



**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	RICHARD BORROWS	
Address	WARD ASSOCIATES 1, ST MARY'S COURT YORK	
Postcode	YO24 1AQ	
Telephone no.	4984544491 01904 544401	
Email address	r.borrows@wardpc.co.uk	

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

Question no. Paragraph

The aims seem reasonable but given what we know about the district's character (brought out in the 2005 document) in relation to outward commuter flows might it not make sense to make the objective of reversing these flows more explicit? in other words try to attract and hold on to employment that meets the needs of the resident population.

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

Topic / Chapter

Question no. Paragraph

T2 Talks about promoting prosperity. Selby town used to be one of the most deprived towns in North Yorks along with Whitby. If this is still the case might a better approach be to address deprivation in the pockets within which it still lies rather than a general, untargeted, approach to wealth creation?
T5 talks about climate change and renewable energy. I would like to see this document biting the bullet of tension between growth and flood risk. Surely there will be some settlements wherein the need for sustainable growth is such as to "trump" flood risk whereas there maybe other DSVs for example wherein the nature of the flood risk (speed of inundation for example) actually justifies a virtual moratorium on development?

(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	Providing Homes		
Question no.	7	Paragraph	3.16

I will come back to this but I remain uneasy about SDC's reliance on Olympia Park (mentioned at paragraph 3.14). There is still no planning permission in place for this despite the application being with the Council since May 2012. The CS Inspector expressed a number of reservations about reliance on this strategic site in his decision letter. He suggested alternative strategies if it failed to come forward with all its attendant gain - might now be the time to think along these lines?

Q8 paragraph 3.23 I would firmly agree that the Council should indeed "over-allocate" I say this because of the Council's long standing over reliance on a limited number of large sites. I have mentioned Olympia Park, Crosshills Lane in Selby is another whose allocation goes back to the 1990s. This latter site was affected by the 2000 floods. It has yet to benefit from planning permission. A more sensible approach it would seem would be to look to a larger number of smaller sites well related to DSVs and the major towns which are deliverable. This would also go to the issue of "housing choice" brought out in the NPPF.

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

Topic / Chapter	Providing Homes		
Question no.	9	Paragraph	3.30

A simple percentage growth approach can only be a starting point for assessing DSVs, nothing more. The important considerations include flood risk, access to services, public transport, and employment opportunities - in other words sustainability issues. Has there ever been a "sustainability matrix" which was applied to the DSVs? It is noticeable from Table 3 what low levels of completions there have been in settlements such as Thorpe Willoughby, Brayton, and Barby/Osgodby despite their size relative to other DSVs. These three surely need to be considered in a different light to the more rural DSVs.

Q10 paragraph 3.38 Site selection needs to have regard to similar considerations to those expressed above in terms of sustainability, flood risk, access to employment etc. Otherwise NPPF considerations such as availability and deliverability come into consideration. Again, as I have said elsewhere, it will probably prove necessary to look at some sites, despite their flood risk, and ask whether compelling reasons for their release take precedent?

Q19 paragraph 3.76

I believe that SDC's existing policy in relation to the former mine sites at Wistow and Stillingfleet make no sense. In terms of highway access it is not true to say they are "remote" - no more so than the other two sites at Whitemoor and Riccall. It is important to note that the highways serving these two do not pass through any residential settlements. The buildings, behind their heavy screening remain vacant since the complex closed - I fail to see the benefit to anyone and "restoration" to agriculture remains a dreamworld solution best left to the 1970s.

Policy H12 of the SDLP concerning conversion of existing buildings to residential use - I believe this is unduly restrictive in the light of the advice within the NPPF which post dates it.

Paragraph 5.12 of the document states that Olympia Park now has pp. According to public access as of 19/01/15 it does not - I assume because the S.106 remains unsigned.

(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.

Q38 paragraph 5.15 At the risk of going over old ground I do not believe SDC should over rely on large sites with questionable histories. I have already mentioned Crosshills Lane and Olympia Park. A wider choice of smaller sustainable sites would tie in better with the NPPF's emphasis on housing choice.

Q43 Brayton paragraph 5.58. This is an extremely sustainable settlement with very few constraints beyond the strategic gap and the conservation area (neither of which are threatened so far as I am aware). It should therefore be treated, I believe at a higher level than the bulk of the DSVs - because of its satellite role in relation to Selby. I believe the same is true of Thorpe Willoughby (Q57 paragraph 5.88).

In relation to Cawood Q46 (paragraph 5.64) I believe this settlement could take a proportionate amount of growth bearing in mind flood risk and heritage constraints. No growth at all would prejudice the future of the services it has and as such the Plan Selby document will probably have to bite the bullet between development and flood risk given that FZ1 sites are few and far between.

Q51 Hemingbrough (paragraph 5.75). This settlement is relatively unaffected by flood risk. It is sustainable in terms of services and public transport and there are sites well related to the settlement. It would seem reasonable therefore that it could accept a level of growth above the "proportionate" figure mentioned in question 9.

(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

R Borrows

Dated

19/01/15

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