



Keith Dawson
Director
Selby District Council
Civic Centre
Doncaster Road
Selby
YO8 9FT

Our Ref: UOL001/pdc

7th August 2015

Dear Mr Dawson

Let's Talk PLAN Selby: Summer 2015

Please find attached response to the above consultation on behalf of the University of Leeds and Hallam Land Management, (UoL / HLM).

The University of Leeds owns farms on Green Belt land at Headley to the south east of Bramham and west of Tadcaster where it used to run its School of Agriculture. The University no longer teaches Agricultural Studies, and the use of the farms for field trials and animal nutrition work is reduced in scale with much of the land tenanted out. The University is therefore considering the future of its land holdings at Headley. These comprise just under 300ha (740 acres) in total of predominantly agricultural land. The majority of this land (circa 250 ha) lies within Leeds District, with the remainder (circa 50 ha) within Selby District (see attached land ownership plan). UoL / HLM is promoting a new settlement on land of up to 5,000 homes and supporting uses on its land at Headley in both Leeds and Selby District.

The site was put forward as a potential development site for consideration as part of the District Council's Sites and Policies Local Plan (PLAN Selby) initial consultation in January 2015.

The context for the promotion of a new settlement on land at Headley has changed since January 2015. Leeds City Council has resolved at its Executive Board of the 15th July 2015 to publish a draft Site Allocations Plan and relevant supporting documents for public participation. This consultation is understood to be commencing in September this year. The draft Site Allocations Plan includes a draft housing allocation for Headley Hall of 3,000 homes (site reference MX2-33 (3391)) which includes land under the control of the UoL up to the Selby District boundary. A further allocation of 7 hectares of general employment land is also made on the site, along with support for a new town centre and supporting retail and commercial uses/services and appropriate primary and secondary schooling. The proposed allocation also includes the review of the Green Belt boundary to accommodate development. The proposed allocation includes all UoL land within Leeds District.

David Lock Associates Limited
50 NORTH THIRTEENTH STREET, CENTRAL MILTON KEYNES, MK9 3BP
t: 01908 666 276 f: 01908 605 747 e: mail@davidlock.com
www.davidlock.com



UoL / HLM are committed to on-going dialogue with the Local Planning Authorities that will also create a supportive and receptive policy environment for such a new settlement at Headley through the PLAN Selby consultation. This will involve ongoing joint-working with and between the two authorities, along with North Yorkshire County Council and all relevant stakeholders. UoL / HLM will be engaging with local communities at the appropriate time.

PLAN Selby

UoL / HLM note that the current technical background work undertaken centres on taking forward the strategy set out within the Selby Core Strategy 2013. UoL / HLM wishes to work constructively with Selby District to bring forward the opportunity offered at Headley in a manner that complements the vision, aims and objectives of the Core Strategy and the potential for a new settlement in this location to meet Leeds housing needs.

Land at Headley can contribute to meeting housing needs in a number of ways, including:

1. A location to deliver new infrastructure (roads, landscape and utility services) supporting growth at land at Headley within Leeds and, potentially, Selby.
2. A potential contingency site related to allocations at Tadcaster under Policy SP6 (in conjunction with the delivery of new infrastructure) given past issues of delivery in and around the town in recent years.
3. A new allocation to deliver housing and employment growth within and/or beyond the Core Strategy horizon of 2027 within Selby in a location that would not be deliverable were it not for the scale of development proposed within Leeds. It is estimated that if the allocation of land for a new settlement within Leeds is confirmed, complementary land within Selby District would have capacity for in the order of up to 800 dwellings and a mix of employment uses well related to the primary road network. The delivery growth in Selby in a sustainable manner with supporting infrastructure and uses and the scale of any delivery within the plan period would be complementary to the planned pattern and rate of delivery within Leeds District, contingent on joint working between the two authorities.

The pursuit of this exciting potential requires a co-ordinated and considered approach in partnership with Leeds City Council and the University of Leeds to ensure that strategic priorities including Green Belt review and infrastructure issues are comprehensively addressed to create the receptive policy environment needed to deliver and achieve sustainable development at land at Headley.

UoL / HLM have set out responses to the questions related to the various technical documents in the attached schedule, and look forward to further engagement with Selby District Council on matters raised relating to these representations.

Yours sincerely

PHILIP COPSEY

Partner

pcopsey@davidlock.com

enc: Plan UOL001 – 034

cc: Steve Gilley The University of Leeds (letter only)
Rebecca Wasse Hallam Land Management Ltd (letter only)



Draft Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)

Q1 (SHMA) Do you have any comments on the:

a. *the housing market areas in and around Selby?*

UoL / HLM note the practical difficulties in identifying Housing Market Areas. The strength of the relationship between Selby District and York and Selby District and Leeds is noted and appears to be increasing in strength in terms of travel to work patterns.

This strong relationship is also reflected in the high self-containment rate from York and Selby in terms of migration (identified at paragraph 2.50), and likewise with Leeds (referred to in paragraph 2.51). The strength of this inter-relationship in housing market terms between Selby, York and Leeds might merit further consideration and testing as the draft SHMA is taken forward.

It is also noted that there appears to be an error in the bottom half of Table 4 relating to travel to work from Leeds into Selby where the incorrect references to places of residence appear to have been included in the first column.

b. *trend based demographic projections?*

UoL / HLM note that the draft SHMA relies on 2012 based headship rates in making demographic projections. It is noted that these differ from the pre-recession 2008 based headship rates as shown in Figure 18. It is further noted that the later section looking at market signals confirms some increases in overcrowding and house sharing in the period up to 2011. There may be some merit in running a further sensitivity test to explore the implications of pre-recession 2008 based headship rates for the Council's objectively assessed housing need.

c. *economic led projections?*

The assumed jobs growth rate in Selby is well below past trends, including the 10 year, 15 year and 20 year average annual growth rate, and appears to assume the same growth rate as the Yorkshire and Humber average, despite Selby growing at a much faster rate than the regional average in the past. An alternative scenario which models higher levels of jobs growth should be considered.

d. *affordable housing need?*

UoL / HLM note the author's view that the evidence supports a continuation of the policy requirement for 40% of homes to be in the form of affordable housing. This does however need to be assessed in the round alongside the clear need for such policies not to hamper economic viability and delivery of homes in general and affordable homes in particular, in line with national planning policy and adopted Core Strategy policy SP9.

e. *market signals?*

No comment at this time.

f. *need for different types and sizes of homes?*

UoL / HLM note the caveats applied by the authors to the analysis of the likely future mix of house type and sizes required, including the influence of other factors including future growth in real earnings and households' ability to save; economic performance and housing affordability as well as demographic data.

g. *housing needs for specific groups of the population?*

No comment at this time.

h. *draft conclusions?*



As noted in the comments above, there may be some merit in giving further consideration to the inter-relationships with York and Leeds in terms of the definition of the Housing Market Area and in assessing the implications of pre-recessionary headship rates on objectively assessed housing need in taking the draft report forward.



Draft Employment Land Review

Q2 (ELR) Do you have any comments on the:

a. *analysis of the economy and commercial markets?*

UoL / HLM note the analysis of the economy and commercial markets, and the low level of development activity that has taken place in Tadcaster.

The allocations to different use classes at Figure 4.8 appears to underestimate the percentage of employment in offices for many office based sectors, and might be reviewed or further explanation provided as to how the assumptions were arrived at.

b. *functional economic areas identified?*

The basis for the Functional Economic Areas (FEAs) within the Draft Employment Land Review is the York and North Yorkshire Economic Assessment 2010 (January 2011) which identified Selby as lying within the functional economies of 'York and Hinterland' and 'West Yorkshire Connected' which together cover Selby District. This further reinforces the need to consider the inter-relationship and influence between York, Leeds and Selby District in considering strategic priorities such as homes and jobs.

c. *availability of the sites set out in Figure 1.3 of the Executive Summary (Figure 3.4 of the main report)? (See note after Q2 (ELR) d)*

UoL / HLM note the approach set out in Figure 3.4 and have no comment to make on the availability of specific individual sites within the existing supply.

UoL / HLM note that potential future employment land is identified from remaining land that was considered in the 2010 ELR, land which is:

- not allocated land or windfall development land,
- not allocated in the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) Preferred Options, and
- a new site put forward for employment uses in the 2013 Call for Sites to inform the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).

UoL / HLM note that no specific Call for Site has been undertaken as part of the Employment Land Review exercise (paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4). Land at Headley has therefore not been considered by the ELR as part of potential future supply at the present time.

UoL / HLM would request that land at Headley is considered in finalising this report as part of potential future employment land supply.

The potential for employment was identified in our representations to the District Council's Sites and Policies Local Plan (PLAN Selby) initial consultation in January 2015. The site has been included in the latest published version of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2015.

Leeds City Council has resolved at its Executive Board of the 15th July 2015 to publish a draft Site Allocations Plan and relevant supporting documents for public participation. The draft Site Allocations Plan includes a draft housing allocation for Headley Hall of 3,000 homes (site reference MX2-33 (3391)) which includes land under the control of the UoL up to the Selby District boundary. A further allocation of 7 hectares of general employment land is also made on the site, along with support for a new town centre and supporting retail and commercial uses/services. This also includes a roll back of the Green Belt boundary to accommodate development.



UoL / HLM consider that the role of land at Headley as part of potential future employment land supply, contributing towards the employment requirements of the Tadcaster FEA, is important in finalising this report working jointly with Leeds City Council.

This potential may undermine the conclusion at paragraph 3.312 that options for potential additional supply: *'are along the A19 / A63 corridors in the South Selby and Selby Town FEAs, and the former mine sites (mostly located in the Selby Rural FEA, with the Gascoigne Wood mine site in the Sherburn FEA).'* Land at Headley offers a further option for consideration: the site is well related to the A1(M) and A64, offers the scope for employment within the Tadcaster FEA which has had little employment activity over a number of years (as shown in Figure 4.1) and would be part of a larger and sustainable new community to include development land in Leeds.

- d. *conclusions, and the basis for the conclusions, on the allocation/de-allocation of the sites set out in Figure 1.3 of the Executive (Figure 3.4 of the main report)? (Appendices 1, 2, 3a and 3b of the ELR main report set out all the sites which were assessed as part of the study, The conclusions are based on a high level assessment of supply and makes recommendations in terms of which sites should be carried forward taking into account the balancing of predicted demand and supply of employment land)*

UoL / HLM note the proposed deallocation of 9 hectares of allocated employment land at London Road, the criteria for identifying key employment locations in Selby at paragraph 5.5 and the need to identify 5-10 hectares of land within the Tadcaster FEA to be met through the consideration of alternative sites in and around Tadcaster through the emerging site allocations plan.

UoL / HLM is promoting a sustainable new settlement at Headley which might provide new employment land within Selby District as an integral part of the development concept. Such employment provision may also have a role to play in contributing towards the employment land needs identified for the overall Tadcaster FEA.

The role that land at Headley might play would be a strategic priority to be planned strategically with Leeds City Council and other partners under the Duty to Cooperate.

- e. *other conclusions/findings of the study.*

The modelling of commercial floorspace change employs a flat apportionment across all commercial use classes (office, industrial and distribution) between the FEAs. Further analysis might be undertaken to consider whether different FEAs might better placed to respond to particular commercial use classes or sectors.



Draft stage 1: Green Belt Study

General Comment:

UoL / HLM are promoting a sustainable new settlement on land at Headley within both Leeds City and Selby District. The West Yorkshire Green Belt is a larger than local area of common interest that requires collaborative strategic consideration between the authorities. UoL / HLM is committed to working with Selby District Council and Leeds City Council to ensure a consistent approach is adopted to this issue.

The stage 1 Green Belt study seeks comments on the approach to potential mechanisms for progression of General Areas to stage 2 which would further investigate the suitability of general areas for development. A further stage 3 assessment would then be applied reviewing whether a permanent future Green Belt boundary could be created. Following these 3 stages suitable land would be identified as a 'Potential Area for Green Belt release' and then be assessed against other non-Green Belt sites within the allocations document, and exceptional circumstances demonstrated for the release of the land from the Green Belt.

UoL / HLM therefore make the following comments in their response to matters covered by the stage 1 assessment and would anticipate making further comment at subsequent stages of this study.

The strategic context for the Stage 1 study is set out under section 4.5 of this study: Duty to Cooperate. UoL / HLM consider that the description at section 4.5 Duty to Cooperate of the approach towards Green Belt review within Leeds by Leeds City Council under the Leeds Core Strategy is incomplete. The final column of the table correctly refers to Green Belt review around the main urban area, major settlements and smaller settlements in Leeds, but incorrectly omits reference to sites unrelated to these areas which may be sustainable locations. The table should be updated to reflect this. To assist, the full text of Leeds Core Strategy Spatial Policy 10: Green Belt is set out below with the relevant section highlighted.

SPATIAL POLICY 10: GREEN BELT

A review of the Green Belt will need to be carried out to accommodate the scale of housing and employment growth identified in Spatial Policy 6 and Spatial Policy 9, as well as an additional contingency to create new Protected Areas of Search (to replace those in the UDP which will be allocated for future development). The review will generally consider Green Belt release around:

- (i) the Main Urban Area (Leeds City Centre and surrounding areas forming the main urban and suburban areas of the City),*
- (ii) Major Settlements of Garforth, Guiseley/Yeadon/Rawdon, Morley, Otley, Rothwell and Wetherby,*
- (iii) Smaller Settlements (listed in Table 1: Settlement Hierarchy),*

Exceptionally, sites unrelated to the Main Urban Area, Major Settlements and Smaller Settlements, could be considered, where they will be in sustainable locations and are able to provide a full range of local facilities and services and within the context of their Housing Market Characteristic Area, are more appropriate in meeting the spatial objectives of the plan than the alternatives within the Settlement Hierarchy. Otherwise review of the Green Belt will not be considered to ensure that its general extent is maintained.

In assessing whether sites in the Green Belt review should be allocated for development, the following criteria will be applied:

- (iv) Sites will be assessed against the purposes of including land in Green Belts identified in national guidance (National Planning Policy Framework). These purposes are:*



- o to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas,*
- o to prevent neighbouring towns from merging,*
- o to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment,*
- o to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and*
- o to assist in urban regeneration.*

Leeds City Council has resolved at its Executive Board of the 15th July 2015 to publish a draft Site Allocations Plan and relevant supporting documents for public participation. This consultation is understood to be commencing in September this year. The draft Site Allocations Plan includes a draft housing allocation for Headley Hall of 3,000 homes (site reference MX2-33 (3391)) which includes land under the control of the UoL up to the Selby District boundary. A further allocation of 7 hectares of general employment land is also made on the site, along with support for a new town centre and supporting retail and commercial uses/services. This also includes a review of the Green Belt boundary to accommodate the proposed development. The allocation includes all UoL land at Headley within Leeds City. This reinforces the need for collaborative joint working between Selby District and Leeds City Council regarding the approach towards Green Belt review in this part of the District.

Green Belt Study Appendix C: Green Belt Review Panel Queries and Arup Responses notes the likelihood of new settlements and allocations (including Headley) coming forward. The Arup assertion that the review would not be objective if draft allocations were considered is questionable. UoL / HLM consider that a further assessment of the individual general areas against the five Green Belt purposes, taking account of potential allocations in neighbouring authorities, should be undertaken as a sensitivity test to the main study to ensure that the plan is positively prepared. This is particularly the case on land at Headley where much of the administrative boundary between Leeds City Council and Selby District Council is not defined by any physical features, and is not readily defined by a defensible boundary.

Q3 (GB) *Using the information within Table 8 of this study, do you have any comments on the approach by which General Areas could be defined as 'weakly' or 'more strongly' fulfilling the five national purposes of the Green Belt (as defined within NPPF Paragraph 80)?*

UoL / HLM note the general approach set out for defining the performance of the general areas in fulfilling the five national purposes of the Green Belt.

General area Tadcaster 4 includes land within the ownership of UoL. With regard to purpose 4: preserving the setting and special character of historic towns, UoL / HLM note the score of 4 attributed due to 'the separation of the historic core of Bramham from Green Belt in Tadcaster 4 by open land'. In line with comments in Q2 above, a sensitivity test reflecting the potential allocation of this land by Leeds City Council might arrive at a different conclusion against this role.

For the avoidance of doubt and in particular, UoL / HLM question the relevance of the 'other view' long distance views to the City of York identified in figure 3 from the A64 close to the A1(M). Page 44 of the Green Belt study notes that potential effects of general development are considered to be due to intervisibility within 5km. Land at Headley is at least 18km from the centre of the City of York. The identification of this view in the study should not therefore influence the consideration of the role of the Green Belt purposes of general area Tadcaster 4 in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.



Q4 (GB) *Do you have any comments on the approach to defining purpose 5 of the Green Belt Review?*

UoL / HLM note the approach of the study to the assessment Green Belt general areas purpose 5 of the Green Belt Review.



Draft Strategic Countryside Gap Study

Q5 (SCG): *Do you have any comments on the:*

- a. principle of defining Strategic Countryside Gaps in PLAN Selby?*
- b. methodology used to assess potential Strategic Countryside Gaps?*
- c. assessment of each potential SCG?*

UoL / HLM has no comment on the approach to Strategic Countryside Gaps at this time.



Draft Methodology for the Identification of Development Limits

Q6 (DL) Do you have any comments on:

the need to identify development limits in PLAN Selby?

an alternative policy approach to protect the countryside?

the proposed methodology for defining development limits?

the conclusions about defining 'tight' development limits?

UoL / HLM has no comment on the draft methodology for identifying development limits at this time.

It should be noted that the application of the selected methodology to Tadcaster will need to reflect and make allowance for the phased approach to allocation around the town set out within Policy SP6 of the Core Strategy.



Draft Method Statement for Defining Safeguarded Land

Q7 (SL); *Do you have any comments on the proposed approach to identifying safeguarded land set out in section 3 of the study?*

UoL / HLM note the proposed approach towards identifying safeguarded land.

The Green Belt Study is the main process through which Green Belt boundaries are reviewed and UoL / HLM are committed to working jointly with Selby District and Leeds City as part of this process as set out in responses to the above questions.

The draft allocation for a new settlement on land at Headley within Leeds is a further influence on the potential approach to defining safeguarded land. The strategic scale and role of the draft allocation and its cross boundary potential are two factors that might inform the approach towards reviewing Green Belt boundaries in this area, or to the safeguarding of land to meet longer term development needs while establishing new, long-term and defensible Green Belt boundaries.



Draft Method Statement for Determining the Status of Villages in the Green Belt

Q8 (VGB); *Do you have any comments on the proposed approach to determining the status of villages in the Green Belt set out in section 3 of the study?*

UoL / HLM has no comment on the approach to determining the status of villages in the Green Belt at this time.



Questions on the PLAN Selby Site Allocations: Draft Framework for Site Selection

Q9 (SS): *Do you have any comments on:*

The overall approach to the site selection process set out in section 6.3 of the study?

The details of the site assessment work proposed in Appendix A of the study?

UoL / HLM note the approach to site selections set out at section 6.3. A sustainable new settlement on land at Headley in Leeds City Council and Selby District is a unique opportunity that can provide infrastructure and potentially built development in Selby District within the plan period.

UoL / HLM note the approach to site selection and site assessment, but are keen to ensure that the PLAN Selby evidence base and methodologies recognise the unique nature of the opportunity at land at Headley and, where appropriate, make allowance for this opportunity. Rigid application of, for example, the quantitative assessment of the proximity to various services would not appropriately reflect the specific circumstances of a new settlement where these services would be an integral element of the new settlement but are not yet in place.

The promotion of a new settlement on land at Headley also transcends the current settlement hierarchy. Consideration of this unique opportunity therefore needs to be considered outside of initial site sift set out at Stage 1 including the relationship to the settlement hierarchy.

The methodology makes reference to sites being fully with the HSE Inner Zone being sieved out. UoL / HLM would note that land at Headley does include some areas within HSE Inner Zones. These areas have been subject of study, are understood and are capable of being appropriately mitigated and integrated within the proposed new settlement.



Questions on the Draft Growth Options for Designated Service Villages

Q10 (DSV): *Appendix B of the study provides a Settlement Profile for each Designated Service Village, including environmental and heritage designations. Is there any information that is incorrect or missing from these Settlement Profiles summaries? (Please note, we are in the process of updating evidence such as flood risk, accessibility, landscape and green infrastructure)*

Q11 (DSV): *If you had the choice, let us know which option for growth of the Designated Service Villages you would choose?*

Q12 (DSV): *Are there any better ways/options of determining how many new dwellings should be built in each of the Designated Service Villages up to 2027*

Q13 (DSV): *What areas of open land in and around your village do you think are especially valuable and tell us why you think so? (please describe as clearly as possible where this land is and its extent. If possible submit a map to us showing the area(s) you have picked out)*

Q14 (DSV): *What parts of the built up area of your village do you think are especially valuable and tell us why you think so? (please describe as clearly as possible where these areas are and their extent. If possible submit a map or photographs showing the areas you have picked out).*

UoL / HLM have no comment to make on the draft growth options for Designated Service Villages at this time.



Market Towns Study

Q15 (MTS): *Is there any relevant evidence base missing from the baseline review and factsheets and is there anything incorrect about our summaries of the evidence? (Please note we are in the process of updating our evidence on matters such as flood risk, landscape and green infrastructure)*

No comment at this time.

Q16 (MTS) *Looking at the factsheets for **Sherburn in Elmet** which talk about the growth and regeneration of the town, do you have any comments on*

- a. *the 'deficits, needs and aspirations'?*
- b. *the technical issues?*
- c. *the options and key planning issues?*
- d. *what areas of open land, in and around the town, do you think are especially valuable and tell us why you think so? (please describe as clearly as possible where this land is and its extent. If possible submit a map to us showing the area(s) you have picked out)*
- e. *what parts of the town's built up area do you think are especially valuable and tell us why you think so? (please describe as clearly as possible where these areas are and their extent. If possible submit a map or photographs showing the areas you have picked out)*

No comment at this time.

Q17 (MTS) *Looking at the factsheets for **Selby** which talk about the growth and regeneration of the town do you have any comments on*

- a. *the 'deficits, needs and aspirations'?*
- b. *the technical issues?*
- c. *The options and key planning issues?*
- d. *what areas of open land, in and around the town, do you think are especially valuable and tell us why you think so? (please describe as clearly as possible where this land is and its extent. If possible submit a map to us showing the area(s) you have picked out)*
- e. *what parts of the town's built up area do you think are especially valuable and tell us why you think so? (please describe as clearly as possible where these areas are and their extent. If possible submit a map or photographs showing the areas you have picked out)*

No comment at this time.



Q18 (MTS) Looking at the factsheets for **Tadcaster** which talk about the growth and regeneration of the town do you have any comments on

a. *the 'deficits, needs and aspirations'?*

Land at Headley lies around 4km to the west of Tadcaster, and is well connected to the town via the A659. UoL / HLM is committed to ensuring the development of a new settlement on land at Headley maximises all possible beneficial effects for Tadcaster, minimises any possible negative effects and contributes positively to its future wellbeing and sustainability.

UoL / HLM note the key deficits, needs and aspirations and the specific issues that Tadcaster faces in terms of promoting retail, employment, housing and open space and the aspiration to take a pro-active approach to identifying new allocations. A new settlement at Headley offers a potential catalyst to support and stimulate new activity within the town, increase visitors to the town centre and promote new and improved connections.

Specific work is currently underway with the UoL's consultant team to set out the manner in which a new settlement at Headley can complement Tadcaster and reinforce its role as a Local Service Centre and its vitality and viability as a retail location. This will be shared with Selby District Council in due course along with other relevant stakeholders.

UoL/HLM also note the reference to representations made at the initial consultation stage of PLAN Selby noting the '*Need to review the Leeds City Council Headley Hall site which must be resisted at all costs.*' which is identified as a key issue under the theme of retail and leisure. From the above it is clear that UoL / HLM consider that the inter-relationship between Tadcaster and a new settlement at Headley can be a positive one, and strongly refute the view that the proposal 'must be resisted at all costs'.

b. *the technical issues?*

No comment at this time.

c. *The options and key planning issues?*

The response to key planning issues has been covered in previous comments.

UoL / HLM note that land at Headley may have a role to play as a potential phase 3 contingency site related to allocations at Tadcaster under Policy SP6 (in conjunction with the delivery of new infrastructure) given past issues of delivery in and around the town in recent years. The site is identified within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment as site Headley 01.

d. *what areas of open land, in and around the town, do you think are especially valuable and tell us why you think so? (please describe as clearly as possible where this land is and its extent. If possible submit a map to us showing the area(s) you have picked out)*

UoL / HLM has no comment to make on this specific point at this time.

e. *what parts of the town's built up area do you think are especially valuable and tell us why you think so? (please describe as clearly as possible where these areas are and their extent. If possible submit a map or photographs showing the areas you have picked out)*

UoL / HLM has no comment to make on this specific point at this time.



Selby District Highway Assessment

Q19 (HA): *Do you have any comments on the highway assessment*

UoL / HLM notes the content of the highway assessment and the baseline assessment of junctions on key routes. It is noted that the A64/A162 junction operates well within capacity including where committed development is taken into account.

Q20 (HA): *Are there any other junctions that should be assessed in addition to those identified in this study?*

UoL / HLM recognise that the current assessment is focussed on roads that are identified to form the key routes that lead to the strategic road network comprising the A1(M), M62 and A64(T). PLAN Selby will ultimately also require an assessment to be made of the capacity of the strategic road network and associated junctions.

UoL / HLM will be undertaking a comprehensive Transport Assessment in support of their promotion of a sustainable new settlement on land at Headley, and is committed to liaising with Selby District Council, Leeds City Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Highways England at all stages of this process.

Leeds / Selby District Boundary

Selby / Harrogate District Boundary

Site Boundary

Land Controlled by the Diocese of York

NOTE

This map is for information purposes only and is not to be construed as a guarantee of accuracy. It is based on the best available information and is subject to change without notice. All dimensions are to be checked on site and any discrepancies should be reported immediately. This map is not to be used for any other purpose without prior permission.

0m 800m

Reproduced by permission of Ordnance Survey under license 100019050.
© Crown copyright and database right 2010.
Ordnance Survey, Southampton, 100019050

Headley, Leeds Site Location

Date	19/01/15	Scale	1:10,000 @ A1
Drawn	AMW	Approved	---
Project	---	Project Number	UOL001-034

David Lock Associates
Town Planning and Urban Design

DAVID LOCK ASSOCIATES LIMITED
50 NORTH THIRTEENTH STREET, CENTRAL MILTON KEYNES, MK9 3BP
TEL: 01908 608711 FAX: 01908 608711 EMAIL: info@dlad.co.uk
www.dlad.co.uk

