

Escrick Parish Council response to Selby District Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation 2021

Please find below the response from Escrick Parish Council to the Selby District Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation 2021.

We have structured our responses as follows:

- 1) Feedback on the consultation process and timing.
- 2) Relevant local context – a summary of key issues pertaining to Escrick Parish.
- 3) Comments on specific sites in / around Escrick Parish.
- 4) Responses to selected questions from the consultation.

1. Consultation process and timing

We wish to raise concerns with the consultation process and timescales. The consultation period has fallen during a period of national lock-down where public meetings are not possible, and many of the normal activities that would stimulate interest through 'word of mouth' are suspended.

We found that awareness of the consultation was low. Even where there was awareness of consultation, the understanding of the topics it dealt with and potential impacts of its conclusions were not well understood.

We were told by SDC that every household would receive a letter advising of the consultation, but at the time of writing we are only aware of one Escrick resident receiving one, which was not received until early March and had no clear deadline on it. Having checked with Stillingfleet residents, they report the same. Other publicity has focused around online and other media, which will clearly have a demographic bias in their audience.

By the time many residents found out about the consultation, the two public online events had already passed. Many residents reported difficulty navigating the consultation portal.

Whilst we have done our best to raise awareness locally, supplemented by local 'action groups', we do not believe this has been sufficient.

Given these issues, we believe it would be flawed to draw any quantitative conclusions from the consultation, as the level of awareness varies significantly across the district and by demographic cohort.

1.1 Representations to the Parish Council

The Parish Council has received several representations, mostly objecting to the proposals at site STIL-D.

2. Relevant local context

2.1 Spatial, highways and connectivity considerations:

We support the Local Plan objectives of focusing development close to services, employment and inter-regional connectivity. We also support the Plan's environmental objectives to reduce reliance on cars, and reducing highways congestion.

In this context Escrick has rather limited suitability:

A19 corridor congestion:

- The A19 is congested not just through Escrick village, but also all the way to the A64 and beyond into York. This will be exacerbated by the Germany Beck development (655 homes), approved holiday park development at North Selby Mine (323 pitches), Clay Extraction at Escrick brickworks (120 daily HGV movements, plus additional for subsequent infill activity), waste sorting facility at Stillingfleet Mine (60 daily HGV movements) and pending [application for new business park](#) at the A19/A64 junction.
- City of York Council regard that the A19 north of Escrick *“currently assessed to be at close to maximum capacity at peak times during weekdays and at weekends.”* This includes not just the A19 itself, but the strategic junctions at A64/A19. Given the impact of existing congestion we believe this is a material consideration for all the sites in/around Escrick.
- The January 2021 Highways Assessment shows the A19 north of Escrick having an AM peak as between 60% - 80% Volume Over Capacity. Despite this, the A19 is regularly stop/start traffic from south of Escrick to York during the morning peak. This suggests the model is underestimating actual demand, or more likely, overestimating the capacity through the junctions north of Escrick. The model shows demand increasing to 90 – 100% by 2040 (a ~ 30% increase). This is simply not sustainable.
- The highways assessment appears overly focused on flows into/out of Selby town centre, whereas the peak commuter flows to/from Escrick are northbound towards York. The rest of the plan acknowledges that people in the district commute more widely including to York, Leeds and elsewhere via the trunk road network. **The highways assessment should not just focus on the North Yorkshire County Council area, but should consider issues into York and onto the wider trunk road network. Similarly, Highways England input on the strategic A64/A19 junction should be sought.**
- Highways' assessments should also consider impacts during periods of bad weather. Various roads to the west of Escrick close each year due to flooding, including Cawood Bridge and Naburn lane. These further funnel traffic congestion onto the A19. As these are regular reoccurring closures for extended periods, the highways assessment should explicitly consider these.

Public transport and sustainable transport connectivity:

- Escrick is further from a train station than any other Tier 1/Tier2 village in Selby District.
- The A19/Fulford Road corridor into York is particularly poorly served with bus lanes, having only 440m of bus lane over the 6.5 mile route, limiting the attractiveness of public transport options.
- It is 9 miles/ 50 minute cycle via the 'Sustrans' cycle path to central York from Escrick. Selby is nearly 8 miles, with no cycle path for much of the route south of Riccall. The cycle path has various sections of poor surface condition, and is unlit and remote making it undesirable for those with personal safety concerns. Whilst suitable for ad-hoc leisure use, it is not viable for

a typical commuter or leisure travel. This appears incompatible with the plan's sustainable transport objectives. The path is over a mile from Escrick village, accessed via unlit country lanes with no cycle segregation.

- There is no continuous cycleway and/or pedestrian link along the A19 from the A64 / York edge to Selby.

Interregional connectivity:

- Escrick is 15 miles / 30 minutes from either the A1(m) or M62.

In summary we believe that spatially Escrick is in the wrong location for significant further development, and that development would be better focused to the south and west of the District, close to existing services, employment and interregional connectivity.

2.2 Land considerations:

We support the local plan policy to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land.

Protection and use of agricultural land within the UK is increasingly important, so that we can reduce reliance on overseas imports and produce our own food nearer to where it is needed (for sustainable reasons, as per the 'food to fork' initiative.)

Most of Escrick Parish is grade 3 agricultural land, with a corridor of grade 2 along the ridge along Escrick Road. Development of this land appears incompatible with the draft plan's policy to give priority for development in those areas of lower grade land, and brownfield sites.

Agricultural land is a precious finite resource which, once built upon, will not revert to this use; therefore good quality agricultural land must be protected from development.

Escrick Parish already stands to lose large tranches of agricultural land – including 63 hectares with planning permission approved for clay extraction – and the rural nature and character of the local area will be further diluted if further large tranches of agricultural land are lost to development within the Parish.

We support the local plan objectives with regard to flooding, flood plain and flood zones. There are significant areas of flood zone 3a to the west and east of the village. Development would therefore be incompatible with the draft plan policies, and the NPPF/Environment Agency sequential test.

In summary, we believe that development should focus on previously developed sites and brownfield sites wherever possible.

2.3 Services and employment:

We support the plan objectives to locate new housing close to existing services and employment, which supports the wider sustainability objectives of the Plan. Whilst Escrick has basic facilities including doctors, primary school and basic Spar shop, it is over 5 miles to the nearest state secondary school, over 8 miles to a public leisure centre/pool, 7 miles to the nearest supermarket, and 7 miles to the nearest railway station. This access is via the busy A19. It is therefore inaccurate to say that sites in Escrick have good access to services and employment.

The majority of the local population work outside the Parish, as there are limited major employment sites locally. Local employment opportunities are generally small scale and localised, and there are no major employment opportunities within a reasonable non-vehicular travel distance.

Many of the facilities in Escrick are split from the community by the busy A19, limiting accessibility.

2.4 Other local issues:

Greenbelt:

Most of the land immediately around Escrick village is part of the York Greenbelt. Its development would therefore be contrary to national policy.

Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP):

A NDP is in the final stages of development for Escrick Parish. Community engagement on this initiative has found:

- Significant concerns with the A19 (both crossing it, and congestion into/out of the area)
- Keen to preserve the Parish's rural setting, character and green spaces
- A tolerance of modest growth – of up to 20 residential properties over the life of the NDP, together with small scale business premises.

We welcome the Local Plan's support for the various NDPs being prepared within the District, and its recognition that Escrick's NDP is the suitable place for any proposals for Escrick Parish and that this, once adopted, will become a statutory part of the Development Plan for the area.

This reflects SDC's assessment of Escrick as a Tier 2 settlement, where no new housing allocations are proposed, thus leaving it to the NDP to fulfil its role and meet local needs and aspirations accordingly.

Infrastructure:

The combined drain/sewer network in the village fails to cope with existing demand, regularly overflowing onto the public highway. Any material development would require upgrades to the capacity of this network.

District Boundary:

The City of York boundary runs immediately to the north of the village. We reiterate the duty to cooperate, which appears particularly relevant to the congestion issues of the A19 corridor, and onwards along Fulford Road into York.

Temporary residents:

It is also worth noting that Escrick Parish supports a significant number of temporary residents. This includes ~140 chalets at Hollicarrs caravan park planning permission for 323 'holiday accommodation units' at the North Selby Mine site, and approximately 250 boarders at Queen Margaret's School. These all place demands on local infrastructure and services over and above the ordinary household residents.

3. Site comments

3.1 [Escrick/001 / ESKK-A \(land to north/east of Skipwith Road\)](#)

We support this site being rejected.

We disagree with the following points of the evaluation:

- **2.1 Site has good access to services and employment:** As outlined above, Escrick is over 5 miles from most services and employment via the congested A19 corridor with little opportunity for realistic sustainable transport use.
- **2.5 Access can be created within the landholding (or through third party land and an agreement is in place.):** It is unclear where the access is proposed, but the plan appears to imply this is from Skipwith Road alongside, or over, Bridge Dyke. This is an area of designated Local Amenity Space. The width of land required to provide access would appear to imply the culverting of Bridge Dyke, which would also be contrary to the Internal Drainage Board's regulations.
- **2.19 Landscape Capacity - Low to moderate sensitivity to development:** The proposal would have a significant impact on the outlook to the east of the village and the amenity of many residents in this part of the village, given that it stretches beyond the majority of dwellings on the settlement edge here.

We also note:

- **The entire site lies within the York Green Belt:** No special circumstances have been shown why the site should be deleted from the Green Belt, when sufficient non-Green Belt land in suitable more sustainable locations exist in Selby District.
- **Site access is within Flood Zone 3:** All access is onto Skipwith Road, where all of the available access locations are within Flood Zone 3. The most northern access available is shown adjoining the existing watercourse and lies within the IDB's no build zone and would possibly require culverting of the beck to achieve the width of land required. The southern part of the site, with the remaining access onto Skipwith Road, lies within Flood Zone 3, regularly floods and holds fairly deep standing water after sustained rain. According to Government advice and using the Sequential Test, land should only be allocated for 'vulnerable uses', which includes residential developments, where there are no other reasonably available sites in Flood Zones 1 and 2, which is not the case here.
- **Development Limits:** The site is outside the current development limits.
- **Size not commensurate with the village:** The proposed housing capacity of over 300 homes is almost double the size of the existing village. Therefore, this is incompatible with the draft policy statement:
 - *4.10 The scale of development proposed is considered to be commensurate with the scale of the existing settlement, form and character of the built form and availability of local facilities in accordance with the preferred settlement hierarchy.*

3.2 [Escrick/002 / ESCK-B \(land to west of Escrick\)](#)

We support this site being rejected.

We disagree with the following points of the evaluation:

- **2.1 Site has good access to services and employment:** As outlined above, Escrick is over 5 miles from most services and employment via the congested A19 corridor with little opportunity for realistic sustainable transport use. The site is also disconnected from the rest of the village and it appears that the only feasible access is via the A19, with services such as shop, village hall and primary school located to the opposite side of the A19.

We also note:

- **Separated from the village by the A19:** There is no direct relationship with the remainder of the village, which mainly lies east of the A19. Consultations for Escrick's Neighbourhood Development Plan have established that the ability to safely cross the A19 is an area of significant local concern.
- **The entire site lies within the York Green Belt:** No special circumstances have been shown why the site should be deleted from the Green Belt, when sufficient non-Green Belt land in suitable more sustainable locations exist in Selby District. The site was specifically put back into Green Belt by CYC for the submission version to the Public Inquiry.
- **Impact on Conservation Area and Listed Buildings:** The site is within the Escrick Conservation Area, and adjacent to the Listed Buildings of The Parsonage and St Helen's Church and their settings.
- **Size not commensurate with the village:** The proposed housing capacity of over 300 homes is almost double the size of the existing village. Therefore, this is incompatible with the draft policy statement:
 - *4.10 The scale of development proposed is considered to be commensurate with the scale of the existing settlement, form and character of the built form and availability of local facilities in accordance with the preferred settlement hierarchy.*

3.3 [Escrick/004 / ESCK-D \(Land to the West of Queen Margaret's School\)](#)

We support this site being rejected.

We disagree with the following points of the evaluation:

- **2.1 Site has good access to services and employment:** As outlined above, Escrick is over 5 miles from most services via the congested A19 corridor with little opportunity for realistic sustainable transport use. The site is also disconnected from the rest of the village with the proposed vehicular access being via the busy A19.
- **2.19 Landscape Capacity - moderate sensitivity to development:** The proposal would have a significant impact on the southern outlook of the village. The mature woodland area on the western part of the site forms an important part of the streetscape on the A19 at its southern access into Escrick village.
- **The rejection reason stated in the evaluation is 'site at risk of flooding' –** we would query if this is an error, and whether it should read that the site is within greenbelt?

We also note:

- **Access:** There are material access issues with this site. It is entirely disconnected from the village, and it appears that the only vehicular access is directly onto the A19. We understand that the applicant proposes pedestrian access via the village playground and associated access path to the village. As the leaseholder of this land the Parish Council has not been approached about providing such access, and therefore it would be incorrect to state an agreement is already in place. The path is narrow and unlit, and is closed after dusk (when the playground closes). We believe a thoroughfare through the playground is incompatible with this being a safe play area. Any attempts to upgrade the path to adoptable standards (e.g. through providing street lighting) would have an adverse impact on the neighbouring properties, and that increased use of this route is unlikely to be acceptable to neighbouring residents.
- **The entire site lies within the York Green Belt:** No special circumstances have been shown why the site should be deleted from the Green Belt, when sufficient non-Green Belt land in suitable more sustainable locations exist.
- **Ecology / SINC:** The western part of the site is mature woodland, an ecological and visual buffer to A19. The large drainage pond is a SDC designated Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The woodland and pond areas need to be removed from any potential housing allocation and protected from future development.
- **Historic Park and Garden:** Eastern part of the site is within the SDC designated Historic Park and Garden.
- **Impact on Conservation Area and Listed Buildings:** The site is within the Escrick Conservation Area.

3.4 [Stillingfleet/003 / STIL-C \(Former Stillingfleet Mine, Cawood Road\)](#)

We support this site being rejected.

We disagree with the following points of the evaluation:

- **2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network - Good local accessibility:** The site relies on access via the congested A19 corridor. It is 30 minutes drive / 18 miles from the M62 motorway network, and similar from the A1. It has previously been cited as an unsuitable and

unsustainable location for major development and there are no changed circumstances to change that evaluation.

3.5 [STILLINGFLEET/004](#) / STIL-D (Heronby / Land South of Escrick Road)

We believe that this site should be rejected, and that other potential locations for a new settlement, if one is required, are better aligned to the draft policies in and wider objectives of the Plan.

We disagree with the following points of the evaluation:

- **2.1 Site has good access to services and employment:** As outlined above, Escrick is over 5 miles from most services and employment via the congested A19 corridor with little opportunity for realistic sustainable transport use.
- **2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network - Good sub-regional accessibility:** The site is over 7 miles from the nearest train station, and relies on access via the congested A19 corridor. It is 25 minutes drive / 16 miles from the M62 motorway network, and similar from the A1.
- **2.16 Heritage Assets - site is South East of Escrick Conservation Area:** Should read South West of Escrick Conservation Area.
- **3.3 Overall Deliverability - 0-5 years:** We assume this means the start of development, as a site of this size would take much longer to develop fully.

We also note:

- **Too close to existing settlement:** The proposed site is less than 600m from the current development limit of Escrick village, which would lead to a merging of the settlements and loss of the distinct character of Escrick.
- **Highways impact:** A site of this scale would have a material adverse impact on traffic levels on the A19. This impacts the ability of existing residents and businesses to make effective travel plans, and separately affects those properties in close proximity to the A19. As outlined above, we note that both Highways England and City of York Council raised concerns about the impact of the substantially smaller holiday park development at the former North Selby Mine site. We believe it is imperative that input from Highways England and City of York Council is sought on this proposal and that an independent highways assessment of the A19 as a whole should be undertaken and publicly consulted on before any more major development proposals that would impact on the A19 even being considered.
- **Loss of grade 2 agricultural land:** The site is approximately 200 hectares. We understand that the northern part of the site is grade 2 agricultural land, and the remainder grade 3.
- **Environmental impact:** One ancient woodland - Heron Wood - is right in the centre of the proposed development site. A second ancient woodland (Moreby Wood) is just across the Cawood Road. These ancient woodlands are delicate and irreplaceable ecosystems as well as beautiful. Public bridleways run through both woodlands so their beauty can be seen and shared by all. If the development at STIL-D were to go ahead, it is unavoidable that an ancient woodland in the middle of, or right next to, a large housing development will be seriously harmed.

4. Response to specific consultation questions

Question 14

Do you agree with the preferred approach to Development Limits? If not, please give the reason for your answer and explain how you would like to see it changed.

We agree that Development Limits should be retained for Tier1/2 villages such as Escrick.

Question 15

Do you agree with the preferred approach to Development in the Countryside? If not, please give the reason for your answer and explain how you would like to see it changed.

We agree with the approach, and that best and most versatile land should be protected. Agriculture is a valuable part of the local economy and an important resource that cannot be reinstated once developed.

Question 18

Do you agree with the preferred approach to the Green Belt? If not, please give the reason for your answer and explain how you would like to see it changed.

We agree – the Greenbelt should be protected. There are other options for where development can take place, and Green Belt boundaries should only be amended in exceptional circumstances and where no alternative available sites exist.

Question 20

Do you agree with the preferred approach to the Design of New Development? If not, please give the reason for your answer and explain how you would like to see it changed.

We agree. This is similar to the approach being taken in Escrick's NDP currently in development.

Question 21

Do you agree with the following preferred approaches to Tackling Climate Change?

1. Communities and Infrastructure Resilience
2. Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions
3. Contributing to Low Carbon Travel
4. Renewable Energy Development
5. Improvements to the Natural Environment

If not, please give the reason for your answer and explain how you would like to see it changed.

We agree with and support these principles.

Question 28

Do you agree with the preferred approach to the Rural Economy? If not, please give the reason for your answer and explain how you would like to see it changed.

We particularly support the view that the former mine sites at Wistow and Stillingfleet are unsuitable for development.

Question 30

Do you agree with the following preferred approaches to Holiday Accommodation?

1. Serviced and non-serviced holiday accommodation
2. Touring caravan and campsites
3. The imposition of conditions to restrict the use and / or period of occupation.

If not, please give the reason for your answer and explain how you would like to see it changed.

Yes – support. We also wish to add, that consideration should also be given to reviewing and updating CIL policies so that such developments make a contribution towards the local infrastructure used by their temporary residents. The uplift in land value resulting from some major developments would make such contributions viable. This would assist SDC in providing for the needs and consequences of holidaymakers.

Restrictions must be imposed and secured in a way that approved holiday accommodation cannot become permanent homes in the longer term, which would be contrary to policy as these sites are generally in open countryside.

Question 32

Do you agree with the following preferred approaches to Local Shops?

1. The protection of existing facilities
2. Proposals for new local shops

If not, please give the reason for your answer and explain how you would like to see it changed.

Yes, we agree. Our NDP consultation found community support for retaining local facilities and allowing the provision of a new local shop to service the local community, reducing the need to travel for local provisions and supporting local businesses and small scale new enterprises

Question 35

Do you agree with the preferred approach to Infrastructure Delivery? If not, please give the reason for your answer and explain how you would like to see it changed.

The approach appears somewhat vague and non-committal. There is no detail on how improvements to highways and transport might be achieved.

CIL criteria should be reviewed with a view to obtaining contribution from a wider range of development types.

The uplift in land value resulting from some major developments would make such contributions viable.

Question 38

Do you agree with the preferred approach to Telecommunications and Digital Infrastructure Provision? If not, please give the reason for your answer and explain how you would like to see it changed.

The policies appear somewhat passive and require reconsideration, when compared to the proactive policies in neighbouring York, which has catalysed the investment in city wide fibre and early 5G adoption.

Question 39

Do you agree with the preferred approach to Sustainable Transport? If not, please give the reason for your answer and explain how you would like to see it changed.

Policies should recognise that the rural nature of many locations in the District means that many have no practical alternative other than to make journeys by car. Whilst schemes to discourage car use in general may be desirable, these need careful consideration to not impact those that do not have a practical choice. In practice this is best achieved by locating new developments where short sustainable journeys are realistically likely to be made by residents and close to the rail network.

Question 40

Do you agree with the preferred approach to Parking and Highway Safety? If not, please give the reason for your answer and explain how you would like to see it changed.

Yes we agree.

Question 43

Do you agree with the preferred Spatial Distribution of Dwellings across the proposed Settlement Hierarchy? If not, please give the reason for your answer and explain how you would like to see it changed.

Please note that comments on individual proposed residential allocations should be made through the Preferred Allocations chapter.

In the first instance we would prefer the Spatial Distribution to prioritise brownfield and previously developed sites. If this is not possible, we support the proposed spatial distribution across the settlement hierarchy.

Question 44

Do you agree with the following preferred approaches to Residential Development:

1. In Selby Urban Area, Tadcaster, Sherburn in Elmet, Tier 1 Villages and Tier 2 Villages?
2. In the Smaller Villages?
3. In the countryside?

If not, please give the reason for your answer and explain how you would like to see it changed.

Yes, including the zero allocation to Escrick leaving it to the NDP to provide for our local needs.

Question 51

Do you agree with the preferred approach to Householder Applications? If not, please give the reason for your answer and explain how you would like to see it changed.

Yes – support

Question 61

Do you agree with the preferred approach to Protecting Designated Sites and Species?

If not, please give the reason for your answer and explain how you would like to see it changed.

Agree

Question 64

Do you agree with the following preferred approaches to:

1. Development within, on top of, adjacent, or near to waterways?
2. Proposals affecting the Lower Derwent Valley Area of Restraint?
3. Proposals within or adjacent to defined Development Limits of Barlby Bridge and the Selby Urban Area

If not, please give the reason for your answer and explain how you would like to see it changed.

We agree. Brownfield areas adjacent to existing services and employment should be prioritised, therefore our support to point 3 above.

Question BURN-G

Do you agree with the potential development of a new settlement at BURN-G? If not, please give the reason for your answer.

Yes.

This is well located close to Selby, the A63 and the M62. At a little over 2 miles from Selby town centre, it is a feasible cycling distance for many, supporting the plan's sustainable transport objectives. The proximity to Selby itself means its development is likely to contribute to the local economy in Selby. The proposal to include a bypass around Burn brings a wider benefit to the Selby Town area, by improving interregional connectivity to the M62 and beyond.

Question STIL-D

Do you agree with the potential development of a new settlement at STIL-D? If not, please give the reason for your answer.

We believe that this site should be rejected, and that other potential locations for a new settlement, if one is required, are better aligned to the draft policies in and wider objectives of the Plan.

We disagree with the following points of the evaluation:

- **2.1 Site has good access to services and employment:** As outlined above, Escrick is over 5 miles from most services and employment via the congested A19 corridor with little opportunity for realistic sustainable transport use.
- **2.4 Proximity to the Road Rail Network - Good sub-regional accessibility:** The site is over 7 miles from the nearest train station, and relies on access via the congested A19 corridor. It is 25 minutes drive / 16 miles from the M62 motorway network, and similar from the A1.
- **2.16 Heritage Assets - site is South East of Escrick Conservation Area:** Should read South West of Escrick Conservation Area
- **3.3 Overall Deliverability - 0-5 years:** We assume this means the start of development, as a site of this size would take much longer to develop fully.

We also note:

- **Too close to existing settlement:** The proposed site is less than 600m from the current development limit of Escrick village, which would lead to a merging of the settlements and loss of the distinct character of Escrick.

- **Highways impact:** A site of this scale would have a material adverse impact on traffic levels on the A19. This impacts the ability of existing residents and businesses to get places, and separately affects those properties in close proximity to the A19. As outlined above, we note that both Highways England and City of York Council raised concerns about the impact of the somewhat smaller holiday park development at the former North Selby Mine site. We believe it is imperative that input from Highways England and City of York Council is sought on this proposal and that an independent highways assessment of the A19 as a whole should be undertaken and publicly consulted on before any more major development proposals that would impact on the A19 even being considered.
- **Loss of grade 2 agricultural land:** We understand that the northern part of the site is grade 2 agricultural land, and the remainder grade 3.
- **Environmental impact:** One ancient woodland - Heron Wood - is right in the centre of the proposed development site. A second ancient woodland (Moreby Wood) is just across the Cawood Road. These ancient woodlands are delicate and irreplaceable ecosystems as well as beautiful. Public bridleways run through both woodlands so their beauty can be seen and shared by all. If the development at STIL-D were to go ahead, it is unavoidable that an ancient woodland in the middle of, or right next to, a large housing development will be seriously harmed.

Question 67

Which site do you think is the most suitable for a new settlement? Please rank them in order of preference.

1. Former Burn Airfield, Burn (BURN-G)
2. Land at Church Fenton Airbase (CFAB-A)
3. Land to the south of Escrick Road, Stillingfleet (STIL-D)

Please give the reason for your answer

BURN-G: Of the three potential new settlement sites, we believe that BURN-G is the most suitable location:

- First and foremost, it is well located:
 - It is well connected to both the A63 and M62 (and hence wider regional connectivity).
 - The proximity to Selby, and its good rail connectivity to Leeds, supports sustainable transport to the regional employment hubs.
 - The ~ 2 mile proximity to Selby, and associated services, are realistic for sustainable local transport use such as cycling. It may be feasible to add a railway station to the existing line between Selby and Templehirst Junction for public transport.
 - The location south of Selby Town and its close proximity to Selby to it as its main urban centre should also help support the Selby economy, with local spending and employment contributing to the economy of the district, rather than neighbouring York. It is a previously developed / brownfield site.
- It brings additional benefits:

- The inclusion of a bypass in the proposals will help not just local connectivity, but connectivity from Selby District to the M62 and wider regional connectivity more generally.

CFAB-A: We believe the site at Church Fenton also offers a credible opportunity.

We are also now aware of the previous Masterplan for the wider RAF Church Fenton site which was for a comprehensive mixed use development. As a brownfield site with wide regional support, with good linkages to major roads and the wider West Yorkshire hinterland, this site should also take preference to the potential Heronby development, which is basically a large residential development only on a congested road with poor wider linkages.