102

LDF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

SELBY DISTRICT COUNCIL
Moving forward with purpose

Selby District Submission Draft Core Strategy
Consultation on Further Proposed Changes (6th Set)
June 2012
Representation Form

An Examination in Public (EIP) into the soundness of the Submission Draft Core Strategy (SDCS) was held between 20 and 30 September 2011 and between 18 and 19 April 2012 in front of an Independent Inspector.

The Independant Inspector has adjourned the EIP until 5 September 2012 in order to consider the implications of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on the Submission Draft Core Strategy and for the Council to consult on any further Proposed Changes to the Submission Draft Core Strategy.

Selby District Council is now publishing and inviting comments on a 6th Set of Proposed Changes to the Submission Draft Core Strategy (and associated documents) in order that all parties can make their views known.

The September and April EIP's have already heard the duly made representations on the Submission Draft Core Startegy which were submitted during the formal Publication stage and subsequent consultation on the first 5 Sets of Proposed Changes. The adjournment should not be used as an opportunity to revisit matters which have been fully considered during the September 2011 and April 2012 hearing sessions.

Representations are therefore invited as part of this consultation on the 6th Set of Proposed Changes to the Submission Draft Core Strategy and associated documents.

Please complete separate copies of Part B of this form for each of your separate representations. It would be helpful if you could focus on the "tests of soundness" and indicate if you are objecting on a legal compliance issue.

Completed representation forms must be returned to the Council no later than 5pm on Thursday 19 July 2012

Email to: ldf@selby.gov.uk

Fax to: **01757 292229**

Post to: **Policy & Strategy Team, Selby District Council, Civic Centre, Doncaster Road, Selby YO8 9FT**

Part A

The Tests of Soundness

The Independant Inspector's role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. The tests to consider whether the plan is 'sound' are explained under paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012) and states a sound Core Strategy should be:

Positively prepared
- the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;

Justified
- the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;

Effective
- the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and

Consistent with national policy
- the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

Contact Details (only complete once)

Please provide contact details and agent details, if appointed.

	Personal Details	Agents Details (if applicable)
Name	John Hamlin	
Organisation		
Address	3, Southlands Close Escrick North Yorkshire YO19 6JE	
Telephone No.	[redacted]	
Email address	[redacted]	

It will be helpful if you can provide an email address so we can contact you electronically.

You only need to complete this page once. If you wish to make more than one representation, attach additional copies of Part B (pages 3-4) to this part of the representation form.

Part B (please use a separate sheet (pages 3-4) for each representation)

Please identify the Proposed Change (*which can be found on the Published Schedule, CD2f*) to which this representation refers or paragraph number of the NPPF Compliance Statement:

PC6.32

Question 1: Do you consider the Proposed Change is:

1.1 Legally compliant	☐	Yes	☒	No
1.2 Sound	☐	Yes	☒	No

If you have entered No to 1.2, please continue to Q2. In all other circumstances, please go to Q3.

Question 2: If you consider the Proposed Change is unsound, please identify which test of soundness your representation relates to:

(Please identify just one test for this representation)

- ☐ 2.1 Positively Prepared
- ☒ 2.2 Justified
- ☐ 2.3 Effective
- ☐ 2.4 Consistent with national policy

Question 3: Please give details of why you consider the Proposed Change is not legally compliant or is unsound and provide details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Proposed Change to the Submission Draft Core Strategy legally compliant or sound.

Not Legally Compliant:

The proposed change in the status of Escrick from a Secondary Village to a Designated Service Village would appear to post-date SDC's assessment of the Draft Core Strategy's compliance with the Localism Act 2011. It is therefore unclear whether SDC has fulfilled its duty to cooperate on all cross boundary issues with the City of York as a neighbouring LPA regarding the proposed change to the status of Escrick given the late timing of this change. This is relevant as Escrick is more economically aligned with York than Selby (ref. SDC Core Strategy Background Paper No.1). Escrick is also located within the current York Green Belt and it is unclear whether SDC's DSV proposal for Escrick has been tested as compatible with the City of York Council's own Green Belt plans. Proposed change PC6.32 should therefore be removed.

Not 'Sound':

SDC's proposed change to the status of Escrick is not justified if it is in response to anticipated difficulties in achieving an adequate housing development strategy for Tadcaster. The SDC Draft Core Strategy states that finding opportunities for new development is a key challenge to ensure the future health of Tadcaster. Changing the designation of Escrick (which Core Strategy Background Paper No.6 states is a village that is compact in form with significant character in a Conservation Area with strong environmental and landscape constraints to development which militate against expansion) is therefore inappropriate. An appropriate response would be to adopt a more positive strategy to the development of Tadcaster. Proposed change PC6.32 should therefore be removed.

Continue overleaf

Question 3 continued

(Continue on a separate sheet if submitting a hard copy)

Question 4: Can your representation seeking a change be considered by written representations, or do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

☒ **4.1** Written Representations ☐ **4.2** Attend Examination

4.3 If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary
(Your request will be considered by the Inspector, however, attendance at the Examination in Public is by invitation only).

(Continue on a separate sheet if submitting a hard copy)

Representation Submission Acknowledgement
I acknowledge that I am making a formal representation. I understand that my name (and organisation where applicable) and representation will be made publically available (including on the Council's website) in order to ensure that it is a fair and transparent process.

☒ I agree with this statement and wish to submit the above representation for consideration.

Signed [redacted] **Dated** 16 July 2012