#### North Yorkshire Local Access Forum

## 11 October 2017

## **District Council Updates**

## Report of the Secretary

## **1.0** Purpose of the Report

#### 1.1 To update the Forum on liaison with District Councils

#### 2.0 Background

- 2.1 The LAF operates an agreed list of nominated representatives willing to act as the first point of liaison with the constituent District Councils in relation to planning and other relevant matters.
- 2.2 This agenda item provides an opportunity for the Forum to be updated on activity since the previous meeting.
- 2.3 Following discussion at the July meeting, Rachel Connolly provided comments on 2 planning applications in the Hambleton District, in consultation with all LAF members:

#### Planning Application ref 16/02269/REM Sowerby Gateway, Phase 3

The Local Access Forum considers that considerable effort has gone into making this large development sustainably transport-friendly, with bus-stops, cycle paths and open spaces. It particularly commends the aspiration to support a connection by cycle to the station.

# Planning Application ref 17/00519/REM at Easingwold for 175 dwellings

The site plan lacks provision which will encourage cycling to the village centre, and the Local Access Forum recommends that the footpath running within the perimeter of the north and northeast of the site be a shared cycle and pedestrian facility, with access onto the track behind the proposed estate. The Forum cannot support the planned poor practice of using the estate roads for visitor parking, as this will discourage cycling through the estate, but instead should be provided in more than one place in dedicated areas to meet at very least the minimum standards laid down by NYCC.

2.4 David Barraclough has provided the following update on the Richmondshire District Council Development Plan:

As was intimated earlier, Richmondshire appears to have abandoned the Delivering Development plan that was to have put some flesh on the bones of the adopted Core Strategy and gone for a full review of the Local Plan. The published timetable for this in the Development Plan Scheme is –

Issues/Preferred Approach Publication Submission Public Examination Adoption June 2018 December 2018 March 2019 October 2019 March 2020

2.5 David has also submitted the following planning application comment to Richmondshire District Council:

## APPLICATION 17/00558/OUT – LAND AT ST ALKELDA'S ROAD, MIDDLEHAM

This advice is given on behalf of the North Yorkshire Local Access Forum (NYLAF) under the provisions of s94 of the CROW Act 2000. NYLAF has no objection in principle to the development of this site for housing. However, it is noted that the OS map shows public footpaths inside the southern boundary and adjacent to the western boundary of the proposed development site. If outline permission is granted, the NYLAF advises that this should be subject to conditions requiring the retention, if not enhancement, of these footpaths and the provision of suitable links into and across the site for the benefit of future residents.

- 2.6 Tom Halstead has provided the attached information with regard to HS2, which is of particular relevance for the Selby area.
- 2.7 Nominated representatives are invited to report verbally at the meeting on activity undertaken.
- 2.8 Going forward, the Chair has requested that the Secretary writes to all District Council representatives requesting feedback in advance of the agenda publication, to ensure that any relevant activity across all Districts can be included in the report.

#### 3.0 Recommendation

3.1 That members note the updates.

BARRY KHAN Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) County Hall NORTHALLERTON

Report author: Kate Arscott, Secretary to North Yorkshire Local Access Forum

Background Documents: None

## HS2

I have looked at the maps for the proposed route of HS2 to see where it might affect the public rights of way network in North Yorkshire. I attach an annotated overview OS Explorer map (HS2.jpg) and three maps from the North Yorkshire website showing more detail. The main points are:

- 1. The route enters North Yorkshire at the boundary with West Yorkshire about 1 km NW of **Mickelfield** and runs S of **Barkston Ash** and N of **Sherburn-in-Elmet** and **Church Fenton** to its terminus S of **Ulleskelf**.
- 2. It will cut across the following roads: **Sandwath Lane** and **Common Lane** to the west of **Church Fenton**; the **A162** south of Barkston Ash; **Coldhill Lane** NW of Sherburn-in-Elmet.
- 3. The route will be aligned along an existing railway cutting (SE 49470 35657 53.814866,-1.250124) just SW of Barkston Ash (Barkston Ash.jpg). At present, an unclassified road (U866/2/70) crosses the railway on a bridge and connects a footpath coming from Barkston Ash (35.4/7/1) with footpaths (35.4/5/2 and 35.4/8/1) leading to Little Fenton and Sherburn-in-Elmet. *It is almost certain that the existing bridge would be removed or replaced, consequently, it would be important to ensure that pedestrian access was retained as this is an important network connection.*
- 4. The route cuts across Sandwath Lane between Sandwath Drive and Sandwath Farm (Church Fenton.jpg). This threatens to remove the link between footpath 35.22/2/1 in Church Fenton and footpath 35.22/1/1 that leads to Scarthingwell.
- 5. The route from Mickelfield joins the existing railway line just after crossing Coldhill Lane near Mile Hill (Coldhill Lane.jpg)

I think the main issue to keep an eye on would be south of Barkston Ash (bullet point 3) where it is probable that the existing bridge would not be replaced. In the worst case, if only one of the roads along this stretch of the proposed route were to be reconnected, then the network of paths around Church Fenton and Sherburn-in-Elmet would effectively be cut off from public rights of way to the north west.

Tom Halstead







