

Sophie King

From: Graham Rawlings
Sent: 19 January 2015 10:11
To: LDF
Subject: PLAN Selby consultation
Attachments: FINAL_PLANSELBY_Online_PDF_Rep_Form_Completed.pdf

Please find attached the response of Burn Community Group to PLAN Selby.

Kind regards

 Graham Rawlings



**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 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	Graham Rawlings	
Address		
Postcode		
Telephone no.		
Email address		

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	Chapter 1		
Question no.	Q1	Paragraph	

Please let us have your comments on the objectives and approach of the 2014 Sustainability Appraisal?

On page 52 of the earlier 2010 Final Sustainability Appraisal (also by Waterman for the Core Strategy) the Council was said to support the ultimately unsuccessful ESS proposal at Burn airfield "as an exception to the locational principles". These principles, embedded in the Core Strategy direct that employment should predominantly be distributed in Selby, Tadcaster and Sherburn with smaller development in the then 17 (now 18) Designated Service Villages.

We have extremely serious reservations about the proposal to use Burn airfield for development (even in the next plan period) particularly against, for example, SA objective 10.1 *Will it reduce the need to travel by increasing access to key resources and services by means other than the car (e.g. by locating employment, health care, education and other amenities in close proximity to residents and improving public transport)?*

We agree with the objective but, like Waterman (and SDC/NYCC and the Planning Inspectorate), we note the site does not meet the locational principles of the Core Strategy.

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

Topic / Chapter	Chapter 1		
Question no.	Q4	Paragraph	

Please let us have your comments on the planned approach to ensuring PLAN Selby is positively prepared.

The approach is lacking in proper consultation. In publicity for PLAN Selby, the Council say it will help them to make decisions about where growth and development can happen across the district. But SDC is acquiring the largest development site in the district (and possibly in the north of England) adjoining the development limits of Burn, a small Secondary Village but unlike the DSVs there is no opportunity for Burn residents to be consulted and in any case, the decision has already been made. This decision to safeguard a strategic site with housing, employment, retail and leisure uses has massive implications for Burn and the wider district but there has been no planning, engagement or consultation about it.

Far from consulting and engaging with residents, two reports about the reasons for purchase from 2013 were actually withheld on the grounds that they contained "*future policy development*". So we appear to be involved in a process that works like this - first take decisions (acquire land), then secretly prepare policy and finally consult everyone other than those most affected. This is a travesty of what should happen in a sound and positively prepared plan. It is inconceivable that having spent £1.7m the airfield will not be developed in some way.

Effectively, other towns and villages will have the chance to influence the way their communities develop while Burn, whose transformation will be the greatest of all Secondary Villages (and more even than the DSVs!), has not been consulted in any way. This goes directly to questions of PLAN Selby's soundness.

(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	Topic 1/Chapter 3 - Housing Allocations		
Question no.	Q7 (b)	Paragraph	

Do you agree with the broad principles of the calculation method?

We agree with the broad principles of housing allocation. SDC have said (see minutes of Council meeting 29th April 2014) that Burn airfield is being purchased to help meet "*future housing development targets for the next development plan period*"

With 220 Ha (representing 5-6000 dwellings) available this could mean a dramatic increase in housing for Burn after 2027. It will represent a huge reversal of planning policy with a substantial amount of housing development on a Greenfield, open countryside site with (presumably) a reduction in housing allocations in the principal settlements. Is this what is anticipated?

Policy SP4 in the CS is to provide "clarity" in managing residential development in different settlement types, "relaxing" it in Designated Service Villages (DSVs) and "restricting" it to infill in Secondary Villages to stop "*unacceptable amounts of housing [being] provided in smaller, less sustainable settlements reducing the need for planned allocations of land where the maximum community benefit can be secured*". SDC will be doing, after 2027 perhaps, exactly what policy SP4 is designed to prevent. Does this seem right?

Continued in separate sheet

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

Topic / Chapter	Topic 1/Chapter 3 – Travellers		
Question no.	Q14 (a)	Paragraph	

Should the Council develop a more detailed local policy that sets out more specifically the criteria when determining planning applications [for traveller sites]?

The draft Core Strategy in 2013 actually had criteria based policies for traveller sites but Mr Pike, the inspector said, in his final report (paragraph 108): "*The Council has chosen to delete these from the modified plan [now the Core Strategy] on the basis that detailed criteria are provided in PPTS and there is no need to repeat unnecessary detail in the plan. In so doing the Council has foregone an opportunity to impose its own local requirements for gypsy and traveller sites and will be obliged to accept without question any future changes to national policy*". Having foregone an opportunity and deleted the earlier criteria because there was no need, SDC are now asking if more criteria are required. This does not seem to be an entirely coherent process.

Government already produces a great deal of guidance including excellent advice on size and locations, in the PPFTS and Designing Gypsy Sites - A Good Practice Guide 2008. However, while there is no objection in principle to adding further refinements, these should work in tandem with existing guidelines and not be in opposition to them. Also, SDC have said publicly that they will only submit planning applications where there is a willing landowner See SDC CEO letter to HCA dated 14 January 2014. In fact the previous draft of the SAPP (see executive agenda 6th Nov 2014) had the following specifically in paragraph 3.60 although it has now been inexplicably removed:

"The Council can realistically only consider potential sites where there is land owner agreement to develop".

Continued on separate sheet

(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.

This response is being completed on behalf of Burn Community Group (BCG). Our full response to all the questions we believe relate to Burn are set out on the attached sheets.

Note:

There is a problem with the formatting of the telephone number box in this form and it does not permit a number to be entered correctly

(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

Graham Rawlings

Dated

January 19th 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

BURN COMMUNITY GROUP (BCG) RESPONSE TO 2014 SAPP CONSULTATION

BCG does not claim to represent the entire village of Burn but we are representative of a cross section of villagers. No doubt there will be a range of opinions but set out below is our response to the 2014 draft SAPP consultation. We hope that Selby District Council (SDC) will be able to take account of our views.

The most significant issue for Burn is the proposed purchase of a 220 Ha strategic site at Burn airfield by SDC. No announcement has yet been made about the purchase but tenants have been informed that all approvals have been obtained and we assume it will be confirmed sometime early in 2015. Hence, our response is written with this uppermost in our mind.

Executive Summary

Burn is a secondary village, one of the very smallest, in a group of settlements in Selby, which are categorised in the 2013 Core Strategy Glossary as "*not considered capable of accommodating planned growth other than small-scale affordable housing*". For many people in Burn this is one of, even perhaps its main attraction. A huge 220Ha strategic site adjoining the development limits of Burn will not simply change Burn, but utterly transform it. We are not being consulted here about a *proposed* development. SDC have already acquired the site subject to contract, the first stage in its certain future development.

The "*early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods*" talked about in paragraph 155 of the NPPF does not seem to apply in Burn. Villages with less than three houses per year planned are being asked about the way they want to see their communities develop *before* decisions are made while Burn, facing the largest development of all, is not. If the objective is to engage in speculative activities as now permitted by the Localism Act 2011, it looks as if Burn will pay a high price by being altered into a substantially larger, more urbanised and industrial village, far from its rural beginnings, contrary to both national and local planning principles and the wishes of the majority of residents. This is happening without any consultation whatsoever.

Officially, the site is described as *remote, inappropriate for employment use, open countryside with a high sensitivity to any development, 98% Greenfield and 87% grade 2 agricultural land and 70% flood zone 3b*. SDC have purchased the site knowing that it does not meet any of the locational principles in the Core Strategy. This does not make sense to us.

The central aim of the NPPF is to minimise travel and reduce pollution. The Spatial Development Strategy set out in policies SP2 and SP4 is designed to achieve this by focusing the majority of development on Selby, Tadcaster, and Sherburn and to a lesser extent on the 18 DSVs. A very large strategic site adjoining a secondary village like Burn to satisfy housing and employment growth as well as provide shopping and leisure facilities will attract investment away from the principal town.

In 2013 the CS inspector Martin Pike said this in his final report:

"About two-thirds of the population lives in the rural parts of the District, where most of the recent growth has taken place. The spatial development strategy seeks to reverse this trend by directing the majority of future development to Selby" And:

"Because of its relatively isolated location, the notion that development at the airbase [Church Fenton in this case] would help support facilities in these other villages would simply be compounding the unsustainable pattern of development that has been prevalent in much of the District in the recent past".

So, the remedy to the very problem that the Core Strategy is intended to address is now being undermined. This approach will require another policy reversal so that we continue the unsustainable course we were set on before the Core Strategy and it makes no sense in planning terms. When an Eco-town was proposed on Burn airfield in 2008, SDC opposed it saying, "*we really feel that an eco town on a greenfield site within the Selby district would not*

have met the Council's priorities of delivering a clean, green and healthy environment and championing a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions".

Selby District Council are now proposing that which it previously voted against by a majority of 28:1 but with neither evidence, policy support, consultation or indeed, money. After concluding in the last SADPD in 2011 that "*an allocation [at Burn airfield] is unnecessary or inappropriate*" SDC are now borrowing £1.7m to purchase it for development. The Core Strategy and the SAPP policies should work harmoniously together but for Burn airfield the site will have to be treated as an exception, and quite unnecessarily so.

Our responses to questions that we feel impact Burn are submitted on the official form and where necessary continued as set out below:

Topic/Chapter	Chapter 1	
Question No	Q1	Paragraph
Please let us have your comments on the objectives and approach of the 2014 Sustainability Appraisal?		

On page 52 of the earlier 2010 Final Sustainability Appraisal (also by Waterman for the Core Strategy) the Council was said to support the ultimately unsuccessful ESS proposal at Burn airfield "*as an exception to the locational principles*". These principles, embedded in the Core Strategy direct that employment should predominantly be distributed in Selby, Tadcaster and Sherburn with smaller development in the then 17 (now 18) Designated Service Villages.

We have extremely serious reservations about the proposal to use Burn airfield for development (even in the next plan period) particularly against, for example, SA objective 10.1 *Will it reduce the need to travel by increasing access to key resources and services by means other than the car (e.g. by locating employment, health care, education and other amenities in close proximity to residents and improving public transport)?*

We agree with the objective but, like Waterman (and SDC/NYCC and the Planning Inspectorate), we note the site does not meet the locational principles of the Core Strategy.

Topic/Chapter	Chapter 1	
Question No	Q4	Paragraph
Please let us have your comments on the planned approach to ensuring PLAN Selby is positively prepared.		

The approach is lacking in proper consultation. In publicity for PLAN Selby, the Council say it will help them to make decisions about where growth and development can happen across the district. But SDC is acquiring the largest development site in the district (and possibly in the north of England) adjoining the development limits of Burn, a small Secondary Village but unlike the DSVs there is no opportunity for Burn residents to be consulted and in any case, the decision has already been made. This decision to safeguard a strategic site with housing, employment, retail and leisure uses has massive implications for Burn and the wider district but there has been no planning, engagement or consultation about it.

Far from consulting and engaging with residents, two reports about the reasons for purchase from 2013 were actually withheld on the grounds that they contained "*future policy development*". So we appear to be involved in a process that works like this - first take decisions (acquire land), then secretly prepare policy and finally consult everyone other than those most affected. This is a travesty of what should happen in a sound and positively

prepared plan. It is inconceivable that having spent £1.7m the airfield will not be developed in some way.

Effectively, other towns and villages will have the chance to influence the way their communities develop while Burn, whose transformation will be the greatest of all Secondary Villages (and more even than the DSVs!), has not been consulted in any way. This goes directly to questions of PLAN Selby's soundness.

Topic/Chapter	Topic 1/Chapter 3 - Housing Allocations	
Question No	Q7 (b)	Paragraph
Do you agree with the broad principles of the calculation method?		

We agree with the broad principles of housing allocation. SDC have said (see minutes of Council meeting 29th April 2014) that Burn airfield is being purchased to help meet "future housing development targets for the next development plan period"¹.

With 220 Ha (representing 5-6000 dwellings) available this could mean a dramatic increase in housing for Burn after 2027. It will represent a huge reversal of planning policy with a substantial amount of housing development on a Greenfield, open countryside site with (presumably) a reduction in housing allocations in the principal settlements. Is this what is anticipated?

Policy SP4 in the CS is to provide "clarity" in managing residential development in different settlement types, "relaxing" it in Designated Service Villages (DSVs) and "restricting" it to infill in Secondary Villages to stop "**unacceptable amounts of housing [being] provided in smaller, less sustainable settlements reducing the need for planned allocations of land where the maximum community benefit can be secured**"². SDC will be doing, after 2027 perhaps, exactly what policy SP4 is designed to prevent. Does this seem right?

The Burn airfield site is described in the last Site Allocations Development Plan Document (SADPD) in September 2011 as "*not related to the principle [sic] town, local service centres or designated service villages*" and "*an allocation is unnecessary or inappropriate*". In other CS documents it is described as "*remote*" and "*poorly related to the existing pattern of development*". It may be that we have overlooked some crucial information but we see no public document indicating either need or policy support for any development at or on Burn airfield in this present plan or indeed the next one.

At present there is controversy concerning SDC's lack of a 5 year housing land supply and proposals to build houses on Greenfield sites in Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby. The Council is vigorously opposed and yet table 4 on page 25 of the draft SAPP shows both villages as DSVs where the plan is calling for 204 and 108 houses respectively up to 2027. It is hard to reconcile SDC's opposition to housing on Greenfield land at Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby, where it is planned to be, with their purchase of a Greenfield site in Burn for housing where it is not. This does not make any sense.

¹ [Council minutes 29th April 2014 item 93](#)

² [Cores Strategy paragraph 4.56](#)

Topic/Chapter	Topic 1/Chapter 3 – Travellers	
Question No	Q14 (a)	Paragraph
<p>Should the Council develop a more detailed local policy that sets out more specifically the criteria when determining planning applications [for traveller sites]?</p>		

The draft Core Strategy in 2013 actually had criteria based policies for traveller sites but Mr Pike, the inspector said, in his final report (paragraph 108): *"The Council has chosen to delete these from the modified plan [now the Core Strategy] on the basis that detailed criteria are provided in PPTS and there is no need to repeat unnecessary detail in the plan. In so doing the Council has foregone an opportunity to impose its own local requirements for gypsy and traveller sites and will be obliged to accept without question any future changes to national policy"*

Having foregone an opportunity and deleted the earlier criteria because there was no need, SDC are now asking if more criteria are required. This does not seem to be an entirely coherent process.

Government already produces a great deal of guidance including excellent advice on size and locations, in the PPTS and Designing Gypsy Sites – A Good Practice Guide 2008. However, while there is no objection in principle to adding further refinements, these should work in tandem with existing guidelines and not be in opposition to them. Also, SDC have said publicly that they will only submit planning applications where there is a willing landowner³. In fact the previous draft of the SAPP (see executive agenda 6th Nov 2014) had the following specifically in paragraph 3.60 although it has now been inexplicably removed:

"The Council can realistically only consider potential sites where there is land owner agreement to develop".

We have no reason to believe it has actually been dropped or that all other (overt) policies will not be subordinated to it as before. In 2011 it was this specific issue that caused all of the then 60 potential sites to be dropped. If this criterion is retained and as a consequence no sites that meet any of criteria in the TNA or in national or local policy for example, come forward with landowner agreement, the search will move to areas outside the broad locations and which perhaps do not meet any other criteria. Does it seem a reasonable approach? We suggest not and it may well leave the Council open to criticism when the SAPP comes to an examination in public or even a legal challenge to any identified site in future.

Unlike other policies and guidance, in the TNA, PPTS and DGS where guidance is often preceded by the word "should" indicating a recommendation or advice rather than a definite instruction, the now unwritten SAPP policy on landowner agreement is more rigid and allows no flexibility. We see absolutely nothing in government policy or guidance, which requires a local authority with compulsory purchase powers to introduce such a requirement so it is not clear what the criterion is intended to achieve. Any additional soft criteria that may be added to the SAPP for guidance will almost certainly be superfluous if landowner agreement is mandatory before a site is allocated. If this really is the main criterion it should be made perfectly clear and explicit as it was in the SADPD of 2011 (page 48).

We note also that among the considerations for assessing traveller site planning applications are the scale of sites compared to the nearest settled community and the existing level of local provision. We hope that the "scale" will be related to populations and not to the physical size of amenity buildings as the Council has previously claimed (see 2013/0565/FUL).

³ See SDC CEO letter to HCA dated 14 January 2014

Topic/Chapter	Topic 2/Chapter 3 – Promoting Prosperity	
Question No	Q16	Paragraph

In the Selby District Local Plan, all Employment Allocations were considered suitable for all types of employment use (B1, B2 and B8). However in the light of the different roles of each of the towns, should PLAN Selby consider a different approach, for example being more specific about the types of employment uses on particular sites?

We believe PLAN Selby should be more specific about different employment sites. It was necessary to be highly specific for the ESS at Burn airfield which was approved in principle in 2006 but the officer's report said, "*It is considered however that the outline consent should be carefully restricted so as to prevent the uses of the site being available for any research and development proposal should we not be successful in getting ESS on the site*". And in his recommendations:

"This permission shall relate only to a science and research facility together with ancillary facilities and services and no other use within Class B1 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 or any subsequent order. Reason: The site is not considered acceptable for any other use within class B1 because of its location".

Even to use the site for any other *research* purpose under class B1 would have required the applicant to demonstrate there was no other possible allocated site within Selby or adjoining districts (condition 04) an area of some 5300 square Kilometres including the metropolitan districts of Leeds, Wakefield and Doncaster as well as the East Riding.

NYCC when consulted on the ESS application at the time said, Burn airfield should "*not be granted permission for general science research and development or other employment land*" since this would "*harm the development plan*". This is surely an acknowledgement that the county planners realised just how unsuitable the site is for employment and housing. They also said this:

"The County Council is concerned that a permission for general research and development in this location would prove difficult to substantiate given the harm to the development plan detailed above and would therefore be insufficient to prevent pressure from alternative employment uses in the future especially offices. Moreover, once developed there may be pressure to expand the site in the future into the open countryside" and "The small hamlet of Burn adjacent to the site would be unlikely to support even minor development". It was also their view that, "in the absence of the ESS the site would be inappropriate for employment use".

Presumably whatever use the airfield is put to in future, it will again have to be treated as an *exception to the locational principles* in the CS. So, the position now is the reverse of that in 2005. Previously it was necessary to compromise on the locational principles *because* of a highly specific development, now it is necessary to *find* a highly specific development so that these same principles will *need* to be compromised in future. This instinctively seems wrong?

SDC are borrowing £1.7m "*safeguarding*" for "*all local plans purposes*" a site that it considered unacceptable for "*any other use within class B1 because of its location*". This is an example of sites being granted approval for one very specific and narrow use in one use class, being then proposed for every possible use class in the TCPA. Therefore we believe it would be useful for the SAPP to be more specific about the types of employment use, particularly for very large sites adjoining Secondary villages.

Topic/Chapter	Topic 1/Chapter 3 – Promoting Prosperity	
Question No	Q17	Paragraph
What should the approach to employment land be in the rural areas, including the Designated Service Villages?		

The Core Strategy suggests 5Ha of employment land in total is to be allocated to all of the rural areas including Eggborough and the A19 corridor. Specific research and development sites are required to be along the A19 north of Selby (CS paragraph 6.31).

So, it is not clear what the purpose of 220 Ha at Burn airfield, even in the next local plan period would be in this context. If even partially developed, Burn airfield would then cease to be a rural area, becoming urbanised and industrialised contrary to most of the Core Strategy policies. Employment land in rural areas should try to retain the essential character of the area and not be "out of scale and poorly related" as SDC's own Background paper 10 suggests that any development of Burn airfield would be.

Topic/Chapter	Topic 1/Chapter 3 – Promoting Prosperity	
Question No	Q19	Paragraph
Within the rural area do we need any special policies or designations for any of the particular rural sites in the District and to support the rural economy? For example: Drax and Eggborough power stations, the former mine sites and former airfields		

It is noted that the September 2014 draft of the Waterman Sustainability Appraisal contained "Burn airfield" specifically in this question. In the final November 2014 SA document this has for some reason been changed to "former airfields" so we assume it still covers Burn airfield although not specifically named.

The firm opinion of Burn Community Group is that the airfields should not be grouped with the former mine sites or power stations. These are all heavy industrial sites whereas the airfields are quite different and have in effect returned to nature or provide an agricultural or community amenity. Burn airfield, nearly 90% grade 2 agricultural land, certainly should not be allocated housing or employment land in this or the next plan period for all of the reasons given in this response.

It may be that the former mine sites, with rail and power connections, offer an opportunity to be redeveloped as a means of regeneration but they are not comparable with the former airfields, particularly Burn that even SDC acknowledges is a Greenfield site. We do not believe the development of Burn airfield as a strategic site with housing and employment complies with any known local or national policy. In fact the 2005 SDLP inspector said this about an attempt to include 0.65Ha inside Burn's development limits:

*"I see no justification to allow such a possibility in this small village. It would be **contrary to the council's strategy, to the principle of sustainable development and to the guidance in PPG3 to extend the development limits and therefore attract such a large amount of housing land** [0.65Ha] to such a small settlement [Burn] rather than to a market town or service village"⁴.*

Burn airfield is more than 340 times the amount of land the inspector referred to in his report.

⁴ [Selby District Local Plan Inquiry 2002 Inspector's Report paragraph 14.228](#)

Topic/Chapter	Topic 2/Chapter 3 – Promoting Prosperity	
---------------	--	--

Question No

Q21 (a)

Paragraph

Are there any such areas that should be safeguarded, allocated or designated to restrict or promote development?

One of the objectives set out in SDC report C/13/23 of 29th April 2014 concerning the purchase of the airfield was to safeguard it as a strategic site and protect the possible route of a bypass for Burn. We asked if this could be done by policy means rather than purchase to save £1.7m but were advised that it could not. However, we now note that among the SDLP "saved" policies are T5 and T5a, which are as follows:

T5 The District Council will safeguard the route corridors for the A63 Hambleton and Monk Fryston bypasses, as defined on the proposals map, by refusing proposals for development, which would compromise implementation of the scheme.

T5A The District Council will safeguard the preferred route corridor for the Osgodby bypass as defined on the proposals map, by refusing proposals for development, which would compromise the scheme.

So, it is not clear if the safeguarding in Q21 (a) is to be by *purchasing* land as has been done at Burn or simply by *policy* means. Using something akin to T5 would have achieved every single objective set out in report C/13/23 on Burn airfield at zero cost to the local taxpayer and with none the attendant risks set out in the earlier secret report of 21st November 2013. SDC seem, on the surface at least, to have spent £1.75m on something that could have been done for nothing. If we are wrong on this, then policies T5 and T5a are effectively redundant and there is no protection for the other proposed bypasses involved but more importantly for the taxpayer any suggestion of further safeguarding or protection would have to be by land purchase. If so, it should be made explicit since the costs are likely to be substantial.

Topic/Chapter	Topic 3/Chapter 3 – Defining Areas	
---------------	------------------------------------	--

Question No

Q24

Paragraph

How should PLAN Selby determine how much Safeguarded Land should be designated for potential future use?

This is a surprising question. SDC have already acquired Burn airfield (or are about to do so) to safeguard it and designate it for future use. The airfield is 220Ha capable of accepting perhaps 5-6000 houses at 35 dwellings per hectare. This is sufficient land for all the housing needed up to 2027 (the actual number required is 5340).

The total employment land required in the Core Strategy is 37-52 Ha (say 45Ha \pm 7) and so the airfield is about 5 times the total employment land for the whole district.

PLAN Selby should determine the amount of safeguarded land by using a proper evidence base, by consultations (like this one), by carefully analysing the need and finally, perhaps most importantly by looking at competing demand. Unless there is a serious competing demand safeguarding is simply not required. None of this was applied to Burn airfield, which is mainly agricultural land with no competing demand whatsoever, but it has been purchased to safeguard it, at a cost of £1.75m in preference to using a simple policy although what it is being safeguarded from is not obvious.

In any case, it appears we are being consulted *after* the decision has already been taken and our responses are immaterial.

Topic/Chapter	Topic 5/Chapter 3 – Climate Change	
Question No	Q26 (d)	Paragraph
<p>Is it necessary for PLAN Selby to consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low-carbon schemes by technology? e.g. wind, solar, hydro?</p>		

Britain has nine (9) coal fired power stations with two of these (Drax and Eggborough) being located in the district with a third (Ferrybridge) located very close to the western border. All nine plants are listed in the Dirty Thirty, the 30 most polluting power plants in the EU according to data published by CAN (Climate Action Network). The three local plants collectively produce 40 million tonnes of CO₂ emissions annually or 40% of the UK total from coal powered stations. This should be borne in mind when considering policies for climate change and renewable energy.

The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) contains this in paragraph 4.2.1, which stems from EU Directive 2011/92/EU as later amended by Directive 2014/52/EU:

*The Directive requires an assessment of the likely significant effects of the proposed project on the environment, covering the direct effects and any indirect, secondary, **cumulative**, short, medium and long-term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects at all stages of the project, and also of the measures envisaged for avoiding or mitigating significant adverse effects.*

Energy from waste

For forty years three very large coal fired power stations have negatively impacted the district's environment. Ferrybridge power station and Kellingley colliery have both had recent approval (I believe) for waste incineration plants further adding to this impact.

Surely, the cumulative effect of these installations must be considered to be enough. We have made a more than reasonable contribution to the nations energy security and we should not be asked to take any more fossil fuel or waste powered energy generation.

On shore wind turbines

Michael Fallon MP, the former Energy Minister announced in April 2014 that if the next government is a conservative one there would be an effective moratorium within 6 months of the election to curtail further large scale onshore wind turbines. Subsidies for these developments will be scrapped.

The announcement was on the basis that there is sufficient numbers of onshore turbines (4000 existing and a further 3000 with planning permission).

We do not believe therefore, that there is a need to identify suitable areas for wind farm use.

Topic/Chapter	Chapter 4 – Development Management Policies	
Question No	Q34 (b) (c)	Paragraph
<p>Should PLAN Selby have a more restrictive policy against the loss of rural community facilities? What could the tests be?</p>		

The loss of Burn airfield for recreational use will be a setback for Burn Gliding Club, for walkers and cyclists using the Pennine trail and for local dog owners. It seems slightly odd for SDC to ask if a more restrictive policy is needed against the loss of rural community facilities

when it is the Council itself that is proposing to remove Burn airfield as a community facility. The site has been subject to four applications to register parts of the site as Community Assets. Of these, one has been approved (runways and associated club buildings), the other three are still under consideration by SDC.

Burn Gliding Club already attracts tourism but this will be lost to the district if the airfield is developed for housing and employment. Thus the need for tourist accommodation (see Q34c) will be *reduced* rather than promoted. Gliding could be seen as amenity open space, outdoor sports and recreation⁵ as described in the technical guidance to the NPPF and is a "water compatible" activity ideal for the airfield which is 70% flood zone 3.

Church Fenton airbase is virtually all flood zone 1 but was sold to continue with flying operations while Burn airfield, 70% flood zone 3 is being "safeguarded" for housing and employment. Again, does this seem entirely rational?

Topic/Chapter	Chapter 4 – Development Management Policies	
Question No	Q35	Paragraph
What policies should PLAN Selby include to manage development in the countryside?		

The Plan seeks comments about development in the countryside covering replacement dwellings, farm diversification, reuse of buildings, appropriate scale, form and character, etc. This is already covered by CS Policy SP4A (c) and is set out in paragraph 4.31 which contains this:

"The Council will resist new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside; or where such development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets; or where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting; or the exceptional quality or innovative nature of the design of the dwelling (tested against the NPPF paragraph 55 and other future local policy or design code)".

The purchase and proposed use of 220Ha of land in Burn outside the village development limits seems to contradict SP4 in every respect. Why purchase a Strategic Development Site for housing in the countryside only to resist building isolated new Homes on it? This does not make sense but we fear the Council will find it irresistible. If the Council believes "*further development management policies*" are needed surely it would be better if they worked with the grain of the existing CS and NPPF policies to provide coherence rather than being contrary to them? Sensible planning decisions that are not liable to costly legal challenge may be difficult if policies are in apparent opposition to each other leaving decisions in the balance and without any clear principles?

Topic/Chapter	Chapter 4 – Development Management Policies	
Question No	Q36	Paragraph
		4.23
How should the Council view large previously-developed sites in the countryside?		

The draft SAPP does not define which sites are being referenced here but we strongly suspect Burn airfield will be included since it is already bracketed with other PDL sites like the

⁵ [Technical guidance to the NPPF Table 2 page 6](#)

former mines (see Q19 above). The "airfields" are also mentioned in paragraph 4.23 of this section. Firstly, it is necessary to be clear about what is PDL. We note the Glossary on page 99 of the SAPP consultation includes a very brief definition of Brownfield Sites but not PDL.

The NPPF Glossary fully explains PDL and includes:

"Land, which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. This excludes [...] land that was previously-developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape in the process of time".

So, according to this definition Burn airfield is not PDL and in this sense does not require the Council to take a view. Also, paragraph 4.23 describes sites that are in "various states of dereliction". Burn airfield is not derelict. It is 87% grade 2 agricultural land and the Gliding Club would, I understand, be very willing to invest in the runways if they were able to purchase the freehold that SDC have prevented.

The last SADPD Preferred Options of 2011 (i.e. after the first round of consultations) also had a topic on airfields (Issue K). This looked at all 5 wartime airfields in the district, Church Fenton, Sherburn, Riccall, Burn and Acaster Malbis.

The preferred option in 2011 was for Riccall and Acaster to be allowed to return to nature, Sherburn and Burn were to continue with flying club operations (and agriculture in the case of Burn) and there was said to be "limited support for housing or a specialist industry on the site at Church Fenton". No allocations were proposed on any of the 5 airfields. Since then Church Fenton Airbase (CFA) has been sold to continue flying operations and had 65 houses approved against the EIP inspector's recommendation while SDC is proposing to purchase Burn airfield for a "future strategic site". This seems to cast doubt on the value of these consultation exercises since the actions that followed are in conflict with the conclusions. It is not at all clear what actually prompted the change since there has been no further consultation until now.

Topic/Chapter	Chapter 4 – Development Management Policies	
Question No	Q37	Paragraph
<p>a) Which SDLP Policies are suitable for continued use in PLAN Selby? b) Which are completely out of date, or no longer necessary? c) Could any be updated or amended for use in the PLAN Selby? How can they be brought up to date?</p>		

We note the policies T5 and T5a are extant policies covering two bypasses:

T5 *The District Council will safeguard the route corridors for the A63 Hambleton and Monk Fryston bypasses, as defined on the proposals map, by refusing proposals for development, which would compromise implementation of the scheme.*

T5A *The District Council will safeguard the preferred route corridor for the Osgodby bypass as defined on the proposals map, by refusing proposals for development, which would compromise the scheme.*

We believe these could be extended to provide a policy T5B with wording along these lines:

T5B *The District Council will safeguard the preferred route corridor for the Burn bypass as defined on the proposals map, and for the strategic site at Burn airfield by refusing proposals for development, which would compromise the scheme.*

This would deliver every objective as set out in report C/13/23 with no cost to the local taxpayer, saving a £1.75m increase in debt and around £90,000 net annual cost of debt

interest. Moreover, all of the risks set out in the secret 21st November 2013 report would be avoided. It is in many ways the perfect solution, no cost, all of the objectives secured without any risk.

SDLP saved policy EMP2 has been superseded by SP2 and SP13 and is out of date.

SDLP saved policy EMP5 should be retained to prevent non-conforming industrial/business uses which are likely to create conditions prejudicial to highway safety or which would have a significant adverse effect on local amenity being developed.

SDLP saved policy EMP9 concerning industrial and business uses outside development limits and established employment areas should be retained to prevent development that has a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, or results in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grade 2 for example).

Topic/Chapter	Chapter 5 – Settlements	
Question No	Q38 – Q55	Paragraph

a) How should [your settlement] grow and develop – what could a vision say? b) What else is needed in [your settlement] that could be allocated a site

This series of questions is addressed to the principal town, the two local service centres at Tadcaster and Sherburn and the eighteen designated service villages (DSVs).

None of the Secondary Villages, including Burn are being consulted because generally no development is to be allocated in these settlements. After March 2015 Burn airfield will be owned by SDC and although it has "*negligible deliverability*" (SDC's own description) we believe some development will be proposed. If so, there would be not just very strong planning grounds for objecting but also for suggesting the SAPP consultation process itself was unsound and has not had the positive community engagement required.

Topic/Chapter	Chapter 6 – Evidence Base	
Question No	Q59/Q60	Paragraph

Q59 Do you have any comments on the evidence that the Council considers necessary?
Q60 Is there any other evidence that the Council should consider gathering?

The suggested evidence base seems comprehensive and it will be interesting to see what this shows as the results are published.

At present we do not see a shortage of land for housing or employment in Selby district. Even without Burn airfield there was a huge excess of land for housing for the 5340 dwellings identified in the 2013 CS as being required up to 2027 (450 per year less permissions already granted). The figures below exclude the airfield, which itself alone has the capacity to allow the entire target of 5340 dwellings to be built. The 2011 SHLAA says the sites are "*suitable, available and achievable*".

SOURCE	Land to 2027 (Dwellings)	Excess over need
2008 SHLAA	22000	311%
2011 SHLAA	28843	440%

2013 draft SAPP	51000*	855%
*Listed through a call for sites but not yet allocated		

There is a similar excess of land for employment beyond the 37 to 52 Ha total required in the plan period up to 2027 of which only 5Ha incidentally is required in all the rural areas:

SOURCE	Employment Land to 2027 (Ha)	Excess over need
ELR Jan 2011	224.49	397%
AMR Dec 2012	286.9	537%
2013 draft SAPP	395*	777%
*Neglecting 665Ha at Drax for a new CCS 450Mw power station. No sites allocated yet.		

The Council have been working recently on the housing shortfall on the basis of "*land supply issues*"⁶, and yet the figures seem to indicate substantial excess. For employment land there were no reported completions at all in 2012/13 (December 2013 AMR). From these indicators it would appear the problem in Selby is not the lack of supply but the lack of *demand*.

We suggest therefore that the evidence base, even allowing that many sites will prove to be unsuitable, will tend to show that there is more than enough land available without the need to purchase a wholly unsuitable site at Burn airfield.

19th January 2015

⁶ [Council Agenda for 24th June meeting page 18](#)