



**Selby District Council  
Local Plan Consultation**

***"PLAN Selby"***  
***(The Sites and Policies Local Plan)***

**Initial Consultation Comments Form**

"PLAN Selby" is the Sites and Policies Local Plan which the Council is developing to deliver the strategic vision outlined in the Core Strategy that was adopted in 2013. When adopted, PLAN Selby will form part of the Local Plan for the District against which planning applications will be assessed.

This consultation is the first stage in our on-going dialogue with you and we hope that you will take time to respond to it and help us move forward. The responses to this consultation will help inform our work and shape the District for the future.

**Comments are therefore invited as part of this Initial Consultation.**

**Please use this form to make your comments.**

Please read the main document PLAN Selby and associated papers, which are available on the Council's website at [www.selby.gov.uk/PLANSelby](http://www.selby.gov.uk/PLANSelby) and at local libraries and Public Council offices.

You will need to see what is in PLAN Selby in order to make your comments. It contains a wide range of issues and specific questions on which we would like your views. Please make sure you are clear about which part of PLAN Selby you are commenting on and ensure we have your full contact details so we can take your comments into account and so that we can contact you about the next stages.

**Completed comments forms must be received by the Council  
no later than 5pm on Monday 19th January 2015**

**Contact Details** - Please provide contact details and agent details, if appointed

	Personal Details	Agent Details (if applicable)
Name	Church Commissioners for England	Daniel Hatcher
Address	c/o Agent	Barton Willmore Regent House Prince's Gate 4 Homer Road Solihull
Postcode		B91 3QQ
Telephone no.		1,217,115,151
Email address		daniel.hatcher@bartonwillmore.co.uk

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

**Comment(s)**

Please ensure you provide reference to the Question and Topic area for each comment you wish to make.

Topic / Chapter

Question no.

Paragraph

Please see attached

(Text is limited to the available area to ensure all text is visible. Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Topic / Chapter

Question no.

Paragraph

Please see attached

(Text is limited to the available area to ensure all text is visible. Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Comment(s)**

Please ensure you provide reference to the Question and Topic area for each comment you wish to make.

Topic / Chapter

Question no.

8

Paragraph

Please see attached

(Text is limited to the available area to ensure all text is visible. Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Topic / Chapter

Question no.

9

Paragraph

Please see attached

(Text is limited to the available area to ensure all text is visible. Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Additional Comments** - Please provide any additional comments you may wish to make.

Please see attached

(Text is limited to the available area to ensure all text is visible. Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### Comment Submission Statement

All comments must be made in an email or in writing if they are to be considered. Your comments and some personal identifying details will be published in a public register and cannot be treated confidentially. Where practical, personal identifiers may be redacted, however Selby District Council cannot guarantee that all identifiers will be removed prior to publication of consultation records.

Signed

Daniel Hatcher

Dated

19th January 2015

**Please ensure you save a copy of your completed comments form to your computer before sending by email**

**Completed comments forms must be received by the Council  
no later than 5pm on Monday 19th January 2015**

**Email:**      **ldf@selby.gov.uk**

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

BRISTOL  
CAMBRIDGE  
CARDIFF  
EBBSFLEET  
EDINBURGH  
LEEDS  
LONDON  
MANCHESTER  
NEWCASTLE  
READING  
SOLIHULL

**BARTON  
WILLMORE**

bartonwillmore.co.uk  
Regent House  
Prince's Gate  
4 Homer Road  
Solihull  
B91 3QQ  
T/0121 711 5151

Policy and Strategy Team  
Selby District Council  
Doncaster Road  
Selby  
YO8 9FT

**BY EMAIL AND POST (ldf@selby.gov.uk)**

19099/A3/DH/rap

19<sup>th</sup> January 2015

Dear Sir/Madam

**'PLAN Selby' – THE SITES AND POLICIES LOCAL PLAN – INITIAL CONSULTATION  
RESPONSE ON BEHALF OF THE CHURCH COMMISSIONERS FOR ENGLAND**

Thank you for your letter dated 20<sup>th</sup> November 2014 inviting comments on the above consultation document. We are instructed by our Client, the Church Commissioners for England, to submit a response to this document accordingly.

Our representations should be read in the context of the land that the Commissioners are promoting for residential development which lies immediately adjacent to the Contiguous Urban Area of Selby and within the parish of Brayton, which is identified as a 'Designated Service Village' (DSV) in the adopted Core Strategy.

**Question 5 – Key Aims and Objectives**

We generally agree that the Aims and Objectives identified at paragraph 2.3 as they align with the vision for growth already established in the adopted Core Strategy. However, in relation to Objective 5, alongside the recognition of the need to set new Development Limits and town centre boundaries as necessary, we consider that reference should also be made within this Objective to the potential need to set new boundaries to Strategic Countryside Gaps (SCG). Later in the document under Key Issue T3 (Defining Areas for Promoting Development and Protecting Key Assets), four issues are highlighted: Development Limits, Strategic Countryside Gaps, Green Belt and Safeguarded Land. Whilst the latter 2 issues are covered under Objective 4 and the first under Objective 5, no reference is made within the Objectives to SCG.

It is also of note that Paragraph 3.103 of the document states that in order to accommodate the amount of development set out in the Core Strategy in the most sustainable locations, PLAN Selby will need to reappraise Green Belt, SCG and Development Limits. This follows on from the Inspector's Report for the Core Strategy Examination, which at paragraph 54 stated:



FS 29637

Registered in England  
Number: 0C342692

Barton Willmore LLP  
Registered Office:  
The Blade  
Abbey Square  
Reading  
RG1 3BC  
T/ +44 1011 8943 8003

**“The Council intends to undertake a review of the strategic gaps at SALP stage and acknowledges that adjustments could be made if part of a gap is required for development.”**

Therefore, in the interests of consistency and clarity, we would suggest that Objective 5 is amended to also include reference to the potential requirement to set new boundaries to SCG, if found to be needed.

### **Question 7 – Calculating the Amount of New Allocations**

In terms of the proposed base date, this will ultimately be determined by when the Plan is submitted and adopted and should ideally provide the most up to date position at the point of adoption. The timetable at Figure 3 of the document indicates, assuming there is no delay in the Plan’s preparation, that the Plan will be submitted in March 2016 with adoption in December 2016. It is therefore likely that a further year’s data will be available prior to the Plan being adopted.

Whilst we generally agree with the broad principles for the method of calculating the amount of new allocations required to be identified within the Plan, as recognised throughout the document and consistent with the Core Strategy following the findings of the Examination Inspector’s Report, for clarity Table 2 should acknowledge that the figures within Column E relating to the residual level of New Allocations required are minimum targets.

### **Question 8 - Overall Amount of New Housing Allocations**

Paragraph 3.17 of the document recognises that, in view of the Core Strategy requirement to provide at least 450 dwellings per annum, **“It is important that the Plan provides sufficient flexibility to deliver at least (our emphasis) the minimum targets over the plan period”**. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that in the context of plan-making, Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid changes. Paragraph 47 continues that authorities should seek to significantly boost the supply of housing, ensuring they meet the full, objectively assessed needs. It also continues by requiring authorities to set out a housing implementation strategy for the full range of housing, describing how they will maintain delivery of a five-year supply of housing land to meet their housing target.

As acknowledged at paragraphs 72-74 of the Inspector’s Report for the Core Strategy Examination, the scale of housing need was identified as being at least 450 dwellings per annum on the basis that the demographic and employment-led forecasts contained a degree of uncertainty meaning that it was difficult to predict with confidence the scale of future housing growth, particularly post-2021 which could potentially increase.

In the context of the above, we support the general principle of seeking to ‘over-allocate’ more than sufficient housing sites to meet the minimum requirement as it is imperative to the principles of sustainable development outlined in the NPPF and the PPG, that sufficient housing is delivered during the Plan period. In doing so, we firstly consider that a distinction needs to be made between adopting this approach to compensate for non-delivery/non-implementation and ensuring that more than the minimum housing requirement is actually delivered.

In terms of the method and scale of any allowance to take account of non-delivery, it is noted that a 10% non-delivery discount on expected contributions from planning permissions has been applied to the calculation of the five year land supply process, which as confirmed at paragraph 3.21 of the document, is consistent with the Core Strategy. As a starting point and for consistency, we would therefore suggest a similar 10% allowance is applied to the residual housing requirement, taking account of the Council’s acknowledgement at paragraph 3.18 of the document that whilst sites to be allocated will need to demonstrate they are deliverable, there is always the potential for changes to circumstances over the life of the Plan which mean some sites may not be delivered. In addition, to



FS 29637

Registered in England  
Number 0C342692Barton Wiltmore LLP  
Registered Office:  
The Blade  
Abbey Square  
Reading  
RG1 3BE  
F7 +44 (0)118 943 0001

ensure that the minimum requirement is exceeded, consideration should also be given to applying an additional 5-10% over and above the non-delivery allowance to provide sufficient flexibility to achieve a significant boost in the delivery of new homes within the District during the Plan period.

**Question 9 – Distributing the housing requirement between Designated Service Villages**

We do not agree that a simple percentage growth across all designated Service Villages (DSV) is a fair and appropriate starting point for deciding the split between DSVs, and consider other factors should also be taken into account.

As highlighted at paragraph 3.24 of the document, the Core Strategy has already set the framework for the approach and this should inform the starting point in the distribution of the housing requirement between individual DSVs. Of note is paragraph 4.19 of the Core Strategy which states in the context of Selby town, that in view of its close proximity with the adjoining villages of Barlby/Osgodby, Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby and the interdependent roles of these settlements, it is anticipated that these villages will fulfil a complementary role to that of Selby. This relationship is evidenced on the basis these particular DSVs are relatively more sustainable than other DSVs due to their size, the range of facilities available and because of their proximity to the wider range of services and employment opportunities available in Selby. Further acknowledgement of the complementary role of the 3 DSVs to Selby town is made within Policy SP2 of the adopted Core Strategy at Part A, bullet 3. This reflects the conclusions of the Inspector who examined the Core Strategy, noting at paragraph 46 of his report the following in respect of the role of these particular DSVs:

**"The Council intends that they should fulfil a complementary role to Selby in the spatial development strategy and acknowledges that they may have scope for providing significantly more development than the other DSVs"**

The above therefore clearly indicates that the framework within the adopted Core Strategy guiding the spatial distribution of housing between DSVs is required to acknowledge the particular role of the 3 DSVs highlighted, in that they are capable of sustainably accommodating a greater level of housing growth than the other DSVs.

A further factor to consider relates to the requirements of the NPPF (paragraph 55) to promote sustainable development in the rural areas, particularly housing growth that can enhance or maintain rural communities. This objective is also referred to at paragraph 4.27 of the Core Strategy in respect of delivering housing within the DSVs. In this regard, we refer to Table 3 of the document which identifies recent housing completions (2011-2014) and existing commitments by DSV. It is notable that 2 of the 3 DSVs referred to above (i.e. Barlby/Osgodby and Brayton), which are two of the most sustainable DSVs in the District, have completions and commitments totalling 14 and 6 dwellings respectively. In contrast, the corresponding figure for the third DSV of Thorpe Willoughby is 136 dwellings. Furthermore, less sustainable DSVs such as South Milford, Eggborough/Whitley and Ulleskelf have corresponding figures of 184, 73 and 58 dwellings respectively.

In light of the above findings, there is a case for taking account of these recent and committed developments when determining the distribution of the residual requirement to ensure that all DSVs benefit from a fair distribution of the housing growth to support sustainable development which supports rural communities across the District. Indeed, bullet 3 at paragraph 3.32 of the document appears to acknowledge this particular point as a factor that will be taken into account when the selection of housing allocations is determined.



Registered in England  
Number: DC342492  
Barton Wilmore LLP  
Registered Office:  
The Blade  
Abbey Square  
Reading  
RG1 3BE  
T/ +44 (0)118 943 8001

Finally, a further factor we consider should be taken into consideration is affordable housing need, and again this is an issue that requires consideration from guidance within the NPPF and adopted Core Strategy, the latter noting at paragraph 4.27 that 59% of the affordable housing need originates from outside the 3 main towns in the District. Indeed, this was an issue that was considered in the Site Allocations DPD (Preferred Options) when considering the distribution of the housing requirement between DSVs. Evidence of affordable housing need was taken from the SHMA, which identified need by sub areas within the District. The Site Allocations DPD used this evidence to adjust the proportion of housing to be directed to individual DSVs where the need for affordable housing was greatest.

#### **Question 10 – Criteria for Site Selection**

As stated, it is confirmed that the 'rules' for choosing sites for allocation within PLAN Selby have been set within the Core Strategy and should therefore be given equal weight in order to ensure development is delivered which satisfies the principles of sustainable development, as set out within the NPPF.

However, we make specific comments in relation to Flood Risk. Alongside the consultation on this document, the Council is also seeking comments on a draft SPD on Flood Risk and the application of the Sequential Test within the District. This particular document acknowledges that a revised approach to both the determination of planning applications and the assessment of new sites through PLAN Selby is required in view of the particular circumstances within the District.

Paragraph 2.5 of the draft SPD highlights that historically, key settlements have developed by rivers, meaning the despite the extent of areas of flood risk, some settlements – Selby Town in particular – possess existing services and facilities, infrastructure, and a population base of sufficient size to justify further growth to both sustain and strengthen the existing community. As such, it recognises a conflict between the application of the principles of development and flood risk, and other development principles which need to be balanced.

Paragraph 3.5 of the draft SPD also confirms that the Core Strategy has already established the settlements that the Council considers to be suitable for targeting growth, having regard to and weighing up all sustainability factors. Paragraph 3.7 continues by confirming that the Core Strategy establishes a mechanism for development in Selby town and the other settlements that in some cases cannot necessarily be accommodated on sites in Flood Zone 1. As such, it clarifies that flood risk has therefore been factored in to both the settlement hierarchy and in establishing the respective housing targets by balancing relative merits, an approach which has been found to be sound through the adoption of the Core Strategy.

Whilst we recognise that flood risk remains a potential constraint to development and that it will be necessary to continue to apply the Sequential Test, as acknowledged at paragraph 7.1 of the draft SPD, the Council recognises that in the circumstances of particular settlements within the District, this will need to be balanced with broader sustainability issues in order to achieve the most sustainable development patterns across the District, as recognised by both national policy and the adopted Core Strategy.

More detailed comments are being submitted separately to the Draft SPD on behalf of our client.

#### **Question 22 – Review of Development Limits**

On the basis that the Development Limits will be required to be adjusted to take account of any proposed housing allocations, we have no further comments on this matter at this stage.



FS 29637

Registered in England  
Number 00342692Barton Wiltmore LLP  
Registered Office:  
The Blade  
Abbey Square  
Reading  
RG1 2BE  
E: [enquiries@bartonwiltmore.com](mailto:enquiries@bartonwiltmore.com)  
F: +44 (0)118 943 0001



### Question 23 – Strategic Countryside Gaps

We consider that it is appropriate that the existing SCG boundaries are reviewed and note and support the Council's intention to do so through the preparation of a study which will be subject to separate consultation at the appropriate time. In respect of the review of SCGs, this approach is consistent with the findings of the Core Strategy Inspector, who noted at paragraph 54 of his report that:

**"The Council intends to undertake a review of the strategic gaps at SALP stage and acknowledges that adjustments could be made if part of the gap is required for development. This would allow the merits of retaining strategic gaps to be factored into consideration of the flood risk, sustainability and other matters relevant to the allocation of land in the wider Selby area".**

This intention to review the SCGs is followed through into the Core Strategy (Paragraph 5.30). Whilst we acknowledge the importance of the SCGs in preventing the coalescence of Selby urban area with the 3 nearby DSVs in order to protect the separate identity of the village communities, we agree with the Council that there is scope to review the existing boundaries to identify land for development without compromising the integrity of such gaps, particularly in respect of the SCG between Selby town and Brayton. We intend to provide further comments with associated evidence in this respect when the relevant study is published for consultation.

### Question 38 – How should Selby grow and develop?

Clearly, the adopted Core Strategy sets out the spatial development strategy to inform how the specific housing requirements for Selby town are to be achieved, with Policy SP2 confirming that Selby, as the Principal Town, will be the focus for new housing development. Part B of the policy notes that in allocating land for development in Selby and the other settlements through the Site Allocations Local Plan, a 'sequential approach' (in respect of a preference for previously developed land and buildings first) will be applied, and where appropriate, this will form part of the NPPF Sequential Test in order to direct development to areas with the lowest flood risk.

Policy SP5 provides further guidance on how the residual requirement for the town is to be accommodated through subsequent allocations. Alongside the strategic allocation at Olympia Park, Part C of the policy states that smaller scale sites both within and/or adjacent to the boundary of the Contiguous Urban Area of Selby are to be allocated, as defined on Map 5.

In the context of Selby town, and with reference to the issues raised in the separate consultation on the Draft SPD highlighted earlier in this response, it is clear that the constraint imposed by flood risk will be a key determining factor in how the town grows and develops in future years. As there is no available land within or immediately adjacent to the Contiguous Urban Area of Selby that is within Flood Zone 1, it is evident that new housing allocations will need to take place on land at greater risk of flooding. As large areas within and adjacent to the town are within Flood Zone 3, in sequential terms, priority will therefore need to be given to land within Flood Zone 2. As highlighted earlier, this approach is acknowledged by the Core Strategy in adopting the particular housing requirement for the town, as found sound by the Inspector.

### Question 43 – How should Brayton grow and develop?

As highlighted earlier in response to Question 9, paragraph 4.19 of the Core Strategy acknowledges that in view of Selby town's close proximity with the adjoining villages of Barby/Osgodby, Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby and the interdependent roles of these settlements, it is anticipated that these villages will fulfil a complementary role to that of Selby. This role is noted because Brayton, as one of the three identified DSVs, is relatively more sustainable than other DSVs due to its size,



Registered in England  
Number: 0C342492

Barton Willmore LLP  
Registered Office:  
The Blade  
Abbey Square  
Reading  
RG1 3BE  
T/ +44 (0)118 943 0001

the range of facilities available and because of its proximity to the wider range of services and employment opportunities available in Selby. This role is further acknowledged within Policy SP2 of the adopted Core Strategy at Part A, bullet 3, and reflects the conclusions of the Core Strategy Inspector, indicating Brayton has scope to provide significantly more development than those DSVs which do not have the ability to complement the growth of Selby town.

Again as highlighted earlier in response to Question 23, whilst land to the north of the village is located within the Strategic Countryside Gap, in recognising the growth potential of Brayton the Core Strategy acknowledges that adjustments to its boundary could be made if part of the gap is required to accommodate development. As confirmed by the Core Strategy Inspector, this, alongside the consideration of flood risk, sustainability and other matters relevant to the allocation of land in the wider Selby area will need to be factored in when determining the most appropriate sites to be identified.

In terms of what else could be allocated to meet the needs of Brayton, we understand through on-going dialogue with the Parish Council, that there is an identified need to expand existing community leisure/recreational facilities within the village. As detailed within previous submissions, the Church Commissioners own land which lies immediately adjacent to the existing Community Centre and associated facilities at Brackenhill Lane/Foxhill Lane, capable of providing additional land to secure its expansion to meet these identified needs. The benefits of this as part of a mixed use proposal to also include new housing within our client's wider land holding were recognised through a draft allocation in the previous Site Allocations DPD Preferred Options document (BRAY014/015/016). The Church Commissioners remain committed to the principle of a mixed use allocation as detailed.

We trust that you will take our comments into consideration but if you do have any questions or would like to discuss any of the issues in further detail, please do not hesitate to contact me. Otherwise, we look forward to notification of future consultation events in relation to the preparation of Plan Selby.

Yours faithfully,

**DAN HATCHER**  
Associate

Enc.

cc John Weir – Church Commissioners



FS 29637

Registered in England  
Number 0C342692

Barton Wiltmore LLP  
Registered Office:  
The Blarke  
Abbey Square  
Reading  
RG1 2BE  
P: +44 (0)118 943 0001