riley Smith Hall'. The policy should make it clear how these will be identified, including a robust methodology, and ensure that any assessment of these features applies this methodology to all buildings, structures and open spaces within the settlement.</p> <p>GPE – Yes agree. It would be appropriate for the policy title to reflect the content of non-designated assets (not areas).</p> <p>You need to provide much more detail about what you mean. There is a severe lack of evidence, information, detail, impact or risk assessments for most of what is written in this document. It feels like a waste of time and money that could have been better spent supporting existing residents who have been short changed by Selby District Council for far too long. This statement applies to many of the questions you are asking so you will see this statement a number of times as it is relevant throughout.</p> <p>Individual buildings worthy of preservation should be listed, especially the Riley Smith Hall.</p>	<p>NOTED – intention is to create such a list for the Neighbourhood area and to urge SDC to create one district-wide.</p> <p>NOTED – by use of the word 'including' in BE3, it is made clear that other assets are likely to be added. The next stage draft plan policy will set out a full list, based on assessment, following HE guidance, of likely candidate assets (NB assessment of all buildings etc. in the parish is totally unrealistic and would needlessly waste scarce time/resources – the search will be informed/focussed not comprehensive) and make methodology clear.</p> <p>NOTED – the error is down to a missed typo.</p> <p>NOTED – it is explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents 'Policy Intentions' section that this document sets out only the "basic intentions of policies and proposals" and that "final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail, will be presented in the final draft plan". This is in order to check that the community is on board with the broad thrust of policies and overall direction of travel before doing what</p>	<p>ACTION – add non-planning community action re SDC creation of a 'Local List'.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

		may be extensive detailed work that may then prove to be abortive.	
	Market forces determine the usage of such assets, otherwise they area drain on public resources	NOTED – the policy intention is about conserving assets not about how they are used or by who.	NO ACTION
	Not really sure, I don't have an opinion on this matter	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Nice buildings that need protecting	NOTED	NO ACTION
	But not exclusive to the The Barn and Riley Smith Hall	NOTED – hence the use of word 'including' in the policy intention.	NO ACTION
	Its out of your controls	DISAGREE – NDP planning policies have the power to exert control over the way development affects non-designated heritage assets – ref national planning policy.	NO ACTION
	It is not clear which are "designated" and "non-designated areas" What sort of "enhancement" is envisaged?	NOTED – 'designated' refers to listed buildings and scheduled monuments, i.e. those identified by Historic England. Non-designated is anything else of evidenced value. No particular enhancements envisaged, e.g. anything proposed that better reveals or restores architectural details or historic character.	NO ACTION
	Does "support" extend to "financially investing in.."?	NOTED – no, support in this context means that policy would be in favour of rather than against sympathetic enhancement proposals. Nothing to do with financial matters.	NO ACTION

<p>PI BE4</p>	<p>SSOB - See comments on BE1 in relation the 'documented character'. There is no indication what layout and design criteria are intended to be put in place that do not already exist. The ability to review these criteria and ensure that they are appropriate is critical to the ability to support or object to this policy intention.</p> <p>TVCSA – (<i>policy intention</i>) mentions criteria which “will cover general aspects of housing layout/design, the design criteria to design out crime and development in the edge of town/countryside areas”. No mention is made of designing for the disabled or elderly nor disabled access.</p> <p>GPE – Yes agree. There is a danger that such a policy may repeat or replicate policies in the Selby Local Plan. As such it will be important that there is an appropriate and documented evidence base to justify the policy approach.</p> <p>You need to provide much more detail about what you mean. There is a severe lack of evidence, information, detail, impact or risk assessments for most of what is written in this document. It feels like a waste of time and money that could have been better spent supporting existing residents who have been short changed by Selby District Council for far too long. This statement applies to many of the questions you are asking so you will see this statement a number of times as it is relevant throughout.</p>	<p>NOTED – detail to follow in next stage draft plan for consultation. Criteria to be based on Design Codes study commissioned by town council from specialist consultants.</p> <p>NOTED – draft plan policy will make every effort to reflect the needs of the disabled/elderly and disabled access, within the context of existing national and SDC policy.</p> <p>NOTED – the town council fully appreciates that it is not the function of NDPs to duplicate existing Local Plan policy. Policy will be based on Design Codes study commissioned by the town council from specialist consultants.</p> <p>NOTED – it is explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents 'Policy Intentions' section that this document sets out only the “basic intentions of policies and proposals” and that “final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail, will be presented in the final draft plan”. This is in order to check that the community is on board with the broad thrust of policies and overall direction of travel before doing what may be extensive detailed work that may then prove to be abortive.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – reflect needs as indicated in draft plan policy</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
---------------	--	--	--

	<p>What is designing out of crime?</p> <p>most architecture is vague and unrelated to any neighbouring property</p> <p>Very important.</p> <p>This could have been more simply expressed.</p> <p>Comment as previously about moving on and not building a "mock past".</p> <p>I agree that it's nice to have a "style" for a town but also we do need to ask what will these new measures do to new development growth?</p> <p>I agree the development has to fit into its surroundings but "clear layout and design criteria" initiated now may be limiting for the next 20 years.</p>	<p>NOTED – designing new developments in order to lower the risks of crime taking place. This is a well-established approach developed in conjunction with the police.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy intention is to address this situation</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the draft plan policy will be more detailed and should make things clearer.</p> <p>NOTED – the scope for modern architectural innovation will be recognised in draft plan policy.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that policy will help deliver high quality development which enhances what the town already has to offer. There is no anticipated impact on growth in the town.</p> <p>NOTED – the NDP will be monitored and can be reviewed at any time during its life if it is felt that policies are not working or have been overtaken by events. By not setting criteria, the area will be open to lowest common denominator development such as the off the shelf housing estates of many bulk housing developers.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>This needs a re-think</p> <p>More detail is required.</p> <p>I think this policy intention is confused and blurs policy intention BE1 with a crime reduction initiative which is very unclear. Re consult on whether 2 policy initiatives are required here.</p> <p>Do not waste money on building new houses! There are buildings in Tadcaster that are in dire need of restoration already.</p> <p>As earlier points, members are straying into areas of design that they do not have the requisite skills for.</p>	<p>NOTED – by not stating why or how it is difficult to respond in any meaningful way to this comment.</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan policy will be fully detailed and evidenced.</p> <p>DISAGREE – BE1 relates solely to the Tadcaster Conservation Area. BE4 relates to other areas of the Neighbourhood Area outside the conservation area. The policy for these areas will be based on a Design Codes study commissioned by the town council from specialist consultants. The next stage draft plan should make things clear.</p> <p>NOTED – the number and location of new housing will be determined by SDC’s Local Plan not by the NDP/town council. Policy Intention TC1 addresses the issue of empty properties.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the town council is using specialist design consultants and NDP consultants to develop its policies in this area.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI BE5	<p>NYCC - public realm is a key element contributing to the user experience of spaces. Ensuring public realm is accessible for all members of the community young and old. Provision of seating can help make spaces accessible whereas signage, art installations can make spaces attractive and desirable.</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>SSOB – no comments</p> <p>TVCSA – you include considerable detail of creating a heritage effect but make no mention of paving being suitable for disabled people nor signage for the blind/partially sighted.</p> <p>GPE – Yes agree. See commentary in relation to BE4.</p> <p>You need to provide much more detail about what you mean. There is a severe lack of evidence, information, detail, impact or risk assessments for most of what is written in this document. It feels like a waste of time and money that could have been better spent supporting existing residents who have been short changed by Selby District Council for far too long. This statement applies to many of the questions you are asking so you will see this statement a number of times as it is relevant throughout.</p> <p>Street furniture should be designed to meet its purpose. Paving should provide a surface that prevents slips and falls and is suitable for wheelchairs and disability vehicles.</p> <p>Maintaining what historic character</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – draft plan policy will make every effort to reflect the needs of the disabled people and the blind/partially sighted, within the context of existing national and SDC policy.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents ‘Policy Intentions’ section that this document sets out only the “basic intentions of policies and proposals” and that “final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail, will be presented in the final draft plan”. This is in order to check that the community is on board with the broad thrust of policies and overall direction of travel before doing what may be extensive detailed work that may then prove to be abortive.</p> <p>NOTED – policy will reflect these concerns in so far as they are capable of being addressed through planning policy, i.e. in so far as they are planning issues.</p> <p>NOTED – Tadcaster’s public realm is full of existing historic character, e.g. cobbled surfaces.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – reflect needs as indicated in draft plan policy.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – reflect concerns in planning policy as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>Important</p> <p>There seems to be a "static" view of history developing here - new design, even for street furniture, can sit very comfortably with older design - I'm not sure what's driving this "static" approach, but I think we need to preserve and also move on. The juxtaposition of the old with the new is something that, when it is done right, is most appealing.</p> <p>In principle</p> <p>I think that these cosmetic looks are nice for a town to have, to both show people we put back into our community.</p> <p>Again rethink</p> <p>We should enhance the historical aspect of the town.</p> <p>What is appropriate forms of development? And who are the town council to dictate this?</p> <p>What a waste of time this town is dying but you want to make the coffin look good</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the policy intention clearly refers to both maintaining the historic character and providing for improvements to public realm and visual appearance, which allows for the new as well as the traditional.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – by not stating why or how it is difficult to respond in any meaningful way to this comment.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the intention here is encourage new developments in the town to contribute to the public realm, but not for inappropriate development, e.g. a factory in a residential area, to be allowed simply because it is promising such a contribution. The town council, with its' community, is legally empowered to produce NDPs with planning policies that help shape their local areas, as clearly stated on P5 of the document.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the encouragement of a high quality public realm is more likely to contribute to a thriving town. Other</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>There needs to be care taken that the use of heritage development is not supported to the detriment of healthy and safe forms of infrastructure etc (e.g. paving which is unsafe for the elderly to walk on nor inaccessible for the disabled).</p> <p>The town has been held back & needs rejuvenation, to bring it into the 21st century.</p>	<p>measures in the plan address the uplift of the town. This approach is very well supported by the community.</p> <p>NOTED – policy will reflect these concerns in so far as they are capable of being addressed through planning policy, i.e. in so far as they are planning issues.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>ACTION – reflect concerns in planning policy as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI BE6	<p>NYCC - locating walking route signage and mile markers can improve health and wellbeing by encouraging walking and active travel.</p> <p>SSOB – no comments.</p> <p>GPE – Yes agree. It is not clear if this policy is for the creation of “gateways” or “gateway features”, and what characterises them. Via the Kelcbar Hill land, GPE has a direct interest in one of these potential gateways.</p> <p>Policy intentions BE1 to BE6 - the wording doesn't say anything - they have no meaning. Very woolly, frothy statements.</p> <p>You need to provide much more detail about what you mean. There is a severe lack of evidence, information, detail, impact or risk assessments for most of what is written in this document. It feels like a waste of time and money that could have been better spent supporting</p>	<p>NOTED – while the TC would not disagree, there is already a plethora of signage, particularly in the town centre/ conservation area. There is a need to take stock and potentially declutter before more signs are added.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the creation of gateway features.</p> <p>NOTED – as explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents ‘Policy Intentions’ section, this document sets out only the “basic intentions of policies and proposals” and that “final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail, will be presented in the final draft plan”. This is in order to check that the</p>	<p>ACTION – add community action re review of signage across the town.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>existing residents who have been short changed by Selby District Council for far too long. This statement applies to many of the questions you are asking so you will see this statement a number of times as it is relevant throughout.</p> <p>I'm a bit unclear about this, but making the gateways more attractive is a great idea - let's have bigger "Tadcaster" signs.</p> <p>Very subjective</p> <p>I think that it's a nice message to our communities vibe</p> <p>Take care with "Enhances" this means different things to different people</p> <p>The Town gateways are already quite attractive with seasonal floral displays.</p> <p>I do not support any green environment development</p>	<p>community is on board with the broad thrust of policies and overall direction of travel before doing what may be extensive detailed work that may then prove to be abortive.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – unclear of the exact criticism here so not possible to address in any meaningful way.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – ‘enhances’ is a commonly used word in planning policies and planning officers apply it on a regular basis. That said, final policy wording has yet to be determined.</p> <p>NOTED – enhancement will not be supported where existing gateways do not require enhancement.</p> <p>NOTED – unclear whether these means no support for development of existing green environments or no support for development which would improve green environments. As such, difficult to respond in a meaningful way – the NDP will not explicitly propose the former but will support the latter,</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – ensure policy wording takes account of existing gateway treatments and does not unnecessarily harm already attractive features.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>I'm not quite sure what this means! I am against building on our fields and open spaces</p> <p>The means of enhancement have not been identified.</p>	<p>subject to the enabling development being acceptable.</p> <p>NOTED – key gateways are the main road routes into the town, i.e. the entrance points. The basic intention is to make them more attractive. The plan includes no proposals to build on fields/open spaces.</p> <p>NOTED – the intention is to support proposals for enhancement, either in planning applications solely for that purpose or, more likely, in proposals for other development near to gateways. But only provided the development proposals are acceptable in their own right. The nature of any enhancement will be judged on its own merits relative to the gateway in question.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<p>Built Environment: Heritage Development & Design – Non-Planning Community Actions</p>	<p>SSOB - There are a number of actions which appear to have been defined as 'non-planning' but which have the potential to be affected by either the Development Management or Planning Policy functions of the planning system. For example, 'Introduce Tadcaster Town Trail Boards' or 'Promotional Tadcaster signage at identified town gateways' both have the potential to require planning permission.</p>	<p>NOTED – this needs clarification before draft plan policies and actions are written.</p>	<p>ACTION – clarify point raised in comment and include boards/signage in policy and/or non-community actions as appropriate.</p>
<p>Built Environment: Heritage Development & Design – General</p>	<p>vacant properties on wighill lane look dreadful</p>	<p>NOTED – expected that this will be addressed as part of the SDC Local Plan Wighill Lane housing development.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

PI GNE1	<p>NYCC - access to green space contributes to the health and wellbeing of communities ensuring that policies support, enhance and increase provision are welcomed. Consideration should be given to a non-planning community action which ensures that green spaces are maintained.</p>	<p>NOTED – maintenance is clearly an issue both for local authorities and other landowners. The town council can only ensure that land its own ownership is properly maintained. There is however scope to lobby other owners, particularly where lack of maintenance is known to be an issue. That said, there are no known issues that need addressing.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>SSOB - Without an indication of where this green and blue infrastructure is to be identified it is impossible to provide meaningful comment in relation to this policy intention.</p>	<p>NOTED – the PID consultation seeks comment on the principle of the policy intention as clearly stated. The next stage draft plan will set out detailed policy relative to a mapped infrastructure network.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>GPE – Yes agree. Not at this stage, but GPE’s interest in this is clear as above.</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>brownfield sites first</p>	<p>NOTED – the assumption is that comment relates to enhancement/ extension of the network onto brownfield land. If it is a more general comment re new development, the DP proposes no new development on greenfield sites.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>You need to provide much more detail about what you mean. There is a severe lack of evidence, information, detail, impact or risk assessments for most of what is written in this document. It feels like a waste of time and money that could have been better spent supporting existing residents who have been short changed by Selby District Council for far too long. This statement applies to</p>	<p>NOTED – as explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents ‘Policy Intentions’ section, this document sets out only the “basic intentions of policies and proposals” and that “final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail,</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>many of the questions you are asking so you will see this statement a number of times as it is relevant throughout.</p> <p>A lot of policy intention appears very vague</p> <p>Agree but elsewhere in this document there are proposals to build on green space and alternative green space does not exist.</p> <p>requirements should be decided and then facilities made to fit; not vice-versa</p> <p>Regarding Blue Spaces, it would be nice to see other groups e.g. canoeists, using the river along with fisher folk. The Lower Wharfe Canoe Club, based in Tadcaster, have been prevented from using the River Wharfe for many</p>	<p>will be presented in the final draft plan". This is in order to check that the community is on board with the broad thrust of policies and overall direction of travel before doing what may be extensive detailed work that may then prove to be abortive.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the document proposes no new development on green space. What it does include (ref housing sites for e.g. H3-8) are intentions to include detailed policies on the delivery of housing sites proposed by SDC's Local Plan, in the event that those sites are allocated for development; this in order to shape that development to achieve the best possible outcomes in the circumstances for both existing and new residents. This is preferable to remaining silent I policy terms and leaving the agreement of details to SDC/its successor authority and the developers.</p> <p>NOTED – what facilities/what requirements? The meaning of this comment in relation to the policy intention is unclear. As such it is not possible to make any meaningful response.</p> <p>AGREE – such water use aspirations are consistent with the town council's 'riverside park' aspiration and would be supported by the NP.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – embrace water use within NP policy and community action re riverside park.</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>years due to vested interest groups and land ownership issues. The Wharfe is a navigation and tidal up to the weir and we are all familiar with pictures of barges, which were a common sight historically. Progress was made towards this end 10 years ago, with the involvement of the canoe club, Environment Agency, British Canoe Union and Tadcaster Anglers, but progress was prevented by actions from SSOB, which was a real shame. There is also the potential for the "swimming" facility of the river to be more widely used, particularly as water quality improves.</p> <p>I think it's vital we keep ensuring these places are kept safe both from humans activity and natural processes.</p> <p>Totally</p> <p>Again I'm not quite sure what is meant here.</p> <p>The means of enhancement have not been identified.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – large interconnected areas of green space, including rivers/streams/ponds etc. are better for wildlife, landscape, recreation, people. The intention is to map and conserve such areas in Tadcaster and improve/extend them if possible. The next stage draft plan, including map, will make this clear.</p> <p>NOTED – the intention is to support proposals for enhancement, either in planning applications solely for that purpose or, more likely, in proposals for other development in or adjacent to the mapped network. But only provided the development proposals are acceptable in their own right. The nature of any enhancement will be</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>The open spaces around the town have a lot of leeway for improvement, but should be done in a modern & bold way.</p> <p>Very good idea</p> <p>This does (<i>not?</i>) actually specify anything</p>	<p>judged on its own merits relative to the location in question.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan will provide detail and a network map. The intention here, as stated, is to test agreement with the principle not the detail.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI GNE2	<p>NYCC - access to green space contributes to the health and wellbeing of communities ensuring that policies support, enhance and increase provision are welcomed. Consideration should be given to a non-planning community action which ensures that green spaces are maintained.</p> <p>SSOB – no comments.</p> <p>GPE – Yes agree. An intention to designate locally important green areas under the Local Green Space banner is supported where this is appropriate for the protection or enhancement of the area. It is important that any potential designations are fully justified and evidence through the supporting information to satisfy the Basic Conditions.</p>	<p>NOTED – maintenance is clearly an issue both for local authorities and other landowners. The town council can only ensure that land its own ownership is properly maintained. There is however scope to lobby other owners, particularly where lack of maintenance is known to be an issue. That said, there are no known issues that need addressing.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – all candidate LGS will be assessed against NPPF criteria before being proposed in the next stage draft plan.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>retain butchers field as play area</p> <p>play areas need upgrading and made safe Play areas need immediate attention. Many not fit for purpose</p> <p>plus thec riverside</p> <p>You need to provide much more detail about what you mean. There is a severe lack of evidence, information, detail, impact or risk assessments for most of what is written in this document. It feels like a waste of time and money that could have been better spent supporting existing residents who have been short changed by Selby Destrict Council for far too long. This statement applies to many of the questions you are asking so you will see this statement a number of times as it is relevant throughout.</p> <p>Also the Quaker Burial Ground needs protecting as it has been under threat of being built on in the past despite being of historical significance.</p> <p>I think it's vital be draw a delicate balance between conservation and development. When it comes to green space we need to include both the people who want it and</p>	<p>NOTED – proposed as a housing site in the SDC Local Plan Preferred Options. LGS designation, should the site meet the criteria, would be in conflict with the emerging Local Plan, which the NDP cannot be.</p> <p>AGREE – already in hand for Grange, Woodlands and Parklands.</p> <p>NOTED – area(s) of riverside can be assessed as candidate LGS.</p> <p>NOTED – as explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents ‘Policy Intentions’ section, this document sets out only the “basic intentions of policies and proposals” and that “final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail, will be presented in the final draft plan”. This is in order to check that the community is on board with the broad thrust of policies and overall direction of travel before doing what may be extensive detailed work that may then prove to be abortive.</p> <p>NOTED – Quaker Burial Ground can be assessed as candidate LGS and also as a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>NOTED – the LGS designation can only be used to protect green space of demonstrable evidenced special value</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – assess area(s) as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – assess site as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>the people who don't to ensure we find the optimal solution.</p> <p>Again, we need the map.</p> <p>Really looking forward to this development</p> <p>"Local Green Space" seems to have been limited to children's play areas - surely there are other facilities which should be considered, too?</p> <p>Absolutely</p> <p>The Quaker area where the Burgiel grind needs developing as a historic site and made into a green space with planting and flowers and benches for relaxation.</p>	<p>to the local community. This will done in full consultation with landowners and the whole community.</p> <p>NOTED – a detailed map showing all proposed Local Green Space will be part of the next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the use of the word ‘included’ indicates that other green spaces will be added in the next stage draft plan. Suggestions of other suitable green spaces to assess are welcomed.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – Quaker Burial Ground can be assessed as candidate LGS and also as a non-designated heritage asset.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – assess site as indicated.</p>
PI GNE3	<p>NYCC - access to green space contributes to the health and wellbeing of communities ensuring that policies support, enhance and increase provision are welcomed. Consideration should be given to a non-planning community action which ensures that green spaces are maintained.</p> <p>SSOB - It is unclear what works the ‘enhancement’ of these green spaces would include in order to increase their value to the local community. Without this</p>	<p>NOTED – maintenance is clearly an issue both for local authorities and other landowners. The town council can only ensure that land its own ownership is properly maintained. There is however scope to lobby other owners, particularly where lack of maintenance is known to be an issue. That said, there are no known issues that need addressing.</p> <p>NOTED – enhancement of spaces would be relative to the needs/opportunities/ existing qualities of those individual</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>information it is not possible to provide either support or further comment.</p> <p>GPE – Yes agree. See comment re GNE2.</p> <p>You need to provide much more detail about what you mean. There is a severe lack of evidence, information, detail, impact or risk assessments for most of what is written in this document. It feels like a waste of time and money that could have been better spent supporting existing residents who have been short changed by Selby District Council for far too long. This statement applies to many of the questions you are asking so you will see this statement a number of times as it is relevant throughout.</p> <p>Consider places for planting trees in woods accessible by the public.</p> <p>I think that the children's play areas in particular would highly benefit from some funding/ refurbishment. If one of the aims is to attract more young people/ couples/ families to Tadcaster, I really believe this to be very important. I personally live near the park on Woodlands Avenue and whilst it is certainly better than nothing, it is a little bit sad.</p>	<p>spaces. As such, it is not possible to be specific in the policy intention. Greater clarity will be provide in the next stage draft plan. The policy will be used to assess the appropriateness of any enhancement proposed through a planning application proposal.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – as explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents 'Policy Intentions' section, this document sets out only the "basic intentions of policies and proposals" and that "final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail, will be presented in the final draft plan". This is in order to check that the community is on board with the broad thrust of policies and overall direction of travel before doing what may be extensive detailed work that may then prove to be abortive.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE – already in hand re Grange, Woodlands, Parklands.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>Sounds good but who will decide "value to the community"</p>	<p>NOTED – decisions on planning applications judged against this and all other policies would be made by SDC/successor authority planners. The final NDP policy will set out criteria to help determine whether a proposed enhancement would increase a space’s community value.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Not if this includes development on the riverside area</p>	<p>NOTED – the policy intention proposes no specific enhancement of any specific site. Any enhancement would need to be appropriate to the site in question – proposals would be judged against policy on their merits. The NDP is certainly not advocating riverside development.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>You used to be able to see the weir from the bridge - would clearance of the Sainsbury's side be acceptable from an environmental perspective.</p>	<p>NOTED – this may be addressed as part of the eventual flood works, but no real perceived need from a visual amenity view point.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>While I agree we need green spaces the big question comes down the both where and how will it affect the towns development.</p>	<p>NOTED – this policy relates to areas which already provide an important green/open/amenity space function for the community in the parish. These are not spaces on which development would normally be countenanced.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Especially the river bank areas</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Green spaces are very important.</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>It is not clear how this differs from GNE2</p>	<p>NOTED – GNE2 relates to the protection of Local Green Space from being built</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

		on. GNE3 relates to making those and other green spaces better for the local communities they serve.	
	Policy will support enhancement but SS Brewery is unlikely to.	NOTED – policy will relate to all identified green/open/amenity space areas not matter what the ownership.	NO ACTION
	Great!	NOTED	NO ACTION
	See above	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Or if this includes development of a riverside park	NOTED – policy could relate to areas of the riverside.	NO ACTION
	another park or updates to existing parks is really important	NOTED	NO ACTION
	More could be done with the Parklands play area. At the moment it is mainly a dog walking area not a play area!!	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Yes, in addition these areas (<i>NB Parklands, Woodlands Ave., Grange</i>) should be enhanced. It is important that if Tadcaster is to become a thriving hub for tourism and local people alike then we should be looking for best in class parkland with more trees, defined paths, improved and more inspiring play equipment and better lighting. We should look to Rowntrees Park and the value of community membership to encourage sustainable engagement with these green spaces.	NOTED – enhancement of Grange, Woodlands, Parklands already in hand. Idea of ‘community membership’ particularly attractive and deemed appropriate for proposed new ‘riverside park’ – which could then act as a model for a similar approach on other town open spaces.	ACTION – research Rowntrees Park model
	Big improvements needed on all 3 areas (<i>NB Parklands, Woodlands Ave., Grange</i>). Feel dirty at the minute	AGREE – already in hand.	NO ACTION
	Should be more visible - signage - + include a central one	NOTED – while the TC would not disagree, there is already a plethora of	ACTION – add community action re review of signage across the town.

		signage, particularly in the town centre/conservation area. There is a need to take stock and potentially declutter before more signs are added.	
PI GNE4	<p>NYCC - access to green space contributes to the health and wellbeing of communities ensuring that policies support, enhance and increase provision are welcomed. Consideration should be given to a non-planning community action which ensures that green spaces are maintained.</p> <p>SSOB – 1) The provision of new sports facilities should be directed toward the Tadcaster Sports Hub proposal currently being developed for the London Road site, Tadcaster. The site is above the flood plain. 2) In relation to policy intention GNE4, and specifically the development of an outdoor exercise area. I wish to make it clear that the provision of fixed and permanent play equipment and/or street furniture is defined as ‘development’ for the purposes of the planning system. The introduction of such features within the River frontages would likely be considered inappropriate given the adopted policy environment and emerging development plan proposals for significant enhancements to sporting and recreation facilities on the site at London Road Tadcaster.</p> <p>GPE – Yes agree. See comment re GNE2.</p> <p>how many times has a skatepark been planned?</p>	<p>NOTED – maintenance is clearly an issue both for local authorities and other landowners. The town council can only ensure that land its own ownership is properly maintained. There is however scope to lobby other owners, particularly where lack of maintenance may be an issue. That said, there are no known issues that need addressing.</p> <p>1) NOTED – this proposal is specifically supported at CFS2. GNE4 does not relate to formal sports facilities. 2) NOTED – GNE4 makes no reference to an outdoor exercise area or river frontages.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the NDP is not concerned with the past but rather seeks to put in place a planning policy context supportive of the skate park idea.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>skatepark a great idea as long as it is well maintained</p> <p>one sports facility at magnets could provide the answer</p> <p>You need to provide much more detail about what you mean. There is a severe lack of evidence, information, detail, impact or risk assessments for most of what is written in this document. It feels like a waste of time and money that could have been better spent supporting existing residents who have been short changed by Selby District Council for far too long. This statement applies to many of the questions you are asking so you will see this statement a number of times as it is relevant throughout.</p> <p>West Tadcaster lacks an informal area for older children to play, for example ball games. This might be provided within the Stutton parish.</p> <p>I think this is a very good idea. I particularly appreciate that some thought seems to be going into catering for children and young people of a wider range of ages than I feel we currently do as a town.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – this is acknowledged but other more local community needs may remain. SDC’s forthcoming ‘Green Space Audit’ should help to further inform this policy.</p> <p>NOTED – as explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents ‘Policy Intentions’ section, this document sets out only the “basic intentions of policies and proposals” and that “final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail, will be presented in the final draft plan”. This is in order to check that the community is on board with the broad thrust of policies and overall direction of travel before doing what may be extensive detailed work that may then prove to be abortive.</p> <p>NOTED – policy cannot make proposals for Stutton Parish. While provision west of the river is considered to be reasonable, it is agreed that provision of both community and recreational facilities on the estates (between Leeds Rd/Stutton Rd) is lacking.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – NP policy to highlight need in the identified area.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	and other services	NOTED – it is unclear what the comment relates to. As such, not possible to respond in a meaningful way.	NO ACTION
	Will be interested to understand where the skate park would go	NOTED – Parklands site or Manor Fields (NB SDC-owned leased to Tadcaster Community Sports Trust) are both possible.	ACTION – NP policy to identify both sites as 'opportunity sites'.
	As long as they are maintained and not become a point of antisocial behaviour.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Proper playing fields are a huge absence from Tadcaster for children, I think this should be a top priority	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Totally dependent on location I thought there was already a skate park at The Barn?	NOTED - a mobile skatepark exists at The Barn – 'The Skatebarn', but no permanent structures. Parklands site or Manor Fields (NB SDC-owned leased to Tadcaster Community Sports Trust) are both possible.	ACTION – NP policy to identify both sites as 'opportunity sites'.
	Skate park would be great for local youth	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Playing fields: yes, but why revert back to a skate park? Seems like pigeonholing all children like to do is skate? There's a million and one other sports and activities that could be supported	NOTED – this is what the local youth say they want. The proposed Sports Park and Community Hub (ref CFS2) will meet other sport needs, as to other existing town facilities.	NO ACTION
	We need more green spaces/parks for the children to play in we lack this as a town so much.	NOTED	NO ACTION

	<p>Building open space or a skate park is less important than properly redesigning existing spaces so that they better serve the community. Additional spaces that are barely used would be a waste of money and a detrimental economic impact. I am highly supportive of the idea in principle but it cannot be a showpiece for the council that neglects other green areas.</p> <p>This is absurd.</p> <p>Young people are under represented in the structure of Tadcaster; pleased that this is being considered.</p> <p>1) Whilst there are many playing fields in the parish some may not be open to the general public namely Riverside school , Tadcaster Grammar, Magnets, Old Police club , lngs . Greater access to such areas may be beneficial. 2) Is a skate Park required?</p> <p>One specific area of Green Space (or perhaps Community Facility) is the provision of a Town Cemetery. I have a significant concern that the existing provision on Leeds Road/Dorchester Road is nearing capacity (as confirmed to me by one of the town's Funeral Directors). The identification, purchase and protection of a future space for use by the people of the town must be prioritised to prevent future generations from having to travel outside of Tadcaster to visit the place of repose of their loved ones.</p> <p>These aims are vital for somewhere the youth can gather.</p> <p>So long as this does not make an area for bad behaviour etc</p>	<p>NOTED – as stated, provision would be to meet evidenced need. Policy will be particularly guided by SDC’s forthcoming ‘Green Spaces Audit’. GNE3 addresses enhancement of existing spaces.</p> <p>DISAGREE – there is no explanation or evidence to support this comment.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED – no scope to open up any of these sites to public access. 2) NOTED – the only available facility is the mobile at The Barn. This is what young people say they want.</p> <p>NOTED – it is understood that the existing site has 40+ years remaining capacity.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>As per GNE3</p> <p>Depends on the image of the skate park</p> <p>Playing fields and parks for the kids don't think we need a skate park.</p> <p>Another good idea</p> <p>As long as it is well lit to discourage gatherings of youth and drug taking</p> <p>Or if this includes development of a riverside park</p> <p>another park or updates to existing parks is really important</p> <p>The idea of a skate park has been haggging around for years - seriously, who writes this stuff!</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the only available facility is the mobile at The Barn. This is what young people say they want.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – of the 2 possible sites, Parklands is in a residential area and Manor Fields has no existing floodlight provision. Only daytime use is envisaged.</p> <p>NOTED - 2 areas of the west bank – town-council owned - are open to the public, offering only grassed areas, occasional benches and planting damaged by flooding. The river itself is never used. It is considered that there is huge potential to strengthen the protection for these areas and to significantly improve their appearance and offer to visitors.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – but not yet delivered aside from The Barn’s mobile facility. NDP will put in place a planning policy context supportive of the skate park idea for when firm proposals for a permanent facility are brought forward.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION - NP policy to propose creation of new riverside park and a complementary non-planning community action addressing non-planning policy matters such as potential community involvement.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	---

PI GNE5	<p>SSOB - The current wording of this policy intention is unclear and raises more questions than answers. What gaps have been identified and what is the intention to 'fill' these gaps.</p> <p>GPE – Yes agree. The policy intention is supported, although it remains important that the approach is fully evidenced and justified (See GNE2 comments) and aligns with the requirements of other relevant legislation including the recent Environment Act (2021) for biodiversity gain and conservation.</p> <p>Protecting the biodiversity and conserving nature rather than new development</p> <p>This is outside the remit?</p> <p>no extra constraints Use the existing procedures to prove the requirement</p> <p>Clear information of what improving biodiversity actually entails needs to be detailed as I'm not convinced that the vast majority of people actually understand the actions required or the benefits.</p> <p>Not much detail is given in this question, but the answer has to be a "yes", of course.</p>	<p>NOTED – SDC policy gaps, if any, still to be identified. Next stage draft plan will include a policy to address any such identified gaps.</p> <p>NOTED – and fully acknowledged.</p> <p>NOTED – it is not a case of either/or. SDC's Local Plan will bring new development whether wanted or not. This NDP will address biodiversity/nature conservation issues, if any, not already addressed in SDC Local Plan policy.</p> <p>DISAGREE – no it is not.</p> <p>NOTED - next stage draft plan will only include a policy to address any identified gaps in SDC Local Plan policy.</p> <p>NOTED – if the need to include a policy in the next stage draft plan is established, policy will include full explanation and evidence/justification.</p> <p>NOTED – detail will follow in next stage draft plan if need for policy is established.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Ambiguous & subjective</p> <p>I don't think this is neither a political and economical thing, biodiversity is well vital to both the sustainability of the towns ecosystems but also our future.</p> <p>I'd like more information on this intention</p> <p>Not sure what is intended in this statement</p> <p>This is ill defined and adds little value. It needs to be more specific to properly consult.</p> <p>In the admittedly infrequent hot summer days, many young people enjoy paddling and swimming in the river.</p> <p>Tadcaster would be enhanced by a nature reserve close to the town i.e. trees, wild flower area and area for people to sit/picnic etc . We need to make the town more inviting.</p>	<p>NOTED – need for a policy still needs to be ascertained with reference to existing SDC policy. Any resultant NDP policy is to be clearly set out and explained.</p> <p>NOTED – there is no argument re the vital nature of biodiversity. It is a case of whether NDP policy can say anything that isn't already said in national/SDC policy as it is not the role of NDPs to duplicate policy set out elsewhere.</p> <p>NOTED – this will be provided in the next stage draft plan should the need for a policy be established.</p> <p>NOTED – it is very much a holding statement of intent until the need or not for a NDP biodiversity/nature conservation policy is established, with reference to existing SDC policy.</p> <p>AGREE – such water use aspirations are consistent with the town council's 'riverside park' aspiration and would be supported by the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – there is a SINC site on the river's west bank by the weir privately-owned (Grimstons) with informal access/use from riverside path. This may offer potential for a local nature park. There is a further SINC (Brickyard Ponds? – east Wighill La/north of</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – embrace water use within NP policy and community action re riverside park.</p> <p>ACTION – investigate potential of both sites with view to NP policy proposal re local nature park.</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>More areas set aside with wildflowers and meadow planting</p> <p>Good idea, clean up the river soon</p>	<p>Hudson Way – Yorkshire Water owned?) which may also offer scope.</p> <p>NOTED – no obvious known areas – ideas welcome.</p> <p>NOTED – no perceived issue/need for river clean-up.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI GNE6	<p>SSOB - The intention of the policy is unclear. There is no indication what protections are intended to be put in place that do not already exist.</p> <p>GPE - Not sure if this policy is justified unless it is to protect water sources for the breweries?</p> <p>Especially local quarries to be used as landfill</p> <p>You need to provide much more detail about what you mean. There is a severe lack of evidence, information, detail, impact or risk assessments for most of what is written in this document. It feels like a waste of time and money that could have been better spent supporting existing residents who have been short changed by Selby District Council for far too long. This statement applies to</p>	<p>NOTED – the intention is as clearly stated, i.e. in order to safeguard local water quality. Such policies are not uncommon in Local Plans for e.g.. Work will be undertaken to ensure that there is no duplication with existing Local Plan policies before draft NP stage is reached.</p> <p>NOTED – the justification will be thoroughly researched before draft NP stage is reached.</p> <p>NOTED – waste and minerals are excluded policy areas for NPs. As such the NP could not specifically control any local quarry development, but could influence it through a more general policy, as is proposed.</p> <p>NOTED – as explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents ‘Policy Intentions’ section, this document sets out only the “basic intentions of policies and proposals” and that “final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail,</p>	<p>ACTION – check that the proposed policy does not duplicate existing Local Plan provision.</p> <p>ACTION – ensure there is sufficient justification to underpin policy.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>many of the questions you are asking so you will see this statement a number of times as it is relevant throughout.</p> <p>This is outside the remit ?</p> <p>Planning should already do this</p> <p>We are also dependent on what is happening upstream - there have been particular issues with the release of sewage in times of heavy rainfall, and particularly so at Ilkley. These issues seem to be being dealt with on a national basis.</p> <p>After seeing what other places have done, dumping waste in water, I think it's important we respect both people who want to enjoy the waters as well as the life living in the water by keeping it clean and safe as we can.</p> <p>The town is where it is due to the rivers and aquifers The brewing industry is heavily reliant on the latter.</p> <p>Lets apply pressure to get rid of sewage from upper river!</p>	<p>will be presented in the final draft plan". This is in order to check that the community is on board with the broad thrust of policies and overall direction of travel before doing what may be extensive detailed work that may then prove to be abortive.</p> <p>NOTED - such policies are not uncommon in Local Plans and would be equally acceptable within a NP.</p> <p>NOTED - Work will be undertaken to ensure that there is no duplication with existing Local Plan policies before draft NP stage is reached.</p> <p>NOTED – such issues are outside the NPs geographical reach. Sewage outfalls into rivers are in any case non-planning issues.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – not perceived as a particular issue warranting action.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – check that the proposed policy does not duplicate existing Local Plan provision.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI GNE7	SSOB - The intention of the policy is unclear. There is no indication what protections are intended to be put in	NOTED – the intention is as clearly stated, i.e. to ensure that the overall	ACTION – check that the proposed policy does not duplicate existing Local

	place that do not already exist. I am also unclear of the definition of 'major development' (perhaps NPPF Glossary) and why such development needs to be held to a higher standard in relation to air quality protection.	impact of proposals on air quality is mitigated. Such policies are not uncommon in Local Plans for e.g.. Work will be undertaken to ensure that there is no duplication with existing Local Plan policies before draft NP stage is reached. A larger development logically has the potential for greater pollution than a small, e.g. a single house. 'Major Development' can be defined in the glossary which will accompany the next stage draft plan.	Plan provision. Define 'Major Development' in draft plan glossary as suggested.
	GPE – Yes agree. Not clear if this will simply replicate other policy and legislation.	NOTED - work will be undertaken to ensure that there is no duplication with existing Local Plan policies before draft NP stage is reached.	NO ACTION
	stop hgvs	NOTED – not in itself a planning policy issue. That said, proposed A64 junction improvement (ref TTT4) is aimed in part at addressing brewery wagon movements in the town centre.	NO ACTION
	More E Vehicle charging points required asap.	NOTED – the document already addresses this via TTT4.	NO ACTION
	Keep emissions low by not constructing huge developments and increasing the population, cars in the town	NOTED – decisions re major developments in the town will be determined by SDC's Local Plan not this NP, which must be Local Plan compliant.	NO ACTION
	Air quality and noise and light pollution need improving not mitigating	NOTED – other NP policies, e.g. on 'Traffic Transport Travel' will work to improve current air quality. GNE7 can	NO ACTION

	<p>I would agree if you added in existing developments, minimising traffic movement and traffic calming measures.</p> <p>I don't quite understand what this will look like but I believe the intention behind the proposal to be good.</p> <p>Throughout SDC area air quality has improved considerably in the last 10-20 years as evidenced by the ONS. Leave it to the expert to decided planning and development issues.</p> <p>The biggest impact here, I am sure, would be actions to divert the beer lorries away from the main town thoroughfares - which requires the opening of an A64 access towards Leeds .</p> <p>As long it is affordable for anyone impacted in that area.</p> <p>I think the best way we can improve Air quality as a town is both add vegetation such as Trees/ bushes around roads, as well as replace roads with paths only or try to</p>	<p>only influence new proposed development and such development cannot be made to address historical problems of previous development.</p> <p>NOTED – planning policy cannot control existing development, only new. The NP's 'Traffic transport Travel' section seeks to address traffic movements and calming.</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan policy/justification should make things clearer.</p> <p>NOTED – the town council is being advised and supported by specialist NP planning consultants and other specialists in preparing the NP. More positive action can only help to improve air quality further.</p> <p>NOTED – TTT2 in the 'Traffic Transport Travel' section specifically addresses this.</p> <p>NOTED – the proposed policy is in line with national planning policy. Developers need to meet requirements whatever the cost.</p> <p>NOTED - The NP's 'Traffic Transport Travel' together with this 'Green & Natural Environment'' section seek to address most of these issues. The town</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include A64 tree/woodland planting as indicated within the NP.</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>encourage people to use bikes or other transport say buses to leave and enter town.</p> <p>Areas should be set aside for tree planting, with the local community encouraged to collect and grow tree seeds. ie Acorns, Beech nuts etc.</p> <p>This may be influenced by national policy, which I would support</p> <p>We should consider hydrogen and electric propulsion for local buses and heavy plant including brewery traffic. JCB has today announced an investment into hydrogen propulsion for heavy machinery and we should immediately support this for future development. It will show Tadcaster as a local leader in green and renewable construction.</p> <p>This "issue" is down to the breweries, talk to them about it as it is NOT the fault of the residents in which you are aiming to blame here!</p> <p>The local air quality must be adversely affected by the ever present A64. Measures could be taken to mitigate CO2 levels through the creation of woodland in otherwise unusable areas i.e. floodplain at the rear of Heineken Brewery. Development in the area should not be at a "major level"</p>	<p>is already well-served by buses. Tree/ woodland planting along the A64 between the A64/A162 Junction and the river could make a significant contribution.</p> <p>NOTED - tree/ woodland planting along the A64 between the A64/A162 Junction and the river could make a significant contribution.</p> <p>NOTED – it is in line with national planning policy.</p> <p>NOTED – this is not a NP planning issue and a non-planning community action re lobbying is unlikely to have any effect as likely limited interest from large businesses.</p> <p>NOTED – there is no absolutely no mention of air quality being the residents fault. TTT2 seeks to address brewery traffic in the town centre.</p> <p>NOTED – development levels will be determined by SDC's Local Plan not the NP which must be Local Plan compliant. Tree/ woodland planting along the A64 between the A64/A162 Junction and the river could make a significant contribution.</p>	<p>ACTION – include A64 tree/woodland planting as indicated within the NP.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include A64 tree/woodland planting as indicated within the NP.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>Green policies are the future & have to be part of any regeneration initiative.</p> <p>More tree planting and conservation of trees at private properties</p> <p>More E Vehicle charging points required asap</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – some kind of trees policy could be considered for inclusion in the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – this is already addressed in the plan – ref TTT4.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider scope for an NP trees policy.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI GNE8	<p>SSOB - The intention of the policy is unclear. There is no indication what protections are intended to be put in place that do not already exist.</p> <p>GPE – Yes agree. Not clear if this will simply replicate other policy and legislation.</p> <p>You need to provide much more detail about what you mean. There is a severe lack of evidence, information, detail, impact or risk assessments for most of what is written in this document. It feels like a waste of time and money that could have been better spent supporting existing residents who have been short changed by Selby District Council for far too long. This statement applies to many of the questions you are asking so you will see this statement a number of times as it is relevant throughout.</p>	<p>NOTED – the intention is very clear, i.e. to address any gaps in existing Local Plan policy. Until such policy has been assessed for gaps, it is not certain there will be a policy and if so what protections that policy will put in place.</p> <p>NOTED – if nothing new can be added, there will be no policy as it is not the NP’s role to duplicate.</p> <p>NOTED – as explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents ‘Policy Intentions’ section, this document sets out only the “basic intentions of policies and proposals” and that “final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail, will be presented in the final draft plan”. This is in order to check that the community is on board with the broad thrust of policies and overall direction of travel before doing what may be extensive detailed work that may then prove to be abortive.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Is this outside the remit?</p> <p>This is already underway and should take account of the local needs. If not, a procedure is already in place to ensure the best solutions</p> <p>Flood prevention measures and funding for these should come from central government as part of a unified plan, using local funding puts Tadcaster at a disadvantage compared to other towns in the area without flooding issues</p> <p>In principle</p> <p>"Policy will fill gaps.....if considered necessary" - I don't think this matter is "considered necessary" but rather a matter that we "have" to solve and "now". Not only have we seen the river time and time again breach is banks we have also seen it's major impacts on our economy. If say this winter after covid already destroyed local business a flood were to occur we could see the worst loss in local business we've seen ever. It's important we don't sort the river out in the short term but we find long term solutions</p>	<p>NOTED – no, not if the NP is able to add new local detail to existing Local Plan policy.</p> <p>NOTED – the town council is well aware that work on a flood prevention scheme is well underway. That does not mean that it should not at least consider whether there is anything the NP can add to existing planning policy to help to protect the area further over the next 18 years up to 2040.</p> <p>NOTED – this is not about the funding of flood prevention and nowhere talks about funding. It is about considering whether there is anything the NP can add to existing planning policy to help to protect the area further over the next 18 years up to 2040 – there is more to flood prevention than EA/SDC/Government funded schemes, e.g. the actions of developers building on land subject to any kind of flood risk.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – work on a flood prevention scheme is already well underway. This is about considering whether there is anything the NP can add to existing planning policy to help to protect the area further over the next 18 years up to 2040. – there is more to flood prevention than EA/SDC/Government funded schemes, e.g. the actions of</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>that will work with both models of increased surface runoff as well as increased rainfall. "better safe than sorry"</p> <p>Again, this statement says nothing to the point. All flood prevention and defense for any town that has a river running through is surely a priority</p> <p>Work with the relevant authorities to improve flood prevention. But also ensure new developments do not increase risk.</p> <p>Obviously!</p> <p>Reintroduction of river dredging please?</p> <p>To vague</p> <p>Flood prevention is something which needs addressing, it also needs to be sympathetic to the natural beauty of our riverbank.</p>	<p>developers building on land subject to any kind of flood risk.</p> <p>NOTED – work on a flood prevention scheme is already well underway. This is about considering whether there is anything the NP can add to existing planning policy to help to protect the area further over the next 18 years up to 2040. – there is more to flood prevention than EA/SDC/Government funded schemes, e.g. the actions of developers building on land subject to any kind of flood risk.</p> <p>NOTED – exactly what NP policy will do if any gaps are found in existing SDC policy on new developments, as stated.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – not a NP planning policy issue. The need for dredging will be assessed by EA as part of their ongoing work on a flood prevention scheme.</p> <p>NOTED – if a policy is considered to be warranted, the next stage draft plan will make the approach clear.</p> <p>NOTED – work on a flood prevention scheme is already well underway.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>It is not well defined as a proposal.</p> <p>Flood prevention is very important. However the river is an asset and the public should be able to enjoy it.</p> <p>The nervousness of local business in the high street to invest is clear ; any thoughts of expanding the business area in and around the high st will need significant development of flood prevention to instill confidence in the business community. In short no repeat of the floods some years ago.</p> <p>The town centre deserves & needs adequate flood defences, to protect the Councils development plans.</p> <p>One of the biggest threats to Tadcaster is a repeat of the 2015 flooding. Many of the businesses there will not be able to recover, no-one would be prepared to take on the empty buildings and the town would suffer terribly. Precious little has been done in terms of effective flood defence and if it happens again, the consequences could be dire.</p> <p>In GNE8: Flood Prevention it says "Policy will fill gaps.....if considered necessary". I don't think it's necessary I can whole heartly say this is a problem that needs to be solves with both willingness and cooperation between towns.</p>	<p>NOTED – it basically represents a holding statement until it is ascertained whether NP planning policy can add anything to existing SDC Local Plan policy.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP has both of these aims well in view.</p> <p>NOTED – work on a flood prevention scheme is already well underway.</p> <p>NOTED – work on a flood prevention scheme is already well underway.</p> <p>NOTED – work on a flood prevention scheme is already well underway.</p> <p>NOTED – the need for a policy will be ascertained by assessing SDC's existing Local Plan policy on flood prevention. NP policy can only address issues within its boundary, not in other towns. It is the EA's responsibility to look at flooding in a wider catchment context.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	Flood defences are needed now and not delayed for four years.	NOTED – work is in hand and everything is being done to speed things up. The NP can do nothing to improve the situation.	NO ACTION
PI GNE9	<p>SSOB - The intention of the policy is unclear. There is no indication what protections are intended to be put in place that do not already exist. The development of a 'micro hydro scheme' on the River Wharfe Weir is not supported. Whilst the weir would originally have provided a 'head' for a water wheel at the Soke Mill, reinstatement or the development of alternative generation is not feasible nor desirable for this sensitive and prominent heritage asset.</p> <p>GPE – Yes agree. This policy would be better entitled renewable energy and technologies. We support the growth of this sector in a town that is poorly placed to support national goals in this area. What about a "Net Zero" Tadcaster?</p> <p>cost versus value and productivity</p>	<p>NOTED – this policy is not about protection of anything and its intention is considered to be clear. Neither the weir nor Soke/Tadcaster Mill appear to be either scheduled or listed by Historic England or identified as non-designated heritage assets by SDC, although they could be assessed for such identification. The town council is not aware of any feasibility study re generation and no evidence is cited in the comment to support the view expressed. Such a study would be essential in trying to move a scheme forward. The desirability or not is a subjective opinion. A successful scheme has been implemented on the Wharfe at the weir in Otley.</p> <p>NOTED – amendment of the policy title can be considered for the draft plan. A 'Net zero Tad' initiative is first and foremost a TC rather than a NP issue.</p> <p>NOTED – any firm proposals would need to be based on a detailed feasibility study and business plan.</p>	<p>ACTION – assess The Weir and Soke/Tadcaster Mill as candidate NDHA. Add commissioning of a micro-hydro scheme feasibility study as a non-planning community action.</p> <p>ACTION – consider amending policy title in draft plan.</p> <p>ACTION – add commissioning of a micro-hydro scheme feasibility study as a non-planning community action.</p>

	<p>too expensive and contradicts BE4</p> <p>Government grants to improve the energy efficiency of the houses would be very helpful</p> <p>What about existing buildings? This should be the priority not new builds which are not needed anyway. This is just about Selby meeting Government targets for new houses, does nothing for Tadcaster residents other than to potentially depreciate their already cheaper, than local, house values. Selby has all the facilities if Selby Council want more houses let them build them in Selby.</p> <p>Policy should support this integration in existing buildings as well.</p> <p>This is 2 questions! The itemised actions are still mainly unproven and expensive to install. Again the "Local Plan" already exists so their should be no need to 'fill gaps'</p>	<p>NOTED – not clear how it contradicts BE4. Any firm proposals would need to be based on a detailed feasibility study and business plan.</p> <p>NOTED – this is beyond the scope of the NP/town council.</p> <p>NOTED – the amount/location of new house building will be determined by SDC's Local Plan, not the NP which must be Local Plan compliant. Installation of domestic-level power generation technologies at existing properties is largely an individual responsibility outside the planning system.</p> <p>NOTED - installation of domestic-level power generation technologies at existing properties is largely an individual responsibility outside the planning system.</p> <p>NOTED – answers to both questions welcomed. Policy puts in place a supportive planning context for installation of 'green' technologies, in line with national planning policy. Gaps do exist in Local Plan policy coverage and it is the legitimate role of NPs to consider whether gaps do exist and whether NP planning policies can plug those gaps and/or add local value to district-wide policies.</p>	<p>ACTION – add commissioning of a micro-hydro scheme feasibility study as a non-planning community action.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>There's plenty of scope for a hydro scheme at the weir that could be developed into an attractive amenity e.g. Modern working mill with artisan bakery and café overlooking the river, viaduct, church, bridge and grassland flood plain in the disused mill building.</p> <p>I am particularly interested in the potential HEP plant at the weir and explored this idea myself in 2010 with other interested parties.</p> <p>Strongly agree with this policy intention</p> <p>Not sure what a micro-hydro scheme at the weir would entail</p> <p>The problem is ground heat isn't really a solution here, while in countries such as Iceland it's great our Green Power Solution should come from Hydro. I think if were to make a long-term plan to increase both water capacity in the river via adding offloading lakes as well as adding Hydro gen gates we could solve two problems at once. Is the cost of power generation on the river going to be effective given how often the river flow is negligible in summer and flooded in winter, with both extremes likely to become more extensive according to some climate scientists?</p> <p>An excellent idea - I hope it actually happens</p> <p>Will a micro-hydro scheme at the River Wharfe weir be publicly or privately owned, operated and maintained; and who will derive the benefits?</p>	<p>NOTED – any proposals will be based on a detailed feasibility study and business plan. Little remains of the original mill on which the sort of amenity suggested could be based.</p> <p>NOTED – the reference to historical work on an HEP scheme is of interest.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan will endeavour to provide more detail.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy will be supportive of a variety of 'green power' solutions. Any firm proposals will be based on a detailed feasibility study and business plan. A successful scheme has been implemented on the Wharfe weir at Otley. The NP role is to put in place a supportive planning policy context for future proposals.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – any firm proposals would need to be based on a detailed feasibility study and business plan to address such issues. The NP role is to put in place a supportive planning policy context for future proposals.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – research documentation on 2010 work at the town council.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add commissioning of a micro-hydro scheme feasibility study as a non-planning community action.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add commissioning of a micro-hydro scheme feasibility study as a non-planning community action.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>Excellent and important policy intention.</p> <p>This weir has been looked at before. It should be pursued and completed this time, to benefit the town.</p> <p>Future proofing</p> <p>I already have solar panels and would encourage any new build to include their installation.</p> <p>This is a very positive proposal and should receive wide ranging support but we must educate and inform local people as to the value of locally generated renewable power.</p> <p>These proposed plans could potentially be hazardous to wildlife in which you apparently aim to "conserve" some measures have been proven to be a hazard to both airborne and aquatic life.</p> <p>Would need to know more about this.</p> <p>I would only support the installation of a micro-hydro scheme if it does not detract and undermine the other policies e.g. GNE1, BE5 and there is a positive business case in terms of use of the energy. Otherwisle the</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the reference to historical work on an HEP scheme is of interest</p> <p>NOTED – unclear what point is being made here so not possible to give a meaningful response</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – while undoubtedly true, this goes beyond the scope of the NP.</p> <p>NOTED - any firm proposals would need to be based on a detailed feasibility study. A successful scheme has been implemented at Otley weir without harm to wildlife.</p> <p>NOTED - the NP role is simply to put in place a supportive planning policy context for future proposals. The next stage draft plan will aim to provide further detail. Any firm proposals would need to be based on a detailed feasibility study and business plan to address such issues.</p> <p>NOTED - any firm proposals would need to be based on a detailed feasibility study and business plan to address such issues. A successful scheme has been</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – research documentation on 2010 work at the town council.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add commissioning of a micro-hydro scheme feasibility study as a non-planning community action.</p> <p>ACTION – add commissioning of a micro-hydro scheme feasibility study as a non-planning community action.</p> <p>ACTION – add commissioning of a micro-hydro scheme feasibility study as a non-planning community action.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>investment should be made in the development of Tadcaster</p> <p>The micro-hydro plan's for the Wharfe sound very interesting & a sustainable green idea.</p> <p>Great</p> <p>New developments should have the use of grey water and tanks as well as solar power mandatory requirement.</p> <p>who will fund the micro hydro scheme, who will upkeep, who will benefit?</p> <p>Depends on cost versus value and productivity</p> <p>Existing buildings should be the priority not new ones</p>	<p>implemented at Otley weir without harm to the river or public realm.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – beyond the remit of planning policy.</p> <p>NOTED - any firm proposals would need to be based on a detailed feasibility study and business plan to address such issues.</p> <p>NOTED – planning policy has no bearing on the installation of domestic technologies in existing buildings.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add commissioning of a micro-hydro scheme feasibility study as a non-planning community action.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Green & Natural Environment – Non-Planning Community Actions	<p>1) Problems regarding refuse and collection and recycling also should include dog fouling of pavements and footpaths. 2) A larger NYCC Collection and recycling facility to replace that on the industrial site should be sought - similar to the Leeds CC site at Thorp Arch, which Tadcaster residents are not allowed to use.</p> <p>Disposal and specifically recycling of waste, with provision and maintenance of the local facilities to do so, should be of continuing importance and be encouraged in policy terms.</p>	<p>1) NOTED – this is a general town council rather than NP issue.</p> <p>2) NOTED – the existing facility is perceived as working well with no real issues.</p> <p>NOTED – nothing NP policy can do as waste planning is an excluded matter for NPs.</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Green & Natural Environment – General	<p>Currently the "Play areas" that exist already are actually used by youths who go there to drink alcohol.</p>	<p>NOTED – not a NP issue.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

PI TC1	<p>Historic England - Conversion of Empty Properties: conversion of ground floors of former retail premises to residential use can present challenging design issues, which need careful consideration.</p> <p>Recommendation:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a new BE policy relating to Shop Front Design, possibly including a Shop Front Design Guide as an Appendix to the Neighbourhood Plan, which covers the conversion of ground floor retail premises to residential use. 	<p>NOTED – this will be considered as part of the development of BE1 (Conservation Area Development & Design – NB most of the empty properties are in the town centre) and in the light of the Design Codes study commissioned by the town council. Account will also be taken of extant SDC design policies re shop fronts.</p>	<p>ACTION – consider recommendation as indicated.</p>
	<p>SSOB - The reuse of empty town centre properties must be appropriate for their town centre location. Whilst this may include residential uses, this needs to be carefully managed to ensure that the town centre retains its commercial core.</p>	<p>NOTED – the town council is mindful of existing and emerging SDC town centre policies.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>GPE – Yes agree. Reuse of empty properties is an important element of the regeneration and future vitality of the town centre but relies on investment by the owner in each case unless other sources of funding are proposed. There is no reliance on wider planning policy to enable this. It is appropriate that they are brought forward for a mix of uses, as they have very limited residential value. It is important that the reuse of empty/vacant properties is not considered as the only source for delivering additional housing in Tadcaster. It should not be relied upon to address the identified housing needs of the town, particularly affordable and family homes.</p>	<p>NOTED – the housing needs of the town will be determined by SDC's Local Plan not this NP/the town council.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>This is desperately overdue</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Definitely. These properties are a disgrace.</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Definitely overdue</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>This policy would boost the development and economy of Tadcaster. It is a pity that there are so many empty houses , they could be rented out, sold or offered to the Council Housing. If the lobby didn't have so much power!</p> <p>Given the reduction in 'High Street' retail shopping in some towns, change of use might be appropriate for some buildings.</p> <p>Strongly agree!</p> <p>laudable proposal buy maybe one in the sky if local landowner is not supportive! In town centre ground floor needs to be kept for retail not housing.</p> <p>However I have reservations about ground floor residential development in the town centre as I think this should be available for commerce.</p> <p>Very much so. To see Tadcaster have so many empty, abandoned or derelict buildings so publicly visible is not an attraction for visitors or new investment and business.</p> <p>Persuade the main landlord to reduce his rents , and also stop the apparent practice of removing toilets to render empty properties "uninhabitable"</p> <p>I would like to see to town centre to support a lot of businesses with some upper floors being devoted to small scale businesses instead of residential accommodation.</p> <p>This needs urgent action but will be difficult as need landlord's cooperation</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE – the NP must however work within the context of SDC town centre policies.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED– the town council is mindful of existing and emerging SDC town centre policies re retail use. The town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town’s principal landowners and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – these are not planning policy issues. The town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town’s landowners throughout the NDP preparation process.</p> <p>NOTED – a range of alternative uses will be supported.</p> <p>NOTED - the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>It is really sad to see empty properties. Business should be encouraged and there are many people who would love to be on the property ladder,</p> <p>I agree with this, but I thought legislation is in force to make landlords restore and let out properties.</p> <p>I believe that the empty properties in Tadcaster are in the main down to one or two individuals who have purchased them with the intent of leaving them vacant. I don't mind that...if you've got that money to spend. I do however feel that the owner/s of vacant buildings (if their identity is known) should be responsible for ensuring they do not become an eyesore.</p> <p>The town centre is laughable at the moment. If my family visit I'm embarrassed to take them into town due to the amount of vacant buildings. This combined with a charity shop looking like a jumble sale with products up and down the street makes Tadcaster town centre look more like a town centre on its last legs. Due to The Smiths owning most of the buildings and dictating what types of shops can be opened it makes it difficult for new businesses to get a foothold. I applied for a pet shop in 2 of The Smiths shops and was advised this isn't the type of business the owner wants in these premises.</p> <p>Hope that Samuel Smiths can be made to either bring their property into use or to relinquish ownership and allow others bring them into use.</p>	<p>the town's landowners throughout the NDP preparation process.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – if it is, it clearly hasn't worked in Tadcaster.</p> <p>NOTED - the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowners throughout the NDP preparation process.</p> <p>NOTED - the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowners throughout the NDP preparation process. The proposed policy will make it easier for those who wish to effect changes of use in empty properties to do so.</p> <p>NOTED - the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowners throughout the NDP preparation process.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>This is a problem that well frankly annoys be a lot, the fact there is tons of land/ buildings that could be used for business or housing but isn't either cause of Red Tape or because of laziness or maybe cause of fear of loss due to past events such as flooding. I think it's important we get back investors via solving both flooding as well as removing red tape to ensure we can get business move in and new development to replace those abandoned buildings.</p> <p>Very essential</p> <p>This is badly needed there are far to many empty properties that could be used as housing or shops with flats above and all derelict properties should be pulled down and modern council houses built that people could afford to rent. Much of the town is an eyesore</p> <p>Think this should be a priority before considering building additional new houses as there are a large amount of uninhabited/ run down/ derelict buildings in the town. Not only do they make the town look completely run down, it doesn't make sense to build new houses when there are existing buildings in the town which could be used, if they were made 'good' again.</p> <p>This is a pre-eminent aspiration which would transform the town at a stroke. The number of derelict and out of use properties are an eyesore and blight on the town. Many of these properties have been derelict for most of the average residents memory and must be restored to either business or housing use.</p> <p>Essential for the low carbon invigoration of the town. Live, work and shop local.</p>	<p>NOTED – the policy aims to address the problem. Work on a flood prevention scheme is already well underway.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – decisions re new housing will be determined by SDC's Local Plan not this NP.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	Good luck on that. We are back to the Smith family again!	NOTED - the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowners throughout the NDP preparation process.	NO ACTION
	Absolutely essential. Maximum priority	NOTED	NO ACTION
	This is essential	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I consider this to be the highest priority. Not only do we need more homes, but the numerous unoccupied buildings are unsightly and unwelcoming to the town.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I believe this is key to the regeneration strategy	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Needs to happen now. Tadcaster has already had this issue for years.	NOTED – the NP is not a quick fix and has to follow a designated preparation process. Efforts re empty properties have been made over many years.	NO ACTION
	This depends on whether the cost of bringing these properties back into productive use is met by the property owner i.e. Humphrey Smith (who should be doing this already)	NOTED - the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowners throughout the NDP preparation process. The proposed policy will make it easier for those who wish to effect changes of use in empty properties to do so.	NO ACTION
	Sites for shops need to be refilled with shops and businesses rather than residential development otherwise the town will have no centre. Tadcaster is already lacking a centre/buzz of activity and that is what needs bringing back to life.	NOTED– the town council is mindful of existing and emerging SDC town centre policies re retail use.	NO ACTION
	Very unsure how this will be achieved due to current ownership of some properties	NOTED - the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with	NO ACTION

		the town's landowners throughout the NDP preparation process.	
	It is hoped that the Brewery and SDC will work together on this. This development plan is similar in some areas to the Vision of Tadcaster which was proposed by the Brewery approx 40 years ago.....	NOTED – the NP approach is necessarily influenced by the emerging SDC Local Plan, which itself is a result of SDC and brewery discussions.	NO ACTION
	This is particularly important to me and will surely bring more visitors to Tadcaster as well as improving the amount of homes available.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Yes! This is fundamental to any transformation efforts. I question why this hasn't happened a decade ago. My concern is that there is other pressure which prevents redevelopment which MUST be tackled head on in order to avoid this town falling into ruin.	NOTED – the NP cannot be held responsible for the past. It seeks to improve things for the future. The town council is endeavouring to work with all in preparing this plan.	NO ACTION
	Absolutely agree! We have some lovely old properties just going to rack and ruin. These buildings should be renovated and brought back into use. As well as providing homes it would really improve the look of the town.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	This is a must	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I don't think we need housing we need shops cafes and restaurants	NOTED – a range of alternative uses will be supported.	NO ACTION
	This is going to be crucial and one of the more important parts of the new policies, we feel. Having moved into the area in the last few months, this was one of our main concerns but we are extremely excited and positive about the future of this beautiful town.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	A list of unused and available properties should be sent out for potential investors	NOTED – this is outside the NP/town council remit.	NO ACTION

	<p>Vitally important to rejuvenate the high street</p> <p>Whilst fully supporting bringing empty town centre properties into use, the aim should be to move these into much needed local business concerns; ground floors should be used exclusively for business and shop use, whilst residential should be confined to upper floors only.</p> <p>We need shops not flats</p> <p>This would be fantastic and would make the biggest difference to Tadcaster in my opinion.</p> <p>This needs to be done first. So many unoccupied residential properties.</p> <p>This needs to be a top priority. Owners of empty property should be stripped of ownership of property which is left uninhabitable for extended periods.</p> <p>This has got to be THE HIGHEST PRIORITY. There are a ridiculous number of vacant properties. This should include re-development into housing.</p> <p>However if rumours are correct the empty properties should be brought back into use FIRST before any new properties are built. Builders/developers tell lies sometimes!!</p> <p>Please make Humphrey bring his properties u to date without submitting to his blackmail over the central car park development</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – a range of alternative uses will be supported. The town council is also mindful of existing and emerging SDC town centre policies re retail use.</p> <p>NOTED – the town council is mindful of existing and emerging SDC town centre policies re retail use. Upper stories offer potential for other uses.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – such action is not within the NP/town council gift.</p> <p>NOTED - a range of alternative uses will be supported</p> <p>NOTED – this is not something which the NP can require.</p> <p>NOTED – central car park development is an SDC Local Plan proposal which the NP cannot oppose. The NP has no remit</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

		re the forcing of landowners to effect property works.	
	Good luck with this plan, unless you get compulsory purchase order's for the Sam's building's, I really can't see it getting off the ground....	NOTED - the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowners throughout the NDP preparation process.	NO ACTION
	Mixed use of buildings with housing in previous retail would provide a blended environment.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Very important	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Persuade the brewery or forget it.	NOTED - the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowners throughout the NDP preparation process.	NO ACTION
	Although as mentioned earlier some of the council bungalows in Tadcaster have never been modernised.	NOTED – not perceived as a particular issue. Not a NP planning policy issue.	NO ACTION
	So pleased to hear this. I've lived here 20 years and am sick of seeing so many empty, neglected and run-down buildings. Successive governments insist on the need to build new housing when we already have so many buildings which could be used in a productive manner.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	All run down properties restored.	NOTED – the NP cannot guarantee this.	NO ACTION
	With regards to housing, there is a significant number of unoccupied and derelict properties that should be the first priority	NOTED – the NP cannot require action on unoccupied/derelict properties to provide housing in advance of any new builds.	NO ACTION
	This is desperately overdue	NOTED	NO ACTION

	This is so important giving such a poor impression + discouraging trade	NOTED	NO ACTION
PI TC2	SSOB - Development of this nature can provide an important feature of a town centre regeneration; however care needs to be exercised to ensure that these facilities are of an appropriate scale and location.	NOTED – other NP policies on the built environment will act to control the scale etc. of new development.	NO ACTION
	GPE – Yes agree. It may be appropriate to provide visitor attractions elsewhere in the town, i.e., outside of a tightly defined town centre.	NOTED – it is considered that the town centre should be the focus for new visitor attractions.	NO ACTION
	but disabled access is not mentioned	NOTED – draft plan policy will make every effort to reflect the needs of the disabled/elderly and disabled access, within the context of existing national and SDC policy.	ACTION – reflect needs as indicated in draft plan policy.
	It would be great to have more festivals that attracts visitors and enhances the neighbourhood network	NOTED – while a good idea, there is currently no driving force in the town willing to make this happen.	NO ACTION
	Some wall murals would be a good idea.	NOTED – this will be encompassed by current SDC work on a cultural strategy for the district’s principal towns.	NO ACTION
	Needs to go further than just Arts and Culture - needs major visitor attractions and direct action to develop the new plans	NOTED – without further information/ examples of the sort of attractions envisaged, it is not possible to respond more meaningfully.	NO ACTION
	Including an Arts Centre	NOTED – such provision would be encompassed by the policy.	NO ACTION
	"culture and the arts in Tadcaster" - it's a great idea to encourage these areas.	NOTED	NO ACTION

	<p>We have a huge history which is only documented on a few notice boards around the town. Brewery tours, a brewery shop (Beer Shop) would draw visitors in too.</p> <p>I agree, we have vital transport links such as the Coastliner that takes people from Leeds to Scarborough, we can use this to setup a visitor commercial zone around the Bus station to help boost business and local money.</p> <p>An arts festival would be very good - not every year, perhaps a 3 year cycle.</p> <p>Culture and the "arts" usually means "fluffy" expensive functionless installations and a waste of money</p> <p>Interested in hearing more on this</p> <p>Our town has so much history, yet what do we offer visitors to our town? A town trail board, not enough to bring visitors to our town.</p> <p>We are a lovely quiet haven where we live in peace, we do not want disruption to this.</p>	<p>NOTED – the promotion of heritage and brewery related tourism, including tours, is addressed under non-planning community actions.</p> <p>NOTED – the whole of the town centre is easily accessible from the bus station.</p> <p>NOTED – while a good idea, there is currently no driving force in the town willing to make this happen.</p> <p>DISAGREE – this is a baseless claim.</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan should provide more detail.</p> <p>NOTED – hence this and other town centre policy intentions and community actions.</p> <p>NOTED – development which promotes culture/arts visitor attractions need not equal disruption. The current peace and quiet is down to the town’s down at heel, dispirited and rundown character – not qualities the town council or community wish to preserve, as evidenced by responses to this consultation.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>There are some fantastic empty properties on the high street that would make excellent studios for artists. Cultural quarter around Riley Smith - The ARK</p> <p>Surely there are other things we need rather than disappointed tourists</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the NP addresses a wide range of other things which the town also needs. Today’s tourists are likely to be disappointed due to the lack of the very things which this and other policies are proposing.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI TC3	<p>NYCC - the policy intentions are welcomed. See comments to BE5 and BE6.</p> <p>SSOB – 1) Any development of the features suggested in the policy intention must ensure that appropriate design and materials are deployed. 2) In relation the desire to re-establish Public Conveniences in the town centre, however, note that the removal by Selby District Council of the previous facilities within the Central Car Park was undertaken due to repeated vandalism and the cost of upkeep. These factors would need to be resolved before any proposal for these facilities could be supported.</p> <p>TVCSA – this mentions public conveniences (previously closed by Selby District Council) but does not describe restoration of disabled toilets which were there originally.</p> <p>GPE – Yes agree. It would be appropriate for the policy to refer to the ease of access to such facilities.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED – other NP policies on the built environment will act to control the development in question. 2) NOTED – it is envisaged that a new facility could be delivered in association with new proposed car parking and operated by the incoming NY authority. The continued presence of facilities at the bus station suggests that operational difficulties need not be insurmountable.</p> <p>NOTED – draft plan policy will make every effort to reflect the needs of the disabled/elderly and disabled access, within the context of existing national and SDC policy.</p> <p>NOTED – draft plan policy will make every effort to reflect the needs of the disabled/elderly and disabled access,</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – reflect needs as indicated in draft plan policy</p> <p>ACTION – reflect needs as indicated in draft plan policy</p>

		within the context of existing national and SDC policy.	
	Provision of public toilets urgently needed	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Cafes and restaurants need to be sited appropriately to prevent them competing for business and then closing. Many town centres are overrun with chain coffee shops/casual restaurants/food takeaways which detracts from the town. Tadcaster should focus on specialising and attracting people from further afield (York, Wetherby, Sherburn etc.) to a few outstanding locations instead of trying to turn every vacant shop into a cafe.	NOTED – policy can be used to control the amounts of different uses within town centre frontages.	ACTION – consider including controls on different uses in policy as indicated.
	1) I do not think Tadcaster needs any new restaurants/cafe bars/public houses. 2) I do think a cycle park with additional security would be a good thing - currently I do not see anywhere safe to lock up bikes other than a Sainsburys.	1) DISAGREE – bars/public houses are not mentioned. Proposals re restaurant/café facilities are supported by the community in this consultation. 2) NOTED	1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION
	The town centre should be an area where you can spend a few hours passing by the day on a weekend so i support this policy. there simply isnt enough to hold any one in the centre of town for longer than an hour at present	NOTED	NO ACTION
	This category covers too many elements to know if I would be in support Again very subjective	NOTED – there is no indication of which are supported and which not. The proposals are supported by the community in this consultation.	NO ACTION
	The central car park could be re-developed for more shops	NOTED – development of the central car park will be determined by SDC’s Local Plan.	NO ACTION
	Definitely need improved restaurant / cafe facilities and cycling provision and better use of the river bank area.	NOTED	NO ACTION

	<p>The list should include shopping and retail facilities.</p> <p>Town needs to be more attractive. The shops that are open are maintained and fit the character of town but we need more choice of shops, i.e. artisan bakery, groceries. Wetherby is a good example of types of business that Tadcaster is lacking. High street lacks vibrancy and life.</p> <p>All for eateries but need a good mix of shops and not just eateries. Need to attract people to tadcaster and eateries just won't be enough. Please take a steer from Wetherby town centre which has a good mix of shops and cafes</p> <p>Should include an intention to improve sporting facilities</p> <p>Great plan's, as long as you can clear the Sam Smiths doctrine.</p> <p>Expansion of the riverside amenity through additional seating and possible cafe seating. Information boards alongside river to show history opposite such as Mill Lane and castle area.</p>	<p>NOTED – there may be scope for a NP retail policy to add value/local detail to existing SDC planning policy.</p> <p>NOTED – there may be scope for a NP retail policy to add value/local detail to existing SDC planning policy.</p> <p>NOTED – there may be scope for a NP retail policy to add value/local detail to existing SDC planning policy.</p> <p>NOTED – this is addressed at CFS2 which supports the Local Plan proposed Tadcaster Sports Park and Community Hub at London Road. The town is otherwise already well-catered for.</p> <p>NOTED - the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowners throughout the NDP preparation process.</p> <p>NOTED - 2 areas of the west bank – town-council owned - are open to the public, offering only grassed areas, occasional benches and planting damaged by flooding. The river itself is never used. It is considered that there is huge potential to strengthen the protection for these areas and to</p>	<p>ACTION – consider policy scope relative to existing SDC policy.</p> <p>ACTION – consider policy scope relative to existing SDC policy.</p> <p>ACTION – consider policy scope relative to existing SDC policy.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION - include a NP policy proposing creation of new riverside park and a complementary non-planning community action addressing non-planning policy matters such as potential community involvement.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>Very important to support local businesses. For example the excellent work by Stutton Road shopkeepers and food outlets, particularly the outside decking installed by Roast Cafe</p> <p>There is no reason why Tadcaster can't become a successful, thriving town. These are good ideas but inevitably will be challenged by the local landowner.</p> <p>it will also increase waste production if you have cafe/bars facilities.</p> <p>YES!!</p>	<p>significantly improve their appearance and offer to visitors.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowners throughout the NDP preparation process.</p> <p>NOTED – there are mechanisms for managing waste. This is not a valid reason to oppose town centre recreational enhancement which is widely supported by the community in this consultation.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI TC4	<p>SSOB - Supported, subject to the detailed wording and application of the final policy.</p> <p>GPE – no comment at this stage. Agreement not known at this stage.</p> <p>specialised markets?</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the failing Thursday market is a general market. Periodic monthly farmers/artisans markets have taken place and are envisaged on a temporary basis on the Britannia car park.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	people aren't aware of existing market though	NOTED – hence the need for enhancement of existing or entirely new.	NO ACTION
	Needs a designated area	NOTED – envisaged as being temporary structures on a pedestrianised Kirkgate.	NO ACTION
	Better location needed for marketing	NOTED – envisaged as being temporary structures on a pedestrianised Kirkgate.	NO ACTION
	needs a designated area	NOTED – envisaged as being temporary structures on a pedestrianised Kirkgate.	NO ACTION
	Provided this does not result in the permanent closure of Kirkgate	NOTED – it would not be a market with permanent market structures. Pedestrianisation from The Ark to the Bridge St/High St junction is envisaged. Full details to be worked out.	NO ACTION
	This will only work if traders are prepared to take part, which at the moment they are not. The market day should not be the same as other local markets, for example Wetherby.	NOTED – current market day is Thursday but trader use very limited at present.	NO ACTION
	I think the current markets/ street fairs held in Tadcaster are a wonderful part of the town's culture and can heartily back any support/ enhancement of them.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Street market once a week but on designated site without disruption traders businesses and traffic	NOTED – envisaged as being temporary structures on a pedestrianised Kirkgate.	NO ACTION
	This needs to be developed in sympathetic harmony with whatever is intended for the current central car parking area	NOTED – NYCC Highways are/will be involved in both pedestrianisation scheme and any future housing scheme.	NO ACTION

	<p>I am not sure of the viability of our open air markets now, which tend to look completely out of character. I would like to see the stall holders have indoor spaces in one of the unused buildings with individual, non-permanent, 'shop fronts' much like the stalls they have but inside.</p>	<p>NOTED – this is unlikely to be feasible given the current realities of re-utilising unused buildings in the town centre.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Seems a good idea</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Tadcaster had a thriving market about 30 years ago. I don't think you'll ever revive it in Tadcaster. Ironically, the central car park was the site of the market when it was thriving.</p>	<p>NOTED – the policy aims to try.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>A weekly market is a wonderful thing in a town and ours has been a sorry affair in recent years.</p>	<p>NOTED – hence the intention to revive it.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>I think the town is too small for its own market place. Nearby villages such as Wetherby should host these</p>	<p>NOTED – there is no proposal for a market place as such.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>A street market would be great to bring in Sole Traders who just started or local business who want to grab new customers. I think that if we allow a platform for this it'll encourage new business in the town.</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>There isn't really any street market at present and a market would be good but the town needs to attract far more young people with families for it to be viable.</p>	<p>NOTED – there is a Thursday market on the social club car park and were periodic Artisan/Cobbles markets in 2021.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Would love to see the existing street market enhanced and promoted further afield.</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>Non-Planning Community Actions to include riverside attractions, coffee bar and beer garden facilities.</p>	<p>NOTED – riverside attractions are addressed in the GNE section. Coffee bar (assumed to be a mobile) and beer garden facilities responsibility of</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Market was once thriving. Needs high visibility, easy access and parking</p> <p>Although Tadcaster has historically been a market Town, do we really need a street market? I along with my friends and neighbours who live in Tadcaster have never visited the market the whole time they have lived here. What is required is more retail developments.</p> <p>Market is a dying trade.</p> <p>Need enhancement of regular market</p> <p>Our market is not a patch on what it was when it was in the central car park.</p> <p>This will increase visitor numbers, everyone loves a great market!</p> <p>Recommend council considers York market as a guide here as this permanent fixture allows for smaller independent food and retail offerings and is accessible to those who work during the normal day.</p> <p>There is not really any space to do this realistically and this could cause major congestion.</p> <p>Must be in the streets not in a back car park</p>	<p>individual commercial providers not the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – current Thursday market is failing. New street market envisaged on pedestrianized Kirkgate.</p> <p>NOTED – it is not an either/or situation and there is community support for the market idea. There may be scope for a NP retail policy to add value/local detail to existing SDC planning policy.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy aims to reverse this trend in Tadcaster. There is community support for the market.</p> <p>NOTED – policy intention supports this.</p> <p>NOTED – policy seeks to revive its fortunes.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it would not be a market with permanent market structures.</p> <p>NOTED – new street market envisaged on pedestrianized Kirkgate.</p> <p>NOTED – new street market envisaged on pedestrianized Kirkgate.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider policy scope relative to existing SDC policy.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>The monthly weekend market is a fantastic addition to the town</p> <p>Not sure we need the town centre WiFi just because they never work well in my experience.</p> <p>Where is it proposed that this street market will be located? There have been various locations attempted over the years and none of these has attracted a significant number of attractive stallholders.</p> <p>Not in favour of a street market if it means closing roads</p> <p>A market town needs a market, but I think a lot of towns are struggling to get trader's to fill the stalls...</p> <p>Opportunity for market is a good thing but need to safeguard access to properties on Westgate so that they are not adversely affected. Use of unused land would enable such an event to be held off street.</p> <p>Good idea</p> <p>Parking may/will be a problem</p> <p>Needs a designated area</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – already in place.</p> <p>NOTED – new street market envisaged on pedestrianized Kirkgate.</p> <p>NOTED – it would not be a market with permanent market structures. Pedestrianisation from The Ark to the Bridge St/High St junction is envisaged. Full details to be worked out.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – pedestrianisation from The Ark to the Bridge St/High St junction is envisaged. Full details to be worked out.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – full details to be worked out. Envisaged that Selby Local Plan and NP parking proposals will address loss of central car parking. Market trader parking not seen as an issue.</p> <p>NOTED – new street market envisaged on pedestrianized Kirkgate.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>Town Centre – Non-Planning Community Actions</p>	<p>NYCC - I support the aspiration for heritage tours and trails set out in the Non-Planning Community Actions on page 16. This might particularly pick up on the less obvious aspects of the town’s development such as its Roman and medieval heritage.</p> <p>SSOB - There are a number of actions which appear to have been defined as ‘non-planning’ but which have the potential to be affected by either the Development Management or Planning Policy functions of the planning system. For example, ‘Introduce Tadcaster Town Trail Boards’ or ‘Promotional Tadcaster signage at identified town gateways’ both have the potential to require planning permission.</p> <p>SSOB - I note also the reference to examining the feasibility brewery tours on page 16. I understand that all three breweries within the town have previously examined the potential of running tours for visiting members of the public, however the health and safety implications of hosting members of the public with visits to operational commercial/industrial sites has rendered such ideas unviable. All three are fully working breweries; they have not been set up to accommodate tours. These aspirations are very unlikely to be realised.</p> <p>Tadcaster Alternative Group – residents and businesses in Wharfe Bank Terrace, Church Mews, Bridge St and Kirkgate will be denied vehicular access to their properties should Westgate and Kirkgate be pedestrianised.</p>	<p>NOTED – Roman and medieval interest could be included.</p> <p>NOTED – this can be considered in deciding how/where to frame these actions in the next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED – it is acknowledged that tours are not feasible for the town’s 3 major commercial breweries. What is envisaged here is a ‘Brewing Heritage Centre’ which is seeking to establish itself in the town, with support from Heineken, Molson Coors and a fledgling microbrewery. The next stage draft plan will make this clear.</p> <p>NOTED – pedestrianisation from The Ark to the Bridge St/High St junction is envisaged. Full details to be worked out but town council confident solutions to potential problems can be sorted out. Scheme is already on NYCC agenda/in programme.</p>	<p>ACTION – specific Roman/medieval as indicated.</p> <p>ACTION – consider planning implications of specified actions in preparing draft plan.</p> <p>ACTION – clarify NP community action re brewery tours as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
---	--	---	--

	<p>the proposed pedestrianisation of Kirkgate/westgate will be a detriment to access to the town rather than encourage visitors.</p> <p>I also do not agree with pedestrianising Kirkgate as the other roads cannot support the traffic flow.</p> <p>Policy Intention TC4 (Non-Planning Community Actions) mentions introducing town centre public Wi-Fi yet this intention not any of the Neighbourhood Development Plan 2021-2040 makes mention of working with providers to bring 5G connectivity to Tadcaster to improve mobile device coverage and improved access to high speed fibre, to support key workers working increasingly from home, in forever increasing smart homes. If Tadcaster is to remain so connected to the local geographic infrastructure, it must also embrace digital infrastructure also.</p>	<p>NOTED – pedestrianisation from The Ark to the Bridge St/High St junction is envisaged. Full details to be worked out but town council confident solutions to potential problems can be sorted out. Scheme is already on NYCC agenda/in programme.</p> <p>NOTED –this is not considered to be a particularly pressing issue for Tadcaster. Equally, it is not an issue can be effectively addressed via a NP planning policy.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Town Centre – General	<p>what facilities have been deemed necessary for the town centre</p> <p>Vitally important to kick start the high street and create a vibrant heart to the town</p>	<p>NOTED – those included in the document.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI CFS1	<p>NYCC - community facilities play a vital role in contributing to the health and Wellbeing of communities. Ensuring that there are adequate facilities for all the community is supported.</p> <p>SSOB - The policy intention provides details of a number of buildings, but doesn't provide details of the service and facilities which are sought to be protected. This needs to be made clear in any forthcoming policy.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan policy will be supported by evidence of the facilities/services offered.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>TVCSA – this does not mention TVCSA. No-where does it mention any needs of the elderly or disabled.</p> <p>TVCSA – the section on Community Facilities and Services lists the organisations that are initially identified for Regulation 14 consultation. This list includes every town organisation that provides for families, youth and sports but does not include any organisations specifically for the elderly. We consider omitting TVCSA from the list of organisations in the CFS1 Protection and enhancement of community facilities is deliberate and discriminatory against the protected characteristics we represent. It is a clear breach of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations and the Public Sector Duty 2011.</p> <p>GPE – Yes agree. There appears to be a significant overlap between this and CFS2.</p>	<p>NOTED – this intention relates to the protection of the built facilities from which services are delivered, which the next stage draft plan policy will make clear. On this basis, it would be Fisher-More Chambers that were listed rather than TVCSA. The policy will be supported by evidence of the services/facilities provided at/from each built facility – this is where any specifically relating to the needs of the elderly or disabled will be included.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the section, more specifically the policy intention CFS1, lists those built facilities so far identified as being of particular value to the community by virtue of the services/facilities they provide to the community. The use of the word ‘including’ in the intention indicates that this is not an exhaustive list but rather one to be added to. This is not a list of organisations nor does the list have anything to do with Regulation 14 consultation - the NPs formal consultation stage – which is unlikely to be reached until towards the end of 2022 at the earliest. As such there is no discrimination and no breach as alleged.</p> <p>NOTED – there is no overlap. CFS1 relates to the protection of existing</p>	<p>ACTION – add Fisher-More Chambers to CFS1 list.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

		facilities. CFS2 relates to the improvement or existing or provision of new facilities.	
	central carpark needs putting on the list	DISAGREE – in planning terms, this is a car park not a built community facility.	NO ACTION
	depends on use of a facility	NOTED – the next stage draft plan policy will be supported by evidence of the facilities/services/uses offered.	NO ACTION
	Are they in risk of loss?	NOTED – while there is no known threat at the moment, this is a plan with a long (2040) time horizon, in which time a lot of things can change.	NO ACTION
	Great, but we need improvements not protection.	NOTED – CFS2 addresses the improvement of facilities. CFS1 is important because a facility cannot be improved if it has already been lost to another use.	NO ACTION
	Agree, these services and facilities should not be lost. All those I have ever interacted with were things that drew me to move to Tadcaster in the first place and remain important parts of my life here.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Public funds should not be utilised to shore up failing facilities. New and better facilities must be encouraged. All listed can and should be replaced if a better option is provided. Market forces must be allowed to determine the requirements.	NOTED – this is not about funding, it is about protecting built facilities in the community uses that they currently provide so they are not subject to changes of use. CFS2 encourages new and better facilities in addition.	NO ACTION
	Essential	NOTED	NO ACTION

Remember we also have tadcaster tennis courts on fairfield road	NOTED – as an open space rather than a built facility, the courts would be better protected under GNE2. The associated pavilion could however be included here.	ACTION – add tennis pavilion to CFS1 list and courts to GNE2.
The council should vigorously support these against possible closure	NOTED – this is the intention.	NO ACTION
List to include Citizens Advice Centre and Tourist Information etc.	NOTED – neither has a facility in Tadcaster. However, Stepping Stones on Kirkgate fulfils a CAB-type role and TVCSA on Westgate provides a site-based service too.	ACTION – add Stepping Stones and TVCSA facilities to policy list.
And support others that attract visitors to the town on a wkend with travelling supporters	NOTED – there is scope to include other built facilities under the policy.	NO ACTION
Absolutely, none of these facilities should be lost.	NOTED – this is the intention.	NO ACTION
Definitely need to hold onto these facilities. They are so important	NOTED	NO ACTION
Current facilities need protecting , community library already limited	NOTED	NO ACTION
Community services are vital, as seen after the Boxing Day Floods.	NOTED	NO ACTION
Scout hut	AGREE – should be included here. As should Girl Guides Hut, adjacent The Barn.	ACTION – add scout hut to CFS1 list, together with Girl Guides Hut.
The gym in Tadcaster really needs upgrading I currently drive outside of Tadcaster to use a gym and would rather stay in Tadcaster	NOTED – there are 3 gyms in Tadcaster – at swimming pool, leisure centre and	NO ACTION

	<p>Critical not to lose the pool</p> <p>How will this be achieved? Many of the facilities identified are run by private or charitable organisations and are already struggling financially.</p> <p>Should also include the Scout Club</p> <p>We need all f those facilities</p> <p>It's a must to keep these & any new community services.</p> <p>Protecting the heart/essence of the town</p> <p>Scout hut</p>	<p>Magnets. Unclear which is meant here. No known issues with ant.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the policy envisaged for the next stage draft plan will seek to protect the buildings in their community uses but will include some 'get-out' clauses/tests, particularly for commercially run facilities.</p> <p>AGREE – should be included here.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE – should be included here.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add scout hut to CFS1 list.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add scout hut to CFS1 list.</p>
PI CFS2	<p>NYCC - community facilities play a vital role in contributing to the health and Wellbeing of communities. Ensuring that there are adequate facilities for all the community is supported.</p> <p>SSOB - Supported, subject to the detailed wording and application of the final policy.</p> <p>GPE – Yes agree. See CFS1 comment. Tadcaster is already well supplied with leisure facilities for a town of its size, while refurbishment is always welcome this should not be at the expense of the higher priorities.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – in planning policy terms, there are no priorities – all policies will be applied equally once NP is made.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>what is the definition of a community hub? prefer one in the town centre - natwest building to bring together many services</p> <p>If the existing is kept and improved developing a Tadcaster Sports Park and Community Hub at London Road is not need</p> <p>You need to provide much more detail about what you mean. There is a severe lack of evidence, information, detail, impact or risk assessments for most of what is written in this document. It feels like a waste of time and money that could have been better spent supporting existing residents who have been short changed by Selby District Council for far too long. This statement applies to many of the questions you are asking so you will see this statement a number of times as it is relevant throughout.</p> <p>1) I am not sure how this would impact on the existing sports centre and swimming pool. 2) In addition, if the town is to support tourism, a combined tourist information office, working and display space which was open at weekends would help promote the town.</p> <p>This is already well advanced and has little to do with the NDP</p>	<p>NOTED – the wording is that of SDC’s emerging Local Plan, which gives no specific detail re the ‘community hub’ aspect of the proposal, but does refer to social facilities.</p> <p>NOTED – this is a SDC Local Plan proposal which the NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – it is explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents ‘Policy Intentions’ section that this document sets out only the “basic intentions of policies and proposals” and that “final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail, will be presented in the final draft plan”. This is in order to check that the community is on board with the broad thrust of policies and overall direction of travel before doing what may be extensive detailed work that may then prove to be abortive.</p> <p>1) NOTED - this is a SDC Local Plan proposal which the NP cannot oppose. 2) AGREE – this is a sensible suggestion.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP is reflecting/supporting the emerging Local Plan proposal in order to present a more holistic picture of overall plans for the town.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – add to CFS2 list.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>Plus Tadcaster Arts Centre</p> <p>Tadcaster Community Sports Trust objective is: “To promote community participation in healthy recreation and the advancement of amateur sport for the benefit of the inhabitants of Tadcaster and the surrounding area through the provision of playing surfaces and facilities for the playing of amateur sport and community recreation for the benefit of the local community with the object of improving physical and mental wellbeing”. The Trust therefore fully supports the development of recreation and sporting facilities on the London Road site as an appropriate location for outdoor sports and leisure facilities. The Trust is well advanced in its proposed plans for the site and in order to deliver a solution which benefits the whole community is working closely with key stakeholders who in turn are providing considerable support. The Trust is proposing to hold a public consultation during February 2022 during which the full plans will be disclosed and be available for viewing by the townsfolk and all other interested parties.</p> <p>Having lived in Tadcaster for a number of years this will cause a nightmare for local people. Because of the increase in new builds and commercial properties in the Sherburn area I have over the last 6-8 years seen for myself the increase in traffic coming from Sherburn and going through Tadcaster either to get to Leeds or to go through Boston Spa to get to the A1. Coupled with the access to HGV's on the brewery site, opposite this would cause an increase in noise and air pollution.</p> <p>In principle</p>	<p>AGREE – this idea is already being promoted by Tadcrafters CIC</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - this is a SDC Local Plan proposal which the NP cannot oppose, but which the town council is currently minded to support. TTT2 seeks to address brewery traffic congestion while GNE7 seeks to address air pollution from new development.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>ACTION – add to CFS2 list.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>Inclusion of a decent sized gym</p> <p>The town is desperately short of grass playing surfaces, all weather playing surfaces, running track etc etc. These facilities are vital to support health and well being, particularly in the postCovid world and funding should not continue to be focused on Selby.</p> <p>There are already sports facilities in the fields adjacent to Tadcaster Leisure Centre which could be developed into a sports centre.</p> <p>But make sure this is a community asset not one which benefits those in charge of the facility</p> <p>Most certainly</p> <p>Per earlier comments that our existing community facilities should be better developed rather than building new facilities which will impact the environment and consume space needed for housing and retail.</p> <p>There should be investment in additional playground facilities near the town centre. A lost opportunity to encourage families to visit the centre and spend money on the highstreet</p> <p>We have a number of disparate sporting activities around the town , bowls, tennis, football , sports centre,</p>	<p>NOTED – Tadcaster Community Sports Trust will be consulting on the proposed details of the scheme, providing an opportunity to input ideas such as this.</p> <p>NOTED – the London Road proposal should address these needs.</p> <p>NOTED - this is a SDC Local Plan proposal which the NP cannot oppose, but which the town council is currently minded to support.</p> <p>NOTED – this is a Tadcaster Community Sports Trust initiative.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - this is a SDC Local Plan proposal which the NP cannot oppose, but which the town council is currently minded to support.</p> <p>NOTED - this is a SDC Local Plan proposal which the NP cannot oppose, but which the town council is currently minded to support. The proposal does not preclude town centre playground facilities, e.g. as part of an improved riverside park.</p> <p>NOTED - this is a SDC Local Plan proposal which the NP cannot oppose,</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include a NP policy proposing creation of new riverside park, including playground, and a complementary non-planning community action addressing non-planning policy matters such as potential community involvement.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>swimming pool. If the aim is to bring these together under a common banner then I would agree , if the aim is to create another stand alone facility then wouldn't.</p> <p>This is definitely needed and will make such a difference to the town.</p> <p>Though this should look to include improved access and parking next to the venue.</p> <p>In principle I agree but not sure I agree with closing Tadcaster Community Pool as it has served us well over the years and is an excellent facility</p> <p>What facilities will the Community Hub offer?</p> <p>think this will be badly used by youths in the area.</p> <p>Great - give the kids somewhere to go and something to do.</p> <p>I am also against any Sports Hub at the site of Tadcaster Magnets/London Road, in part because of the sheer amount of additional traffic which would then use the road causing additional noise pollution and decreasing air quality.</p>	<p>but which the town council is currently minded to support.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – SDC Local Plan proposal includes both.</p> <p>DISAGREE – there is no known plan to close the pool.</p> <p>NOTED – according to the SDC Local Plan proposal, “it will broadly comprise sports pitches, car and coach parking, changing facilities, ancillary buildings, running/cycle/trim trail track and open space/play/nature and ecology areas.” A Tadcaster Community Sports Trust consultation is due in early 2022.</p> <p>NOTED – there is no evidence to support this claim.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - this is a SDC Local Plan proposal which the NP cannot oppose, but which the town council is currently minded to support. GNE7 seeks to address air pollution from new development.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>No to a sports Hub at Tad Magnets/London Road because of increase traffic congestion & noise pollution and air pollution</p> <p>Tadcaster Community Sports Trust supports the development of recreation and sporting facilities on the London Road site as an ideal location for provision of outdoor sports and leisure/play facilities. The development of this site for these purposes would most certainly enhance its value to the local community.</p> <p>Need to also consider places for older children (teenagers) to meet and socialise</p>	<p>NOTED - this is a SDC Local Plan proposal which the NP cannot oppose, but which the town council is currently minded to support. GNE7 seeks to address air pollution from new development.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the plan supports the idea of the Tadcaster Sports Park & Community Hub. The town is felt to have generally good young people sports facilities, plus uniform groups & The Barn, but maybe does not cater enough for 16+. Would be beneficial to consult this group directly.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consult young people via the Grammar School.</p>
Housing - Preamble	<p>Tadcaster Alternative Group – the <i>(NB town)</i> council should immediately engage in developing its own housing needs analysis for the town as Selby District Local Plan is flawed.</p> <p>Gladman - Page 18 of the consultation document highlights that the Steering Group are considering undertaking a 'Housing Needs Assessment' to complement the work undertaken by the District Council.</p>	<p>NOTED – the council will be commissioning this piece of work to commence early 2022. This is no reflection on the SDC district-wide work in this area but is designed to be a local needs analysis, in order to understand better what the town's citizens/ households need.</p> <p>NOTED – the steering group/town council have previously resolved not to include any site allocations within the NP. The NP could, however, include</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include policy as indicated.</p>

	<p>Gladman would welcome such an assessment and suggest that it would be extremely useful to understand and reflect the true housing needs of the town. Such assessments are common practice for Neighbourhood Plan Groups to undertake and enable them to ascertain whether they should allocate sites for development. Available, deliverable and unconstrained development sites are a limited resource within the Tadcaster neighbourhood area. However, if a Housing Needs Assessment and Site Selection process identifies that additional housing is required above that proposed through the Selby Local Plan there are avenues which the Steering Group can explore to deliver this.</p>	<p>general policy support for new housing development to meet evidenced need on suitable unallocated land within Tadcaster's development limits.</p>	
PI H1	<p>SSOB - Supported, subject to the detailed wording and application of the final policy.</p> <p>GPE – 1) Yes agree. The emphasis of this policy is supported by GPE in that the housing mix should reflect the most recent evidence of housing need, and that evidence should be kept up to date. 2) The policy should be extended to suggest that such housing should come forward on a mix of sites and site sizes, including brown and green field, allocated and non-allocated. Such an approach would enable the delivery of a range and mix of housing types including affordable and family homes, which may not come forward on constrained brownfield sites.</p> <p>empty properties first</p> <p>local needs</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED 2) DISAGREE – housing site selection/allocation is considered to be a matter for the SDC Local Plan not the NP. There is no reason why the range and mix of homes specified in the comment cannot come forward on sites to be allocated in the Local Plan.</p> <p>NOTED – such prioritisation is not within the gift of the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy will aim to get such needs met, based on a soon to be commissioned local housing needs assessment.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>A need for starter homes</p> <p>I would like to see a lot of evidence before any new building is agreed.</p> <p>As pointed out earlier housing requirements need to take into account broader issues not just local ones.</p> <p>Any housing development should put the needs of the community/residents first, not the profits of a housing developer. I also think any new housing development should ONLY be considered AFTER far more of the abandoned/ empty/ derelict housing is back in productive use. Otherwise, I fear that insular new build estates will be added onto Tadcaster that will not revitalise the community. As a former resident of such a development (elsewhere in the country) I can strongly advise that simply constructing more houses does not a community make.</p> <p>Sounds good but how is going to determine the local housing needs?</p>	<p>NOTED – the soon to be commissioned local housing needs assessment will establish need for such homes.</p> <p>NOTED – the amount and location of new housing will be determined by SDC’s Local Plan with which this NP must be compliant. The town council’s own soon to be commissioned local housing needs assessment will inform the NP policy on the mix of new housing to be built.</p> <p>NOTED – NP housing mix policy and the evidence it will be based on will seek to ensure that what is built meets both wider and local need.</p> <p>NOTED – the amount, location and phasing (e.g. relative to reuse of empty properties) of new housing development will be determined by SDC’s Local Plan, not this NP which must be Local Plan compliant. The NP policy on housing mix will seek to ensure that any such new housing meets local as well as wider needs.</p> <p>NOTED – via the town council’s own soon to be commissioned local housing needs assessment.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>I don't want to see Tadcaster become an even larger town. I lived most of my life in a city. When I moved here it was so peaceful; low noise levels, not many cars parked on the street. Now you can't walk down some footpaths without having to walk on the road for cars and vans parked on the footpaths. Noise levels have increased. More housing/infrastructure = more people = more noise pollution = more air pollution = increase in waste = a negative effect on our planet.</p> <p>I agree in theory but the problem is we need to attract development, while we can encourage diverse buildings I think we should remove as much red tape as possible to both help expand Tadcaster inside and out.</p> <p>Yes but it needs to be for all citizens of tadcaster, and not focus on affordable housing</p> <p>Definitely need to undertake an assessment of need to identify how much and what type of housing is needed.</p> <p>There are several sites in and around the town centre for a mix of housing to supplement the repair and upgrade of existing properties at various price levels. These should be fitted with solar panels.</p>	<p>NOTED - the amount and location of new housing development will be determined by SDC's Local Plan, not this NP which must be Local Plan compliant. Various of the NP's planning policies will seek to promote the green environment as a counter-balance to new development.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP policy will serve to balance out the wider mix requirement with the local requirement such that both wider and local needs are met, i.e. a different shade of existing red tape. This will not deter developers who will be eager to come to Tadcaster.</p> <p>NOTED – the soon to be commissioned local housing needs assessment will establish need for all types of homes. H1 has no affordable homes focus. H2 may address gaps in affordable homes policy as stated.</p> <p>NOTED – to be commissioned in early 2022.</p> <p>NOTED – the locations for new housing development will be determined by SDC's Local Plan not this NP. NP planning policy cannot require solar panel installation.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>I'm not convinced that Tadcaster needs new housing builds. I think there are sufficient empty properties which need to be utilized first.</p> <p>Do not build new houses, it is pointless and a waste of resources.</p> <p>The mix needs to be carefully considered not to lower the standards of housing in the community.</p> <p>It would be great to move in to a four bedroom house very few in Tadcaster available</p> <p>Although local need is important it sounds like a waste of resources to survey. There is a clear lack of family dwellings</p> <p>Tadcaster arguably benefits from the lack of new property and land to build on ; this keeps Tadcaster as a defined compact area rather than a suburb of the larger cities of Leeds and York. New property would serve to swell numbers not currently linked with the local community</p> <p>There are plenty of boarded up properties that need sorting first.</p>	<p>NOTED – the amount, location and phasing (e.g. relative to reuse of empty properties) of new housing development will be determined by SDC's Local Plan, not this NP which must be Local Plan compliant.</p> <p>NOTED – it will be based on the town council's soon to be commissioned local housing needs assessment. A combination of planning policy and building regulations ensure a minimum housing standard.</p> <p>NOTED – the soon to be commissioned local housing needs assessment will establish need for such homes.</p> <p>NOTED – the local housing needs assessment to be commissioned will be free to the town council. Clear documented evidence is required to underpin planning policy rather than perceptions.</p> <p>NOTED – the amount and location of new housing development will be determined by SDC's Local Plan, not this NP which must be Local Plan compliant.</p> <p>NOTED – the phasing (e.g. relative to reuse of empty properties) of new housing development will be determined by SDC's Local Plan.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>Though redevelopment of existing properties should be the priority before new build to support policy GNE9</p> <p>"Local housing needs" must be seen to include the poorest in our society, including listening to their voices.</p> <p>Once again if rumours are correct will the builder/landowner dictate who purchases/rents the properties? Will the properties be leasehold or freehold? If the 'Lord of the Manor' does dictate whoever rents/buys the properties Tadcaster will be full of white married couples who vote Conservative go to church and have no SKY TV.</p> <p>Use existing empty houses first</p> <p>Very good idea - good luck in getting it past Humphrey. I think you are going to need support at a governmental level to include compulsory purchase orders, otherwise Humphrey will just tie this up in litigation.</p> <p>Affordable housing and housing for older people also affordable</p> <p>Promotion of rentals also</p>	<p>Stipulations re reuse of empty properties first are not in the NP's gift.</p> <p>NOTED – the soon to be commissioned local housing needs assessment will establish all local housing needs and ensure all voices are heard.</p> <p>NOTED – the allocation of sites for new housing development will be determined by SDC's Local Plan not this NP. Questions re the details of those sites should be directed towards SDC.</p> <p>NOTED – the phasing (e.g. relative to reuse of empty properties) of new housing development will be determined by SDC's Local Plan. Stipulations re reuse of empty properties first are not in the NP's gift.</p> <p>NOTED – the soon to be commissioned local housing needs assessment will establish need for such homes. Affordable housing may also be addressed via a separate H2 policy, as stated.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI H2	SSOB - The intention of the policy is unclear. There is no indication what additional policy provisions are intended to be put in place that do not already exist. From the information available, this is unnecessary.	NOTED – the intention is very clear, i.e. to address any gaps in existing Local Plan policy. Until such policy has been assessed for gaps, it is not certain there will be a policy and if so what provisions that policy will put in place.	NO ACTION

	<p>GPE – Yes agree. The policy intention is supported, although it remains important that the approach is fully evidenced and justified.</p> <p>affordable homes should be compulsory on all schemes</p> <p>You need to provide much more detail about what you mean. There is a severe lack of evidence, information, detail, impact or risk assessments for most of what is written in this document. It feels like a waste of time and money that could have been better spent supporting existing residents who have been short changed by Selby District Council for far too long. This statement applies to many of the questions you are asking so you will see this statement a number of times as it is relevant throughout.</p> <p>One of the problems with this element of the plan is the relatively constrained geography of the Tadcaster parish. There is already some spillover of housing into Stutton and Healaugh and new housing might require a further extension of this. External factors also need to be taken into account, for example the plan by Leeds City Council (not implemented yet) to build 3,500 houses on land just outside Tadcaster's boundaries would have a major impact</p>	<p>NOTED – any policy would be appropriately evidenced and justified.</p> <p>NOTED – the requirement for affordable housing on housing sites is/will be determined by SDC Local Plan policy. This will not relate to very small schemes where compliance would be impossible/not feasible. NP policy may supplement SDC policy if considered necessary and feasible, as stated.</p> <p>NOTED – it is explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents 'Policy Intentions' section that this document sets out only the "basic intentions of policies and proposals" and that "final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail, will be presented in the final draft plan". This is in order to check that the community is on board with the broad thrust of policies and overall direction of travel before doing what may be extensive detailed work that may then prove to be abortive.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP can only address housing matters within its boundaries. Approaches were made to neighbouring parishes re a joint approach but were declined. The allocation of land for housing in Tadcaster and indeed Stutton and Healaugh will be</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>on Tadcaster requiring the use of land that otherwise might be allocated to housing.</p> <p>nonsense question, that is explained by the last 3 words!</p> <p>Energy efficient and well insulated homes required.</p> <p>Too many people cannot get on the property ladder. I do believe the empty houses round Tadcaster should be utilised first.</p> <p>Where new-build developments are made, whether on green- or brownfield sites, a high proportion of 'affordable' and indeed 'social' housing should be demanded from the developers. They make significant profits by selling houses in towns like Tadcaster which the community shouldn't be afraid to demand a share of in return for accommodating the new houses into the community.</p> <p>This is vital if we want to bring new people in, and if we want to keep existing people. We should show that we're</p>	<p>determined by SDC's Local Plan, not this NP.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the consultation asks for views on whether the NP should plug any identified policy gaps re the affordable housing issues specified.</p> <p>NOTED – these are not affordable housing issues. NP planning policies are barred from addressing such housing standard issues.</p> <p>NOTED – the phasing (e.g. relative to reuse of empty properties) of new housing development will be determined by SDC's Local Plan. Stipulations re reuse of empty properties first are not in the NP's gift. The soon to be commissioned local housing needs assessment will help determine the level of need re first time buyers.</p> <p>NOTED – the requirement for affordable housing on housing sites is/will be determined by SDC Local Plan policy. NP policy may supplement SDC policy if considered necessary and feasible, as stated.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>a community via showing that we offer security and safety to all.</p> <p>If necessary</p> <p>Its the councils duty to make sure all new housing goes to local young families or couples to give the town a chance to come alive and flourish. But is must be a realistic price, preferably council owned and rented out.</p> <p>See above</p> <p>I don't agree with new building new housing in Tadcaster.</p> <p>Affordable housing with reason so as not to lower the standards of housing in the community.</p> <p>Vital to provide affordable homes especially in a semi rural area where wages are relatively low.</p> <p>The thing that keeps Tadcaster safe and welcoming is the house prices are high so the only people who are here are the people that can afford it. we came from a run down,</p>	<p>NOTED – as stated.</p> <p>DISAGREE – this is not an SDC (or a town council) legal duty. SDC policy re the mix of housing to be built is/must be based on its district-wide housing needs assessment. The NP will supplement this by highlighting local needs based on its own soon to be commissioned local housing needs assessment.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the amount and location of new housing will be determined by SDC’s Local Plan, not this NP which must be Local Plan compliant.</p> <p>NOTED – the level of affordable housing provision will be determined by SDC affordable housing policy, supplemented by NP policy if/where necessary, based on the town council’s soon to be commissioned local housing needs assessment.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - the level of affordable housing provision will be determined by SDC affordable housing policy,</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>cheap area that were not looked after at all, we built our life up so we could escape that and succeeded, we don't want to go back to that.</p> <p>Would love an affordable housing house</p> <p>Concern over comments about affordable housing, planning for the future must be aspirational</p> <p>Affordable housing is desperately needed. Builders are allowed far to much leeway on new properties, only building the very minimum AFFORDABLE homes. The council should be building, owning and renting houses out again. Not everyone wants to spend years paying to buy when its only real value is when you die. Currently a 2-bed property to rent in Tadcaster is between £750 to 800 per month, if your lucky; so naturally people can't save to buy as well as paying this sort of sum each month.</p> <p>Making properties affordable to the local people is very important.</p>	<p>supplemented by NP policy if/where necessary, based on the town council's soon to be commissioned local housing needs assessment.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the nature of the concern felt is not clear. As such, it is not possible to respond in any meaningful way.</p> <p>NOTED - the level of affordable housing provision will be determined by SDC affordable housing policy, supplemented by NP policy if/where necessary/feasible, based on the town council's soon to be commissioned local housing needs assessment. This assessment should establish the local need for rental properties, including affordable rented.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI H3-H8	<p>NYCC - A number of the potential housing sites may contain significant archaeology, particularly the Central Area Car Park. Each site would need a thorough survey to assess the impact of the proposal on the significance of the archaeology. This should include trial trenching where a desk based approach is insufficient to assess the significance.</p> <p>SSOB - Supported, subject to the detailed wording and application of the final policy.</p>	<p>NOTED – this is already covered in general terms by policies in adopted and emerging SDC plans. It could however also be specifically covered in relation to named sites in NP housing design/development policies and in 'Built Environment' policies.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>ACTION – consider inclusion of archaeological significance in next stage draft plan policies as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>TVCSA – it is proposed that the central carpark is utilised for new affordable housing, but in doing so removes the only demarked disabled parking bays in the centre of the town.</p>	<p>NOTED – the central car park proposal (NB not exclusively for affordable homes) is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the NP cannot oppose. The NP policy intention, as clearly stated, is to set out development requirements for this and other named sites should those sites be confirmed for allocation by SDC. Such requirements would be in addition to those set out by SDC Local Plan policies.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>GPE – Yes agree. In principle the Steering Group’s intention to prepare concepts or outline development briefs for the “likely” allocations is supported. There are advantages to this approach either as general guidelines for the Plan Area and town or for the specific allocations. On individual sites there may be some duplication with the emerging Local Plan. Where specific sites are mentioned the NP needs to be convinced of their suitability and deliverability, in particular there are grave local doubts about the appropriateness of development in the highly valued central area car park.</p>	<p>NOTED – NP policies on specific sites will be careful not to duplicate Local Plan provisions. Any more general guidelines will be set out in the NP’s Built Environment policies. The NP will be led by whichever specific sites are confirmed in/likely to be confirmed in the Local Plan, irrespective of whether they are considered to be appropriate allocations, as it is seen as important that the NP can at least help to shape the development of sites in the community’s best interests.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>central carparking - free- is key to attracting visitors</p> <p>need the carpark</p>	<p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council’s NP cannot oppose.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
	<p>excluding central carpark</p> <p>but not at loss of carparking centrally</p>	<p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council’s NP cannot oppose.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>need to retain a central carpark for visitors and customers for local shops</p> <p>central carpark always busy it needs to remain</p> <p>no to central carpark</p> <p>but not to build on central carpark - old people need it</p> <p>Central car park needs to be kept as it is</p> <p>Central car park is essential for parking. Close to shops etc.</p> <p>should not build on central carpark or butchers field.</p> <p>I disagree with the proposal to build 43 houses on the Central Area Car Park. SDC proposal states "Reinstate the historical residential land". This area was not all residential, there was a brewery, complete with yard, chapel and workshops. The statement is therefore inaccurate. SDC also states that the proposal "will only be considered acceptable" if "like for like car parking is provided elsewhere in the town centre". This has not been found. TTT3 only lists RHY as a "town centre" parking area, and the proposal is that this is to be used as residential parking. No provision has been made for shoppers to park in the town centre.</p>	<p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – the central car park and butcher's field housing proposals are SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposals which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – the central car park housing and replacement car parking proposals are SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposals which the town council's NP cannot oppose. A good point is made re the fact that proposed replacement parking for central car park is not "like for like elsewhere in the town centre", although it is not clear how 'town centre' is defined by either the respondent or SDC. Robins Hood Yard and Commercial St could reasonably be said to service the town centre. The NP could in principle propose other 'town</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement 'town centre' car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>The Central Car park is an important amenity in the town, well used by local residents and an essential part of the town 'offer' to people visiting the town and using its facilities, businesses, venues and so forth..</p> <p>I strongly oppose building upon the central car park in any capacity but particularly as housing. The central car park is a vital town facility. It supports every single business in the town centre. Building housing there will be horrendous for the town and I believe it absolutely conflicts with some of the aims laid out by the council themselves. I fundamentally disagree that any other site would work so well or be so discreet as the existing central car park. It would absolutely undermine support for the markets and street fairs as both patrons and vendors use the car park. It would undermine support for the churches whose congregations (many of whom are elderly and could not necessarily walk if parked further away) use the car park. If the council wishes to attract tourism and café culture, this would certainly not be helpful to that aim. In addition, building houses on this site would bring more traffic and parking issues to the centre as, likely, every new resident would have AT LEAST one car per household (very possibly more). All of this would put more pressure on on-street parking in the the centre of town. I truly believe that building on this site would be hideously short-sighted for the town's future and cannot believe the council could truly justify this as in anyway good for Tadcaster.</p>	<p>centre sites' for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC's car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood's Yard/Hodgson's Terrace site.</p> <p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	-----------------------------------

	<p>6 questions in one! The Central car park is a significant and unique facility compared with surrounding towns, it must be protected to encourage both locals and visitors. Much of the rest cannot happen without a major change from SSOB.</p> <p>Would like , though , to understand what may be planned for Central Area Car Park</p> <p>I have reservations about residential building on the car park. Surely there are better locations of that size for housing? I think that the central area should be available for community/commercial use.</p> <p>The loss of the central car park in Tadcaster would in my opinion be a grave mistake and act as a deterrent to visitors and potentially locals using town facilities. I agree with the other sites</p> <p>The central car park should be kept. This is vital for people to travel into Tadcaster. I use on numerous occasions during the week. And it ideal walking distance to the shops, riley smith hall and the church. It is also convenient for the swimming pool as this car park is often full when swimming lessons are on.</p> <p>I agree, however I don't not believe that the central area car park should be developed as a housing site. This should remain a car park.</p>	<p>NOTED – responses were invited re all 6 sites. The central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose. The town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowning breweries and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.</p> <p>NOTED – SDC's Preferred Options Local Plan (Proposal TADC-H) sets out the details as currently known.</p> <p>NOTED - the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED - the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED - the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED - the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>Central Area Car Park should not be built on</p> <p>In principle. I would not build on the central car park area though.</p> <p>I do not agree with building houses on the central car park.</p> <p>1) I approve development, in principle, on all the six sites named. I think the vacuum that is currently the central car park would be an ideal site for housing and I would support a scheme that does not make car parking the dominant design feature of such a development. People with disabilities, including those related to advanced age, must be catered for and there should be provision for loading and unloading. Permanent car parking right outside one's home is not a necessity in my view, but a luxury - I don't have it and am prepared to walk a distance to my parking spot. It is also arguable that a lot of people need to exercise more, anyway. 2) The grassed area next to the central car park would make a nice Green space and I would like this to be included in the plan.</p> <p>Central car park should not be built on under any circumstances, this is a vital community asset which sets Tadcaster apart from several other towns in the area and its loss would be devastating to the town centre, causing further decline and preventing the achievement of the council's vision for Tadcaster in 2040.</p> <p>Tadcaster businesses do not want to loose the main central car park & after all the hassle and money SDC threw at it and the River bridge due to a certain individual</p>	<p>NOTED - the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED - the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>1) NOTED – SDC Local Plan Preferred Options Proposal TADC-H caters for disabled parking on site – this could be located at Chapel St/High St corner of site. NP policy could stipulate this, together with in-curtilage residential car parking only. 2) NOTED – site is currently already protected as Local Amenity Space in the adopted SDC Local Plan. It could additionally be assessed as a candidate Local Green Space.</p> <p>NOTED - the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED - the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) ACTION – include NP policy provision as stated. 2) ACTION – assess site as candidate Local Green Space.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>thinking on himself rather than the local people you should ALL be ashamed to be even raising this issue. I imagine it's just to make some money for SDC and not solely for the benefit of local people/business owners or the very much needed visitor to the Town.</p> <p>Would disagree with housing on the central car park area, as alternative provision would be unlikely to be sufficient to support local businesses It seems counterintuitive to move the fit for purpose car park to less favourable locations rather than seek other areas to build housing</p> <p>Am concerned that at least 1 of the proposed sites flooded recently therefore the flood defences are not presently adequate, this situation will likely get worse with the effects of Global warming. More information required on flood prevention plans.</p> <p>I am against too much development in the central car park.</p> <p>I strongly disagree with the central car park being used to build houses. I cannot think of a quicker way to destroy the town than to take away the main and central parking. There is little enough parking already and visitors are not going to come if they have to search for parking or it is far away from the shops.</p> <p>I would object to the central area car park being proposed as a 'likely to be allocated' housing site. This car park is a major amenity for the residents of Tadcaster and a major benefit to visitors. No amount of small, disparate, out of the way, difficult to locate car parks would compensate for</p>	<p>Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED - the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – these are SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposals and as such it is an SDC Local Plan responsibility to address any flood risks.</p> <p>NOTED - the central car park housing proposal, including the amount of housing, is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED - the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED - the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose. The prioritisation of redundant property</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>the loss of this centrally located amenity. Let all the redundant properties in the town be brought back into use before the need for exploring this site is undertaken. If we want to attract visitors to the town the central car park must be retained.</p> <p>The development of the central car park should not form part of the initial tranche of housing but be reserved for a later stage when it's best use can be best assessed in the context of the development of the town as a whole.</p> <p>Central area car park is a NO. All this vision is about regeneration of the town. The central carpark has to stay for this to happen. History and the death of city high streets verses shopping centres shows you people want to park next to the shops and not walk from a carpark which is a few hundred meters away.</p> <p>As long as loss of central car park doesnt have a negative impact in allowing easy access to the centre</p> <p>However if the main carpark is to be built on more parking will be required if the shops, cafes, etc. are to attract customers.</p> <p>Disagree on allowing Humphrey Smith to be allowed to develop his land for housing - in exchange for bringing a few of his properties back into use (which he should be doing anyway). He will undoubtedly renege on any agreement made with him as he is thoroughly untrustworthy.</p>	<p>reuse over new build is not in the NP's gift.</p> <p>NOTED - the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose. The phasing of Local Plan sites is not within the NP's gift.</p> <p>NOTED - the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – The NP could in principle propose other 'town centre sites' for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC's car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood's Yard/Hodgson's Terrace site.</p> <p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose. The town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowning breweries and indeed all</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement 'town centre' car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>The car park areas need to remain as car park areas, reduction in parking will not help the prosperity of the town centre.</p> <p>In my opinion it's a good plan to build houses where historically there were buildings there before. The central car park, and Mill Lane being good examples of this. However I don't think we should build on fields until all the empty run down properties in town are renovated.</p> <p>Not sure about central car park</p> <p>I don't understand the logic of changing the central area car park into housing. It doesn't seem to fit with the big picture plan?</p> <p>Particularly agree that central carpark be built on. It is dead land and often used by non shoppers but workers who park all day. Building on it provides vibrancy to the centre.</p> <p>The central car park should stay as a car park as it is central! Businesses struggle enough without losing a nearby car park. Also local residents to the car park have to put up with the noise and unsociable behaviour from customers leaving the late licensed social club. To have to endure a new housing development being built seems very unfair. Most of these residents are elderly.</p>	<p>other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.</p> <p>NOTED – The NP could in principle propose other 'town centre sites' for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC's car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood's Yard/Hodgson's Terrace site.</p> <p>NOTED - The prioritisation of redundant property reuse over new build is not in the NP's gift.</p> <p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p>	<p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement 'town centre' car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>The intended use of the Central Area Car Park for housing is extremely short-sighted: the existing car park is used not just by the people of Tadcaster but by many from surrounding villages who come to the town on a regular basis for the day-to-day shopping needs. They have little alternative but to travel by car and need parking space. If the central car park is lost, these residents will shop elsewhere.</p> <p>Development of the central car park would seem to be at odds with the development of Tadcaster , particularly when there are so many vacant properties around the car park itself. Appropriate development of other areas is fine, but again emphasis should be on redevelopment before new.</p> <p>Do not think we can afford to lose the central car park.</p> <p>In my opinion, the use of the central carpark for new housing is ludicrous. Anything owned by the brewery is unlikely to be developed.</p> <p>Strongly object to Central Car Park being removed</p> <p>In principal a good idea bar the potential of building on the central car park. If your plan is to attract more businesses, visitors and residents, they will need somewhere to park surely?</p>	<p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council’s NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council’s NP cannot oppose. The prioritisation of redundant property reuse over new build is not in the NP’s gift.</p> <p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council’s NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council’s NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – The NP could in principle propose other ‘town centre sites’ for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC’s car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood’s Yard/Hodgson’s Terrace site.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement ‘town centre’ car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>Not central car park</p> <p>I disagree with proposals to building housing on the central car park. How can you say you want to bring in visitors and create a cafe/arts & heritage culture when there will be nowhere central to park cars/motorcycles and bicycles and it's not "GREEN" to dig up a car park that cost thousands of pounds of legal fees and tarmac to put in place.</p> <p>the biggest issues I have are the proposed building on the town centre car park when there is such a significant number of empty properties in the area that could be developed.</p> <p>Don't take the car park away</p> <p>There is no point in trying to attract visitors to the town if you are going to build on the central/main car park. The idea of building houses on the central car park in Tadcaster is the stupidest I've ever heard.</p> <p>removing the parking in the town centre and pedestrianising roads will discourage people from visiting - highlighted by the observed increase in usage of the town centre car park after barriers were installed at magnets car park.</p>	<p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose. There is no evidence that pedestrianisation will discourage visitors. The NP could in principle propose other 'town centre sites' for replacement parking, e.g.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement 'town centre' car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>this car park is normally full on a daily basis where are people supposed to park for the chemist etc, especially the elderly who cant walk far.</p> <p>But not at the cost of the central car park which is over full on many days already. To lose it would kill the town centre off altogether</p> <p>you intend to keep play areas GNE2 yet in the next breath intend to build on one?</p> <p>butchers field should be a play area</p> <p>should not build on central carpark or butchers field.</p> <p>Butcher's Field access roads narrow and busy already.</p>	<p>Tadcaster Albion FC's car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood's Yard/Hodgson's Terrace site.</p> <p>NOTED – the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – the Butcher's Field housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose. GNE2 cannot be used to protect Butcher's Field as Local Green Space, i.e. to effectively give it Green Belt status, as this would openly conflict with SDC housing plans, which the NP cannot do.</p> <p>NOTED – the Butcher's Field housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – the Central Car Park and Butcher's Field housing proposals are SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposals which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – SDC's Preferred Options Local Plan proposal for the site states that provision of safe vehicle access to the site is a requirement of development.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>I would also be concerned about the traffic flow to Butcher's field. (I always thought it was Butch's field after the horse that lived there?)</p> <p>Butch's field has in the past been a viable play area for Hillcrest and Marlborough children and as such should be maintained as a green space and returned to being a play area. The central area car park is essential for disabled driver access to the town centre, proposed car parks are too far away.</p> <p>1) Should not build on central car park on Butchers Field. 2) Barnados to be developed into a hotel.</p> <p>I do not agree with building houses on the land north of Station Road.</p>	<p>NOTED – the Butcher’s Field housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council’s NP cannot oppose. Acknowledged that correct name is Butch’s Field.</p> <p>NOTED – the Central Car Park and Butcher’s Field housing proposals are SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposals which the town council’s NP cannot oppose. The NP could in principle propose other ‘town centre sites’ for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC’s car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood’s Yard/Hodgson’s Terrace site.</p> <p>1) NOTED – the Butcher’s Field housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council’s NP cannot oppose. 2) NOTED – as supported in E3. However, it has now become apparent that only Fircroft and immediate environs lies within the Neighbourhood Area – this makes NP policy support for a hotel on Former Barnado’s Home impossible, although could include a non-planning community action promoting use of whole site for hotel purposes. Group to discuss.</p> <p>NOTED – the Station Road housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options</p>	<p>ACTION – amend name to Butch’s Field where appropriate.</p> <p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement ‘town centre’ car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – add new community action as suggested, caveated in the event of proposed housing failing to come to fruition.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>1) Land north of Station Road needs to be built on sensitively as this is one of the main gateways to the town. 2) Mill Lane also needs to be sensitive to potential flooding issues/future use as part of a flood defence scheme.</p> <p>and Mill Lane is a flood zone</p> <p>I don't agree with all of the proposed housing developments as I believe the proposed Mill Lane development will cause a huge amount of congestion in that part of the town. There would only be the one access point in and out of this development and combined with the existing Sainsbury's traffic will make it an extremely busy access road.</p> <p>1) Not the mill lane development 2) but would definitely like to see the development of the land to the rear of 46 Wighill Lane and Former Coal YArD as well as the row of terraced houses next to this site which not only look awful but are an accident waiting to happen as they look as though they could collapse at any point.</p>	<p>Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>1) NOTED – NP policy can reflect this requirement which is in line with BE6. 2) NOTED – this is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal and as such it is an SDC Local Plan responsibility to address any flood risks.</p> <p>NOTED – Mill Lane is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan housing proposal and as such it is an SDC Local Plan responsibility to address any flood risks.</p> <p>NOTED – Mill Lane and all other housing proposals are SDC Preferred Options (PO) Local Plan proposals which the town council's NP cannot oppose. Local Plan PO states that proposals will be required to 'provide safe access to Mill Lane'. Could consider other possible site access points in developing detailed NP policy, e.g. improvement of Rosemary Row.</p> <p>1) NOTED – Mill Lane housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose. 2) NOTED – this row of terraces already included in the proposed site and earmarked for bringing back into use.</p>	<p>1) ACTION – policy for Station Road site to reflect gateway location. 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider other possible access points during policy development as suggested.</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>Also land to rear of 46 wighill lane: Not to have access from prospect drive / prospect Avenue. Street too narrow as it is.</p> <p>I'm particularly interested in your plan's for the derelict properties @ 46 Wighill Lane & the coal yard as we live in the cottages @ 42 Wighill Lane, I know the said buildings where due to be re developed then Sam's put an objection in & subsequently purchased the buildings off the developer & are left as an eyesore, as per Humphry Smiths order's. I'm sorry that there's a Sam Smiths theme in a lot of my feedback, but he has held this town back for decades.</p> <p>No greenfield should be built on til all other optiosn used</p> <p>I don't believe new housing is necessary for the town and object to the proposed new housing developments on "likely to be allocated sites" Housing is already relatively cheap in Tad and lots of it.</p> <p>Don't agree with the development of new housing sites. New builds are never in keeping with the "existing historical and architectural quality" (one of the key aims). They will put a huge strain on transport congestion, emissions and infrastructure. Improve whats already there rather than generating a sprawling mass of development which will negatively affect the appearance and resources of the town.</p>	<p>NOTED – ‘provide safe vehicle access from Wighill Lane and/or Prospect Drive’ is a stated requirement of SDC Local Plan Preferred Options proposal which the town council’s NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – this row of terraces already included in the proposed site and earmarked for bringing back into use. Please note this is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal not a NP/town council proposal.</p> <p>NOTED - prioritisation of this nature is not in the NP’s gift. Any allocation of greenfield land will be determined by SDC’s Local Plan not the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – proposals for/allocation of housing sites are determined by SDC’s Local Plan not the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – proposals for/allocation of housing sites are determined by SDC’s Local Plan not the NP. As such it is SDC’s responsibility to address infrastructure, design and other implications. That said, NP policies will also address design, traffic and air quality issues – ref environment and traffic sections.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>I am happy to support new housing as long as there is enough in place to cope with the increase in residents such as roads, parking, schools etc</p> <p>I think we should get local input from these areas and then consider both the environmental impact and the economical impact then weigh which direction we should take via a vote.</p> <p>Make use of the land that is available but in a sympathetic manner</p> <p>I don't agree with the building of new houses on some of these specified sites</p> <p>Unlikely some of land would be available for development</p> <p>As with any new housing it has to be sympathetic to our needs and resources such as school places, Doctors, etc....</p>	<p>NOTED - as new housing is proposed by SDC's Local Plan, it is SDC's responsibility to address infrastructure implications. That said, NP policies will also address traffic – ref traffic section. The NP could in principle propose other 'town centre sites' for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC's car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood's Yard/Hodgson's Terrace site.</p> <p>NOTED - as new housing is proposed by SDC's Local Plan, it is SDC's responsibility to consult locally, which it has done once in 2021 and will again later in 2022.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the proposed housing sites are SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposals which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – SDC's Preferred Options Local Plan would not have proposed the sites had they not been known to be available for development.</p> <p>NOTED - as new housing is proposed by SDC's Local Plan, it is SDC's</p>	<p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement 'town centre' car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>How can you come here and claim to want to conserve greenery and wildlife and then on the next page say how you want to develop new houses on GREEN AREAS. This is absolutely outrageous and ridiculous. Again, all you want to do is build new houses and that is it. You don't care about Tadcaster at all because if you did then this plan would consist of renovation plans for existing land and buildings and would aim to preserve nature. What you want to do is destroy nature and cause mass disruption. Not to mention destroy the surrounding roads. This plan has lost all merit now it has shown its true intention.</p> <p>Again the town council are not town planners, urban designers or architects. Leave it to the professionals and then respond when development is designed</p> <p>Focus should be firmly on rapidly restoring derelict properties around the area , and clearly establish accommodation potential of these versus likely demand for housing. Sites designated for building conflict with the aspiration for more green space and leisure facilities of residents already in the town.</p>	<p>responsibility to address infrastructure implications.</p> <p>NOTED – the proposed housing sites are SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposals which the town council's NP cannot oppose. The best NP policies can do is work with the proposals it cannot change and do its utmost to protect other green areas and to address traffic issues, empty properties etc.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the town council has commissioned specialist NP planning consultants and design consultants to work on its NP. It will shortly commission housing specialists to advise on its housing need provisions. This is in line with the NP powers bestowed upon town councils by Government.</p> <p>NOTED – the prioritisation of restoration over new build is not in the NP's gift. The proposed housing sites are SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposals which the town council's NP cannot oppose. The best NP policies can do is work with the proposals it cannot change and do its utmost to otherwise address green spaces, leisure facilities etc.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>But want to ensure green spaces are also protected and we don't become somewhere with too many houses crammed into one place.</p> <p>So long as the building works and access to new estates does not impact on the existing householders</p> <p>Would need further clarification on specific land being used and number of houses etc</p> <p>not at all sure about the method of identifying sites for new housing</p> <p>Gladman - Gladman support the regeneration of Tadcaster and attempts to regenerate brownfield sites and vacant derelict buildings for residential uses and welcome the Steering Groups proposals to deliver outline briefs or potential design codes for these sites. However, it is vital that this approach is balanced with proportionate greenfield development that can viably deliver affordable housing and family homes which can help to reverse the aforementioned trends. It is unlikely that the sites proposed through the emerging Selby District Local Plan will deliver such housing given the density and site sizes of the preferred site allocations. Furthermore, Gladman are</p>	<p>NOTED - the amount/location of new housing will be determined by SDC's Local Plan which the town council's NP cannot oppose. NP policies will protect as much green space as possible.</p> <p>NOTED – proposed accesses to proposed new housing areas are set out in SDC's Preferred Options Local Plan. Building works are considered by planning to be a temporary nuisance but SDC can put in place agreements with developers to mitigate against any severe adverse impacts.</p> <p>NOTED – all such information currently available is set out in SDC's Preferred Options Local Plan, as these are SDC not town council/NP proposals.</p> <p>NOTED – this is determined by SDC's methodology, i.e. nothing to do with the NP/town council.</p> <p>NOTED – the steering group/town council have previously resolved not to include any site allocations within the NP. The NP could, however, include general policy support for new housing development to meet evidenced need on suitable unallocated land within Tadcaster's development limits.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include policy as indicated.</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>concerned that taking the regeneration led approach to deliver housing in the Town is at risk of never being delivered, as it relies on the cooperation of a single landowner and previously this approach has resulted in significant under delivery on allocated housing sites in the Town. Gladman therefore suggests risk should be spread across multiple sites, with different landowners, in order to ensure delivery.</p> <p>Should not build on central car park on butchers field</p> <p>Barnados to be developed into hotel</p> <p>As long as extra parking is protected to support a vibrant town centre</p>	<p>NOTED – these are SDC Local Plan proposals which the NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – as supported in E3. However, it has now become apparent that only Fircroft and immediate environs lies within the Neighbourhood Area – this makes NP policy support for a hotel on Former Barnado’s Home impossible, although could include a non-planning community action promoting use of whole site for hotel purposes. Group to discuss.</p> <p>The NP could in principle propose other ‘town centre sites’ for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC’s car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood’s Yard/Hodgson’s Terrace site.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action as suggested, caveated in the event of proposed housing failing to come to fruition.</p> <p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement ‘town centre’ car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p>
Housing - General	<p>NYCC - North Yorkshire County Council’s Children and Young People’s Service (CYPS) made the following response to Selby DC’s Local Plan consultation on proposed allocations for new housing in Tadcaster town in spring 2021: <i>Current forecasts indicate that there will be</i></p>	<p>NOTED – this is an issue for SDC’s Local Plan through which new housing development is planned/sites allocated and infrastructure implications, such as schools, addressed.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p><i>significant under-capacity in Tadcaster town primary schools and the limited volume of housing proposed will do little to fill this.</i></p> <p>CYPS continue to raise these concerns.</p> <p>-The total forecast pupil numbers in the three primary schools in Tadcaster (Riverside, Tadcaster Primary Academy and St Joseph's), have fallen from 577 in 2018/9 to 540 in 2021/2, and are forecast to fall further to 510 by 2029/30.</p> <p>-Riverside Primary School, Tadcaster has recently consulted on reducing its published admission number from 60 students to 45 students. The published admission number is the number of children admitted into the school at Reception each year. While this is currently limited to 60, the actual average current year group total at the school is 50, the smallest year 36, and the largest year 56. In their consultation, the Trust states that <i>"Whilst many schools see some fluctuation to pupil numbers over time, it is evident both through the declining trend in actual numbers taking up places at local schools and through North Yorkshire forecast data, that the demand for pupil places will not be maintained at its previous level. This is, in a large part, due to a lack of available housing within the normal catchment of the school."</i></p> <p>No proper thought given to transport/congestion and the strain on the town, schools, medical centre, infrastructure. Tadcaster doesn't need new housing developments, new housing developments are never in keeping with the "historical and architectural quality" and they would put a huge strain on the infrastructure and resources which are needed by existing residents.</p> <p>You have not given sufficient thought to the transport strain or services available ofr the increased number of residents nor the impact on the historical setting of the</p>	<p>NOTED - as new housing is proposed by SDC's Local Plan, it is SDC's responsibility to address infrastructure implications. That said, NP policies will seek to address traffic and housing design issues.</p> <p>NOTED - as new housing is proposed by SDC's Local Plan, it is SDC's responsibility to address infrastructure</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	-----------------------------------

	<p>town. New builds are not appropriate or needed outside the existing town boundary.</p> <p>1) But not at the loss of the central car park 2) and how about getting Humphry to also make his land by the old cinema over to parking as it is very much needed in Tadcaster. It is about time he did something for other people not just to suit himself</p> <p>Gladman - Firstly, as you are aware Gladman are promoting land at Kelbar Hill which has the capacity to deliver up to 500 new homes, significant open space provision and community benefits alongside funding to support aspirations across the wider town. While this site falls within land designated as Green Belt, the developable area is unconstrained by flood risk and offers a suitable location for development in close proximity to the town centre and community facilities. National Policy is clear that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified through the preparation of plans and strategic policies. Indeed, it has been generally considered that it is not appropriate for neighbourhood plans to allocate sites for release from the Green Belt. However, there are numerous examples where Neighbourhood Plans have tackled with this issue. Little Aston Neighbourhood Plan recommended that the Green Belt should be amended to exclude Tufton Cottage as it was considered it did not</p>	<p>implications. That said, NP policies will seek to address traffic, community facilities and housing design issues.</p> <p>1) NOTED - the central car park housing proposal is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>2) NOTED – The Green is currently protected as Local Amenity Space in the adopted SDC Local Plan. As such, car parking is not viable. Site could additionally be assessed as a candidate Local Green Space.</p> <p>NOTED – the steering group/town council have previously resolved not to include any site allocations within the NP. The NP could, however, include general policy support for new housing development to meet evidenced need on suitable unallocated land within Tadcaster's development limits.</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION</p> <p>2) ACTION – assess site as a candidate Local Green Space.</p> <p>ACTION – include policy as indicated.</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>meet the five purposes of Green Belt. Through Policy GB1 it was proposed the designation was amended through the Local Plan process. The Inspector agreed that the policy was appropriate and complied with due process by not attempting to alter strategic policies and only requests such an amendment is considered through the strategic planning process. Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan identifies 1.76 hectares to be removed from the Green Belt to accommodate development for up to 40 new dwellings. The Plan developed a Housing Needs Assessment, Site Selection paper and Green Belt review and considered that Policy SD1 established a minimum housing requirement for the village while the supporting text suggested that further nonstrategic changes to the Green Belt boundary could be made. The Examiner agreed and supported the approach taken by Thorpe Parish Council stating:</p> <p><i>“I must firstly commend Thorpe Neighbourhood Forum on the quality and quantity of the supporting evidence that lies behind the submission documents. It has, in the vast majority of cases satisfied me that the policies are based on proportionate and compelling evidence. Too many neighbourhood plans choose to work just within the parameters of local plan housing figures. However, in the case of Thorpe, the Forum has actually sought to plan for higher housing growth, based on the evidence of its own commissioned Housing Needs Assessment, notwithstanding the constraints that apply to this part of Surrey. The allocation of a further area of land to come out of the Green Belt for housing will ensure, through the Forum’s proactive negotiations with this major landowner, CEMEX, the delivery of a comprehensive package of measures which address current deficiencies in the village, such as the lack of parking for users of the church and the Village Hall. It is apparent that the preparation of this neighbourhood plan has proceeded in parallel with the</i></p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p><i>publication, consultation, examination and adoption of the new Runnymede Local Plan. There is plenty of evidence of the close collaboration between the Forum members and Runnymede’ planners. This clearly has allowed the neighbourhood plan to respond to the changes that the new local plan has led at a strategic, boroughwide level, including importantly the inseting of Thorpe village from the Green Belt. Previously Thorpe was the only village in Runnymede Borough within the Green Belt. It is similarly clear that the Neighbourhood Forum, through preparing this plan has been able to influence, to some extent, the local plan process.”</i></p> <p>In this regard, there is precedence for neighbourhood planning forums positively seeking to understand and address their local housing need, even in significantly constrained locations and areas. It may not be appropriate for Tadcaster Town Council to provide policies which amend the Green Belt boundaries. However, if the Steering Group supported the opportunities which development at Kelcbar Hill could deliver, notably in helping to address socio-economic issues in the town, then a suitably worded policy which seeks consideration for development at the site through the Local Plan process may help to see long-term development of the site. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the potential scope of development at Kelcbar Hill and what it could offer the community alongside the future scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
PI E1	SSOB - The intention of the policy is unclear. There is no indication what protections are intended to be put in place that do not already exist, nor to which areas (in addition to Station Road and York Road) that these protections may apply.	NOTED – any protections relating to other named sites, additional to Station Road and York Road, will be akin to those proposed for Station Road/York Road in the Preferred Options Local Plan. The use of the word ‘may’ in the policy intention indicates that such a	NO ACTION

		policy approach is still under consideration, part of which relates to other sites. The next stage draft plan would clearly identify any areas to be subject to protection.	
	GPE – Yes agree. It would be appropriate to identify the extent of the identified areas on a proposals map. Duplication of Local Plan policy.	NOTED – policy duplication would be avoided and areas identified on the proposals map.	NO ACTION
	Market forces must apply unless central government is attracted into Tadcaster. What other sites are to be considered	NOTED – any sites considered appropriate for protection would be detailed in the next stage draft plan should such a policy be pursued. Protection via NP policy is as legitimate as that given by Local Plan policy in order to secure Tadcaster’s employment opportunities and future sustainability.	NO ACTION
	I don’t understand what this means	NOTED – in simple terms, it means that land currently in industrial/commercial use could be protected in that use so as to prevent change of use to, for e.g. housing. This is preserve the town’s employment base and its sustainability.	NO ACTION
	it's important we ensure that people stay employed to help keep money moving and our economy stable.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Local jobs provide wealth to the community.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	1) We should consider the future of work in 2040 and be honest about which industries need protecting vs those which naturally will decline. 2) Support instead should be provided to retrain and upskill local community in the	1) NOTED – this is why the intention is couched in ‘may’ rather than ‘will’ terms – because how to address the	1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION

	<p>involvement of technology in future world of work and also in service sectors such as care, nursing, leisure etc.</p> <p>What happens if market demand is not there, but demand for conversion to residential is?</p> <p>The traffic around the industrial estate and access to the tip etc. is horrendous. Perhaps some yellow lines near the egress to Station Road would help but again parking is the problem. Parking is also the problem and dangerous when turning up Station Road from Boston Spa. You should have yellow lines around the bend and also at the bottom of Station road. There was a crash there only recently involving a police car because someone could not see. If cars are parked right on the junction of Station Road you also cannot swing wide to get up the road. I consider this to be very dangerous a serious accident waiting to happen</p> <p>The Station Road Industrial Site is in the wrong place. Better place for housing and industrial site at edge of town</p>	<p>difficulty raised is still being considered – not an easy judgement to make. 2) NOTED – these are not planning policy issues and there are no obvious other actions which the NP could include in this respect.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy would be modelled on SDC Preferred Options Policy EM2 (clause c) which sets out circumstances where there would be flexibility.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that yellow lines at the estate/tip access point would simply serve to move the problem elsewhere. New car parking provision, e.g. at Manor Fields may offer a solution. The junction with the Boston Spa road as is not perceived as posing a serious enough problem to warrant action.</p> <p>NOTED – such a fundamental re/allocation of land would be an SDC Local Plan rather than a NP issue.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement 'town centre' car parking, including consideration of named sites, e.g. part of Manor Fields.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI E2	<p>SSOB - Supported, subject to the detailed wording and application of the final policy.</p> <p>GPE – Yes agree.</p> <p>there is enough in tadcster and surrouding area</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – no evidence is presented to support this assertion. The policy intention is in line with emerging SDC</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Car parking to be made available on site. There is too many vehicles "on road" parking.</p> <p>You need to provide much more detail about what you mean. There is a severe lack of evidence, information, detail, impact or risk assessments for most of what is written in this document. It feels like a waste of time and money that could have been better spent supporting existing residents who have been short changed by Selby District Council for far too long. This statement applies to many of the questions you are asking so you will see this statement a number of times as it is relevant throughout.</p> <p>New developments need to take into account the impact on local traffic.</p> <p>Jobs are vital. To exclude jobs because they look different would be ludicrous and stupid. Do we expect new businesses to include derelict premises just so they match the current situation!</p>	<p>Local Plan policy and is seen as important for sustaining an employment base in the town.</p> <p>NOTED – a policy criterion to this effect could be included in the policy, as part of development being respectful of its surrounding environment.</p> <p>NOTED – it is explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents 'Policy Intentions' section that this document sets out only the "basic intentions of policies and proposals" and that "final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail, will be presented in the final draft plan". This is in order to check that the community is on board with the broad thrust of policies and overall direction of travel before doing what may be extensive detailed work that may then prove to be abortive.</p> <p>NOTED – a policy criterion to this effect could be included in the policy, as part of development being appropriate within and respectful of its surrounding environment.</p> <p>NOTED- unclear what point is being made here, but it seems to imply that new business premises would be excluded on design grounds. While NP and indeed SDC design policies will apply to all new development</p>	<p>ACTION – consider inclusion of on-site parking clause within policy.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider inclusion of on-site parking clause within policy.</p> <p>NOTED</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>Don't know what windfall sites are</p> <p>I thought this was about local employment and industrial/commercial land but I note that you refer to "windfall sites" I have read somewhere that windfall sites usually refer to housing not commercial property?</p> <p>I don't know what a windfall site means</p> <p>Provision of office space to attract 'white collar' work to the town is extremely valuable, as well as providing community access to e.g. solicitors, accountants etc. Would also reduce the requirement for people to commute into York (more environmentally friendly, revitalises the town centre).</p> <p>In part subject to comments above about future world of work.</p> <p>The growth of employment in Tadcaster is important provided these places are not eyesores and a noise nuisance.</p>	<p>proposals, the intent here (E2) is for e.g. to protect local amenity/neighbour uses and to address issues such as parking, traffic congestion/safety etc. i.e. issues of good planning.</p> <p>NOTED - the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) defines windfall sites as: 'Sites which have not been specifically identified as available in the Local Plan process. They normally comprise previously-developed sites that have unexpectedly become available.' This term can be included in the draft plan Glossary of Terms'.</p> <p>NOTED – offices are already an acceptable use within the boundaries of the town centre. Any proposals for offices outside the town centre would be subject to SDC Local Plan tests.</p> <p>NOTED – market forces will determine what if any new employment development proposals come forward. If they do, the NP policy will provide a supportive planning context.</p> <p>NOTED – policy criteria to this effect could be included in the policy, as part of development being appropriate within and respectful of its surrounding environment. The NP design policies will in any case work to avoid eyesores.</p>	<p>ACTION – include 'windfall sites' in NP Glossary.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider inclusion of clauses re noise and acceptable design.</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>Sympathetic Development of existing major employment sites (Breweries , engineering firms) should be supported , but with major shifts to home based working and commuting to Leeds , York and the major industrial estates at Sherburn in Elmet it is questionable why new employment sites in the area would be required. However some redevelopment or repurposing of sites to the eastern extremities of the town may afford opportunity.</p> <p>Redevelopment / re-use of large factory space in Islington should be promoted.</p> <p>This policy is important, to keep the young employed in well paid & diverse forms of work.</p>	<p>NOTED – market forces will determine what if any new employment development proposals come forward. If they do, the NP policy will provide a supportive planning context.</p> <p>NOTED – site is already safeguarded in Local Plan. Not clear what NP can add.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI E3	<p>SSOB – 1) A hotel in this open countryside location is not supported. The Fircroft and the former Barnardo’s buildings (which when built comprised Fircroft’s coaching and stabling and its lodge) are intended to be restored to comprise residential uses. 2) I would wish to highlight that the existing hotel within the settlement the listed building (Shann House) is only partially converted and is proposed for extension in the future. This is a prominent and important site in the regeneration of the settlement though its main use will be for bed and breakfast. There are a number of well-maintained pubs in the centre of Tadcaster for socialising use and the Riley Smith Hall provides exceptional larger scale facilities. 3) In terms of the location of any such provision, you will be of course aware that Hotels and Tourist development are defined as ‘main town centre uses’ within the Glossary to NPPF and that therefore the requirements of the sequential test, impact assessment and sustainability would of course apply to any proposal outside of the defined town centre. 4) I also note that the site is located outside the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>	<p>1) NOTED – a hotel development utilising existing buildings only would be no more or less appropriate than residential development in this location. A hotel would be in line with SDC Local Plan Preferred Options EM6, subject to satisfying EM7/sequential approach.</p> <p>2) NOTED – any future extension of Shann House as a hotel is likely to supported under the terms of the envisaged policy. The policy is not concerned with facilities for socialising.</p> <p>3) NOTED – the town council is aware of this.</p> <p>4) NOTED – in actual fact, part of the site as identified in the SDC Preferred Options Local Plan lies within the NA. It has now become apparent that only Fircroft and immediate environs lie within the NA – this makes NP policy</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p> <p>3) NO ACTION</p> <p>4) ACTION – add new community action as suggested, caveated in the event of proposed housing failing to come to fruition.</p>

	<p>'Fircroft' is in Healaugh.</p> <p>TVCSA – whilst we acknowledge that this is a gap in provision for visitors to the town, the previous plan earmarked this property as potential development for a residential/nursing home. There is no longer any provision identified and we consider this to be a deterioration in your policy intentions. The only residential/nursing home in the area has closed and to make no suggestion for incorporating such facilities within the plan is discriminatory. Perversely, Edgerton Lodge which was a previously closed home is currently being disposed of by Selby District Council when it could be retained and a strategy for re-opening it incorporated in the Development Plan.</p> <p>GPE – No disagree. A general policy to deliver additional “tourism/visitor” accommodation in the plan area would be supported. However, there is a difficulty with E3 as drafted. This site off Wighill Lane in that it has an extant planning permission for residential development and is the subject of a draft allocation in the emerging Selby Local Plan. The Steering Group will need to acknowledge the Basic Conditions that the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan align with the policies in the strategic document, and that the policy approach is fully justified and evidence. It is not apparent that such evidence has been prepared or is available.</p>	<p>support for a hotel on Former Barnado’s Home impossible, although could include a non-planning community action promoting use of whole site.</p> <p>NOTED – for the sake of accuracy, it should be noted that there is no previous NP/town council plan and that as such E3 cannot represent ‘a deterioration in policy intentions’. It has now become apparent that only Fircroft and immediate environs lie within the NA – this makes NP policy support for a hotel on Former Barnado’s Home impossible, although could include a non-planning community action promoting use of whole site. The NP could also offer general policy support for residential/nursing home in the Neighbourhood Area.</p> <p>NOTED – acknowledged that the SDC preferred options allocation is a difficulty, albeit one that could be surmounted with appropriate wording. The larger obstacle is that of the majority of the site lying outside the NA, making whole site NP policy coverage impossible. Policy could, as suggested, simply offer general rather than site-specific support for hotel/visitor accommodation development.</p>	<p>ACTION – add new community action as suggested, caveated in the event of proposed housing failing to come to fruition. Add new policy in Community Facilities section as indicated.</p> <p>ACTION – include policy offering general rather than site-specific support for hotel/visitor accommodation development.</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>could have happened years ago</p> <p>1) Where is the evidence for this? 2) What about a Caravan\Motorhome park to the East of Tadcaster with improved access to the town from this side via the A64 from Leeds to York?</p> <p>See the earlier comment on self-catering accommodation and its overall impact on the available housing stock.</p> <p>Yes, provided this is done respectfully and is not simply a large, ugly chain hotel inappropriately inserted into the beautiful countryside.</p> <p>Location suggested is inappropriate (no one would stay so far from anything) and is already earmarked by SDC for housing. SSOB would have to agree anyway. As for fitting in with surrounding environment = it is nonsense to keep the malaise that already exists.</p> <p>Let's hope that an investor can be found</p> <p>I would particularly like to see the development of the Jackdaw Pub area into a community hub supporting such things as a smaller public house, surgery, community centre, play space, shops and other.</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP is not answerable to the past nor can it address it.</p> <p>1) NOTED – the general absence of visitor accommodation in the town is the evidence. Creating a supportive planning context for the development of such accommodation is consistent with the NP vision/aims re tourism.</p> <p>2) NOTED – not considered feasible to promote 2 major junction improvements. A64/A162 considered the better option. No perceived need/demand for caravan/motorhome park.</p> <p>NOTED – considered negligible given only a handful of AirBnb properties in the parish.</p> <p>NOTED – unlikely to be pursued in policy terms. It has now become apparent that only Fircroft and immediate environs lie within the NA – this makes NP policy support for a hotel on Former Barnado’s Home impossible, although could include a non-planning community action promoting use of whole site.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – this could be encompassed under Policy E4, with the E4 policy area defined in order to include the Jackdaw pub site.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action as suggested, caveated in the event of proposed housing failing to come to fruition.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – define policy area as indicated and specify support for suggested uses within the policy wording.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>About time</p> <p>Should there be plans for the hotel to be in the centre of town for easy access to transport links?</p> <p>More visitor accommodation would be welcome - a lot of folk do want to stay in Tadcaster for various reasons.</p> <p>NO.</p> <p>Somewhere for visitors to stay is a much needed investment. If we are to invest in bars and a cafe culture this would stretch to evening meals and dining. The natural way forward would be a place for visitors to stay after enjoying these delights</p> <p>In principle</p> <p>This is vital if we want to encourage tourism/ outside investment</p> <p>Yes absolutely needs to happen</p> <p>This site should definitely been brought into use. Its a disgrace that it has been left empty for so long.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – acknowledged that this would be acceptable in SDC planning policy terms. Policy could simply offer general rather than site-specific/locational support for hotel/visitor accommodation development. In planning terms, a town centre location would be the most acceptable.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – without further elaboration, it is not possible to provide a meaningful response. The policy has wide community support.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – unlikely to be pursued in policy terms. Site is however earmarked for housing by SDC. It has now become</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include policy offering general rather than site-specific support for hotel/visitor accommodation development.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action as suggested, caveated in the event of</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>Not sure, there is already a huge amount of traffic which uses this road which causes congestion at key times in the day so not sure about adding to this issue.</p> <p>How does this intention align with the H3-8 for housing development on the same site?</p> <p>I think the demand for an additional hotel needs to be there before one is commissioned otherwise we could end up with a white elephant.</p> <p>Good luck on that. We are back to the Smith family again!</p> <p>Important to make good use of all empty property</p> <p>Both properties stood empty and decaying for years , how will this be achieved ?</p> <p>A decent hotel will be an excellent addition to the town.</p> <p>Yes! But we must build in partnership with wider redevelopment otherwise we build a hotel which is not attractive to tourists and falls into ruin. We must give people a reason to visit and stay in Tadcaster and then build the lodgings.</p>	<p>apparent that only Fircroft and immediate environs lie within the Neighbourhood Area – this makes NP policy support for a hotel on Former Barnado’s Home impossible, although could include a non-planning community action promoting use of whole site.</p> <p>NOTED – it is not a question of ‘commissioning’ a hotel, simply of creating a supportive planning policy context for inward hotel investment should it materialise – the market will decide.</p> <p>NOTED – hotel unlikely to be pursued in policy terms. Site is however earmarked for housing by SDC. It has now become apparent that only Fircroft and immediate environs lie within the Neighbourhood Area – this makes NP policy support for a hotel on Former Barnado’s Home impossible, although could include a non-planning community action promoting use of whole site.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the ultimate policy is likely to be less specific and to provide a generally supportive planning policy context for any hotel development proposals that may come forward.</p>	<p>proposed housing failing to come to fruition.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action as suggested, caveated in the event of proposed housing failing to come to fruition.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>Tadcaster is NOT a holiday resort, it is a town where we live our lives.</p> <p>It would be lovely to have a hotel in Tadcaster we have relatives and friends that visit and would be great for them to have somewhere to stay overnight!</p> <p>Not sure this is needed. Old Britannia pub would be better choice as more central to town</p> <p>I live near here and particularly welcome this.</p> <p>Focus on getting Tadcaster right for those of us who live here</p> <p>Development of the site as a hotel in principle is fine, but depends upon an attractive aspect to the river wharfe and access to viaduct / cycle routes etc: It therefore needs to be done in tandom with major investment along the river scene.</p> <p>-What a waste of decent buildings, ie Bernados home on Wighill & other substantial boarded up Sam's properties around town...</p>	<p>NOTED – nowhere is it stated that it is a holiday resort. But it already is a visitor destination on which the NP seeks to capitalise and for which it seeks to provide. This is not incompatible with a town where people live, e.g. Otley, Ilkley.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - hotel in the stated location unlikely to be pursued in policy terms given that former Barnado's Home part of site lies outside Neighbourhood Area. Acknowledged that a town centre location is more acceptable in SDC planning policy terms. Old Britannia is SSOB-owned and former bank buildings in centre considered better options.</p> <p>NOTED – majority of NP focuses on just this. A thriving tourism sector will benefit residents too.</p> <p>NOTED - hotel in the stated location unlikely to be pursued in policy terms given that former Barnado's Home part of site lies outside Neighbourhood Area.</p> <p>NOTED – hotel unlikely to be pursued in policy terms given that former Barnado's Home part of site lies outside</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>-It will never happen unless Sam Smith has a different mentality from his father</p> <p>what the town needs</p> <p>Just not sure we need a hotel in Tad. Who would use it? I can't imagine Barnado's as a Premier Inn but I could imagine it as a youth centre or even a cinema (think of the great cinema in Wetherby, run by locals).</p> <p>SDC - I do note that under Policy E3 (hotel development/visitor accommodation) that reference is made to the site at Fircroft and the former Barnados Home on Wighill Lane as a possible site for hotel/visitor accommodation. This is a site currently identified for residential use within the Preferred Options Local Plan and I would suggest that a suitable need for such accommodation is identified and consideration of the site viability and deliverability is undertaken to support this approach.</p> <p>Neither does Tadcaster need a hotel. As I previously noted SDC may decide to use the building as a social housing enterprise. Remember these proposals are for the local community the ones who live here now and the ones who will come to live here when we are no longer around.</p> <p>How does the proposal for housing development on the Fircroft/Former Barnado's Home align with E3 for a new hotel development on the same site?</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Area. Site is however earmarked for housing by SDC.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – hotel on this site unlikely to be pursued in policy terms given that former Barnado’s Home part of site lies outside Neighbourhood Area. There is however very limited visitor accommodation and support for a hotel is in line with the NP vision/aims re tourism. Site is earmarked for housing by SDC.</p> <p>NOTED – hotel on this site unlikely to be pursued in policy terms given that former Barnado’s Home part of site lies outside Neighbourhood Area. A policy more generally supportive of hotel development is more likely – noted that evidence would strengthen the policy underpin.</p> <p>NOTED – the current absence of visitor accommodation suggests that it does and no evidence is presented to the contrary. Support for such provision would be in line with the NP vision/aims re tourism. The SDC housing proposal is acknowledged. Hotel on this site unlikely to be pursued in policy terms given that former Barnado’s Home part of site lies outside Neighbourhood Area.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include policy offering general rather than site-specific support for hotel/visitor accommodation development.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>The building could be turned into flats four housing needs. Don't think a hotel is necessary</p> <p>We would love to use our property for glamping eventually. Much money needed to town + support business</p>	<p>NOTED – it is proposed for housing in the DC Local Plan.</p> <p>NOTED – not possible to comment more meaningfully re glamping idea without more information. An adopted NP will help support fundraising bids.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI E4	<p>SSOB – 1) NB. There appears to be an error on the questionnaire whereby no response is sought in relation to this policy intention. 2) Notwithstanding the above, the intention of the policy is unclear. There is no indication what protections are intended to be put in place that do not already exist. The wording appears to simultaneously resist the loss and prevent the development of further facilities in these locations. This obvious tension would need to be resolved.</p> <p>GPE – Yes agree – no further comment at this stage.</p> <p>E4?? Yes.</p> <p>E4 - Yes</p> <p>e4 yes</p> <p>What about E4?</p> <p>WHAT HAPPENED TO POLICY INTENTION E4.</p> <p>(This survey does not ask if I agree with E4 for some reason).</p>	<p>1) NOTED – an error occurred in setting up the questionnaire.</p> <p>2) NOTED – the intention should read 'support the provision of new facilities'. The next stage draft plan policy will clarify the protection to be given.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - an error occurred in setting up the questionnaire, hence its absence.</p> <p>NOTED - an error occurred in setting up the questionnaire, hence its absence.</p> <p>NOTED - an error occurred in setting up the questionnaire, hence its absence.</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>I also agree with Policy Intention E4 which appears to be missing from the survey.</p> <p>You did not ask about Policy intention E4- my response to this is YES.</p> <p>Also yes to E4</p> <p>E4 MISSING</p> <p>No E4 shown</p> <p>Where is E4 on the survey?</p> <p>1) Where has E4 gone? Please protect Stutton Road shops and perhaps help with car parking. 2) There is an empty site next to the Jackdaw pub that could be used for housing or parking.</p> <p>You forgot E4.</p> <p>The support of local shopping is essential to a vibrant and low climate impact town.</p>	<p>NOTED - an error occurred in setting up the questionnaire, hence its absence.</p> <p>NOTED - an error occurred in setting up the questionnaire, hence its absence.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - an error occurred in setting up the questionnaire, hence its absence.</p> <p>NOTED - an error occurred in setting up the questionnaire, hence its absence.</p> <p>NOTED - an error occurred in setting up the questionnaire, hence its absence.</p> <p>1) NOTED - an error occurred in setting up the questionnaire, hence its absence. E4 will serve to protect the shops. Car parking provision could be included in policy as a development to enhance the shopping function. 2) NOTED – this could be encompassed under Policy E4, with the E4 policy area defined in order to include the Jackdaw pub site. Housing not considered to be an appropriate use.</p> <p>NOTED - an error occurred in setting up the questionnaire, hence its absence.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) ACTION – include parking provision in policy as indicated. 2) ACTION – define policy area as indicated and specify support for suggested uses within the policy wording.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>Very important - Stutton Road is a very important social hub and needs support not discouragement with limiting planning applications.</p> <p>e4 - yes</p> <p>e4 - yes</p> <p>E4 - yes</p> <p>e4 ?</p> <p>e4 - yes</p> <p>e4 - yes as long as parking is made better and safer</p> <p>E4 parking needs improving but yes</p> <p>What about E4?</p> <p>There was no mention of policy intention E4. As I live on Stutton road this one concerns me a little. There is already issues regarding the amount of traffic using Stutton road at present and there is also an issue regarding speeding along the road. I would oppose this if provisions weren't in place to manage this.</p> <p>But I do want to mention you did forget E4.</p> <p>Finally, I must point out that E4 POLICY is missing on both this and the paper forms - a strange oversight.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - an error occurred in setting up the questionnaire, hence its absence.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - car parking could be included in policy as a development to enhance the shopping function.</p> <p>NOTED - an error occurred in setting up the questionnaire, hence its absence.</p> <p>NOTED – a 20mph zone could be promoted via a community action from Woodlands Ave to Leeds Road.</p> <p>NOTED - an error occurred in setting up the questionnaire, hence its absence.</p> <p>NOTED - an error occurred in setting up the questionnaire, hence its absence.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include parking provision in policy as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re lobbying for 20mph zone as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

<p>PI TTT1</p>	<p>NYCC - locating walking route signage and mile markers can improve health and wellbeing by encouraging walking and active travel.</p> <p>NYCC - Whilst the LHA would support this approach in principle, any proposals put forward as part of the 'Neighbourhood Plan Map' which would impact upon the publicly maintainable highway, must be discussed with the relevant representatives of NYCC, to ensure the proposal is feasible and to prevent abortive works.</p> <p>SSOB - It is not possible to comment on this intention without some indication of the routes and extent of the proposed protection, improvement and extension works.</p> <p>Tadcaster Alternative Group – we have been told that Selby are involved in a negotiation with SSOB about the future development of the town centre. That being the case then, if it is a pre-requisite to agree to the development of the central car park for housing before anything can be agreed (as we have also been told) there should be a number of further issues on the table which the community desires in lieu of accepting the apparent 'red line' position of SSOB, including:- -to add to TTT1 extending the walking, cycling opportunities by opening up a PROW across the ex Barnado's land from the eastern end of the viaduct to Wighill Lane to feed into the Old Coach Road.</p> <p>GPE – Yes agree. A policy to increase "accessibility" across the Plan area would be supported as a general aim. Any defined rights of way will need to have regard to their</p>	<p>NOTED – while the TC would not disagree, there is already a plethora of signage, particularly in the town centre/ conservation area. There is a need to take stock and potentially declutter before more signs are added.</p> <p>NOTED – NYCC are a statutory consultee at the draft plan Regulation 14 consultation stage.</p> <p>NOTED – detail will be provided in next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED – the suggested addition to the network will be considered for inclusion in the next stage draft NP. The town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowning breweries and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>ACTION – add community action re review of signage across the town.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider suggested network addition for NP inclusion.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
----------------	---	---	---

	<p>legal status as a permissive route or PROW and the nature of traffic allowed (footpath, bridleway, etc.).</p> <p>why??</p> <p>Cycling provisions please!</p> <p>But where is the detail?</p> <p>Take steps to open to two registered public footpaths in the town centre which are currently closed by obstructions.</p> <p>Not much need or desire for more facilities and must keep horses away from town centre</p>	<p>NOTED – in order to fill any gaps in the current network, e.g. to complete desirable circular routes; to improve existing routes where there are problems; and to add to the protection of existing routes.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - It is explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents 'Policy Intentions' section that this document sets out only the "basic intentions of policies and proposals" and that "final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail, will be presented in the final draft plan".</p> <p>NOTED – viaduct to Wighill Lane via Fircroft is assumed to be one of the paths. Not clear which is the other. In both cases, there is nothing more the NP can do that is not already being done.</p> <p>NOTED – there are in fact gaps in the current network, where desirable circular routes could be completed and existing routes where there are problems for users.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>Re-opening the viaduct and allowing access from both Wighill Lane through to Wetherby Road and the riverside path would be beneficial to walkers, cyclists and horse riders.</p> <p>A link between the viaduct and Wighill Lane would be nice.</p> <p>The network is important, but crucial is the need to encourage folk to walk and cycle more. In recent years, cycling has really taken off in our area, but the majority of this is purely recreational. The number of people using bicycles as a mode of Transport in Tadcaster is small. I'm one of them, of course. We look to The Netherlands as an example, where a big chunk of journeys are by bike.</p> <p>I don't see a problem with the existing provision. Of course though, if you want more visitors and more housing that may need to increase the need for further provision, but generally I'm not sure. No mention is made of past, current, possible future population of the town or how many houses you and SDC wish to build. So it's impossible for me to offer any further comment.</p> <p>In principle, as it is not yet identified I am unable to know if I would be in support</p> <p>Also yes other modes of transport are needed for other plans and goals such as climate change.</p> <p>Haven't seen the map</p>	<p>NOTED - the suggested addition to the network will be considered for inclusion in the next stage draft NP.</p> <p>NOTED - the suggested addition to the network will be considered for inclusion in the next stage draft NP.</p> <p>NOTED – network extension and improvement, including infrastructure, will encourage more walking and cycling. See also NP non-planning community actions for further ideas. Other ideas welcome.</p> <p>NOTED - there are in fact gaps in the current network, where desirable circular routes could be completed and existing routes where there are problems for users. Future housing numbers will be determined by SDC's Local Plan not the NP/town council and cannot be opposed by the NP. The NP's vision/aims re tourism/visitors are well supported by the community.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – as stated, routes both new and for improvement are 'to be</p>	<p>ACTION – consider suggested network addition for NP inclusion.</p> <p>ACTION – consider suggested network addition for NP inclusion.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>A map?</p> <p>Definitely improved cycling provisos, ideally linking the existing cycle paths to fully connect Newton Kyme through Tad to Wetherby <i>(NB connect Tad to Weth via NK?)</i></p> <p>A well established footpath across the former Barnado's home was closed off by the landowner in 2009? and has remained closed following two public inquiries which ultimately ruled in the landowner's favour. The path remains closed even though it is located at a perimeter extremity of his land and away from his property which is empty. There is no reason why this path cannot be made available for public use and could be included in TTT1 for improving and extending the town's walking routes.</p> <p>Why did the town stop the cycle path proposed by Sustrans from Newton Kyme to Tadcaster?</p> <p>I think it's a shame that Tadcaster has no cycle paths like Wetherby and York. We should have a cycle network connecting us to these other towns. We have many cyclists coming through but they are forced onto our narrow roads and can cause a hazard.</p> <p>I didn't think this is an issue we have at the moment</p>	<p>identified' – this will be part of the next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED - the suggested addition to the network will be considered for inclusion in the next stage draft NP. NP policy can only address routes within the Neighbourhood Area/parish, though non-planning community action can be included for outside.</p> <p>NOTED - the suggested addition to the network will be considered for inclusion in the next stage draft NP. The town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowning breweries and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.</p> <p>NOTED – 'the town' did not stop the path. This is a work still in progress while Sustrans seek to identify a workable option to complete the path.</p> <p>NOTED – NP seeks to address this.</p> <p>NOTED - there are in fact gaps in the current network, where desirable circular routes could be completed and</p>	<p>ACTION – specify desired route in NP policy.</p> <p>ACTION – consider suggested network addition for NP inclusion.</p> <p>ACTION – specify desired route in NP policy.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>Even painted cycle routes on existing roads will help (eg the wide main road in from Islington).</p> <p>can the local council get agreement to develop the viaduct, like that done across the river between boston spa and the thorp arch trading estate ?</p> <p>I am very keen that as many people as possible cycle or walk for short journeys in the town. I launched an initiative regarding this with the Town Council in 2010. Some progress was made, particularly with the primary schools around the "school run" issue. I don't believe the initiative has been retained, but the benefits to individuals, the environment, the town are manifold and I would like to see things move in this direction in future. I would be prepared to help with such a move. The motor car must cease to be the dominant feature of our town centres - this ties in with pedestrianisation and limiting car parking spaces. People must learn that the use of the car to drive and park as near to their destination as possible is a privilege and not a right, and may need to change.</p>	<p>existing routes where there are problems for users.</p> <p>NOTED – policy wording will allow for such provision.</p> <p>NOTED - the suggested addition to the network will be considered for inclusion in the next stage draft NP.</p> <p>NOTED – the town council is sympathetic to this view, but considers that action is down to the schools rather than the NP.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider suggested network addition for NP inclusion.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI TTT2	<p>NYCC - The Local Highway Authority (NYCC) and National Highways are responsible for the regulation of the local and strategic road network respectively. NYCC prioritises improvement works where there is a significant traffic issue or history of collision in the location. It is recommended that all aspirations concerning the publicly maintainable highway, or objectives involving proposed highway implementation are discussed with the relevant representatives of NYCC and/or National Highways prior to including in the plan, to prevent the inclusion therein of aspirations which are not feasible.</p>	<p>NOTED – NYCC are a statutory consultee at the draft plan Regulation 14 consultation stage.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>SSOB – 1) In relation to policy intention TTT2 and the highways improvements onto the A64, I am unaware of a robust evidential basis to support the development of these road junctions, nor the basis upon which the Town Council consider this would support the aims and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst no detailed plans are provided, it seems from the road layout that any such access would be outside the Neighbourhood Plan boundary. As such, this feature of the policy intention would not be supported. 2) I would however like to add the route along Joseph St, between Station Rd and High Street as a highway improvement scheme. This road widening was part of a formal plan put forward by the Highways Authority some years ago.</p> <p>Tadcaster Alternative Group – we have been told that Selby are involved in a negotiation with SSOB about the future development of the town centre. That being the case then, if it is a pre-requisite to agree to the development of the central car park for housing before anything can be agreed (as we have also been told) there should be a number of further issues on the table which the community desires in lieu of accepting the apparent ‘red line’ position of SSOB, including:- -to add to TTT2 – to create a new east bound exit from the A64/A162 London Road junction, thus negating the need for heavy brewery transport using Leeds Road.</p> <p>GPE – Yes agree. See comment to TTT1.</p>	<p>1) NOTED – the A64 proposal clearly links to both the vision (paragraph 4) and aims (aim 10). Evidence will be provided as part of the next stage draft plan – such improvements have been looked at by SDC in the past and are referenced in the Preferred Options Local Plan TADC-M. It is acknowledged that some of the works relating to the junction improvement would need to take place outside the Neighbourhood Area.</p> <p>2) NOTED – while the town council is not opposed to such a scheme, it would like to see a justification for it. Could it, for e.g. be linked to revised traffic circulation in the town centre as part of pedestrianisation plans?</p> <p>AGREE – there is a strong case for a ‘clover leaf’ junction with 100% access/egress for all routes.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>1) ACTION – compile evidence in support of proposed A64 junction improvement. Reference fact that part of junction improvement site lies outside Neighbourhood Area in next stage draft plan.</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – policy to support ‘clover leaf’ junction as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>disabled access</p> <p>why?</p> <p>In my opinion the actual development are enough</p> <p>a64/a162 - This was proposed in Feb 1989</p> <p>Agree with point one but unsure about points 2-3</p> <p>a64/162 proposed in 1989</p> <p>You need to provide much more detail about what you mean. There is a severe lack of evidence, information, detail, impact or risk assessments for most of what is written in this document. It feels like a waste of time and money that could have been better spent supporting existing residents who have been short changed by Selby District Council for far too long. This statement applies to many of the questions you are asking so you will see this statement a number of times as it is relevant throughout.</p>	<p>NOTED – draft plan policy will make every effort to reflect the needs of the disabled/elderly and disabled access, within the context of existing national and SDC policy.</p> <p>NOTED – variously, to address HGV-based congestion in town centre; to improve cycling and pedestrian movement/safety; to improve town centre user environment/experience.</p> <p>NOTED – this may provide a useful historical reference for the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – as no reasons are given, it is not possible to provide a more meaningful response.</p> <p>NOTED – this may provide a useful historical reference for the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – it is explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents ‘Policy Intentions’ section that this document sets out only the “basic intentions of policies and proposals” and that “final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail, will be presented in the final draft plan”. This is in order to check that the community is on board with the broad thrust of policies and overall direction of travel before doing what may be extensive detailed work that may then prove to be abortive.</p>	<p>ACTION – reflect needs as indicated in draft plan policy</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – research 1989 reference.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – research 1989 reference.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>I disagree with the proposal to the pedestrianisation of Kirkgate/Westgate</p> <p>1) A64/A162 connection should be both on and off from the western approach. 2) Kirkgate/Westgate should not be pedestrianised. The road width should be limited to one lane (except at the junctions with High St) and traffic calming measures introduced. The resulting spaces should be used for wider pavements.</p> <p>I agree with most proposed improvements except for the pedestrianisation of Kirkgate/ Westgate. Personally I believe the current one way system works well and helps to alleviate traffic congestion in the town centre. The current system of temporary pedestrianisation (for example, for markets and fairs etc) works well and is appropriate. I would also point out that traffic is clearly much heavier on the surrounding roads on these days (understandably). Therefore, I would not like to see this be made a permanent issue for the town centre.</p>	<p>NOTED – it is considered that pedestrianisation will improve the town centre user environment/experience. Pedestrianisation from The Ark to the Bridge St/High St junction is envisaged. Full details to be worked out but town council confident solutions to potential problems can be sorted out. Scheme is already on NYCC agenda/in programme.</p> <p>1) AGREE – there is a strong case for a ‘clover leaf’ junction with 100% access/egress for all routes. 2) NOTED - it is considered that pedestrianisation will improve the town centre user environment/experience. Pedestrianisation from The Ark to the Bridge St/High St junction is envisaged. Full details to be worked out but town council confident solutions to potential problems can be sorted out. Scheme is already on NYCC agenda/in programme.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that pedestrianisation will improve the town centre user environment/experience. Pedestrianisation from The Ark to the Bridge St/High St junction is envisaged. Full details to be worked out but town council confident solutions to potential problems can be sorted out. Scheme is already on NYCC agenda/in programme.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) ACTION – policy to support ‘clover leaf’ junction as indicated. 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>1) PRIORITY ONE is the ability to travel towards and from Leeds on A64/A162 junction vastly reducing heavy traffic in the town and safer for children near TGS. 2) Item 2 doesn't exist? 3) Item 3 Definitely NO as previously mentioned. Policy should not be instigated if something better than existing is proposed.</p> <p>1) Very much so re. A64/A162 improvement to allow both West and Eastbound traffic. 2) Concerned that pedestrianisation of Kirkgate will inhibit traffic flow around the existing one-way system.</p> <p>As mentioned above , the lack of A64 access towards Leeds from London road is a quiet outrage , and a telling symbol of the unhealthy effect of vested interests on the town</p> <p>This is long overdue, particularly the A64/A162 London Road junction - provision of Leeds/A1 bound access i feel would alleviate a lot of the traffic prolems within the town. But this must be done inconjunction with routing traffic away from the town centre. How can a new, vibrant, cafe culture plan be implemented when the traffic noise in the centre is so off putting.</p> <p>Epecially point 1</p> <p>Tadcaster Community Sports Trust would ask that the proposed A64/A162 London Road Junction within this</p>	<p>1) AGREE – there is a strong case for a ‘clover leaf’ junction with 100% access/egress for all routes.</p> <p>2) NOTED – the meaning of the comment is not clear, so not possible to provide a meaningful response.</p> <p>3) NOTED – it is considered that pedestrianisation will improve the town centre user environment/experience. Pedestrianisation from The Ark to the Bridge St/High St junction is envisaged. Full details to be worked out but town council confident solutions to potential problems can be sorted out. Scheme is already on NYCC agenda/in programme. Meaning of final sentence is unclear, so not possible to provide a meaningful response.</p> <p>NOTED – policy seeks to address this.</p> <p>NOTED – it is envisaged that a revised traffic circulation system linked to pedestrianisation will serve to route traffic away from the centre.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – traffic speed could be controlled via restrictions. The SDC</p>	<p>1) ACTION – policy to support ‘clover leaf’ junction as indicated.</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p> <p>3) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>policy intention be reconsidered further taking account of the proposed sports park location. The Trust envisages such a junction improvement would likely increase vehicle speeds and volumes along the A162 to the detriment of road safety and more particularly in relation to future users of the sports park. The vision for the site includes for pedestrians and cyclists having easy access to the facility via existing footways but it is felt that such movements could become vulnerable to these increased traffic movements along the A162. Albeit we acknowledge that traffic speed restrictions could be implemented, increased traffic flows there is also a potentially increased risk of accidents with vehicles seeking to turn into and out of the proposed sports park. It's probably fair to say the road improvement is car/vehicle focussed and would therefore not encourage the health or wellbeing of Tadcaster residents which is a key Trust objective, but in addition any improvement would require some of the land at the southern end of the proposed sports park. We would wish to point out that under our proposals the southern end of the site is designated for nature and ecology providing facilities for amongst other things school projects and outdoor classrooms. In addition, a lake/large pond is intended which will not only enhance the ecological offering but also assist with water attenuation which will be a key requirement at the site.</p> <p>To reclaim part of the town centre from the cult of the car and pedestrianise it, would be a marvelous thing for Tadcaster. People will just have to walk a little bit further!</p> <p>NO to creating an access to A64 at London Road junction. The main reason on my part is noise & air pollution & destruction of green space.</p>	<p>Preferred Options Local Plan proposal re the Tadcaster Sports Park and Community Hub (ref TADC-M) requires provision of "safe cycle and pedestrian routes linking to the surrounding residential areas and the town centre" (e.g. new cycle lanes?)(clause 5) and ensuring that "design and layout allows for land required for future A162/A64 junction improvements" (clause 10). This is an acknowledged problem junction with only limited access which causes town centre HGV problems.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE - this is an acknowledged problem junction with only limited access which causes town centre HGV problems. It has already been considered in the past by SDC and is</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	-----------------------------------

	<p>Would disagree with pedestrianisation of Kirkgate/Westgate. This would preclude access for residents in this area. Would be problematic for emergency services to access a number of properties . How do hearses get to the Church?</p> <p>In the main i agree, however i dont see the benefits of turning Kirkgate into a pedestrian only part of town</p> <p>Pedestrianisation of Kirkgate/Westgate not in the interests of the elderly and infirm who have severe walking issues and who require access to central facilities, dentist, churches, optician etcetera.</p> <p>I agree that we should ensure that traffic flow is at its best for both the economies sake, people's sake and emissions sake.</p> <p>As earlier - against permanent pedestrianisation of Kirkgate.</p> <p>Not sure Kirkgate has enough shops etc to warrant pedestrianisation</p>	<p>referenced in its Preferred Options Local Plan.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that pedestrianisation will improve the town centre user environment/experience. Pedestrianisation from The Ark to the Bridge St/High St junction is envisaged. Full details to be worked out but town council confident solutions to potential problems can be sorted out. Scheme is already on NYCC agenda/in programme.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that pedestrianisation will improve the town centre user environment/experience. Pedestrianisation from The Ark to the Bridge St/High St junction is envisaged. Full details to be worked out but town council confident solutions to potential problems can be sorted out. Scheme is already on NYCC agenda/in programme.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that pedestrianisation will improve the town centre user environment/experience. Enhanced shopping environment will encourage new shops in. Pedestrianisation from The Ark to the Bridge St/High St junction is envisaged. Full details to be worked out but town council confident solutions to potential problems can be sorted out. Scheme is already on NYCC agenda/in programme.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>Add to the list of highway improvements - A64 Tadcaster Bar Interchange. In 2004 the then Highways Agency(now Highways England) went to public exhibition stage on a scheme for providing an east-bound off slip and a west-bound on slip at the eastern end of Tadcaster ByPass. The scheme was eventually shelved and removed from the programme partly due to the objections of a local landowner. Following the bridge collapse in 2015 I lobbied the local MP, Selby District Council and the Highways Agency for support in re-including the scheme in the highways programme. The Highways Agency wrote to say they would continue to work with Selby DC and NYCC to establish a better case for the scheme in which the recent floods had highlighted a clear issue with the resilience of the local road network. The scheme has the following benefits:- it provides resilience in the road network in case of flooding in the town centre; it provides and completes a convenient route for access to Tadcaster east to and from the A64; it reduces the volume of traffic through the centre of Tadcaster, and, it supports future air quality by reducing the amount of through traffic in the town centre. The scheme would require no new structures - only the provision of dumbell roundabouts on either side of the A64.</p> <p>Not sure about pedestrianisation of Kirkgate. Access to church essential</p> <p>Pedestrian area not needed</p>	<p>DISAGREE – it is considered that A64 junction improvement is,realistically, an either/or situation and that A64/A162 improvement is on balance the better option.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that pedestrianisation will improve the town centre user environment/experience. Pedestrianisation from The Ark to the Bridge St/High St junction is envisaged. Full details to be worked out but town council confident solutions to potential problems can be sorted out. Scheme is already on NYCC agenda/in programme.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	-----------------------------------

	<p>Slip road improvements would help reduce congestion in town and create a cleaner air environment</p> <p>A map/plan would help</p> <p>There is no case for creation of Leeds / A1 bound access. The existing accesses are sufficient.</p> <p>Much needed especially the London road a64 junction</p> <p>Brilliant news. New junction to a64 will alleviate heavy wagons going through Tad to get to A1. Also fully support pedestrianisation of Kirkgate to allow street cafe culture.</p> <p>Creation of Leeds/A1 bound access at A64/A162 must be a priority to remove many heavy goods vehicles from the town centre (especially Leeds Road).</p> <p>I'm not sure about pedestrianising Kirkgate as businesses would potentially lose trade...</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – a map will be provided as part of the next stage draft plan.</p> <p>DISAGREE - this is an acknowledged problem junction with only limited access which causes town centre HGV problems. It has already been considered in the past by SDC and is referenced in its Preferred Options Local Plan.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that pedestrianisation will improve the town centre user environment/experience. Pedestrianisation/enhanced shopping environment may encourage shops in. Pedestrianisation from The Ark to the Bridge St/High St junction is envisaged. Full details to be worked out but town council confident solutions to potential problems can be sorted out. Scheme is already on NYCC agenda/in programme.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>Probably the last item on the to-do list would be pedestrianising Kirkgate. Until all the other improvements have been made and the town is properly rejuvenated, this can wait.</p> <p>I am also against your proposals for an access to the A64 to Leeds at London Road in part because of the sheer amount of additional traffic which would then use the road causing additional noise pollution and decreasing air quality.</p> <p>No to proposal to add slip road to Leeds A64 at London Road.</p> <p>I am also against your proposals for an access to the A64 to Leeds at London Road</p> <p>FIRST priority create a Leeds bound and from Leeds journey on junction over bypass and London Road. The vast majority go west very little goods traffic goes east</p> <p>Tadcaster Alternative Group – we have been told that Selby are involved in a negotiation with SSOB about the future development of the town centre. That being the case then, if it is a pre-requisite to agree to the development of the central car park for housing before</p>	<p>NOTED – policies are not dealt with on a priority basis. They are applied equally to planning proposals as they come forward. The policy will put in place a supportive planning policy context for any pedestrianisation proposal that may come forward rather than signal implementation over/above any other policy.</p> <p>DISAGREE - this is an acknowledged problem junction with only limited access which causes town centre HGV problems, including air/noise pollution. It has already been considered in the past by SDC and is referenced in its Preferred Options Local Plan.</p> <p>DISAGREE - this is an acknowledged problem junction with only limited access which causes town centre HGV problems, including air/noise pollution. It has already been considered in the past by SDC and is referenced in its Preferred Options Local Plan.</p> <p>NOTED – this is as proposed.</p> <p>NOTED – not appropriate to add to GNE7 as it is a highway improvement proposal, but agree re adding to TTT2.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – policy to support ‘clover leaf’ junction as indicated.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>anything can be agreed (as we have also been told) there should be a number of further issues on the table which the community desires in lieu of accepting the apparent 'red line' position of SSOB, including:- to add to GNE7 – to create a new east bound exit from the A64/A162 London Road junction, thus negating the need for heavy brewery transport using Leeds Road.</p> <p>Disagree with the Westgate/Kirkgate pedestrianisation</p> <p>64/A162 – This was proposed in Feb 1989!!!</p>	<p>There is a strong case for a 'clover leaf' junction with 100% access/egress for all routes.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that pedestrianisation will improve the town centre user environment/experience. Pedestrianisation/enhanced shopping environment may encourage shops in. Pedestrianisation from The Ark to the Bridge St/High St junction is envisaged. Full details to be worked out but town council confident solutions to potential problems can be sorted out. Scheme is already on NYCC agenda/in programme.</p> <p>NOTED – but not implemented. The hope is that the case is now stronger.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
PI TTT3	<p>Historic England - The Policy could be seen to be in conflict with policies TTT1 & TTT2. Recommendation:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish evidence of need for current or increased level of parking. 	<p>NOTED – not clear where the suggested conflict lies. The named car parking areas to be protected are those proposed in SDC's Preferred Options Local Plan as replacement parking for the Central Car Park which is proposed for housing development. The support for increased town centre parking reflects the fact that some of the proposed replacement parking is for outside the town centre leaving a shortfall on current capacity.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>NYCC - NYCC is the Local Highway Authority. Improvement schemes are prioritised based on evidence. As per the responses to other questions, it is recommended that conversation with NYCC is undertaken so the feasibility of introducing a scheme can be explored, prior to this being included as an ambition of the plan.</p> <p>-Please note: Any proposed changes to on-street parking will require conversation with the relevant NYCC representatives in order for the proposal to be assessed for deliverability and desirability.</p> <p>SSOB - In relation to policy intention TTT3, I am not aware of any evidence or national or local policies which suggests that an 'increase' in public parking capacity would be beneficial to the settlement or reflect the aims and objectives of sustainable development. Indeed, there has been research conducted in relation to this matter (evidence base to the Selby Core Strategy and Selby Local Plan) which points to the regeneration benefits associated with a rationalisation and reorganisation of parking facilities within the settlement.</p> <p>Tadcaster Alternative Group? – I have some observations to make on the car parking proposals contained in the NP. There is a suggestion in the document that increased public car parking capacity could be found at:-</p> <p>-Robin Hood Yard – I agree but this will be limited because this area is currently heavily used by businesses and residents on Kirkgate, Bridge St and Wharfe Bank Crescent, all of whom will require continued access.</p> <p>-Commercial Street – there are only 10 car parking spaces in front of the Power Plus Garage (on what used to be the old petrol filling forecourt) which is currently leased by the garage. This area has been rejected as one of the Selby District Plan preferred options because of its flooding vulnerability.</p>	<p>NOTED – NYCC are a statutory consultee at the draft plan Regulation 14 consultation stage. The policy does not relate to on-street parking.</p> <p>NOTED – the named car parking areas to be protected are those proposed in SDC's Preferred Options Local Plan as replacement parking for the Central Car Park which is proposed for housing development. The support for increased town centre parking reflects the fact that some of the proposed replacement parking is for outside the town centre leaving a shortfall on current capacity.</p> <p>NOTED – the named car parks as listed are SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposals (for replacement parking for the Central Car Park in turn proposed for housing), which the NP cannot oppose, not NP/town council proposals. The town council is not aware of the rejection of Mill Lane/Commercial St on flooding grounds. If this proves to be the case and they are not listed in the next stage Local Plan, those car parks will not be included in the next stage draft NP policy. TTT3 indicates that it would also support provision of</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement 'town centre' car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>-Land at Mill Lane – there is no land at Mill Lane which is designated for additional public car parking. All this land has already been earmarked for housing development. In any event, if some of it became available for public car parking it would be rejected for the same reasons as commercial street.</p> <p>-Tadcaster Albion’s car park does provide additional capacity and is currently in use daily during the week by a number of town centre workers and visitors. It has to be pointed out that this car park is at the lowest point in the flood plain and is usually the first area in the town to be flooded. It is not in the Selby Plan and if it was then it could well be rejected as an option for the same reasons as Commercial St.</p> <p>-London Road – this proposals is part of the proposed new sporting complex on London Rd, which I wholeheartedly support. However the proposed car park for this complex is considered by many to be ‘out of the town centre’.</p> <p>-To conclude, the future public car parking requirements for Tadcaster are going to be challenging to meet. Finding a solution will require significant additional land being made available in the town centre if the proposal to develop the town centre car park for housing is progressed. At this time there is no indication that any suitable alternative proposal meets the town centre ongoing car parking needs.</p> <p>-Finally, the car parking chaos in the last few months at the bus station car park during the recent vaccination/ testing blitzes at the medical centre is a further compelling reason for more car parking to be provided in the town centre.</p> <p><i>(NB based on analysis of current/future car parking appended)</i></p>	<p>increased town centre car park capacity over and above the listed car parks, in recognition of the fact that the replacement parking proposed by SDC does not all lie within the town centre, resulting in a shortfall on current car parking capacity. The NP could in principle propose other ‘town centre sites’ for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC’s car park (on non-match days – NB not precluded by flooding issue), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood’s Yard/Hodgson’s Terrace site.</p>	
--	---	--	--

	<p>TVCSA – it is proposed that the central carpark is utilised for new affordable housing, but in doing so removes the only demarked disabled parking bays in the centre of the town. No consideration has been paid to replacing this within the town centre and the alternative car parking areas in Section TTT3 are unsuitable. Three sites are distributed on the outskirts between ¼ and ½ mile from the Town Centre. Robin Hood Yard is the only one close to the town centre, but it includes physical features that will need to be regulated in future planning proposals and should be defined in the plan:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the land is privately owned, unsurfaced and the landowner has indicated he wishes to surface it in natural stone which requires special attention to ensure it is suitable for those with mobility issues. -there is a significant level difference between the town centre and Robin Hood Yard and the gradients and distances to be negotiated by wheelchair users need to be in line with Building Regs Part M. -the access routes in and out of the car park are very tight so segregation of disabled pedestrians and vehicles must be designed. <p>All these features can be anticipated, as I have done here. If you do not define them in the Development Plan and then developers fail to provide them later it is a clear discrimination and will be a breach of the Public Sector Equality Duty 2011. This car park is indicated in Selby District Councils Preferred Options Local Plan with proposals for allocations, but section 28.2 of this plan indicates that the Tadcaster Neighbourhood Plan Group in the town are responsible for the detailed proposals. No Impacts Assessment for the practical use of this car park by the disabled has been discussed with Regulation 14 Consultation Bodies.</p>	<p>NOTED – 1) the named car parks as listed in TTT3 are SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposals (for replacement parking for the Central Car Park in turn proposed by SDC for housing), which the NP cannot oppose, not NP/town council proposals. As such it is SDC’s responsibility, in respect of the Robin’s Hood Yard proposal, to require the design features specified in the comment, through its own Local Plan policy where appropriate or through its building regulation functions. Ditto the carrying out of any impacts assessment.</p> <p>2) Section 28.2 of the Preferred Options Local Plan states:-“The Council designated the Tadcaster Neighbourhood Plan Area in May 2020, and the Tadcaster Neighbourhood Plan Group in the town, which is progressing the Plan will need to ensure it contains policies and proposals which plan positively for growth in line with the Local Plan.” This wording appears in the introduction to the Tadcaster section of the plan and clearly relates generally to what the NP should contain in terms of supporting growth as proposed in the Local Plan. It in no way relates to the NP having responsibility for the detailed proposals of the Local Plan and clearly does not state this as asserted in the comment.</p> <p>3) TTT3 indicates that it would also support provision of increased town centre car park capacity over and above</p>	<p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement ‘town centre’ car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>GPE – Yes agree. The policy intent is supported. In line with comments on TTT1, consideration will need to be given to the accessibility of parking facilities to ensure an appropriate distribution of parking provision to underpin the regeneration of the town centre. There is however, a potential contradiction in the this policy to protect existing capacity and H3 -H8 which seek to identify several sites for housing, in particular the Central Area Car Park. The current central car park represents the largest and most valuable parking resource in the town.</p> <p>with defined blue badge parking in sensible places</p>	<p>the listed car parks, in recognition of the fact that the replacement parking proposed by SDC does not all lie within the town centre, resulting in a shortfall on current car parking capacity. The NP could in principle propose other ‘town centre sites’ for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC’s car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood’s Yard/Hodgson’s Terrace site.</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan policy will only identify for protection, on The Neighbourhood Plan map, car parking areas where there is no conflict with SDC Local Plan proposals such as for Central Car Park. TTT3 also indicates that it would support provision of increased town centre car park capacity over and above the listed car parks, in recognition of the fact that the replacement parking proposed by SDC does not all lie within the town centre, resulting in a shortfall on current car parking capacity. The NP could in principle propose other ‘town centre sites’ for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC’s car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood’s Yard/Hodgson’s Terrace site.</p> <p>NOTED – policy could include a requirement re the level/location of</p>	<p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement ‘town centre’ car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p> <p>ACTION – consider inclusion of requirement as indicated.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>There's enough car parkings</p> <p>Why not have a park and ride next to a new Caravan\Motorhome Park on the East Side of Tadcaster as suggested above and make all the car parks 2 hours max. We just get people from outside tadcaster clogging up the parking with no benefit to the town.</p> <p>"Policy will protect existing public car parking capacity in the town centre" This statement is in direct conflict with the proposal to build houses on the central car park. Of the 4 listed sites only Robin Hoods Yard could be described as the "Town Centre". It is also proposed that RHY will be used as "off site parking for residents" for these central car park properties, as a result it will therefore will not be "Public parking"</p> <p>I am not opposed to increasing the parking capacity at some of the proposed sites. However, I am in absolute opposition to this being at the expense of the central car park in pretty much any way, shape or form. None of the sites would support local commerce as well as the existing car park.</p>	<p>blue badge parking spaces on new car parking areas.</p> <p>NOTED – with the SDC proposal for housing development of the Central Car Park, replacement town centre car parking would be required.</p> <p>DISAGREE – there is no evidence presented to either substantiate the complaint or support the ideas put forward.</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan policy will only identify for protection, on The Neighbourhood Plan map, car parking areas where there is no conflict with SDC Local Plan proposals such as for Central Car Park. TTT3 also indicates that it would support provision of increased town centre car park capacity over and above the listed car parks, in recognition of the fact that the replacement parking proposed by SDC does not all lie within the town centre, resulting in a shortfall on current car parking capacity. The NP could in principle propose other 'town centre sites' for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC's car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood's Yard/Hodgson's Terrace site.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement 'town centre' car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>Existing parking provision can be protected by keeping the Central Car Park. Additional parking may be useful to enhance the use of particular areas.</p> <p>Protect Central Car Park and existing capacity.</p> <p>The parking at TCST (<i>NB i.e. London Rd</i>) cannot be included as it will be a private facility - should be under 'Non-Planning Community Actions'</p> <p>As it is proposed that the current town centre car park will be used for housing, it is important that all other parking options are clearly defined and discussed prior to proceeding. At the consultation meeting I attended on the 13/11/21, it was mooted by the planning official in attendance that a larger scale map of the town centre noting possible car parking locations and capacities be presented for further discussion. The plans available were small scale and lacked detail.</p> <p>And retaining our rare "free parking" provision</p> <p>I am broadly in agreement with this but the new car parking must have easy and safe routes to the town centre. If its difficult, or takes more than a few minutes to walk into town, there is a risk of discouraging visitors.</p> <p>This doesn't look sufficient and requires suitable capacity to service the intended improved facilities and retail offering.</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP cannot protect land in car parking use where that site is proposed for development in the SDC Local Plan. Hence the need for additional.</p> <p>NOTED – it is included because it is a Selby Local Plan proposal.</p> <p>The NP could in principle propose other 'town centre sites' for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC's car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood's Yard/Hodgson's Terrace site.</p> <p>NOTED – decisions re free or charged parking are not planning matters. No perception that this is under threat.</p> <p>NOTED – policy could include requirements re access points and town centre pedestrian links.</p> <p>NOTED - TTT3 also indicates that it would support provision of increased town centre car park capacity over and above the listed car parks, in recognition of the fact that the replacement parking proposed by SDC does not all lie within the town centre,</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement 'town centre' car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include requirements as indicated in draft plan policy.</p> <p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement 'town centre' car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>Tadcaster Community Sports Trust wishes to point out that proposed parking provision at the proposed sports park will also be available to serve the longer-term parking needs of Tadcaster town centre. It may be argued the location for such parking is not ideal when compared to existing provision, but the Trust objective is to promote health and well-being and would suggest the exercise undertaken as a result of parking at the sports park would be of benefit to those individuals who use the facility. It could also promote the increased use of cycling which a further key consideration in the Neighbourhood Plan. In addition, there will also be facilities at the sports park for the parking of larger vehicles such as coaches which could assist the development of the tourist economy.</p> <p>The existing car park should not be built on. The suggested new sites are not convenient for the town especially for adults with young children or the elderly.</p> <p>Creating a few spaces in the areas listed would not make up for the loss of spaces in the central car park. No-one is going to come to Tadcaster and search these areas for somewhere to park. They'll just go elsewhere.</p>	<p>resulting in a shortfall on current car parking capacity. The NP could in principle propose other 'town centre sites' for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC's car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood's Yard/Hodgson's Terrace site.</p> <p>NOTED – there are however also concerns regarding elderly/disabled/young family users not able to walk the extra distance to the centre and the potential discouragement to visitors who cannot park in the town centre – The London Road site is well outside the defined town centre boundary.</p> <p>NOTED – this is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal which the NP cannot oppose. TTT3 also indicates that it would support provision of increased town centre car park capacity over and above the listed new car parks, in recognition of the fact that the replacement parking proposed by SDC does not all lie within the town centre, resulting in a shortfall on current car parking capacity. The NP could in principle propose other 'town centre</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement 'town centre' car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>More parking needed not less. Road sides filling up rapidly which often causes congestion.</p> <p>As previously mentioned, if folk have to park a bit further away from the town centre, then they will have a bit of exercise and also pass several shops that they wouldn't have done otherwise. This could lead to additional purchases. The counter argument is that people would go to the next town to shop and Tadcaster would lose out. I don't believe this to be the case - I think they would get used to the new system. Many towns will also be taking similar action, so Tadcaster need not suffer by the proposed parking revision.</p> <p>1) Public car parking will unfortunately be required for many decades to come and should be planned for appropriately. 2) Protection of the provision of free car parking is vital to the prosperity of businesses in the centre of town; Wetherby provides free car parking, as does Boston Spa, so charging for car parking would be a death knell for the town centre.</p>	<p>sites' for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC's car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood's Yard/Hodgson's Terrace site.</p> <p>NOTED – policy supports increased town centre public car parking provision. The NP cannot oppose proposed Central Car Park development.</p> <p>NOTED – there are however also concerns regarding elderly/disabled/young family users not able to walk the extra distance to the centre and the potential discouragement to visitors who cannot park in the town centre. Hence policy is supportive of increased town centre provision.</p> <p>1) NOTED – with its support for increased town centre parking, the policy does this. The NP could in principle propose other 'town centre sites' for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC's car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood's Yard/Hodgson's Terrace site.</p> <p>2) NOTED – decisions re free or charged parking are not planning matters. No perception that need for protection is an issue.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement 'town centre' car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>1) I'm unclear how you can "protect existing public parking in the town centre" when you clearly state in the same paragraph that you "also support development" I think the development you mean is putting housing on the existing central car park. As a resident I am totally against this. 2) I do think though that the car park should be free for an hour and then a charge should be made for the remaining stay even if it's 50p > £1.</p> <p>I feel we have enough parking in the town with the centre car park , bus station and sainsburys</p> <p>Would need to know full details of plan for Robin Hood Yard as would have a direct impact on our property</p> <p>Parking it vital if we want people to use other modes of transport.</p> <p>The proposed car parks other than Robin Hood Yard are not within the walking distance of the town centre facilities for persons with walking limitations.</p>	<p>1) NOTED – new development can enable the associated creation of new parking areas; the creation of a new car park is in itself ‘development’. The proposed housing development of Central Car Park is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal not a NP/town council proposal and not one the NP can oppose. The development referred to in TTT3 is not housing development on the car park.</p> <p>2) NOTED – decisions re free or charged parking are not planning matters. Parking charges would be very unpopular and the pandemic has eased the problem highlighted with more people now homeworking.</p> <p>NOTED – TTT3 responds to the situation where housing development of the Central Cat Park is likely. Hence the need for replacement parking.</p> <p>NOTED – details as far as they are currently known are set out in SDC’s Preferred Options Local Plan (ref TADC-H).</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>Noted - TTT3 indicates that it would support provision of increased town centre car park capacity over and above the listed new car parks, in recognition</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement ‘town centre’ car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>1) If Kirk gate is pedestrianised how would cars access to Robin Hood yard ? 2) What is happening with the Britannia bus centre car park? 3) Developing car parks outside of the town centre would require improvements to walkways into the town centre.</p> <p>Surely this contradicts H3-8. There is not enough parking in the town</p> <p>Would this provide sufficient parking?</p>	<p>of the fact that the replacement parking proposed by SDC does not all lie within the town centre, resulting in a shortfall on current car parking capacity, to the detriment of users highlighted. The NP could in principle propose other 'town centre sites' for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC's car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood's Yard/Hodgson's Terrace site.</p> <p>1) NOTED – pedestrianisation envisaged from The Ark south so access not affected. 2) NOTED – retained and improved. Imminent Selby DC scheme to install electric vehicle charging and enhance appearance. 3) NOTED – policy could include requirements re access points and town centre pedestrian links.</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan policy will only identify for protection, on The Neighbourhood Plan map, car parking areas where there is no conflict with SDC Local Plan proposals such as for Central Car Park. TTT3 also indicates that it would support provision of increased town centre car park capacity over and above the listed car parks, in recognition of the fact that the replacement parking proposed by SDC does not all lie within the town centre, resulting in a shortfall on current car</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) ACTION – include requirements as indicated in draft plan policy.</p> <p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement 'town centre' car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>As per previous comments, additional housing and car parking at Mill Lane with only the one access point will cause huge amounts of congestion</p> <p>Supported on the proviso that the increased public car parking at the four listed sites are additional and not in replacement of the Central area car park. In which case the four listed sites should be included as development areas NOT car parking.</p> <p>Leave the central carpark alone.</p> <p>Please do not get rid of any existing car parks, we need these.</p>	<p>parking capacity. The NP could in principle propose other 'town centre sites' for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC's car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood's Yard/Hodgson's Terrace site.</p> <p>NOTED – Mill Lane is a SDC Preferred Options (PO) Local Plan proposal which the town council's NP cannot oppose. Local Plan PO states that proposals will be required to 'provide safe access to Mill Lane'. Could consider other possible site access points in developing detailed NP policy, e.g. improvement of Rosemary Row.</p> <p>NOTED – the 4 listed sites are replacement parking for Central Car Park, as proposed in the SDC Preferred Options Local Plan, from which the NP cannot vary. TTT3 supports increased parking over/above these sites. The NP could in principle propose other 'town centre sites' for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC's car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood's Yard/Hodgson's Terrace site.</p> <p>NOTED - The proposed housing development of Central Car Park is an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal not a NP/town council</p>	<p>ACTION – consider other possible access points during policy development as suggested.</p> <p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement 'town centre' car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>Keep the central car park</p> <p>But suggestion had previously been made to pedestrianise kirkgate. If so Robin Hood yard wouldn't work.</p> <p>How does this fit with the building plan?</p> <p>I don't think a huge car park in the centre of the town is a particularly good use of space. Large businesses in the centre need to learn to adapt and if necessary build their own provision</p> <p>The central car park should be the main car park for its accessibility to the local shops and businesses.</p> <p>Robin Hood Yard cannot realistically be considered as an acceptable area for car parking - the entrance is far too narrow.</p> <p>1) Development of robin hood yard as parking seems bonkers as access is very poor 2) and could be used to develop housing / other commerical development near to the river wharfe, church etC:</p>	<p>proposal and not one the NP can oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – scheme envisaged from Ark to Bridge St/High St so access not affected.</p> <p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan policy will only identify for protection, on The Neighbourhood Plan Map, car parking areas where there is no conflict with SDC Local Plan proposals such as for Central Car Park.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the Central Car Park is subject to an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal for housing - not one the NP can oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – this SDC Preferred Local Plan proposal (NB not a NP proposal) is subject to requirements to:-'meet national and local car park design standards' and 'provide safe access and egress for vehicles and pedestrians'.</p> <p>1) NOTED – this SDC Preferred Local Plan proposal (NB not a NP proposal) is subject to requirements to:-'meet national and local car park design standards' and 'provide safe access and egress for vehicles and pedestrians'.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>1) I agree with developing new parking sites but not with the loss of the central car park. 2) Humphry could also give his land next to the old cinema for parking which would help for the Church, Riley Smith Hall and adjacent businesses as well as the town centre.</p> <p>The Central carpark should be included here. It is by far the most important.</p> <p>Good idea</p> <p>No consideration has been paid to replacing this (<i>NB Central Car Park</i>) within the town centre and the alternative car parking areas in Section TTT3 are unsuitable. Three sites are distributed on the outskirts between ¼ and ½ mile from the Town Centre. Robin Hood Yard is the only one close to the town centre, but it includes physical features that will need to be regulated in future planning proposals and should be defined in the plan:- -the land is privately owned, unsurfaced and the landowner has indicated he wishes to surface it in natural stone which requires special attention to ensure it is suitable for those with mobility issues.</p>	<p>2) NOTED – alternative proposals such as these cannot be advanced by the NP which must be in line with the Local Plan.</p> <p>1) NOTED – the Central Car Park is subject to an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal for housing - not one the NP can oppose. 2) NOTED – site is protected as Local Amenity Space in the adopted SDC Local Plan. It could additionally be assessed as a candidate Local Green Space. Other more feasible parking options exist.</p> <p>NOTED – the Central Car Park is subject to an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal for housing - not one the NP can oppose.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – 1) the named car parks as listed in TTT3 are SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposals (for replacement parking for the Central Car Park in turn proposed by SDC for housing), which the NP cannot oppose, not NP/town council proposals. As such it is SDC’s responsibility, in respect of the Robin’s Hood Yard proposal, to require the design features specified in the comment, through its own Local Plan policy where appropriate or through its</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – assess site as candidate Local Green Space.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement ‘town centre’ car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>-there is a significant level difference between the town centre and Robin Hood Yard and the gradients and distances to be negotiated by wheelchair users need to be in line with Building Regs Part M.</p> <p>-the access routes in and out of the car park are very tight so segregation of disabled pedestrians and vehicles must be designed.</p> <p>All these features can be anticipated, as I have done here. If you do not define them in the Development Plan and then developers fail to provide them later it is a clear discrimination and will be a breach of the Public Sector Equality Duty 2011. This car park is indicated in Selby District Councils Preferred Options Local Plan with proposals for allocations, but section 28.2 of this plan indicates that the Tadcaster Neighbourhood Plan Group in the town are responsible for the detailed proposals. No Impacts Assessment for the practical use of this car park by the disabled has been discussed with Regulation 14 Consultation Bodies.</p>	<p>building regulation functions. Ditto the carrying out of any impacts assessment.</p> <p>2) Section 28.2 of the Preferred Options Local Plan states:-“The Council designated the Tadcaster Neighbourhood Plan Area in May 2020, and the Tadcaster Neighbourhood Plan Group in the town, which is progressing the Plan will need to ensure it contains policies and proposals which plan positively for growth in line with the Local Plan.” This wording appears in the introduction to the Tadcaster section of the plan and clearly relates generally to what the NP should contain in terms of supporting growth as proposed in the Local Plan. It in no way relates to the NP having responsibility for the detailed proposals of the Local Plan and clearly does not state this as asserted in the comment.</p> <p>3) TTT3 indicates that it would also support provision of increased town centre car park capacity over and above the listed car parks, in recognition of the fact that the replacement parking proposed by SDC does not all lie within the town centre, resulting in a shortfall on current car parking capacity. The NP could in principle propose other ‘town centre sites’ for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC’s car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood’s Yard/Hodgson’s Terrace site.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>In TTT3 it is proposed that there would be a car park at Robin Hood Yard - how does this work if the approach is pedestrianised?</p> <p>cant pedestrianise kirkgate and use robin hoods as a carpark</p> <p>Public car parking. If people have to drive round back street areas looking for somewhere to park they will not come back to Tadcaster. There are too many places nearby where you can park your car e.g Wetherby/ Harrogate/Knaresborough/ Leeds/ Garforth.</p>	<p>NOTED – scheme envisaged from Ark to Bridge St/High St so access not affected.</p> <p>NOTED – scheme envisaged from Ark to Bridge St/High St so access not affected.</p> <p>NOTED – the public car parking proposals detailed in the NP are SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposals, not town council proposals. NP TTT3 supports increased capacity. The NP could in principle propose other ‘town centre sites’ for replacement parking, e.g. Tadcaster Albion FC’s car park (on non-match days), part of Manor Fields, possibly an expanded Robin Hood’s Yard/Hodgson’s Terrace site.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – include a policy supporting other sites for replacement ‘town centre’ car parking, including consideration of named sites.</p>
PI TTT4	<p>NYCC - Whilst the LHA would support the intentions of this policy, at present there is no minimum standards for the installation of electric vehicle charging points in developments.</p> <p>-Developments with electric vehicle charging points will be outlined in the Transport Statement/Assessment to be produced and submitted in support of a planning application. Prior to this, developers will need to ascertain whether there is adequate capacity in the local electricity network to supply the number of electric vehicle charging points required and set out in the Transport Statement/Assessment whether any capacity improvements are likely to be needed. If investigations conclude that there are constraints that cannot be addressed, developers may not be able to deliver on any minimum standards set within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>NOTED – while it is acknowledged that there are currently no national or local minimum standards in force, there are Yorkshire-based strategies/studies, e.g. for West Yorkshire, which set out planning guidance re standards and which have informed Local Plan policies in West Yorkshire, e.g. the adopted Leeds Core Strategy. Policy standards will be based on such work. It is also acknowledged that feasibility may be an issue in some cases – this issue can be built into the policy.</p>	<p>ACTION – reflect feasibility issue in draft plan policy.</p>

	SSOB - Any requirement to install vehicle charging points needs to be balanced against the potential impact upon access, heritage, ecology and other important considerations.	NOTED – as such installation will take place where new car parking is to be provided, it is more likely that the car parking itself needs to be balanced against such considerations rather than the installation of a few charging points in just a few spaces. Adopted Local Plans include such policies so there is no reason why NPs cannot.	NO ACTION
	GPE – Yes agree. No comments at this stage.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	one for the future	NOTED – the NP time horizon is 2040.	NO ACTION
	I guess you will have to.	NOTED – national policy on car manufacture indicates so.	NO ACTION
	More public charging required, especially near A64	NOTED – the policy will apply wherever new car parking is being provided as part of a development, wherever that may be.	NO ACTION
	No wish for residents to loose the town centre car park .	NOTED – the Central Car Park is subject to an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal for housing - not one the NP can oppose. This is not relevant to TTT4.	NO ACTION
	Not until I see what they are	NOTED – detail will be provided in the next stage draft plan.	NO ACTION
	Charging points in the Central Car Park would be a useful facility to attract person travelling on the A1M, A1, A64 to stop over in Tadcaster.	NOTED – as things stand Central Car Park is likely to be developed for housing. As such, any installation of charging points is unlikely to occur.	NO ACTION

	<p>Plus existing parking facilities</p> <p>Absolutely and supporting homes who may seek to embrace domestic charging of EVs to enhance Tadcaster's air quality</p> <p>Is essential as more people move driving electric vehicles</p> <p>If you're intent on new car parking provision - you could put as many charging points in as you like but I doubt they'll be used.</p> <p>I agree with the installation of electric vehicle charging points in new developments. A solution will need to be worked out at a national level for folk, such as us, who live on a street with a pavement between the house and the street where the car is parked - i.e. how to charge a car in such a situation.</p> <p>Services such as electric car charging points, possibly to attract motorists from the A64 to recharge and spend time in Tadcaster, should be prioritised. In the longer run, revenue from car charging could defray costs of providing parking.</p> <p>1) Totally agree with the need to provide an EV hub in the local carparks....2) Or we could just go back to using the horses as in your canny advert for SSOB on page 22! On</p>	<p>NOTED – planning permission is not normally required for installation where parking already exists off-road, e.g. an existing car park or residential driveway – installation is down to owners and covered by buildings regulations. As such not relevant to NP planning policy.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the NP has a 2040 time horizon. Given Government policy on car manufacture electric cars and the need for charging points will progressively increase.</p> <p>NOTED – the issue raised is acknowledged but is not one the NP can tackle. Action by Government and at a local level, the Local Highways Authority will be needed.</p> <p>NOTED – possible defraying of costs is an issue for car park owners/operators not the NP.</p> <p>1) NOTED 2) DISAGREE – there is no bias or link up with local employers in this NP. While 4</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>that note I would think that who ever designed the consultation brochure should be reminded to be impartial and not be seen to be 'linking up' with a large local employer to sell the residents of the Town this "Plan" of "intention for future prosperity" who's prosperity are you referring too I wonder, as residents we don't make any money out of the town....you make it from us.</p> <p>I think that if we put Electric car charging stations it will both encourage people to switch as well as show that Tadcaster is aiming for a better future.</p> <p>Its an asperation but will ordinary people ever get to afford electric cars in the near future</p> <p>Most certainly, though houses with solar panels should also be fitted with charging points, which would provide free charge to the property owners.</p> <p>This will be a major issue in year's & decades ahead, I fear it will also be very costly to install the necessary infrastructure...</p> <p>More charging points will be required over time. If parking is away from housing, there will be a major need for investment in infrastructure to meet demand.</p> <p>Great - just bought one. It's the future.</p>	<p>out of 9 of the photos used are brewery related (JS brewery x3; SSOB x1), this simply reflects the fact that Tadcaster is a brewery town and its 3 breweries loom large in the street scene and life of the town. Note should be taken of SSOB comments on this NP, many of which are critical.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – given Government policy on car manufacture, the answer in time is yes, e.g, TVs, videos etc.</p> <p>NOTED – this is a matter for individuals not this NP.</p> <p>NOTED – in the case of car parking in new development, the cost will fall to the developer.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Traffic, Transport, Travel – Non-Planning Community Actions	T AFC car park. Please bear in mind how people would get to and from this car park. On the one hand walking through the Sam Smiths brewery operations and the narrow New Street or along the public footpath to Bridge Street which currently has two inappropriate kissing gates	NOTED – acknowledged that access requirements would need to be addressed.	ACTION – policy to include requirements re access as highlighted.

	<p>that prevent buggies, pushchairs, wheelchairs from exiting that way.</p> <p>The use of TAFC as a regular car park can only go ahead with improvements to the access down the side of Bartles, for pedestrians and/or cars. Flood lighting would also need to be considered.</p> <p>1) Utilising TAFC car park will be very difficult to find for casual visitors. 2) If employees of a Company want cycle racks then they should approach their employer = it can't be enforced upon them.</p> <p>Good idea to use AFC site for car park. Can this not be permanent and relocate the club who must be desperate to leave</p> <p>Cycle route must include route over viaduct to Wighill lane</p>	<p>NOTED – acknowledged that access and lighting requirements would need to be addressed.</p> <p>1) NOTED – acknowledged that signage requirements would need to be addressed. 2) NOTED – it is hoped that encouragement will persuade employers to take action.</p> <p>NOTED – relocation is not within NP remit. Any initiative would need to come from club itself.</p> <p>NOTED - the suggested addition to the network will be considered for inclusion in the next stage draft NP.</p>	<p>ACTION – policy to include requirements re access and lighting as highlighted.</p> <p>1) ACTION - policy to include requirements re signage as highlighted. 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – consider suggested network addition for NP inclusion.</p>
Traffic, Transport, Travel – General	<p>NYCC - At present, these <i>(NB the policy intentions)</i> are based on the perceived issues gathered in community consultation rather than based on empirical evidence which would be required to support the progression of any identified schemes.</p> <p>-All of the proposals would require agreement and progression by NYCC in its capacity of Local Highway Authority. It is recommended that in order to achieve a robust plan with clear, achievable ambitions, that dialogue is opened directly with the LHA to explore the feasibility of the proposed improvements.</p> <p>-It is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan's provisions for highway improvements will be guided by the outcomes of</p>	<p>NOTED – empirical evidence will be provided where possible in support of next stage draft plan policies. But in essence, the NP's Traffic etc. policies will express support for aspirational schemes rather than make concrete proposals. NYCC/Highways will be statutory consultees on the draft plan.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Selby District Council's work. Perceived issues with parking and congestion are referred to in the Neighbourhood Development Plan document and shall in part be based on the understanding of the impact of development gained through the collection of evidence, traffic modelling and in the production of transport assessments.</p> <p>NYCC - The Neighbourhood Plan makes reference to the local bus services but makes no attempts through the policies to support the bus services. For example, through supporting public transport infrastructure, prioritising bus service improvements and infrastructure over town centre car parking. Making sure that preferred development sites are accessible to existing public transport services and will therefore improve the feasibility of the bus services.</p> <p>TVCSA – you have identified car parking, walking, cycling and horse-riding provision, highway improvements, electric vehicle charging, buses but at no stage have you mentioned community transport which is relied upon by large numbers of elderly and disabled residents. TVCSA provides over 4000 journeys per year, so to omit this from your considerations is unacceptable and discriminatory to those in the community with Protected Characteristics who rely upon it.</p> <p>1) Do not agree with the loss of the central car park especially if more housing is built. 2) You also need more parking for the Police and Fire station staff north of Station Road. 3) You also mention developing next to Fairfield road. That means the tennis courts which are protected under a trust unless the club agrees to suitable alternative accommodation. 4) They have also lost their roadside parking due to the increase of home owner</p>	<p>NOTED – given that the allocation of development sites will be determined by SDC's Local Plan not the NP, some of the issues raised are matters for SDC not the town council. Others such as bus service improvement are not necessarily planning issues. No perceived need for NP support provisions. No public transport issues raised during consultation.</p> <p>NOTED – the town council would welcome input at the next consultation stage, or before, as to how NP planning policy and/or non-planning community actions could help to address community transport issues in Tadcaster.</p> <p>1) NOTED – the Central Car Park is subject to an SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposal for housing - not one the NP can oppose. 2) NOTED - The NP could in principle propose other 'town centre sites' for</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – include a policy supporting 'part of Manor Fields' and other sites for replacement 'town centre' car parking. 3) NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>vehicle ownership and reluctance to use the allocated parking spaces and also because of the increased number of police attending the station.</p> <p>need illuminating 30mph signs on every incoming main road</p> <p>Road safety needs to be a priority for all users. Speed bumps/cameras as you come in to Tad from the A64 both from Leeds and York. Traffic including lorries come flying through on these roads constantly throughout the day and nothing is being done about it.</p> <p>I think speed cameras should be considered, particularly from A64 to Toulston Lane to Garnett Lane</p> <p>Please sort out the Boston Spa Road and Station Road junction outside Coors Brewery. It is very dangerous we need yellow lines for a good way around the bend and at the bottom of Station Road. You cannot see left and cannot swing wide when cars are parked everywhere. Cars have even started parking on the other side of the road (Sports Centre side) as well which makes it a single lane and traffic goes haywire. It is an accident waiting to happen. There was one there recently.</p> <p>stutton road is the most overlooked street in the town for speeding, parking and driving on pavements. policy needs to help these residents.</p>	<p>replacement parking, e.g. part of Manor Fields.</p> <p>3) NOTED – the NP makes no mention of any development next to Fairfield Road.</p> <p>4) NOTED - The NP could in principle propose other ‘town centre sites’ for replacement parking, e.g. part of Manor Fields.</p> <p>NOTED – all primary town entrances would benefit from this.</p> <p>NOTED – all primary town entrances would benefit from cameras allied to illuminated signs. Speed bumps not supported.</p> <p>NOTED – all primary town entrances would benefit from cameras allied to illuminated signs.</p> <p>NOTED – the junction with the Boston Spa road as is not perceived as posing a serious enough problem to warrant action.</p> <p>NOTED – a 20mph zone could be promoted via a community action from Woodlands Ave to Leeds Road.</p>	<p>4) ACTION – include a policy supporting ‘part of Manor Fields’ and other sites for replacement ‘town centre’ car parking.</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action re illuminated signs as suggested.</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action re cameras/illuminated signs as suggested.</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action re cameras/illuminated signs as suggested.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add community action re lobbying for 20mph zone as indicated.</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>Non-Planning Community Actions - General</p>	<p>GPE – no comments.</p> <p>existing hotel is substandard and doesnt meet building regs as not accessible for disable</p> <p>amazing town full of dereliction</p> <p>1) central carpark proposal too intensive - slum of tomorrow – 2) and where will residents park?</p> <p>more time and effort should be made into providinfg safe and better cycling and pedestrian links across the area</p> <p>1) make sure you fill all the empty houses before you take a good green field. 2) If you close Kirkgate how are cars going to get to park in robin hood yard?</p> <p>Please, please, please do not lose the central car park for housing</p> <p>Cycle lanes take up a lot of room. Fron what I have seen in other towns with cycle lanes they are hardly used</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is understood that Shann House is partially converted and to be further extended in the future, presumably to meet applicable standards. This is a matter for the owner not the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – NP seeks to address this.</p> <p>1) NOTED – proposal is an SDC Local Plan proposal which the NP cannot oppose. 2) NOTED – SDC proposal requires dedicated residents parking.</p> <p>NOTED – this is already addressed via this plan’s TTT1 and non-planning community actions.</p> <p>1) NOTED – prioritisation of such matters is not in the gift of the town council NP. 2) NOTED – scheme envisaged is from The Ark to Bridge St/Main St., so access not affected.</p> <p>NOTED – proposal is an SDC Local Plan proposal which the NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – a cycle route is not necessarily an on-road cycle lane. Cycle use is likely to/needs to increase to contribute to more sustainable travel. New/better</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
---	---	--	---

	<p>1) More improvement on flood defences needed 2) improvement to access the beach and walking by the river</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes, promote tourism, food festivals and street markets, more litters</p> <p>1) These are shorter term actions which could be put in place relatively quickly to support current residents. 2) Some are a nonsense " eg Countryside management - address areas in need of management" Recycling, rubbish and litter - address identified problems" They don't say anything and therefore its not possible to comment on them. They should be more specific - use SMART objectives to give clarity, people will then be able to comment effectively. 3) I do wonder how many, if not all of them, have been on the agenda for a lot of years and never actioned.</p> <p>1) I disagree with the proposed closure of Kirkgate/ Westgate on a permanent basis. There is no longer a weekly market. 2) The original proposal for this plan was to include extensive changes to the junctions at either end of Joseph Street and the widening of the road. There is no mention of these in the proposal.</p>	<p>cycle routes will encourage this increase.</p> <p>1) NOTED – work on new flood defences is already in hand. 2) NOTED - it is considered that there is huge potential to significantly improve the riverside appearance and offer to visitors.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED – highlighting them may serve to get them actioned more quickly, in which case they will not appear in the next stage draft plan. 2) NOTED – agreed that the ‘countryside management’ and ‘recycling etc.’ actions are very vague. 3) NOTED – if they are still ‘on the agenda’, all the more reason to include them in an attempt to get them addressed.</p> <p>1) NOTED - it is considered that pedestrianisation will improve the town centre user environment/experience and encourage a regular revitalised market. Pedestrianisation from The Ark to the Bridge St/High St junction is envisaged. Full details to be worked out but town council confident solutions to</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – include a NP policy proposing creation of new riverside park and a complementary non-planning community action addressing non-planning policy matters such as potential community involvement.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – delete community actions indicated. 3) NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>I think there are some really lovely ideas within these sections. I essentially support most of these actions aside from the pedestrianisation of Kirkgate/ Westgate.</p> <p>None at this stage.</p> <p>All fine with me , but let's ensure that we develop the potential walking routes in the surroundings and don't over-focus on the cyclists</p> <p>Significant change needs to happen on a much shorter timescale than in the development plan, and certainly before SDC ceases to exist. Everything that can be done without waiting for the plan to be finalised needs to be done ASAP. I fear that everything will be put on hold indefinitely and this plan will go the same way as all the other plans that have been consulted on in the past and ultimately nothing happens and the town declines further.</p> <p>all ok</p> <p>Seems OK, as long as the cycling does not hinder those who need to travel by car/ buses.</p> <p>I agree with all these proposed actions and am particularly interested in the cycle and walking related ones. As a member of the Tadcaster Walkers are Welcome committee, I can advise that we are about to sign up to</p>	<p>potential problems can be sorted out. Scheme is already on NYCC agenda/in programme.</p> <p>2) NOTED – while the town council is not opposed to such a scheme, it would like to see a justification for it. Could it, for e.g. be linked to revised traffic circulation in the town centre as part of pedestrianisation plans?</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the approach will be balanced but based on perceived/evidenced need.</p> <p>NOTED – the planning policy elements of the plan cannot be fast-tracked – the NP has to go through a prescribed statutory preparation process. Once the NP is more firmed-up, it should be possible to accelerate some of the community actions. Actions can also be prioritised in the finally ‘made’ plan.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – cycle routes are more likely to be off-road than on-road. Provision needs to be made to encourage more sustainable travel modes.</p> <p>NOTED – Tadcaster Walkers Are Welcome Cttee should be added to consultee list.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add group to consultees list</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>the North Yorkshire Path Keeper Scheme which will allow us to help maintain public rights of way and also to liaise with landowners to encourage them to sort out issues.</p> <p>Happy that the proposals cover the interests and aspirations of the younger end of the community but the needs of the the older residents appear to be taking a back seat.</p> <p>None</p> <p>I agree with most of the non-planning actions it will be interesting to see how much is actually accomplished.</p> <p>now make it happen</p> <p>NO</p> <p>Some excellent ideas to enhance the town environment and work towards a vibrant community.</p> <p>They all make sense and part of the wider vision</p> <p>Creative use of derelict property a high and immediate priority</p> <p>Include these in the policy plan</p> <p>Not at present</p>	<p>NOTED – it is considered that facilities/ provision do exist - e.g. U3A, adult education, Yorks. Country Women, Men’s Club – but that could perhaps be better utilised/promoted. Not really a NP issue.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – implementation will be the responsibility of may partners in co-operation, including the local community.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – already addressed in the NP as far as it can be.</p> <p>NOTED – they are not planning matters so cannot be addressed via the planning policies.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	Due to some ownership issues with properties and land how will all this be achieved ?	NOTED – through a mixture of planning policy implementation by SDC/its successor authority and co-operative work with landowners, local partners and the community. The next stage draft plan will include an action plan with potential funding/delivery partners for each action identified.	NO ACTION
	All comments have been made throughout.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	All seem relevant and welcome thoughts. Thank you to all who have worked hard to put these proposals together.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I'm supportive but they feel lacking in ambition. We should focus on community collaboration to support policy initiatives. For example if we pedestrianise an area let's accompany that with the delivery of a local market and provide cycle parking nearby. That way the community sees value in redevelopment, sustainability and value rather than the inconvenience of a closed former right of access.	NOTED – the elements of the e.g. given are all already in the NP. The next stage draft plan will include an action plan identifying potential funding/delivery partners for projects.	NO ACTION
	I agree with the comments.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	No	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Particularly keen to renovate derelict housing so they can provide homes for people in need	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Great idea	NOTED	NO ACTION
	NO	NOTED	NO ACTION
	Support	NOTED	NO ACTION

	<p>Many appear to be sensible and practical steps; funding permitting these could be executed now for an immediate and practical benefit for the local community.</p> <p>Good Job</p> <p>Naive without the Lord of the Manors go-ahead.</p> <p>There are a lot of positive idea's, but 90% of the success or failure will hinge on coaxing Sam Smiths out of the 18th century & into the 21st...</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>1) More flowers along river bank wildflowers meadow flowers tree planting flowers in town centre green spaces public benches. 2) Riverbanks dogs must be in leads enforced by bailiffs etc fines to be applied. To avoid disturbance of anglers.</p>	<p>NOTED - Once the NP is more firmed-up, it should be possible to accelerate some of the community actions. Actions can also be prioritised in the finally 'made' plan.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowning breweries and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED – already addressed in general terms through policies in the 'Green& Natural Environment' and 'Town Centre' sections. 2) NOTED – not recognised as a problem needing to be addressed.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p>
General	<p>Coal Authority - Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on it.</p> <p>SSOB - The comments below are provided in order to highlight, support and raise issues with regard the policy intentions set out in the document. On a number of occasions, the policy intentions are vague and obscure, and provide no clear vision of what is sought to be achieved. Where possible I have indicated the areas of information required, however in some instances it is not possible to form a reasonable view unless some indication</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - it is explicitly and clearly stated in the introduction to the documents 'Policy Intentions' section that this document sets out only the "basic intentions of policies and proposals" and that "final policy wordings, together with full evidence and detail, will be presented in the final draft</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>of the areas, routes or sites to which the policy is intended to apply, is provided for examination.</p> <p>TVCSA – we hereby raise a formal complaint of discrimination on the grounds of Age and Disability on the basis that Tadcaster Town Council is failing to demonstrate compliance with its obligations under the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty 2011.</p> <p>TVCSA – we have studied this plan with care and find no reference to either the Elderly or Disabled, both of which are protected characteristics within the Equality Act. None of the Policy Intentions makes mention of any consideration of facilities for these groups, nor makes reference to the protection of these groups rights, even though some Policy Intentions in the plan degrade their existing rights and facilities. On the other hand, the Plan includes considerable detail for the needs of the young and active through provision of ‘café culture’, sports facilities, play areas, skate park, etc. Therefore the plan demonstrates a clear bias towards the young and active to the exclusion of the elderly and disabled and fails in the obligation to advance equality of opportunity.</p>	<p>plan”. This approach is in order to check that the community is on board with the broad thrust of policies and overall direction of travel before doing what may be extensive detailed work that may then prove to be abortive. A detailed draft plan will be available for full consultation at Regulation 14 stage.</p> <p>NOTED – this has been dealt with via the town council’s complaints procedure.</p> <p>NOTED – draft plan policies will make every effort to reflect the needs of the disabled/elderly and disabled access, within the context of existing national and SDC policy. The plan will also endeavour to include non-planning community actions to the same end, based on evidence of need. It should be noted that both sports facilities and café culture can be enjoyed by all ages and abilities. It should also be noted that the policy intentions document put out for consultation is based on limited consultation and initial perceptions of need with the express purpose of getting initial community responses as to content and gaps. The comment could have usefully highlighted gaps, specific needs, issues in relation to the</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – reflect needs as identified in draft plan policies.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>TVCSA – (NB ref specific comments made re BE4, BE5, TC3, CFS1, E3 & ‘Travel, Transport and Travel’) – whilst there is no explicit requirement under the National Planning Policy Framework for these to be detailed in the Neighbourhood Development Plan, the weight of wider documentation including the National Planning Policy Framework, Equality Impact Assessment is clear that the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty 2011 also apply.</p> <p>TVCSA – overall, this Neighbourhood Development Plan demonstrates a heavy bias towards facilities for younger protected characteristics whilst at best ignoring and in some cases actually deteriorating the planning intentions of providing for the Elderly and Disabled. This is clear discrimination under Equality Act 201 and a breach of the Public Sector Equality Duty 2011.</p> <p>TVCSA – ref Regulation 14, Consultation with Consultation Bodies – under the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, in Part 5 Neighbourhood Development Plans, there is a requirement at the pre-submission consultation and publicity stage (Regulation 14) that a qualifying body must “consult with consulting bodies in Paragraph 1, Schedule 1 whose interests the qualifying</p>	<p>elderly and disabled which the NP could address.</p> <p>NOTED – draft plan policies will make every effort to reflect the needs of the disabled/elderly and disabled access, within the context of existing national and SDC policy. The plan will also endeavour to include non-planning community actions to the same end, based on evidence of need.</p> <p>NOTED – the document consulted on is not a NDP in either final or draft form. It is a policy intentions document put out for consultation, based on only limited prior consultation and initial perceptions of need, with the express purpose of getting initial community responses as to content and gaps. Draft plan policies will make every effort to reflect the needs of the disabled/elderly and disabled access, within the context of existing national and SDC policy. The plan will also endeavour to include non-planning community actions to the same end, based on evidence of need.</p> <p>DISAGREE – this is not a Regulation 14 consultation, so the formal requirements are not applicable. The town council has however used its best endeavours in this informal non-statutory consultation on its policy intentions document to “liaise with</p>	<p>ACTION – reflect needs as identified in draft plan policies.</p> <p>ACTION – reflect needs as identified in draft plan policies.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>body considers may be affected by the proposals for a Neighbourhood Development Plan. In Schedule 1 for purposes of Regulation 14, a consultation body includes(m) “voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit all or part of the Neighbourhood Area, (q) “bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the Neighbourhood area.</p> <p>-The Town Council actually imposed this requirement on the Steering Group in the Terms of Reference, Dec 2020, when it gave them responsibilities to:- liaise with relevant organisations and stake holders to secure their input in the process; analyse the results of questionnaires or other evidence received during the planning process and use them to prepare a robust draft plan.</p> <p>-It is unclear if the Town Council has attempted to monitor compliance with its Terms of Reference because meeting minutes are unavailable (<i>NB see separate comment re ‘Compliance Documentation’</i>). However, we are unable to find any relevant Regulation 14 organisation associated with the Elderly or Disabled that has been consulted in preparation of the draft plan. In fact, the published Project Plan states that Regulation 14 consultation will take place next Apr/May, which is after the draft plan has been published, public consultation carried out and the second version of the plan produced. This is clearly contrary to the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations as interpreted in the Town Council’s Terms of Reference.</p> <p><i>TVCSA – NB re ‘Compliance Documentation’, i.e. ref published online/website information – full comment appended to grid</i></p> <p>GPE - The comments support the broad thrust and aspirations of the Plan and underpins the Estate’s interest in a vibrant town and community.</p>	<p>relevant organisations and stake holders to secure their input in the process” and apologises for any omissions in this that may inadvertently occurred. This consultation results grid represents the analysis of the results of questionnaires and other evidence received during the consultation and sets out how they will be used to prepare a robust next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED – any initial website problems were rectified as soon as they were discovered/brought to the town council’s attention.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	-----------------------------------

	<p>GPE - As a general comment it is suggested that the Steering Group ensures that the NP is underpinned by a robust and up to date evidence base so that the Basic Conditions are satisfied.</p> <p>GPE - In summary, it is worth noting that the main points of the NDP are all aspects we recognise and support, and we acknowledge the following headlines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree the general scope and aspiration of the NDP • Recognition of the significant socio-economic problems and patterns affecting the town and the businesses within it • A declining and derelict town centre, albeit without the requirement for a planning-led solution • A limited number of brownfield opportunities • Support for outline development briefs for vacant/underutilised land and buildings, with the need for realistic assumptions of deliverability and potential. • The need for a robust and up to date evidence base to support the aspirations, policies, and projects to be set out in the NPD. • Ensure that the NPD does not emerge and function simply as a design guide. <p>GPE - It is important that in bringing forward the NPD that it satisfies and accords with the Basic Conditions set out in the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. This requires that the Neighbourhood Plan should be in general conformity with the strategic policies for the area, namely the adopted Core Strategy and the emerging Selby Local Plan. It is not clear that the existing and proposed evidence base and other supporting documents will fully justify some of the policy proposals and directions. Therefore, the NDP has an important role to play in representing the views and aspirations of the community.</p>	<p>NOTED – the next stage draft plan will be underpinned by detailed evidence and policy justifications.</p> <p>NOTED – it should also be remembered that the NP must work with and be in general conformity with the strategic elements of the SDC adopted Local Plan, while taking full cognisance of the new emerging Local Plan. In short, the NP is not the sole vehicle delivering change in Tadcaster.</p> <p>NOTED – the town council is well aware of the basic conditions, which as a matter of fact do not include general conformity with emerging Local Plans, although as stated immediately above, it is necessary to take full cognisance of such plans. The next stage draft NP will include full policy justifications and evidential underpin.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>GPE - The Consultation document identifies an aspirational vision for Tadcaster and the Plan Area, along with a suite of draft policies and projects to deliver it. Efforts to incorporate adjacent parishes (particularly Stutton) which comprise part of the settlement of Tadcaster appear to have been unsuccessful. This should not affect the plan.</p> <p>GPE - Several policies appear to be lacking in an evidence base, particularly where they divert from the emerging Local Plan. The Steering Group will need to be aware that the Basic Conditions are met with an up to date and robust evidence base that justifies the contents of the Plan.</p> <p>GPE - It may be useful to include evidence from local schools, which see demographic trends via pupil numbers. These also draw on North Yorkshire County Council statistics. The long-term protection of the town's good quality schools should be a priority for the NP.</p> <p>GPE - welcomes the opportunity to assist the Steering Group in bringing forward the Neighbourhood Plan. Discussion with the Steering Group and representatives would be constructive particularly where the Neighbourhood Plan aligns with and enables the Estate to</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – evidence will be provided as part of the next stage draft plan, as clearly stated on P10 of the Policy Intentions Document. Any divergent, i.e. conflicting, policy intentions will be resolved in the draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED – falling role numbers is essentially an issue for SDC's Local Plan through which new housing development is planned/sites allocated and infrastructure implications, such as schools, addressed. And also for the NYCC as education authority. NP policy could however contribute via a caveated 'school protection' policy. Playing fields could also be assessed as candidate Local Green Spaces. NP could also include a non-planning community action re lobbying to keep all schools open, as necessary, relative to circumstances.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add 'school protection' policy and community action as indicated. Assess school playing fields as candidate Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>achieve its own aspirations over the Plan period and can assist with delivering on the community's aspirations.</p> <p>I also have an issue with some of the images used in your brochure particularly the ones "advertising" a certain brewery.....are the members of the steering group acting with impartiality?</p> <p>SDC - I have reviewed the Initial Consultation identifying the policy intentions and themes in response to the identified priorities raised by the community and I have no specific comments to make at this early stage. The policy suggestions recognise and align with the emerging Local Plan and identified preferred options and also notes the emerging evidence base supporting the Local Plan, such as the Green Space Audit, along with the current Conservation Area Appraisal work. In addition the Policy Intentions document recognises where additional evidence will likely be required to support aspirations on housing need, protection of heritage assets and identifying green space opportunities.</p> <p>SDC - I am keen to ensure we have a close working relationship as your plan progresses so do not hesitate to contact me if you wish to discuss any issues, seek views on proposed approaches or require access to our evidence base or other supporting information. I will aim to ensure you are kept up to date with our emerging evidence base and approaches as the Local Plan progresses.</p>	<p>NOTED – 4 of 9 photos show breweries (JS x3; SSOB x1). The breweries are a prominent part of the street scene and a big local employer so loom large in the town. The town council responses to SSOB comments in this results grid clearly show there is no bias in favour of the breweries or any other stakeholder for that matter.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>1) I do not know where to begin. It is a joke and clearly just paying lip service to consultation. This survey is very badly worded, could easily be skewed as there is no tracking of who has completed it, how many times anyone would complete or whether the people completing it actually even live in Tadcaster. Someone could easily skew this survey. Total waste of time and money that could have been spent improving things for the people who currently live in Tadcaster. 2) There seems to be a clear agenda from the start that this is all just about building new houses in Tadcaster with no consideration of evidence, need, risk or impact.</p> <p>I applaud the vision of the plan but would like to see it within my lifetime. However the development proposed will need a developer to see long and short term profit in the proposals for it to take place. And although the whole plan is exciting I would want to see more detail on actual proposals.</p> <p>1) I would like to know more about who is responsible for drawing up these plans and where the data came from to produce the needs for change set out in the plan. 2) I would like to see more provision for the reduction in noise pollution and better air quality. 3) I'd also like to see better funding for our local schools. 4) More green energy</p>	<p>1) DISAGREE – the consultation has gone directly to every address within the parish. It is a tried and trusted approach used in the preparation of many other NPs and has never been found to be subject to ‘skewing’ of any kind. The cost is minimal.</p> <p>2) DISAGREE – all of the house building proposals detailed in the plan are SDC Preferred Options Local Plan proposals, which the NP cannot oppose.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP should be ‘adopted’ by the end of 2023 and implementation commenced immediately thereafter. NPs have to go through due process before ‘adoption’. As a planning policy based document it is inevitably dependent on development coming forward. Full detail will be provided in the next stage draft plan. Some of the non-planning community actions may be capable of earlier implementation. Once the NP is more firmed-up, it should be possible to accelerate some of the community actions. Actions can also be prioritised in the finally ‘made’ plan.</p> <p>1) NOTED – this is an initial consultation document, produced by a steering group of local town councillors and community members, under the auspices of the town council, with advice/support from commissioned</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) NO ACTION 4) NO ACTION 5) ACTION – re photos and artist impressions in draft plan as indicated.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>ideas implemented. 5) Your brochure was quite contradictory on the one hand we need to look to plan for the future of the town but the other was images of Tadcaster past. You could have sold it better to me if you'd have had some town planners mock up the "future Tadcaster". 6) I like the idea of making Tadcaster a green and safe place to live and work. I'm not sure these plans fulfill that. 7) I'll just end by saying take care of going down a path of bistro's and cafe's and pedestrian zones. I think back when I go and visit my home city all there are are cafe's and eateries and bars and pubs..most of the shops have gone and the main city centre street is no longer the vibrant place it once was, now litter everywhere all the individual local business priced out and long gone and even the big business no longer there, so sad. But then I remember two local places I like to visit perhaps you could look into what makes them work so well and implement some of their ideas one is Wetherby and the other is Garforth.</p> <p>I think the plan in the main is a solid one. The town has fallen into an almost derelict state now and unless action is taken this will only continue to get worse. Unfortunately until the smiths release the strangle hold they have on the town, dictating what shops can open, leaving buildings (home and commercial) to degrade and become eyesours im not sure this will happen. We have hundreds of cyclist travel through the town each week, Beer dvocates who would love to visit tadcaster for the breweries and brewery history yet we dont do anything to capture this.</p>	<p>town planning consultants. It is based on initial community soundings, pre-existing survey data and town council perceptions.</p> <p>2) NOTED – GNE7 addresses air quality. There is no evidence that noise pollution is a problem requiring action.</p> <p>3) NOTED – schools funding not recognised as an issue needing to be addressed.</p> <p>4) NOTED – GNE9 addresses green energy.</p> <p>5) NOTED – such a mock-up would be prohibitively expensive. The NPs words are what matter not the images. That said, thought can be given to photo use in the draft plan, together with possible use of artist impressions to illustrate selected policy approaches.</p> <p>6) DISAGREE – it is considered that the NP's policies and actions will deliver a greener/better place to live.</p> <p>7) NOTED – there may be scope for a NP retail policy to add value/local detail to existing SDC planning policy.</p> <p>NOTED – the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowning breweries and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process. The NP addresses cycling, brewery tours and the town's heritage with a view to improving the offer in all cases.</p>	<p>6) NO ACTION 7) ACTION – consider policy scope relative to existing SDC policy.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>We have an awesome history and dont seem to make this heard. Hopefully you will do something about this.</p> <p>I would like to see the town developed in line with the 21st century but without that development being held to ransom or being subject to local business dictates.</p> <p>There appeared to be considerable tension between members of Town Council at the information event at The Barn. Also if the Mayor tells us that elements are a fait accompli, it seems a little disingenuous to be seeking the opinion of residents.</p> <p>I think that generally these are great plans and the fact you are requesting the input from the town is both democratic and useful to help ensure you're doing the correct things/ decisions.</p> <p>It would be of huge benefit to Tadcaster if all the policy ambitions were achieved and let's hope all the principal landowners in the town agree with the stated aims!</p> <p>1) The town council really needs to have a good look at itself if this is all they can come up with, you have no real idea on what the town needs and can't see past the end of your own noses. You need to look at development of the town and tackle issues that you are able to deliver on. 2) Why build new homes and reduce parking ? what does that achieve, 3) get the town tidied up get a dedicated Police presence tackle ASB, crime DRUGS and empty</p>	<p>NOTED – the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town’s landowners, businesses and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.</p> <p>NOTED – the town council is clearly 100% behind the NP policy intentions document having approved it for consultation purposes. Certain plans for the town are likely to be a ‘fait accompli’ as they will be dictated by SDC’s Local Plan from which the NP cannot vary.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED – this initial document is based on initial community soundings, pre-existing surveys and town council perceptions. Community input is invited/welcomed as to the issues the NP should be tackling. 2) NOTED – the housing and car parking proposals detailed in the NP are SDC</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>property. Attract business not obstruct it. Go away and have a proper strategy and development vision that is real not a fairy tale</p> <p>Please keep everyone consulted and updated and don't give in to blackmail from Humphry. There are legal measures to get people to bring properties back into service without him blackmailing you!!!</p> <p>My overriding comment on the whole document is that everything is dependent upon the cooperation of Sam Smiths Brewery.</p> <p>Good luck in the forthcoming battle with H. Blimey - I think I just solved Line of Duty!</p> <p>Gladman - Gladman are in general support of the Policy Intentions for the Neighbourhood Plan as demonstrated through the appended Questionnaire response. Gladman support the general thrust of the Initial Consultation document for the Tadcaster Neighbourhood Plan which seeks to rejuvenate and revitalise the town through strengthening the economic and retail offering within the town, tackling the town's historic housing problems</p>	<p>Preferred Options Local Plan proposals not NP proposals – the NP cannot oppose them.</p> <p>3) NOTED – the NP seeks to address the empty property issue as far as it is able. The criminal issues specified are not recognised as being serious enough to warrant any action and hardly within NP remit. It is considered that the totality of NP policies/actions will help to address some of the reasons which underpin criminal activity.</p> <p>NOTED – the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowners, businesses and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process. There will be full consultation on the next stage draft plan.</p> <p>NOTED – the town council has been and will continue to be in discussion with the town's landowners, businesses and indeed all other stakeholders throughout the NDP preparation process.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>alongside many other community aspirations. All while respecting the key historical character of the town. As the Town Council is aware, Tadcaster is facing significant socio-economic problems, including a declining working age population impacting local labour availability, declining population of children generating pressure on the long-term viability and vitality of local schools and significant high street retail vacancy rates. In addition, Tadcaster is experiencing affordability issues in relation to housing.</p> <p>Need to keep central car park. Need to redevelop all empty properties. Attached is a copy of Tadcaster express dated February 1989 which covers a lot of the same issues – not surprising that people have lost belief that it will ever happen!</p>	<p>NOTED –central car park development is an SDC Local Plan proposal which the NP cannot oppose. NP seeks to address empty properties. NP can only address here and now and future not the past.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	------------------

Notes:

TVCSA = Tadcaster Volunteer Cars & Services Association

GPE = Grimston Park Estate

SSOB = Sam Smiths Old Brewery

SDC = Selby District Council