

# **Full Sutton & Skirpenbeck Parish Council Response to 2<sup>nd</sup> application by Gladman Ltd**

## **Public Consultation – Community Involvement**

### **Engagement with local Community and Stakeholders**

Gladman have failed in their Public Engagement exercise, simply not engaging. This development falls within the Parish of Full Sutton & Skirpenbeck, not Stamford Bridge.

A leaflet drop was undertaken in Stamford Bridge only.

Both Gladman and Stamford Bridge Parish Council have failed to consult Full Sutton & Skirpenbeck PC and neglected to involve the PC at a meeting held on the 1<sup>st</sup> September 2016. This is simply disgraceful.

This development along with others on the East of Stamford Bridge **WILL** affect those living on the East in a major way with regard to traffic, infrastructure and environmental issues.

Access from not only this development and others already in progress will adversely affect access in both directions of the A166.

Fast moving and heavy volumes of traffic, with access onto the A166 new junctions will be dangerous, roundabouts and lights would be required.

### **Travel Assessment**

It is blindingly obvious to residents east of Stamford Bridge that access into the village and subsequent joining onto the A166 from developments in progress and proposed will have **MAJOR** impacts not minimal.

Negligible impact shows the Travel Assessment to be flawed and shows the author to be out of touch with local problems that already exist and will manifest further.

Impact over the Bridge and with regard to traffic lights will cause major problems and control of these issues will be impossible unless tackled and steps to improve placed immediately.

The investigation into local infrastructure is not only misguided but wrong.

### **Facilities and Services**

What mitigation will be provided? When the mistake will have occurred confirming the area and the infrastructure cannot cope if this development goes ahead.

Facilities and parking are condensed into a small area which at best is congested at non peak times.

People use cars to access these services, the influx of several hundred more will cause chaos, affect the environment and put residents at risk of accidents.

Residents on the proposed site and those in progress will not walk to these services, footpath access is poor in fact even dangerous. Crossing of the A166 will put residents/children's lives in danger.

What provision would be suggested to alleviate these problems.

What other modes of travel other than private car will be used? Cyclists are already wary due to the volume of traffic on the A166.

## **School**

How will Stamford Bridge school cope with dozens if not hundreds of extra pupils?

Access is not available.

What provisions are to be made for school bus stops to Pocklington schools and York schools?

Buses stopping on the A166 will cause major hazards, endanger children's lives and cause unnecessary congestion.

It will be too late to tackle when it is found that education access is problematic, further discussion will not help when several years will be required to solve or provide new schools.

There are not any safe crossing points due to existing junctions and road layout of the A166 east of the village.

It is already known that parents (or the majority) will drive their children to school causing major parking and obstruction problems, hardly any will walk particularly in inclement weather.

Update: Councillor Wakefield has made contact with the school and they have stated that they only have capacity for an extra 85 pupils over the next 5 years.

## **GP**

The GP Surgery will not and cannot accept an additional several hundred new patients. Further discussion with anyone will not improve the situation **FULL STOP.**

Update: Councillor Wakefield has made contact with the Surgery and they are at full capacity, he has a meeting with them on Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> November, update to follow.

## **Bus Services**

All services would depend on viability and profitability which would be considered by the operators.

In times of austerity and unknown economic developments, low profitability and frequency of existing services, whom I wonder would consider running these services?

Would someone consider pointing out employment opportunities in the area! Limited at the prison, likewise on proposed building sites who can only employ what they need and when completed those positions are no more. The developer probably bringing in labour from their last site.

## **Contribution**

Most shoppers in the area visit large supermarkets, their journey will be hampered by the same

problems this development will add to i.e. Large volume of traffic, delays on the A166 and congestion at Stamford Bridge.

## **Affordable Housing**

Affordable housing is the only positive aspect of this development, however how many in this area require it? Employment would be a key factor in sales of such and where are these opportunities? Limited at best.

## **Allocations Plan**

According to Mr Andy Wainwright, Strategic Development Services Manager, ERYC this area is not included in the 30 year development plan. Does the developer appreciate this?

ERYC are of the opinion that this application is a non starter according to the above officer.

## **Site Location**

**NOT** in the allocated development plan.

## **Site Access**

Transport Assessments are misguided and narrow minded if they consider the suggested access from the site to the A166, together with those already underway is safe. Traffic lights and mini roundabouts, safe footway access over the A166 and for cyclists is essential to prevent loss of life.

## **Miscellaneous**

It is thought by some, that the amount of housing required to meet East Yorkshire demands far outweighs that actually required for Stamford Bridge and surrounding villages enormously.

House prices will be affected due to over demand.

There will be at least 1500 new inhabitants, probably 1000 or more automobile, existing infrastructure, particularly the bridge will not be able to cope.

Travel assessment again is misguided and narrow minded if they consider that this development and others will have minimal impact on the area, you have to be a local to realise this fact or a tourist who has queued for hours to clear Stamford Bridge in either direction.

With regard to the distribution of the consultation leaflet, this should have been distributed to Full Sutton & Skirpenbeck villages as the development is in their Parish. **IT WASN'T** why? A lack of knowledge of the area by the author's of this consultation document?

## **Conclusion**

This is purely and simply over development which is not sustainable in the local area. It will impact on traffic, environment and affect residents of the area, having a negative impact on their quality of life.

Unless the local school is drastically upgraded, Doctor's Surgery significantly enlarged the village

centre will be inundated with vast parking and access problems.

Neither the A166, it's transitory single bridge and traffic lights will be able to cope.

Should the village flood again as in Christmas 2015, where access through the village was denied for several days, people newly moved to the area and not knowledgeable of alternative routes of which there are few will cause untold vehicular problems.

This development in addition to those already underway is a development to far.

Full Sutton and Skirpenbeck Parish Council  
7<sup>th</sup> November 2016

Addendum 11<sup>th</sup> November 2016 – Vice Chair's comments.

This morning (Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> November) I had a brief meeting with Helen Cox, General Manager and Joanne Rowe, Managing Partner at the Strensall Practice of My Healthcare, which encompasses the surgery at Stamford Bridge and other local practices.

Firstly the practice was unaware of the application for a further 210 houses in addition to those already commenced beside the A166 east of Stamford bridge.

With regard to capacity for the Stamford Bridge surgery to care for another possibly extra two thousand potential patients is questionable.

Where at the moment there is some capacity available, the extra numbers would require additional consulting rooms. A limited number could be provided by either creating new ones on the present site or indeed extending the present building which has a limited scope for so doing, an extension would be costly and probably remove most of the car park, which would affect patient access/parking. Also the cost of this would be borne by the practice which seems unfair, the 106 levy would seem to be a reasonable way of funding the additional space required and should this development progress would need applying for.

Additional patients would need a new budget again something borne by the practice as additional nhs funding would not be forthcoming.

In contradiction of the consultation document, neither the consultation company or developer have ever approached the practice management for their views or information with regard to their ability to cope in their present state.

In conclusion no heed has been taken to additional patients that may result from the existing population increasing their families, further highlighting the deficiencies of the consultation document.

Clive Wakefield  
Vice Chair FSSPC.