



**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	York Diocesan Board of Finance	Robert Murphy
Address	c/o Agent	Smiths Gore, 26 Coniscliffe Road, Darlington
Postcode		DL3 7JX
Telephone no.		01325 370 432
Email address		robert.murphy@smithsgore.co.uk

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

Page 1 of 4

Comment(s)

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

Topic / Chapter	Chapter 2
-----------------	-----------

Question no.	5a	Paragraph	
--------------	----	-----------	--

We consider the potential setting of Development Limits, as referred to under Objective 5, to be an inflexible strategy that is a potential threat to housing delivery across the district. We believe that the setting of development limits as a blanket approach is in conflict with Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in terms of rural settlements which encourages sustainable development in rural areas and recognises the importance of (a) locating housing where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and (b) development in one village offering the potential to support services in a village nearby.

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

Topic / Chapter	Chapter 3
-----------------	-----------

Question no.	9a	Paragraph	
--------------	----	-----------	--

Table 4 demonstrates the differences in scale in terms of the size of the 18 Designated Service Villages (DSVs) across the district. To demonstrate this, the largest DSV is Brayton, with an approximate 2267 dwellings, while the smallest DSV is Appleton Roebuck with an approximate 347 dwellings. This indicates the difference in size between some of the DSVs and, as such, it would clearly be inappropriate to allocate an equal share of development to each DSV (as is suggested at paragraph 3.29) and adopt a 'one size fits all' approach to the development of DSVs that fails to take into account their very different characteristics and infrastructure capacities. The sheer difference in scale between some of the DSVs means that any approach to distributing development should be tailored to reflect the scale, function and capacity of each individual DSV. Our client, the York Diocesan Board of Finance (YDBF), has significant landholdings within two of the larger DSVs at Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby and, as such, would advocate a sensible approach to the distribution of housing numbers that focussed significant development within these two DSVs which have the capacity to accommodate additional development and are in sustainable locations in close proximity to the principal town of Selby to the east. To this end, we have previously submitted sites for consideration to the SHLAA in both Brayton (reference BRAYTON/017) and Thorpe Willoughby (references THORPE/004 and THORPE/005 that are in the ownership of our client and sites THORPE/007 and THORPE/008 that are in the ownership of an adjacent landowner but are the subject of a joint promotion exercise) and would request that these be considered further as PLAN Selby develops and moves towards the allocation of specific sites.

(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	Chapter 3	
-----------------	-----------	--

Question no.	22	Paragraph	
--------------	----	-----------	--

The drawing of settlement limits is a restrictive policy application that allows little room for flexibility. When boundaries are tightly drawn around a settlement, little scope is allowed in policy terms for that settlement to grow. As such, we would not advocate the drawing of development limits as this does not provide flexibility across the plan period for housing delivery targets to be met. Planning policies relating to development management should be entirely capable of setting controls to ensure that development is located in appropriate and sustainable locations and that, where development is proposed that conflicts with key policies, applications are refused accordingly. Development limits impose an additional layer of control that is not compliant with the flexible approach set out in the NPPF and we would therefore contend that this policy restriction is inflexible and unnecessary. However, if through the PLAN Selby process it is decided that development limits are to be set, then we would advocate that these be drawn loosely around settlements to allow a degree of room for growth. It is also vitally important that any limits set are justified clearly in the supporting text to any policy and that these are supported by a relevant and up to date evidence base.

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

Topic / Chapter	Chapter 3	
-----------------	-----------	--

Question no.	23a	Paragraph	
--------------	-----	-----------	--

While we recognise the role of Strategic Countryside Gaps (SCGs) across the district, care should be taken in allocating new gaps as, as with settlement boundaries, this is an inflexible policy approach that restricts development. A balanced approach is therefore required that weighs the potential allocation of SCGs against the requirements for increased housing delivery across the plan period. We would therefore contend that it is unnecessary to draw a new SCG between Selby and Thorpe Willoughby as to do so would be to impose a further restriction on development that is not necessarily compliant with the need to sustainably grow both Selby (in its key role as the principal town in the district) and Thorpe Willoughby (as one of the larger DSVs in the settlement that we consider is capable of accommodating further growth across the plan period). It is also vitally important that, should the PLAN Selby process consider that new gaps should be brought forward, any gaps identified are justified clearly in the supporting text to any policy and that these are supported by a relevant and up to date evidence base.

(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.

Chapter 5, Question 43a

We consider that there is scope for further growth at Brayton and that, as per our earlier answer to Q9a, the level of development proposed should reflect the status of Brayton as the largest of all 18 DSVs (i.e. the development targets for the 18 DSVs should not simply be divided up equally amongst all of the settlements). Any development in Brayton should be well related to the existing settlement pattern and, as such, we would propose that the land (reference BRAYTON/017) submitted on behalf of our client previously would represent an appropriate location for further development.

Chapter 5, Question 57a

We consider that there is scope for further growth at Thorpe Willoughby and that, as per our earlier answer to Q9a, the level of development proposed should reflect the status of Thorpe Willoughby as one of the largest of the 18 DSVs (i.e. the development targets for the 18 DSVs should not simply be divided up equally amongst all of the settlements). The current settlement pattern at Thorpe Willoughby lends itself to development in a westerly direction as this is where a number of defensible boundaries are located in the form of the existing road network. Were the settlement to grow in an easterly direction, there are no obvious defensible boundaries that would limit development to a scale that would be appropriate to the size of the settlement. As such, any development in Thorpe Willoughby should be well related to the existing settlement pattern and, in line with this, we would propose that the land (references THORPE/004 and THORPE/005) submitted on behalf of our client, when combined with land (references THORPE/007 and THORPE/008) promoted separately but in conjunction with our clients land, would represent an appropriate location for further development.

(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

Dated

19/01/2015

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