

No. 6

Village Growth Potential

(February 2010)



Core Strategy Background Paper

No. 6

Village Growth Potential

February 2010

Introduction

- 1.1 This Background Paper provides further evidence and analysis to inform the distribution of future housing growth and to identify villages that can accept a proportion of that growth. These are referred to as Designated Service Villages in the Core Strategy. The remaining villages with defined Development Limits are termed Secondary Villages.
- 1.2 Potential housing growth in rural settlements has to be considered within the strategic context set by the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), which seeks to concentrate the majority of new development in the main urban centres. In Selby District, Selby is the only settlement identified as a principal town although RSS also promotes limited development in Local Service Centres such as Tadcaster and Sherburn in Elmet to serve local needs and acknowledges national policy on development in more rural areas. PPS7 (Para. 4) states:
- ‘Local Planning Authorities should set out in Local Development Documents their policies for allowing some limited development in, or next to, rural settlements that are not designated as local service centres, in order to meet local business and community needs and to maintain the vitality of these communities. In particular, authorities should be supportive of small-scale development of the nature where it provides the most sustainable option in villages that are remote from, and have poor public transport links with, service centres.’*
- 1.3 The Core Strategy contains proposals for the general distribution of housing development based on the following hierarchy of settlements:
- Level 1 Principal Town
Selby *
 - Level 2 Local Service Centres
Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster
 - Level 3
Villages with potential for planned sustainable growth. (Designated Service Villages)
 - Level 4
Less sustainable villages which are not suitable for planned growth but which historically have exhibited potential for absorbing infilling and other small scale development within development limits.

* For the purposes of the Core Strategy, Selby is defined as the contiguous urban area formed by Selby town, Barlby Bridge/Olympia Mills in Barlby and Osgodby Parish and residential and industrial development in Brayton Parish.

- Level 5

Hamlets, small groups of dwellings and dispersed residential development outside development limits where future residential development will be resisted.

- 1.4 The main purpose of this Paper is to inform the Core Strategy process by identifying those villages where future planned growth may be accommodated. No attempt is made to quantify in detail the potential amount of future development appropriate for individual villages or identify preferred allocations in those settlements - that will be a function of a future Allocations DPD, or Area Action Plan in the case of Selby town and the parishes of Barlby and Osgodby, Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby.

Designated Service Villages

- 2.1 The term 'Designated Service Villages' in the Core Strategy replaces references to Primary Villages which were previously identified at Further Options stage. Primary villages are those villages considered to have the best overall level of sustainability on the basis of a number of indicators examined in Background Paper No. 5 (Sustainability Assessment of Rural Settlements). Designated Service Villages refer to larger, more sustainable villages which are considered capable of accommodating further sustainable growth.
- 2.2 While the sustainability assessment provides an indication of the relative sustainability of settlements, the potential of individual villages to accommodate further growth is of course dependent upon a number of other factors including flood risk, environmental capacity and availability of sites. Villages with populations over 600 persons which were included in the previous sustainability assessment have therefore been re-appraised to take account of factors which may influence future growth potential.

Village Growth Potential Study

- 3.1 The following villages are included in the study:
Appleton Roebuck, Barlby, Barlow, Beal, Brayton, Brotherton, Byram, Camblesforth, Carlton, Cawood, Church Fenton, Cliffe, Drax, Eggborough, Escrick, Fairburn, Hambleton, Hemingbrough, Hensall, Hillam, Kellington, Monk Fryston, North Duffield, Osgodby, Riccall, South Milford, Stutton, Thorpe Willoughby, Ulleskelf, Wistow, Whitley.
- 3.2 These comprise all the former Selby District Local Plan, Policy H6 villages, except Barlby Bridge (which is now treated as part of the contiguous built-up area of Selby), plus Beal and Escrick.
- 3.3 Villages with less than 600 populations are excluded because there is a significant difference in population size between villages in the 600 –

1100 population range and the next group of villages with lower populations, which are also considered too small to provide a sound basis for building a reasonable level of sustainability in the future.

3.4 The study covers the following factors :

- Relative Sustainability (See Background Paper No.5)
- Groundwater Source Protection Zones
- Waste Water Treatment Capacity
- Agricultural Land Classification
- Highway Network Constraints/Public Transport
- Biodiversity
- Form and Character
- Landscape Sensitivity
- Flood Risk
- Land Availability/Residential Site Potential

Relative Sustainability

3.5 The relative sustainability of villages is reviewed in Background Paper No.5, Sustainability Assessment of Rural Settlements. The Paper categorises villages into relative sustainability levels based upon four indicators of:

- Size, which provides a broad indication of the local market and need for services, together with the potential for developing local communities and community groups
- Availability of basic local services,
- Accessibility to larger service centres by public transport, including principal towns(Selby and other towns outside the District), Sub - Regional Centres (York), and Local Service Centres (Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster), and
- Availability of local employment opportunities within a short commuting distance.

3.6 While non of these individual indicators provide a definitive guide to sustainability, they do provide a collective indication of relative sustainability.

Groundwater Protection

3.7 Information on Groundwater Source Protection Zones is provided by the Environment Agency. Residential development is less constrained than many forms of commercial development in relation to groundwater protection but should nevertheless avoid close proximity to borehole facilities in Source Protection Zone 1.

Waste Water Treatment Capacity

- 3.8 Information on waste water treatment capacity in each settlement is provided by Yorkshire Water. Significant new development will often require extension to capacity at local treatment works although, at this stage, this is not treated as an overriding constraint on development potential. This could either be at developers expense or achieved through Yorkshire Water's Forward Capital Programme. Detailed implications will be explored through a future Allocations DPD.

Agricultural Land Value

- 3.9 The quality of agricultural land is generally very high in Selby District and agriculture is an important industry. Highly productive agricultural land is an important natural resource and the Core Strategy aims to protect this resource wherever possible. However, it is considered that this factor alone will not definitively preclude development entirely and agricultural land quality is more likely to influence the possible scale of development at later stages of the plan making process, particularly when identifying new allocations (Allocations DPD).

Highway and Transport Issues

- 3.10 Advice on highway issues has been obtained from comments received from North Yorkshire County Council and the Highways Agency in response to consultations undertaken during preparation of the Core Strategy and the 2009 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). As planned development is only realistic in the larger villages, highway capacity will rarely be a prohibitive constraint, although it may influence the scale of any future development proposed.
- 3.11 Public transport accessibility is already a factor taken into account in the relative sustainability assessment described above. Public transport provision is, however, variable, but is unlikely to be sufficient reason to prohibit new development entirely. New development can provide opportunities to support and improve services.

Biodiversity

- 3.12 This includes national and international designations such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), and Nature Reserves, plus local designations such as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs). Wherever sites with particular ecological value are located in close proximity to villages they may constrain new development in that locality.

Form and Character

- 3.13 The impact of new development on the character and form of villages including Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings is an important consideration. However, rarely will the character of villages preclude further development entirely, although it may influence the design and scale of any new development.

Landscape Sensitivity

- 3.14 The landscape setting of villages and its sensitivity to new development has been assessed through a Landscape Sensitivity Assessment. This takes account of the landscape setting and relationship with the surrounding areas, and Locally Important Landscape Area (LILA) designations.
- 3.15 It is also appropriate to consider circumstances where villages are within or adjacent to the Green Belt. Green Belt policies are aimed at protecting openness, thereby precluding development. The existence of Green Belt must be given significant weight and boundaries may be amended, through a review undertaken within the LDF process, only if exceptional circumstances are demonstrated. The impact of any development proposals on the openness of Green Belt is a prime consideration and therefore it is logical to pay particular regard to the landscape sensitivity assessment in these cases.

Flood Risk

- 3.16 Flood Risk information is taken from the Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2009), more details of which are also available on the Council's website. A PPS25 Sequential Test has also been undertaken to assess relative village suitability for development from the point of view of flood risk, as part of a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk. (published separately).

Land Availability

- 3.17 This study does not attempt to assess the relative merits of potential development sites. The information in the Council's 2008 Strategic Housing Land Assessment (SHLAA), which was published in 2009, has been used to give a general indication of potential development opportunities but does not give any commitment to the scale and future development of individual sites. Prior to the Core Strategy being adopted, the information in this Study is being used to guide the selection of Designated Service Villages. Following adoption of the Core Strategy, an Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and Selby Area Action Plan (SAAP), will be the vehicles through which the scale and location of future development allocations in village settlements will be considered.
- 3.18 The detailed results for each village are presented in Appendix 3, accompanied by a series of maps.

Assessment

- 4.1 In considering which villages are suitable for further planned growth the following factors are given most weight:-
- Relative sustainability
 - Availability of local services / local service function
 - Land availability
 - Environmental capacity
- 4.2 A number of villages, namely Barlby and Osgodby, Brotherton and Byram, and Monk Fryston and Hillingham, which are sufficiently close to each other to share services and facilities have been considered jointly.
- 4.3 It should also be noted that in addition to larger sustainable villages, Service Villages may include more remote villages which perform a local service function in line with PPS7 (see para 1.2 above), provided they have the capacity to accommodate additional growth without compromising the character of the village and its surroundings.
- 4.4 The analysis of village growth potential is presented in Appendix 1. This suggests that the following villages meet sustainability and growth potential requirements to justify Service Village status :
- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Barlby/Osgodby | Kellington |
| Brayton | Monk Fryston/Hillingham |
| Carlton | North Duffield |
| Church Fenton | Riccall |
| Eggborough | South Milford |
| Fairburn | Thorpe Willoughby |
| Hambleton | Wistow |
| Hemingbrough | |
- 4.5 While most of the villages previously identified as Primary Villages are included in the list there are a number of exceptions. For example Camblesforth, Cawood and Ulleskelf are excluded because they are more vulnerable to flooding than other villages and fail the PPS 25 Sequential Test undertaken in connection with the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
- 4.6 While flood risk is a measurable constraint, environmental and other considerations are more subjective, and therefore less definitive in terms of assessing growth potential. For example current infrastructure capacity /service constraints may be overcome to facilitate future development. There are also circumstances, such as in Brotherton/Byram and Escrick, where a number of factors combine to inhibit future planned growth.
- 4.7 North Duffield is an example of a village which was not previously identified as a Primary Village, but which is designated as a Service Villages because it fulfils the function outlined in PPS7 of providing a service function for a local area which otherwise has relatively poorer links to higher level centres. (see Paragraphs 1.2 and 4.2 above).

- 4.8 Villages are excluded from the list of Designated Service Villages for one or more of the following reasons :
- the village falls within the 'least sustainable' category of overall sustainability
 - the village fails the PPS25 sequential flood risk test
 - there is no scope for expansion without significantly affecting the form and character of the village, and /or
 - the surrounding landscape exhibits a greater sensitivity to development.
- 4.9 These villages, together with former Selby District Local Plan Policy H7 villages which were considered too small to be included in the Study, are referred to as Secondary Villages in the Core Strategy. These are listed in Appendix 2.
- 4.10 Although not considered appropriate locations for planned growth through new allocations, the Secondary Villages, which all have defined development limits, will not necessarily be sterilised from development. Many have extant planning permissions which are likely to be implemented over time and opportunities for small scale affordable housing to meet local needs would be encouraged. In addition any policy permitting windfall development similar to the existing policy of development/redevelopment on previously developed land within Development Limits will also allow some limited development.

Appendix 1

Village Growth Potential Analysis		
Village	Comment	Status
Appleton Roebuck	<p>Scores poorly in relative sustainability compared with most villages assessed and has limited local services. Small size and relatively poor public transport access to higher level services.</p> <p>The Landscape assessment noted particularly sensitive landscape around the southern fringes of the village.</p>	Secondary Village
Barlby / Osgodby	Good local services and a very sustainable location with easy access to higher level services and employment opportunities in Selby.	Designated Service Village
Barlow	Scores poorly in relative sustainability compared with most villages assessed and has limited local services. Small size and relatively poor public transport access to higher level services in Selby.	Secondary Village
Beal	Scores poorly in relative sustainability compared with most villages assessed and has limited local services. Small size and relatively poor public transport access to higher level services.	Secondary Village
Brayton	Good local services and a very sustainable location with easy access to higher level services and employment opportunities in Selby.	Designated Service Village
Byram/Brotherton	<p>Less sustainable than villages closest to jobs and services within Selby, but good local services and access to larger centres outside the District</p> <p>However, no significant development sites were identified in the 2008 Strategic Housing Land Assessment. Although there may be scope for further growth on the eastern side of Byram development would not be well related to the existing pattern of development and There there are no obvious boundaries to development in that location. Expansion of Byram / Brotherton is therefore considered inappropriate at this point in time.</p>	Secondary Village
Camblesforth	Less sustainable than villages closest to jobs and services within Selby, but has good local services. However Camblesforth is not considered a suitable location for further planned growth in view of the fact that most of the land within and surrounding the village has a high probability of flooding and the village fails the PPS25 Sequential Test	Secondary Village

*Selby District Local Development Framework
Core Strategy Background Paper No.6*

	carried out in association with the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	
Carlton	<p>Less sustainable than villages closer to the jobs and services within Selby but has good local services.</p> <p>Because of flood risk issues in other villages in the south-east of the District, Carlton is the most appropriate location to meet local need in that area.</p> <p>Development should not prejudice the character, appearance and nature conservation interest of the extensive woodland and parkland associated with Carlton Towers.</p>	Designated Service Village
Cawood	<p>Less sustainable than villages closest to jobs and services within Selby, but has good local services. An improved bus services would improve access to higher level services and employment opportunities in both Selby and outside the District in York. However Cawood is not considered a suitable location for further planned growth in view of the fact that most of the land within and surrounding the village has a high probability of flooding and the village fails the PPS25 Sequential Test carried out in association with the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>	Secondary Village
Church Fenton	<p>Less sustainable than those villages closer to the jobs and services within Selby but has good local services and access to intermediate range of services and employment opportunities in Sherburn in Elmet.</p>	Designated Service Village
Cliffe	<p>Scores poorly in relative sustainability compared with most villages assessed and has limited local services. Small size and relatively poor public transport access to higher level services in Selby.</p>	Secondary Village
Drax	<p>Scores poorly in relative sustainability compared with most villages assessed and has limited local services. Small size and relatively poor public transport access to higher level services in Selby.</p> <p>In addition Cawood is not considered a suitable location for further planned growth in view of the fact that most of the land within and surrounding the village has a high probability of flooding and the village fails the PPS25 Sequential Test carried out in association with the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>	Secondary Village
Eggborough	<p>Less sustainable than those villages closer to jobs and services within Selby but has good local services.</p> <p>Eggborough is the largest village in the</p>	Designated Service Village

*Selby District Local Development Framework
Core Strategy Background Paper No.6*

	<p>southern part of the District and has a range of potential housing site opportunities. Eggborough is the most appropriate location on which to focus meeting local needs in the southern part of the District.</p>	
Escrick	<p>There are strong environmental and landscape constraints to development particularly south of the village which militate against expansion. The village is has significant character with a Conservation Area and is compact in form.</p> <p>Relatively sustainable with good local services and good access to higher level services and employment opportunities in York and Selby.</p>	Secondary Village
Fairburn	<p>Less sustainable, than those villages closest to the jobs and services within Selby but has good local services. Relatively good access to larger centres outside the District e.g Knottingley, Castleford and Pontefract.</p> <p>An improvement in the bus services would be desirable and some growth could assist in achieving such improvements.</p> <p>Development to the west of the village should be avoided where it would impact on the important Fairburn Ings Nature Reserve.</p>	Designated Service Village
Hambleton	<p>Relatively sustainable location with good access to the higher level of services and employment opportunities in Selby.</p> <p>Following closure of the Post Office, it has only two of the four key local services but it is a relatively large village which provides a good base for stabilising and potentially improving the services available locally.</p>	Designated Service Village
Hemingbrough	<p>Less sustainable location than those villages closer to the jobs and higher level services within Selby, but has good local services and some development potential.</p>	Designated Service Village
Hensall	<p>Relatively well serviced village but of limited size and a fragmented structure. It has relatively poor public transport accessibility to a major service centre. It is also not as sustainable as nearby Eggborough which is a more appropriate focus for local needs in this area.</p>	Secondary Village
Kellington	<p>Less sustainable than those villages closer to the jobs and higher level services within Selby but has good local services. Relatively good access to employment and services outside the District in Knottingley, Castleford and Pontefract. Some limited development potential.</p>	Designated Service Village
Monk Fryston/Hillam	<p>Less sustainable than those villages closer to the jobs and higher level services within Selby</p>	Designated Service Village

*Selby District Local Development Framework
Core Strategy Background Paper No.6*

	<p>but good local services and some development potential.</p> <p>The Landscape Assessment notes the sensitivity of the landscape to the north of Monk Fryston which includes Monk Fryston Hall and adjoining farmland which is essential to the setting of the village and the wider area. Development to the north of the A63 is therefore likely to be severely restricted as a result.</p>	
North Duffield	<p>Limited size and relative remoteness from higher level services and employment opportunities in Selby reduces general sustainability rating. However, it does have good local services serving the eastern part of the District. Limited growth serving strictly local needs would assist in supporting this function (as referred to in Para. 4 of PPS7).</p>	Designated Service Village
Riccall	<p>Relatively good access to the jobs and services within Selby and has good local services.</p> <p>The Landscape Assessment notes the sensitivity of the landscape to development on the eastern side of the A19.</p>	Designated Service Village
South Milford	<p>Less sustainable than those villages closer to the jobs and higher level services within Selby but has good local services and easy access to an intermediate range of services and employment at Sherburn.</p> <p>The Landscape Assessment notes the sensitivity of the landscape to development particularly around the south-west quadrant of the village.</p>	Designated Service Village
Stutton	<p>Limited services and, limited overall sustainability without exceptional circumstances, other than proximity to Tadcaster. It is considered to be an inappropriate village for expansion, other than for limited affordable housing. The north-eastern edge of the village is the most open but there are flood risk issues there. On balance it is considered that Stutton should not be viewed as an overflow opportunity for Tadcaster.</p>	Secondary Village
Thorpe Willoughby	<p>Good local services and a very sustainable location with easy access to higher level services and employment opportunities in Selby.</p>	Designated Service Village
Ulleskelf	<p>Has limited services (no primary school for example), although it does possess a rail service to Leeds and York. Ulleskelf is not considered a suitable location for further planned growth in view of the fact that most of the land within and surrounding the village</p>	Secondary Village

*Selby District Local Development Framework
Core Strategy Background Paper No.6*

	has a high probability of flooding and the village fails the PPS25 Sequential Test carried out in association with the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	
Whitley	Scores poorly in relative sustainability compared with most villages assessed and has limited local services. Small size and elongated structure along A19 make it an inappropriate village in which to focus further development. It is also not as sustainable as nearby Eggborough, from which it is separated by the M62 motorway, and which is a more appropriate focus for local needs in this area.,	Secondary Village
Wistow	Only has 2 of the key services,(school and part-time post office) available but is close to and has relatively good access to higher level services and job opportunities in Selby. An improvement in the bus service would be desirable and some growth could assist in achieving this. Limited further growth serving local housing needs could help to stabilise further service loss.	Designated Service Village

Appendix 2

Secondary Villages (Villages Not Considered Suitable for Planned Growth)

Appleton Roebuck *	Hensall *
Barlow *	Hirst Courtney
Barkston Ash	Kelfield
Beal	Kellingley Colliery
Biggin	Kirk Smeaton
Bilbrough	Little Smeaton
Birkin	Lumby
Bolton Percy	Newland
Burton Salmon	Newton Kyme
Burn	Ryther
Chapel Haddlesley	Saxton
Church Fenton Airbase	Skipwith
Cliffe *	South Duffield
Colton	Stillingfleet
Criddling Stubbs	Stutton *
Drax *	Thorganby
Escrick	Towton
Gateforth	West Haddlesley
Great Heck	Whitley *
Healaugh	Womersley

* Former Selby District Local Plan Policy H6 villages which were included in the Growth Potential Study