

## EXAMINATION HEARINGS

### AGENDA

**WEDNESDAY 27 FEBRUARY 2013 at 10.00am**

***Note: Thursday 28 February has been reserved in case one day is not sufficient.***

#### **1. GREEN BELT AND POLICY CPXX**

**Is the approach to a Green Belt review consistent with national policy? Does Policy CPXX establish appropriate and robust guiding principles to enable potential localised Green Belt reviews to be undertaken in other plans?**

- *Should policy CPXX require a Green Belt review to be undertaken?*
- *In part C(iii) of policy CPXX, is it appropriate that sustainability is the sole criterion – could environmental/community/other benefits also justify Green Belt releases?*
- *Should other criteria be added to part D (eg land not performing a Green Belt function, or removal of anomalies)?*
- *Does Footnote 2 imply greater weight will be given to Green Belt than to other environmental constraints?*
- *Is the policy consistent with the NPPF "exceptional circumstances" test and does it give sufficient importance to sustainability considerations?*
- *Does the policy offer sufficient protection to settlements like Escrick which are surrounded by Green Belt?*

#### **2. DEVELOPMENT IN VILLAGES – POLICIES CP1 AND CP1A**

**Is the approach to Secondary Villages and Development Limits sound and consistent with national policy?**

- *Is the limitation on development in Secondary Villages consistent with the aim of rural regeneration?*
- *Is there any change to the evidence base pertaining to the categorisation of Fairburn as a Secondary Village?*
- *Should the plan be more specific about the process by which Development Limits will be reviewed? Are Development Limits for Secondary Villages so out of date as to justify some development adjacent to extant boundaries in advance of the review?*

#### **3. THE APPROACH TO WINDFALLS – POLICIES CP2 AND CP3**

**Is the approach to windfalls sound and consistent with national policy? Is there clarity about the calculation of the 5 year supply?**

- *In the windfall footnote, should the figure of 5,340 not be 5,380? Should it (and other) figures be rounded up?*

## Selby District Core Strategy Examination

- *Given the acknowledged contribution windfalls will make to housing supply, should the delivery target in policy CP2 be increased to about 550 dwellings per annum? Should the target be included in policy CP3?*
- *Is the contribution from windfalls as a significant and sustainable source of housing supply properly taken into account?*
- *Is there sufficient clarity about the basis for the 5 year supply calculation? Does the Council intend that both 'known' and 'unknown' windfalls will contribute to the 5 year land supply?*
- *If allocations consistently deliver less than 450 dwellings per annum, will some windfalls contribute to that target rather than being additional to it in the 5 year land supply calculation? Should policy CP3 explicitly recognise that windfalls are taken into account when considering under performance?*
- *Does part CC of policy CP2 allow only allocated sites to be taken into account when assessing the trigger points in Tadcaster? Should the contribution from windfalls in Tadcaster be made explicit?*
- *Has there been any change to circumstances surrounding the delivery of land for development in Tadcaster? What is the up-to-date position on the planning application for Mill Lane?*

### **4. OLYMPIA PARK AND POLICY CP2A**

#### **Has there been any change to circumstances surrounding the delivery of Olympia Park?**

- *What is the up-to-date position on the planning application?*

### **5. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN RURAL AREAS – POLICY CP9**

#### **Is the approach to sustainable development in rural areas sound and consistent with national policy?**

- *Should research and low/carbon/renewable energy generation be specifically identified as one of the forms of sustainable development that will be supported in rural areas in policy CP9?*
- *Do the amendments to paragraph 6.29 and policy CP9 give sufficient clarity as to the types of re-use which may be suitable at Stillingfleet and Wistow former mine sites?*

### **6. RENEWABLE/ LOW CARBON ENERGY – POLICY CP14**

#### **Is the approach to renewable/ low carbon energy proposals consistent with national policy?**

- *Is policy CP14 sufficiently positive when it states that the Council will "consider" identifying suitable areas for renewable/low carbon energy sources?*
- *Is there an ambiguity in part B of policy CP14 – could the policy be interpreted as indicating that the criteria in part B only apply to community-led initiatives for renewable/low carbon energy schemes?*

**7. ANY OTHER MATTERS ARISING FROM 7<sup>th</sup> SET OF PROPOSED CHANGES**

**8. REVOCATION OF REGIONAL STRATEGY**

**Does the Core Strategy remain sound and consistent with national policy following revocation of the Yorkshire & Humber Plan?**

- *Has there been any material change in the evidence base underlying the housing and population projections and forecasts since the April and September 2012 hearing sessions?*
- *What is the significance of the reference in the Post Adoption Statement on the Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Revocation of the Yorkshire & Humber RS to a net additional 30,000 homes per annum for the region to 2026?*
- *Is it appropriate for the Council to continue to rely on the 2004 evidence base which underpinned the RS housing provision figure (which proposed 22,260 homes per annum for the region), particularly as post 2004 based projections all indicate an increase in natural change (more births than deaths)?*
- *With the removal of the RS policy H4 target of 40% affordable housing, coupled with the more flexible approach to affordable housing promoted in NPPF, is policy CP5 sound?*