



Ref: RGB/CP/Yk1603/P/SDC/Let1
Date: 12th October 2010

Mr Ryan King
LDF Team (Planning)
Selby District Council
Civic Centre
Portholme Road
Selby
North Yorkshire
YO8 4SB

Dear Sir,

Re: Comments on the draft Selby District Interim Housing Policy

I am contacting you having received the Proposed Interim Housing Policy for the Selby District to take this opportunity to make the following comments regarding the proposed approach.

The rationale for the document to provide advice to developers on suitable locations for development prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy is supported in principle, as is the focus on Selby and the designated service villages as the main areas for housing delivery.

Paragraph 1.3 of the document sets out the Authority's objective which is to prevent inappropriate infill development, by restricting development on garden land to prevent overdevelopment of neighbourhoods. In order to ensure that suitable levels of housing continue to be delivered in the context of this policy and the current housing need in the District, this objective must be supported by subsequent policy that enables suitable alternative including unallocated sites to come forward in settlements identified for growth. In order to clarify this point it is recommended that the wording of paragraph 1.4 should be amended as follows:

- 1.4 The Council is therefore considering interim ~~measures~~ *guidance to control manage* proposals for windfall (unplanned) development prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy ~~which is programmed towards the end of 2014. The implementation of this policy will~~ *These are intended to* reflect changes in national guidance *and the emerging approach in the draft Core Strategy*, to support development in the most sustainable locations, and to strike a balance between maintaining the vitality and longer term sustainability of all settlements while avoiding the worst excesses of garden grabbing particularly in small settlements.

This amendment would support the guidance that is set out in the remainder of the proposed document, in particular paragraph 1.7 which allows flexibility in terms of greenfield development in the larger, sustainably located settlements. This approach is supported and should be expanded in light of the likely need for allocations as a result of the emerging Core Strategy guidance. Therefore the following new paragraph should be considered as an insertion to the SPD following on from paragraph 17:



“In light of the need to provide for a continuous supply of housing within the period of the emerging plan it is appropriate that sites of a scale which will make a meaningful contribution to this requirement are granted permission prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy. These sites cannot be of a size that will predetermine the overall strategic distribution in the Core Strategy and will need to conform to paragraphs 69 and 71 of PPS3. Such sites in Selby, Sherburn in Emmett, Tadcaster and the service villages (as defined in the emerging Core Strategy) are likely to be greenfield sites but will be expected to deliver environmental or social benefits as well as providing housing in order to justify their early release”

I trust these brief comments are sufficiently clear and constructive, however should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me on 0114 228 9190 to discuss matters further.

Yours sincerely,

Roland Bolton BSc MRTPI
Senior Director