

# WELBURN PARISH COUNCIL

Chairman: M.J. Cleary, Cillbarrain, Wandale Lane, Bulmer, YORK YO60 7ES

Clerk: R.J.I. Corden, Konrad Cottage, Welburn, YORK YO60 7DX

Charlotte Bogg,  
Ryedale District Council,  
Malton. YO17 7HH

COPY

16th July, 2009

Dear Ms Bogg,

## RESPONSE TO LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK CONSULTATION

The following are the questions in the document on which the Parish Council wishes to comment:

SC3 Do you agree with this broad approach for the distribution of development in Ryedale? If not, what other approach would you propose? Do you agree with the criteria used in assessing service villages?

The Parish Council considers that Option 3 "Development focussed in the market towns, with a network of 'service villages' which have a reasonable set of services and facilities. Elsewhere development would be limited to local needs only" is the best option for the distribution of development in Ryedale. Villages need to be of a considerable size before being able to support a viable shop. The Parish Council agrees with the criteria used in assessing service villages. The Parish Council is convinced that there is a need for controlled infill development for local needs in the District.

H1 Do you think that we should build more private houses up to as many as 350 dwellings a year?

The Government figure has increased from 200 to 350 in two years. Whilst the Parish Council is not convinced of the reliability of these figures, it agrees there will have to be some development based upon local needs. However, the more housing there is, notwithstanding the provision of more employment opportunities in the District, the more people will have to commute to work outside Ryedale.

H2 Do you think that we should only build more than 200 homes per year if we could restrict additional numbers to affordable housing for local people?

Yes.

H5 Do you think we should have an additional tier in the settlement hierarchy as locations for Rural Ryedale Community Housing sites?

No. There is already provision for building such properties in any village that shows a proven need.

H7 Do you think the proportions set out above broadly reflect the role of these settlements in Ryedale? What is an appropriate individual proportion of housing for Kirkbymoorside and Pickering?

The Parish Council considers that Option 1 (50%/25%/15%/10%) is the best reflection. No more than 10% of the houses required should go to the service villages if that option is chosen.

NBE10 In view of this: a) should we designate the Vale of Pickering as an Area of High Landscape Value or b) should we we replace AHLV's with a policy approach that protects the character and value of all landscapes?

- a) Yes. AHLV's are preferable because they are specific.
- b) No. General policies might be easier but they are likely to be vague in practice and therefore not very useful. Consideration should also be given to designating the historic parkland surrounding Castle Howard as an additional AHLV.

NBE11 Do you think that there are other areas which should be identified as Visually Important Undeveloped Areas? Are there any VIUA's that should no longer be identified?

If the landscape surrounding Castle Howard is not designated as an AHLV, it should be a VIUA.

S1 Do you agree that sites should be discounted from consideration based on the criteria set out in Stage 1?

Yes.

S3 What are your views on the sites submitted in the Parish of Welburn?

The 2002 Ryedale Local Plan says the following regarding Welburn: "The majority of the settlement is linear in form and virtually all the properties in the historic core of the village front onto the main street. .... Welburn has little, if no, potential for further expansion, without seriously affecting the character of the village. Only infill frontage development is likely to be acceptable. Development within that part of the settlement falling within the Welburn Conservation Area will be expected to reflect the historic character and appearance of the settlement in terms of its relationship to the street and surrounding buildings, in its design and detailing, and in the choice of materials used for its construction." In 1987 the village was incorporated into the Howardian Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

There are currently about 80 dwellings fronting onto the main street, of which half a dozen or so have been built in the last ten years in accordance with the criteria above. The Parish Council is of the opinion that such gradual, controlled development is of benefit to the village, and there are further opportunities for such piecemeal development in the future. If there were to be absolutely no development, the village would gradually die. If all the submitted sites were to be developed, the rural character of the village would be lost for ever. Any development in Welburn that is required should reflect local needs and not be subject to any minimum site density.

Taking the submitted sites in numerical order:

- 124 The only access to this site is across Common Land opposite the Church, and the access is round a 180° blind bend at the top of Church Lane, which is very narrow and often experiences problems with parked vehicles. At its junction with the main street, it is narrow and with severely limited vision. For this reason the Parish Council is of the opinion that the site is unsuitable for development.
- 242 The site is a mile away from the centre of the village and outside the Conservation Area, but whilst it is close to the A64 for transport links, it is remote from the village services. Planning applications 03/00912/OUT and 07/00434/OUT refer.
- 296 Part of Site 124: see above.
- 303 An infill site, already covered by current planning policies.
- 328 Part of Site 242: see above.
- 425 A site within the Conservation Area and largely outside the 2002 Development Limits. The access onto the main street is narrow, curving and inclined, and on the inside of a bend where many cars are parked either outside the Garage or outside people's houses because they do not have any off-street parking.
- 426 This is the largest of the sites, and would attract a minimum density of housing, which would increase the population of the main part of the village disproportionately. The access onto the main road to the east of the current limit of development is potentially hazardous. The access onto Church Lane is over a portion of unadopted road, and the residents responsible for its upkeep would not welcome additional through traffic along what is at present a quiet cul-de-sac. As noted under Site 124, the access from Church Lane onto the main street is unacceptable. The Parish Council considers that this size of development runs completely counter to the District Council's proposed policy, in that it would be well in excess of local needs. For these reasons the Parish Council is of the opinion that this site is unsuitable for development.

There are also local concerns about car parking in the village – in the opinion of the Parish Council, it is imperative that any new development should have a minimum of two off-street parking spaces per dwelling – and about the ability of local services such as water, sewerage and the telephone system to cope with any significant increase in demand.

The Parish is not well served by regional infrastructure. Access onto the A64 is dangerous and when the main road is closed following an accident, the diversions through the village make life very difficult indeed. Any significant additional development would severely worsen an already unsatisfactory situation.

Yours sincerely,

Richard J.I. Corden, Clerk.