Selby District
Submission Draft Core Strategy
Publication Version January 2011
Representation Form

Part A

In completing this representation form, you are providing a formal consultation response under Regulation 27 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2008 with regard to the Selby District Submission Draft Core Strategy DPD on grounds of soundness only.

Please complete seperate copies of Part B (pages 3 and 4) of this form for each section, policy, table, map or diagram about which you wish to comment.

If you believe that a section, policy, paragraph, table, map or diagram is unsound with regard to more than one test of soundness please provide a seperate representation for each test.

The Tests of Soundness

Soundness is explained in PPS12 (Planning Policy Statement 12) in paragraphs 4.36 - 4.47, 4.51 and 4.52 and the boxed text. Specifically paragraph 4.52 states that to be sound a Core Strategy should be:

1 Justified

PPS12 provides that to be 'justified' a DPD (in this case the 'Core Strategy') needs to be :

- founded on a robust and credible evidence base involving:
  - evidence of participation of the local community and others having a stake in the area
  - research/fact finding - the choices made in the plan are backed up by facts
- the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives

2 Effective

PPS12 states that Core Strategies should be effective. This means:

- Deliverable - embracing:
  - Sound infrastructure delivery planning
  - Having no regulatory or national planning barriers to delivery
  - Delivery partners who are signed up to it
  - Coherence with the strategies of neighbouring authorities
- Flexible
- Able to be monitored

3 National Policy

The DPD (in this case the 'Core Strategy') should be consistent with national policy. Where there is a departure, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) must provide clear and convincing reasoning to justify their approach.

Completed representation forms must be returned to the Council no later than 5pm on Monday 21st February 2011.

Email to: ldf@selby.gov.uk **(Please save a copy to your computer prior to e-mailing your response)**

Post to: LDF Team, Development Policy, Selby District Council, Civic Centre, Portholme Road, Selby YO8 4SB

IMPOSSIBLE TO EITHER SAVE OR EMAIL THE COMPLETED DOCUMENT IN WINDOWS 7 ? WINDOWS SHOWS MESSAGE TO THIS EFFECT

Contact Details (only complete once)

Please provide contact details and agent details, if appointed.

	Personal Details	Agents Details (if applicable)
Title	mr	
First Name	john	
Last Name	cook	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation		
Address Line 1	61 elmete ave	
Address Line 2	sherburn in elmet	
Address Line 3		
County	n yorks	
Postcode	ls25 6eh	
Telephone No.		
Email address		

You only need to complete this page <u>once</u>. If you wish to make more than one representation, attach additional copies of Part B (pages 3 and 4) to this part of the representation form.

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

Part B (please use a seperate sheet (pages 3 and 4) for each representation)

Please identify the part of the Core Strategy to which this representation refers:

See "3" below

Section No.		Policy No.		Paragraph No.	
Map No.		Figure No.		Other	

Question 1: Do you consider the DPD is:

1.1 Legally compliant	☐	Yes	☐	No
1.2 Sound	☐	Yes	☒	No

If you have entered No to 1.1, please continue to Q2. In all other circumstances, please go to Q3.

Question 2: If you consider the DPD is unsound, please identify which test of soundness your representation relates to:

(Please note you should complete seperate Part B (pages 3 and 4) of this form for each test of soundness the Core Strategy fails.)

(Please identify just one test for this representation)

☐ 2.1 Justified

☐ 2.2 Effective

☐ 2.3 Consistent with national policy

Question 3: Please give details of why you consider the Core Strategy DPD is not legally complient or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

the plan and options for Sherburn show no evidence of co-ordination with adjoining authorities, and are unsound because of this lack.

A large part of sherburn residents work in Leeds (consistent with sherburn's leeds postcode), whereas the plan only mentions N Yorks employment. The vast majority of the potential new housing capacity listed in the plan is green-field land in a village with (as the plan says) an already over stressed infrastruture. Within 8miles of Sherburn there is sufficient Leeds brown-field land for several thousand houses, in Castleford, a decaying post-industrial town with superb motorway/ rail connections to leeds and elsewhere, and underused infrastructure.

There is no evidence in the plan as written that this aspect was considered, or any coordination attempted. Not a good way to get hundreds of green field houses down a difficult commute to Leeds, when alternatives exist half a mile over the n yorks border with Leeds.

(Continue on a seperate sheet if submitting a hard copy)

Question 4: Please provide details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Stategy DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in Q2 where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Core Strategy DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

see comments above. A new section re adjoining areas and options is needed.

(Continue on a seperate sheet if submitting a hard copy)

PLEASE NOTE *your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination. For further information on the stages see The Planning Inspectorate website (http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/appeals/local_dev/index.htm)

Question 5: Can your representation seeking a change be considered by written representations, or do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

☒ 5.1 Written Representations ☐ 5.2 Attend Examination

5.3 If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary

(Your request will be considered by the Inspector, however, attendance at the Examination in Public is by invitation only).

Representation Submission Acknowledgement

I acknowledge that I am making a formal representation under Regulation 27 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2008. I understand that my name (and organisation where applicable) and representation will be made publically available during the public examination period of the Core Strategy in order to ensure that it is a fair and transparent process.

☒ I agree with this statement and wish to submit the above representation for consideration.

Signed **Dated** 10 feb 2011