



Further Options

Councils Response to Comments Received

The Further Options Consultation was held during November/December 2008.

The Council's response to the comments received on individual questions was approved at a meeting of Policy and Resources Committee held on 1 September 2009.

Question 1

Do you agree with the Council's criteria for defining Primary Villages and if so, do you agree with those 20 villages selected? If not explain why.

Summary of Responses

- 1.1 There is no particular focus in the responses on any one particular aspect of the methodology used to define the relative sustainability of settlements. However, a number of respondents, including key stakeholders such as the Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage, made the point that other factors needed to be taken into account in order to determine the extent of growth potential in each settlement. Factors mentioned were flood risk, character and setting, landscape and infrastructure. Waste water treatment capacity was also mentioned by one respondent.
- 1.2 Three comments referred to the local services used in the analysis. One suggested that quality of services should be taken into account rather than just the number. A second suggested Post Offices should not be a key service, because of the possibility of them closing and a third suggested other facilities should also be compared.
- 1.3 Three respondents referred to placing increasing emphasis on transport issues in considering growth in villages. Two respondents wished to see more attention paid to the local road network and the potential knock on effects of growth for neighbouring villages and a third was concerned that public transport in some Primary Villages was not of sufficient standard to prevent significantly higher car usage and increases on the neighbouring Strategic Road Network.

- 1.4 The majority of the comments received relate to issues associated with specific villages arising out of concerns over the growth potential implied by the categorisation of villages (even though the document did indicate that the potential for further development will vary considerably between villages.)
- 1.5 The most frequently mentioned villages are Wistow (5) where responses advocate downgrading to Secondary village classification and Whitley(3) where responses requesting it be considered jointly with Eggborough as a Primary village.

Comments

- 1.6 While it is not the purpose of the Core Strategy to identify specific development sites (except for strategic housing and employment sites), it has always been recognised that further work was necessary to provide evidence at the local level for the strategic distribution of new development. Much of the work required for this was not available at the time of the consultation and reliance was placed on a more theoretical assessment of sustainability as a guide as to where we should be looking for growth potential. This sustainability work continues to be a basis for assessing development distribution. However, additional studies requested by Task and Finish Group, together with other ongoing work, will provide greater support for the final amounts and locations of development proposed across the District. These studies include: a village growth potential study which includes all the former Selby District Local Plan 'H6' settlements; a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment; Strategic Housing Land Assessment and Strategic Housing Market Assessment. An additional study of landscape sensitivity and the potential impacts of development around the market towns and larger villages is also proposed.
- 1.7 As indicated above it is not intended that the Core Strategy will provide specific growth proposals for each village. This will be a matter for the Selby Area Action Plan and a future Allocations DPD. No comment is therefore made on individual settlements at this stage. A further paper on the distribution of housing, which includes reference to the supporting information mentioned above, will be produced in the near future. Alternative distributions will also be subject to testing through highways and accessibility models in conjunction with the Highways Agency and North Yorkshire County Council.
- 1.8 The comments with regard to the local services analysis used in the village sustainability assessment are noted. Background Paper No 5 provided an explanation of why the four key services were chosen. It also recognised that most villages had a variety of other services such as village halls, churches, chapels and a various types of recreational facilities. The number and type of such facilities may be significant in assessing the strength of the role individual villages within a locality. However, because the types of facility available vary from village to village and the significance of the role and quality of the facilities is also difficult to weight, it is considered that

concentration on basic facilities catering for everyday needs is the most helpful in this current exercise. Provision of most of the basic services is considered to be the best and most objective measure of the primary service role of villages within their locality.

Conclusion

- 1.9 The additional work on villages extends our knowledge on general sustainability issues including factors which may affect the level of growth desirable/achievable in the Primary Villages, by taking account other local factors such as waste water treatment capacity. The village sustainability study will inform the more strategic decisions on housing distributions to be included in the Core Strategy but will also inform the next level of the Development Plan process where the amount and location of allocations within specific villages will be decided.
- 1.10 The improved evidence from this work will provide greater confidence in linking individual villages to more specific policies based on comprehensive assessment of both need, growth potential and function of the village rather than solely on the more theoretical sustainability classification. It is envisaged the policies will be relatively general and could be written to allow some flexibility in specific circumstances when the Allocations DPD is prepared.

Question 2a

Do you agree with the overall distribution of housing as indicated in the proposed distribution Table? (in the consultation report) ie

Proposed Distribution of Housing 2004 - 2026

	Selby Area Action Plan**	Sherburn in Elmet	Tadcaster	Primary Villages (Outside Selby AAP area)**	Secondary Villages (excluding Osgodby)**	Total
Completions and Commiments*	2641	319	198	977	798	4933
Dwellings from future allocations	2774	227	273	1273	0	4547
TOTAL	5415	546	471	2250	798	9480
%	57	6	5	24	8	100%

* The contribution from commitments has been discounted by 10% to allow for some non - implementation

** Selby together with the Parishes of Barlby and Osgodby, Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby within the Selby Area Action Plan boundary.

Summary of Responses

- 2.1 Respondents were marginally in favour of the proposed distribution (69 / 51). Analysis of those responses wishing to see some change, (See Table in Appendix 1) indicates a balance in favour of more development in all the settlement categories other than Selby.
- 2.2 Amongst the key stakeholders, Government Office question the proportion of development attributed to Primary Villages, although they do recognise that the increased perception of flood risk in Selby may reduce the potential growth there. The (former) Regional Assembly response is generally very supportive of the distribution proposals but also recognises that flood risk had not been fully taken into account in the current Regional Spatial Strategy. Both responses stress the need to justify why individual settlements are selected for further growth, based on their role and function.
- 2.3 The main reasons given by respondents for wanting a reduced emphasis on Selby AAP were congestion, flood risk and excessive use of greenfield land. Two respondents were concerned at the potential distribution within the Selby AAP, particularly mentioning possible over-development in Brayton. Two respondents were concerned that the Secondary status of Osgodby would unduly restrict development there. Two respondents suggested the possibility of new settlements; one on the Wakefield/Selby border and the other at the M62/A19 junction

Comments

- 2.4 As indicated above in comments on Question 1, further work is being undertaken to review the housing distribution. This will refine the options, discussed at the previous Task and Finish Group, which are being tested in the Highways Agency Model, and in collaboration with North Yorkshire County highways. Agenda item 3 considers the new evidence provided by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, the Strategic Land Availability Assessment and the Village Growth Potential Study. (The latter study is referred to in Paragraph 3.12 above and has been extended to include all the former Selby Local Plan 'H6' villages .as requested at the previous Task and Finish Group).
- 2.4a The final choice of distribution will ultimately be the result of balancing the weighting attached to strategic factors, such as the sustainability and function of settlements, impact on the strategic highway network and the desirability of minimising lengthy commuting, and local factors such as flood risk, meeting local housing needs, local environment and land availability. An appreciation of some or all these factors is present in the responses with a number of often conflicting opinions resulting. The overall analysis of responses, suggests that while there is general support for the development distribution, there is on balance a general view in favour of redistributing some development from Selby to all categories of settlement across the settlement hierarchy. In the final analysis, the Council will need to consider these views in the light of the latest evidence from the above studies and the responses from stakeholders.

- 2.5 Although two respondents, with vested interests, called for new settlement proposals, there was no significant general promotion of such a major amendment to the current settlement structure. As the Council has already made its views clear to the Regional Assembly on this issue, it is not proposed to take these views forward into the revised distribution.
- 2.6 The housing distribution is considered in more detail in Agenda item 3 (including issues associated with individual settlements).

Conclusion

- 2.7 The new evidence available in combination with the consultation response provides a new basis for refining the preferred housing distribution.

Question 2b

In particular, should there be more or less housing in Tadcaster?

Summary of Responses

- 2.8 The ratio of responses was 60/14 in favour of more housing in Tadcaster., whilst 6 respondents indicated agreement with the level which had been proposed.
- 2.9 The general balance of the comments is that Tadcaster through its relative size, level of services and employment opportunities represents a preferred location for an increased amount of housing in preference to that proposed in the smaller villages. A smaller number of respondents indicated its development could ease the pressure on Selby as it was less congested than Selby and should have a more equal share of new development.
- 2.10 There were also a number of respondents who considered there was a need for more housing in the town because of the lack of recent development and/or the need to support the viability of the town.
- 2.11 The single most popular reason quoted was the good communications generally, with other respondents specifically mentioning the attractiveness of the town as a commuting location to Leeds and York.
- 2.12 Within those responses suggesting less development than is currently proposed, physical and ownership constraints on further development represented the main group of reasons. Other reasons mentioned were reliance on car commuting and lack of employment opportunities. One respondent suggested Tadcaster was already overloaded and another feared a loss of character unless future development was limited.

Comments / Conclusion

- 2.13 Councillors are already aware of the complex set of issues associated with planning for further development in Tadcaster. Tadcaster's allocation of new housing development is re-visited in the housing distribution paper (Agenda item 3) in the light of the most recent evidence collected in the recent studies, particularly the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the Strategic Land Availability Assessment.

Qu. 2c

In particular, should there be more or less housing in Sherburn in Elmet?

- 2.14 Of the 64 responses which specifically indicate a clear preference for 'more' or 'less' housing in Sherburn in Elmet to that being proposed, the ratio is 42/22 in favour of more housing in Sherburn. 3 respondents indicate agreement with the level which had been proposed.
- 2.15 Of those in favour of more housing at Sherburn, the reasons most quoted were employment opportunities, communications and rail services, services and infrastructure and land availability. Reducing pressure for development in villages was also mentioned.
- 2.16 Of those preferring less development than being proposed in Sherburn, concern over the amount of recent development and future growth within the town, coupled with the perceived inadequacy of current infrastructure and services are the main reasons given. 3 respondents suggested Tadcaster was a more appropriate location, whilst lack of evidence of local need and the need to limit commuting were also mentioned.

Comments

- 2.17 The responses indicate a 2 to 1 majority view that Sherburn in Elmet should accommodate a larger proportion of future new housing than currently proposed. The existence of employment opportunities in or close to the town was the most quoted reason. However, many of those who preferred to see less housing there were concerned at the amount of growth which had already taken place there and the perceived inadequacy of current services to cater for it.

Conclusion

- 2.18 The Core Strategy will need to balance the potential opportunities for further growth at Sherburn against the RSS policy of catering primarily for local needs outside Selby and the impact of further growth on the function, character and service infrastructure of the town.

Qu. 3

Please tell us whether you agree or disagree with the following options for strategic housing development on the edge of Selby (please number in preference order 1= highest , 6 lowest)

Site A - Cross Hills Lane

Site B - West of Wistow Road

Site C - Bondgate/Monk Lane

Site D - Olympia Mills

Site E - Baffam Lane

Site F - Foxhill Lane/ Brackenhill Lane

Summary of Responses

- 3.1 From the preferences given by respondents, Site D and Site A emerge with relatively consistent results in that they appear most in the highest ratings and least in the lowest ratings. Site F exhibits a dichotomy between those rating it highly and those rating it lowly. Sites B, C and E have consistent low ratings, with Site C having the most assignments to the lowest rating.
- 3.2 Overall, flooding and highway constraints were regularly recognised as the most crucial factors to be fully explored and taken into account.
- 3.3 Site A (Cross Hills Lane)
Good access and/or opportunity to provide better access to the north of the town is the most quoted positive reason in favour of the site. High flood risk, and associated issues, together with high infrastructure costs are the two outstanding issues mentioned by respondents in relation to development on this site.
- 3.4 With regard to the last two issues mentioned above, the Environment Agency noted that the Selby Dam Study reveals a higher flood risk on parts of the site than previously recognised which may reduce the developable area. North Yorkshire County Highways consider the site has good connectivity to the highway network and would not present issues in terms of network capacity.
- 3.5 Site B (Wistow Road)
This site was considered to be an appropriate development site and or a natural extension of Selby by 3 respondents. This was the most quoted point in favour of the site. High flood risk and associated issues, high infrastructure costs and poor access and highway capacity were the three main negative issues associated with the site.
- 3.6 The Environment Agency considers the site is low risk other than adjacent to Cockret Dike. However, they note that secondary defences could displace flooding to other areas. North Yorkshire County Highways consider that Wistow Road does not have the necessary capacity to serve development on the scale envisaged and that mitigating measures are not possible. They therefore do not support this site.
- 3.7 Site C (Bondgate/Monk Lane)
Within the eight positive points made on this site in Responses, there was no particular consensus on any one issue. High flood risk and associated issues, high infrastructure costs and poor access and highway capacity were the three main negative issues associated with the site, which received the most negative ranking overall.

- 3.8 The Environment Agency strongly advised against this site coming forward particularly as Holmes Dike becomes flood locked when Wistow Lordship flood storage is used up. In addition to potential overtopping or breach of main river flood defences additional risk is associated with the potential for a breach of the Barrier Dam. Existing properties would also be at risk due to water displacement. The site is also severely constrained in highway terms and North Yorkshire County Highways YCC advise that Wistow Road does not have the capacity to accommodate development on any scale and there are no realistic highway solutions.
- 3.9 Site D (Olympia Park)
The fact that this site was largely previously developed land is the main reason given in support of this site. Other factors quoted are that development would bring much needed visual improvement and that it was well related to the highway and public transport network. High flood risk and high infrastructure costs were again the main negative issues associated with the site.
- 3.10 The Environment Agency indicate that the site has a high risk of flooding and a further understanding of the risk is required through a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. North Yorkshire County Council notes that the site has good connectivity to the highways network and does not present any major issues in terms of network capacity.
- 3.11 Site E (Baffam Lane)
Low flood risk and good access were the two main points associated with this site. By far the most quoted negative issue was the impact on the Strategic Gap between Brayton and Selby and the resulting coalescence of the two settlements
- 3.12 The Environment Agency considers this site to be sequentially preferable to sites A,B,C and D in flood risk terms. North Yorkshire County Council notes that the site has good connectivity to the highways network and does not present any major issues in terms of network capacity. Urbanisation would affect significant views of St Wilfrids Grade 1 Listed church and impact on the special character of Brayton Conservation Area.
- 3.13 Site F (Foxhills Lane/Brackenhill Lane)
The issues raised on this site were very similar to those on Site E.
- 3.14 The Environment Agency considers this site to be sequentially preferable in flood risk terms to Sites A,B,C and D. However, North Yorkshire County Highways consider that Foxhills Lane is not suitable for this scale of development without significant highway infrastructure investment to facilitate delivery of this site. Urbanisation would affect significant views of St Wilfrids Grade 1 Listed church and impact on the special character of Brayton Conservation Area.

Comments

- 3.15 A summary of the key stakeholders' comments was reported to the last Task and Finish Group, together with a summary of the Sustainability Appraisal of the sites. At that stage the conclusion was drawn that Site D (Olympia Park) performed slightly better than the other residential sites in terms of environmental and social objectives, although a flood risk issue remained to be investigated further. The results from the overall consultation are broadly consistent with the Sustainability Appraisal outcome, which provides a sound basis for developing a course of action.
- 3.16 All the strategic sites have at least one negative issue associated with their development to full capacity. Site B appears to be severely constrained in highway terms and Site C in both highway and flood risk terms. On the evidence of the sequential test undertaken in connection with the level 2 SFRA for the Core Strategy, Sites E and F appear to be the least constrained in flood risk terms, although this must be balanced with environmental and sustainability considerations, including the desirability of avoiding the coalescence of settlements. Overall Sites A and D received the most consistently positive comments in the consultation, and it is recommended that further investigation into flood risk mitigating measures be undertaken as part of the SFRA Level 2 work to help establish the feasibility of releasing either site before a decision is made about which (if any) strategic site should be taken forward.

Conclusion

- 3.16a Further work on traffic, flood risk and landscape impacts need to be completed before a final decision can be made on the choice of preferred site(s)

Qu. 4

Do you agree that market housing should only be allowed in the Principal Town (Selby); Local Service Centres (Sherburn and Tadcaster) and the Primary Villages? If not please explain why.

Summary of Responses

- 4.1 The responses to this question were equally split (55/55) between those agreeing and those disagreeing. However, 40% of those disagreeing were landowners or had some connection with the development industry. The equivalent figure for those agreeing with the question was 13% with the majority being individuals and parish councils.
- 4.2 The main reasons for disagreeing with the question related to the impact of not allowing market housing in Secondary Villages. 16 respondents referred to the impact on the sustainability/vitality of Secondary Villages. In a similar vein, a further 6 respondents referred to not adequately meeting the needs of these villages. The potential restriction implied on the reuse of Previously Developed Land and redundant agricultural buildings was considered to be a negative impact of not allowing market housing in Secondary Villages.

- 4.3 Respondents also commented on the inequity of allowing affordable but not market housing in Secondary Villages and/or commented on the impact on the social mix if only affordable housing was permitted.
- 4.4 Two respondents commented adversely on not meeting market *demand* (as opposed to need) in Secondary Villages and six respondents, all through the same agent, commented on the potential impact on house prices, of a restriction on market housing in Secondary Villages.
- 4.5 Relatively few respondents gave a reason for their agreement with the statement. However, the main reason quoted (6 respondents) referred in some way to the unsustainability of the smaller settlements. 5 respondents referred to development being subject to local need, with 2 of these suggesting all development should be subject to need.
- 4.6 Six respondents indicated that although they were in general agreement with the statement, they were not against some development in smaller villages provided it was meeting an identified local need and/or protected the character of the village.

Comments

- 4.7 Although there was an equal split between respondents agreeing and disagreeing with the question, the caveats expressed by some of those agreeing suggested that there was some sympathy with small developments which met a local need in "Secondary Villages". Generally this would mean the provision of affordable housing (which is already supported through exception sites or other specific schemes) through small 100% allocations provided funding without market housing can be found.
- 4.8 In addition the reuse of previously developed land and buildings is a sound argument for some development, provided it does not detract from the character of the settlement. There is, however, an issue relating to use of garden curtilages. In the past this has led to high levels of windfalls within the Secondary Villages and in some cases a diminution in character.
- 4.9 As a result of the current economic downturn, windfalls have fallen from approximately 150% of the annual District housing requirement in 2006/07 to about 50% in 2008/09. There is, therefore, less reason for concern than previously that windfall development will inhibit achievement of RSS objectives in Selby District and a more relaxed stance on windfall development may be appropriate. However, it is considered that it is neither appropriate nor sustainable to consider expansion of smaller villages through allocations (other than for affordable housing) in the light of comments made by both Government Office and the (former) Regional Assembly.
- 4.10 It is therefore recommended that the current approach of not promoting allocations for general market housing in the smaller villages be maintained but that the housing delivery policy in the Core Strategy be slightly relaxed to enable small scale allocations for 100% affordable housing and small scale infilling in addition to redevelopment/development on previously developed land. The Strategy could also specifically refer to development within residential curtilages, making it clear that the Council will rigorously enforce stringent standards, through existing national and local policy, to ensure that such development is appropriate to the location in amount, type and design.

Qu. 5

Do you agree with the different thresholds proposed for affordable housing? If not please explain why.

Summary of Responses

- 5.1 The responses to this question were equally split (53/53) between those agreeing and those disagreeing. However, 49% of those disagreeing were landowners or had some connection with the development industry. The equivalent figure for those agreeing with the question was 6% with the majority being individuals and parish councils.
- 5.2 The overriding reason given for disagreeing with the thresholds for affordable housing proposed is a perceived lack of evidence on need and viability. Respondents claim that it is not possible to accept the thresholds without a more thorough evidence base.
- 5.3 In overall terms there was general agreement over the specific issue of the ratio and thresholds being proposed for affordable housing, although of those disagreeing there was a slight balance in favour of less strict ratios and thresholds.

Comments

- 5.4 The overall result disguised the fact that landowners/developers and associates were almost universally against the proposals at the present time. The main reason given was that more evidence was required on need and viability before any view on the thresholds could be forthcoming. It is acknowledged that the current SHMA (not available at the time of consultation) provides a more up to date assessment of housing needs in the District.
- 5.5 The results of the SHMA indicates that there is identified need to support a continuation of the 40% proportion of affordable housing and the introduction of lower thresholds in rural areas. However, the outcome of the current Viability Study (which is due before the end of July 2009) is required before affordable housing policies can be finalised.

5.6 Conclusion

The current policy of negotiating a 40% proportion of affordable housing should be maintained but this and the site / settlement thresholds should be reviewed in the light of new evidence in the SHMA and economic viability assessment, once the results are available.

Qu. 6

In order to help meet the need for affordable housing, do you agree with the use of commuted sums for housing schemes below the proposed thresholds? If not please explain why.

Summary of Responses

- 6.1 The balance of the responses to this question was in favour (55/29) of the use of commuted sums. 38% of those disagreeing were landowners or had some connection with the development industry. The equivalent figure for those agreeing with the question was 5% with the majority being individuals and parish councils.
- 6.2 Of those responses disagreeing with the statement, the two main themes of the reasons given were the need for more information and the impact on the viability on development. In the former case, evidence from the SHMA and viability studies, and information on the level of contribution being sought was particularly mentioned. In the case of viability of requiring commuted sums, reference was made by a number of respondents to the current economic circumstances which was considered to be an additional threat to viability.
- 6.3 A number of respondents disagreed with this approach to providing affordable housing and some considered it would be seen as a tax on development. Alternatives such as shared ownership, costs borne by the community not by developers or house buyers, allocate more land generally and allocate more land specifically for 100% affordable housing were suggested.
- 6.4 Three respondents indicated that commuted sums should only be required if there was an identified need.

Comments

- 6.5 In general there was substantial support from Parish Councils and the general public for the use of commuted sums; but little support from those involved in the development industry. However, as with the affordable housing policy generally, there is a need for strong evidence on the need for the policy and its viability. It will not be possible to finalise this policy until the viability study has been completed.

Qu.7

If a strategic employment site is provided, which of the following do you consider is the most appropriate location?

- **Site G Olympia Park (land adjoining Selby By-pass)**
- **Site H Burn Airfield**

Have you any other suggestions?

Summary of Responses

- 7.1 An outline of the response of key stakeholders on the strategic employment sites, together with the Sustainability Appraisal summary was presented to the previous Task and Finish Group on 23rd February 2009. An appraisal of the full response to the strategic employment sites is provided below.

- 7.2 Despite the high flood risk associated with Site G, this site is overwhelming (6 to 1) preferred by respondents to a major business park / general employment development at Burn Airfield. Although there appeared to be misconceptions in 3 responses on the amount of previously developed land utilised within Site G and also a slightly rosy general perception of the accessibility of the site by public transport and walking (particularly the main part lying to the south of the railway), the site generally was considered to be a favourable one with regard to its location and setting within the Selby urban area and its accessibility for the Selby workforce.
- 7.3 Initial concerns over the degree to which Site G, the former Burn Airfield, is affected by flood risk have been somewhat reduced as the Environment Agency have indicated that a more detailed investigation may demonstrate that two thirds of the site falls within an area of high flood risk (Flood Zone 3a) rather than functional floodplain. The remaining third is at low flood risk.
- 7.4 However the (former) Yorkshire and Humber Assembly express concerns over use of Burn as a general employment site. It wishes to see the site retained as a regionally significant inward investment site for single user research and development purposes.
- 7.5 There was no concentrated support for any particular alternative strategic site, although there is an implicit thread in the above suggestions that the Core Strategy should be supportive, in a variety of ways, of smaller scale and specialist employment opportunities across the District. Additional suggested strategic employment sites are:-
- Existing industrial sites in Selby (Tate and Lyle, Clarion, Rigid Paper, 'Dock area')
 - Former Mine Sites (North Selby, Wistow)
 - Brayton Hall farm
 - Former pig farm opposite GreenCore
 - M62/ Eggborough area
 - New M62 service Area and International hotel, Hensall
 - Strategic rail freight interchange at Darrington on the Wakefield / Selby border south of Knottingley / M62
 - Extension to Sherburn industrial estate
 - Gascoigne Wood
 - Former airfields (Church Fenton, Barlow)

Comments

- 7.6 The responses support the tentative conclusions contained in the previous report to Task and Finish Group, that work continues to deliver Site G (Olympia Park) as a strategic employment site and that Site H (Burn Airfield) continues to be safeguarded as a single user inward investment site. Additional work will be undertaken as part of the Level 2 SFRA to assess how future flooding can be managed at Site G, Olympia Park

- 7.7 It is considered only two of the further suggestions for employment sites made by respondents has the potential in terms of location and size to become strategic sites serving Selby but these are not of a general employment nature being linked to rail-freight
- 7.8 The Gascoigne Wood site has the advantage of being previously developed land but does have a recent planning permission for rail freight related uses. The Knottingley site falls within the West Yorkshire Green Belt and is largely 'greenfield' in nature. Further advice is being sought from LGYH / Yorkshire Forward as to whether there is demand for an additional regional facility to help assess whether there are sufficient exceptional circumstances to justify such a proposal to be taken forward.
- 7.9 In addition to identifying strategic sites it will be important for the Core Strategy to express sufficient flexibility to respond to a range of genuine, viable proposals for employment development in appropriate locations, if additional job opportunities are to be created to support greater self-sufficiency of employment within the District.

Qu.8

Please tell us whether you agree or disagree with the following statements:

- A Land Allocated for employment purposes but which is undeveloped should be considered for mixed use or possibly other uses, if there is no realistic prospect of employment development coming forward.**
- B Existing employment premises should be protected from redevelopment where there is evidence of market need.**
- C For new business development the focus should be on securing small/medium sized business space and general industrial premises in suitable locations.**
- D New housing development should be balanced with an appropriate level of business development.**

Summary of Responses

- 8.1 In general there was overwhelming agreement with the statements. Individual comments on the statements were relatively few in number but are summarised below.

8.2 Comments made on Statement A

The main theme of the comments (9 comments) was that cases should be assessed on the characteristics of the site and/or the nature of the potential uses. Of these some respondents indicated that sites should be assessed on their merits or that changes should go through the normal development control process.

Yorkshire Forward indicated that any reduction in employment land supply needs to be addressed through provision of new sites that meet the needs of a modern service and knowledge economy

Another respondent indicated that a realistic timescale should be used to ensure land is not lost prematurely.

8.3 Comments made on Statement B

Fewer comments were made directly relating to this question but 3 responses made a comment relating to the need to consider cases on their merits. The Yorkshire Forward comment above is also relevant to this question.

A respondent with an interest in a large site with potential for redevelopment suggested policies should be flexible to allow employment to be directed to the most appropriate sites and should not sterilise existing sites if they are more suitable for other uses.

A second respondent with a similar large potential redevelopment site suggested that employment sites in predominantly residential areas should not be restricted from redevelopment taking place. Redevelopment may remove 'bad neighbour' uses and improve the environment for local residents.

8.4 Comments made on Statement C

The main group of comments (4) suggest that the policies locating and attracting new business development should be based on the individual needs of the development and responsive to market demand.

Two respondents disagreed with the suggestion in the statement that large scale employment development would not be sought.

A further response suggested that support for existing businesses was important in encouraging new employment opportunities.

Another response recommended that evidence for the policy would need to be provided, whilst another suggested the Strategy should concentrate on providing for local needs rather than trying to attract new sectors, with the Selby area being an exception.

8.5 Comments made on Statement D

The comments made on Statement D reflect that whilst most agree generally with the statement there are a variety of qualifications/reservations.

Two respondents agree but have reservations on how or whether a good balance between the two uses could be achieved.

Two respondents emphasise the need to keep a reasonable separation between the two uses, or at least to try and achieve a close mix on every site; and a further two respondents note that often sites were more suited to one or other of the uses and a close balance within a small area was not realistic. A further response suggests that options for site usage should be assessed on their merits in accordance with criteria based policies.

One respondent considers housing should be the priority for development with employment following, and one advocates the reverse.

Finally, one respondent agreed with the statement, provided there was a market need for both uses.

8.6 Other Comments

Two respondents stressed the importance of employment generation to the strategy, indicating that housing development should be employment led. 'There is no logic in allowing large scale housing development where there is no potential for employment growth.'

Two responses noted the lack of business premises within the District, one mentioning small/medium businesses and the other start-up units.

Two respondents commented on the value of business incentives paid to businesses in the form of rental discounts. However, they were also concerned that business rate remissions should be monitored to prevent firms leaving when the discount ceases.

Comments

8.7 There was clearly substantial support for all four statements in principle. The most disagreement was with Statement A with some respondents noting the value of the convenient location within Selby of older industrial areas. However, of the overall comments made, the main theme was one of not being too rigid in policy terms, i.e. being responsive to market demand and, when considering changes of use and employment allocation, assessing proposals on their individual merits in accordance with a criteria based policy.

8.8 Government Office indicate that the statements tend to reflect existing national policy and that Local Development Documents should avoid unnecessarily repeating national policy. They also suggest that any departure from national policy would need to be justified by sound local evidence.

8.9 Conclusion

The responses suggest that respondents consider there is no strong case for departing from established national policy on employment land provision. In the light of GOYH comments it is necessary to review whether the Core Strategy can rely on national / regional policy with appropriate cross referencing or whether there are particular circumstances that justify local policy .

Qu.9

Do you agree that approximately 10% of the energy requirements of major development schemes should be produced from on-site renewables or from on-site renewables or from other decentralised renewable or low carbon supplies?

If not should the percentage be higher or lower?

- 9.1 Apart from the specific comments relating to the proposed 10% requirement a number of other comments relating to renewable energy were received. These are considered at the end of this section. Other comments on climate change issues including reducing greenhouse gas emissions, energy efficiency, building design for example are dealt with elsewhere under 'Other Comments' later in this report (see also Appendix 1).

Summary of Responses to 10% question

- 9.2 61 respondents agree with the statement and 57 disagree, although only 38 of those agreeing do so unconditionally, the remainder attach further caveats.
- 9.3 Of those who expressed a view on the proportion of energy requirements to be produced locally, 25 indicated a higher percentage, 2 a lower percentage and 15 wanted flexibility to allow for individual site circumstances/viability to be taken into account and/or different types of development.
- 9.4 Although there was reasonable support for the 10% level there were a number of responses saying that the percentage needs to be based on sound evidence and the final percentage justified when compared to alternative levels. Respondents tended to express caveats – particularly for the need for flexibility in any requirements where viability might be threatened or where special restrictions e.g Listed Buildings or Conservation Areas might present difficulties. Some suggested changing targets may also be appropriate over time, but need to demonstrate evidence for chosen percentage.

Comments (10% issue)

- 9.5 National policy on renewables is set out in PPS22 and its Annex and more specifically in PPS1 Planning and Climate Change (2004), Supplement to PPS1 and The Planning and Energy Act (2008).

- 9.6 Amongst other things these say that LPAs should, in their Core Strategy and supporting LDDs, provide a framework that promotes and encourages renewables and low carbon energy generation. LPAs should expect, and have power to require a proportion of energy supply of new developments to be secured from decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy sources, through policies in their DPDs.
- 9.7 PPS1 Supplement requires that LPAs have an evidence-based understanding of the local feasibility and potential for renewable and low-carbon technologies, requiring their own assessments. LPAs should set out target percentages where it is viable, set out the type and size of development to which the target will be applied and ensure there is a clear rationale for the target and it is properly tested. Such policies should be set out in a DPD not an SPD.
- 9.8 At Regional level, the Regional Spatial Strategy (2008) has translated the national requirements into specific targets for all Local Authorities. RSS Policy ENV5 B.3 states the requirements for renewable and low-carbon energy in new developments:
- “Promoting and securing greater use of decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy in new development, including through Development Plan Documents setting ambitious but viable proportions of the energy supply for new development to be required to come from such sources. In advance of local targets being set in DPDs, new developments of more than 10 dwellings or 1000m² of non-residential floorspace should secure at least 10% of their energy from decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources, unless, having regard to the type of development involved and its design, this is not feasible or viable.”*
- 9.8a It should be noted therefore that existing statutory Regional Spatial Strategy Policy ENV5 already establishes a 10% requirement for energy from decentralised, and renewable or low-carbon sources on developments meeting a size threshold, and subject to type of development, design and feasibility/viability. This provides the basis for current development control decisions.
- 9.9 We can choose to continue to rely on this regional policy or set more challenging targets through the Core Strategy and / or subsequent DPD documents. However, any different targets must be based on a robust local evidence and be properly tested and justified.

Conclusion

- 9.10 Further work is required on this issue to establish whether there is a case for higher local targets particular in view of the Governments commitment to 'raise the bar' on renewable energy provision. This may require additional resources to commission specific research. Councillors may feel this is not justified in view of the potential for delaying the Core Strategy further and wish to therefore continue to rely on regional targets in the Core Strategy which can articulate how the District will contribute to renewable energy in association with national and regional planning and energy policies, with a view to introducing more ambitious targets at a later date through a development management DPD . See also comments on 'Renewable energy' and 'Other Comments' in the climate change section.

Summary of Other Responses relating to Renewable Energy

- 9.11 The Regional Assembly note that the document should make reference to supporting renewable energy development and the renewable energy targets set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy (2008). RSS ENV5 sets targets for installed grid connected renewable energy capacity for Selby District of 14 MW by 2010 and 32 MW by 2021.
- 9.12 The LDF should include a robust criteria based policy that will be used to assess all applications for renewable energy developments but recognised that would be most appropriate in a Development Management DPD.
- 9.13 Yorkshire Forward suggests that the Core Strategy considers those broad locations where renewable energy development would be planned.
- 9.14 Some respondents referred to the need to include policies, which deal with the environmental impact of renewable energy schemes themselves. Visual amenity should not be sacrificed. If wind turbines are to be used for renewable energy the effect on wildlife should be taken into account. The policy will need to take into account of guidance provided in PPS22 that permissions for RE projects should only be granted where the objectives of Listed Building and Conservation Area designations will not be compromised.
- 9.15 The development plan should encourage and promote different renewable energy generation technologies (solar, biomass, wind, geothermal, hydro etc as well as CHP).

Comments on Other Renewable Energy Responses and Climate Change Issues

- 9.16 The Further Options Report establishes that the Core Strategy will include policies that "will cover energy conservation, renewable energy and flood risk management. In terms of energy conservation the policy will aim to manage the design and location of development to: reduce the need to travel, especially by private car; improve the energy efficiency and minimise resource consumption of developments; and promote use of sustainable design and construction techniques" (Further Options Report Para 5.4).

- 9.17 In addition it stated that “Other Core Strategy policies will support renewable energy projects within the District subject to their local impact being proportionate to their importance as energy generators, and support micro-generation proposals wherever possible, again subject to there not being an unacceptable impact on the locality” (Further Options Report Para 5.5).
- 9.18 As such and in response to the wider and related comments on renewable energy, low-carbon energy, energy efficiency and climate change issues raised by submissions, it is intended that further research will help determine the range of policies and appropriate level of detail or single over-arching policy we ought to include in the Core Strategy (as opposed to a future Development Management Policies DPD).
- 9.18a The range of policies which may be appropriate to include in the Core Strategy could be:
- ❖ Supporting the achievement of the Regional Spatial Strategy targets
 - ❖ Investigating the community heating opportunities near Selby
 - ❖ Supporting micro-generation proposal not connected to the national grid
 - ❖ Improving energy efficiency
 - ❖ Promoting sustainable design and construction techniques
- 9.19 Officers will prepare a Background Paper on renewable energy and climate change issues for consideration prior to finalising policies in the draft consultation Core Strategy . (See also ‘Other Comments’ on Climate Change below). The acquisition of local evidence will be critical to developing ‘sound’ policies.

Additional Comments on Installed Renewable Energy Targets

- 9.20 Clearly it will be appropriate to refer to the RSS targets for Selby District grid-connected renewable energy targets. Selby District would exceed its 2010 target of 14 MW if the Rusholme Wind Farm planning permission were implemented. This does not mean however that further applications should be rejected as national and regional policy dictates that regional targets should be viewed as a starting point not a ceiling.
- 9.21 It should also be noted that Drax Power has announced plans to build a dedicated biomass-fired renewable energy plant on land adjacent to Drax power station capable of producing 300 MW of grid-connected electricity. The District Council will be a consultee on a planning application to be submitted to the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC).
- 9.22 It is interesting to also note that there is an additional North Yorkshire target for “Co-firing” of 75 MW to 2010 and 67 MW to 2021 in the RSS. Assuming that there are only opportunities for co-firing at existing power stations, then this requirement falls to Selby District to attain on behalf of North Yorkshire as a whole. Both Eggborough Power Station and Drax Power Station produce energy from co-firing biomass. However, such proposals fall outside the control of the planning system.

9.23 Given the clear potential to exceed our Regional Spatial Strategy targets by some margin, it could be argued that Selby should seek to set more challenging targets through the Core Strategy. However, the main issue again would be the amount of further technical work, which would be required to test alternative scenarios and provide evidence for the tests of soundness. It is considered such a route would be too onerous in terms of costs and time required at the present time.

Further Comments on renewable Energy ‘Areas of Search’

9.24 Guidance contained in PPS1 Supplement and PPS22 (Renewable Energy) highlights that Local Authorities should set out criteria to reflect local circumstances and identify where renewable energy development may be considered appropriate.

9.25 While it may be appropriate to include an appropriate policy in the Core strategy on how proposals for renewable energy will be considered at local level it is the officer’s view at this stage that the resources required to establish a sound evidence base in identifying specific areas within the District as appropriate for renewable energy schemes is likely to be too substantial. Such costs (in time and money) are unlikely to outweigh the benefits given that having such areas does not mean we can refuse applications elsewhere.

Qu. 10

The Government is introducing a Community Infrastructure Levy on new development. Please tick those that you consider to be important.

Broadband; Community Facilities; Cycle and walking infrastructure; Education; Green Infrastructure; Health; Public Realm; Rail and Bus Infrastructure; Recreation Open Space; Recycling; Road Infrastructure; Other (please specify)

Summary of Responses

10.1 129 responses were received to this question, with 116 of the respondents having chosen one or more of the category that they consider being important.

A good range of developers, individuals and stakeholders have chosen to make a choice or comment on this question.

Below is the number of respondents who chose the categories that they considered to be important.

Broadband	31
Community Facilities	72
Cycle & walking infrastructure	68
Education	60
Green Infrastructure	53
Health	63
Public Realm	20

Rail and Bus Infrastructure	85
Recreation Open Space	61
Recycling	56
Road Infrastructure	69
Other	9

10.2 Other suggested categories

Suggestions made for other categories include

- Wildlife protection/encouragement
- Protection of Listed Buildings
- Community Safety
- Cycle tracks
- Improved footpaths
- Wind farm green energy scheme
- Flood defences
- Green roofs
- Space for nature
- Improve health and well being
- Reduce environmental impact
- Formal sports provision
- Affordable Housing
- Cultural facilities
- Litter reduction
- Children and young people's issues through centres, early years, youth and children's social care

10.3 Two respondents disagreed with the principle of the CIL and 4 planning consultants consider that the Council has misunderstood the legislation, considering it to be unsound to include aspirational choices not included in the legislation. They also note that it is not a duty on the Council to implement the CIL legislation – but to be decided upon.

10.4 Comments also made that if implemented, the CIL should be fair and ensure that it is not putting onerous financial pressure on developers. Advised to avoid any overlap with S106 obligations and consider a site size threshold. There was also concern over the how the CIL may be administered

Comments

10.5 In the light of the early implementation experience in other authorities, it is suggested that the Council does not implement the Community Infrastructure Levy at this stage, but continue to maintain a watching brief and continue with the use of S106 agreements, which have delivered local benefits successfully over recent years. Given more time to consider the implications of the new procedure to potential local benefits, there will be possibility of reviewing the situation when the Developer Contributions SPD is revisited in the future.

Qu. 11

Do you have any views on opportunities to enhance or create Green Infrastructure?

Summary of Responses

- 11.1 54 of the 176 respondents commented on this question. A number of additional comments were received on recycling, green construction techniques and some cryptic 'green' comments that seem to indicate a misunderstanding of the question.
- 11.2 14 comments include support for the principle of Green Infrastructure, with some asking for more information/consultation.

Of those who made relevant comments, suggestions of opportunities to enhance or create Green Infrastructure include:

- Keep villages green – build a by-pass
- Health walks – designed and signposted
- Improvements to cycle routes and creation of new ones (inc A19, A1041, Selby Dam)
- Countryside, green space, green belt, greenfield sites and wildlife to be protected from development with strengthened rules
- Strategic site F could incorporate a significant tree belt
- Positively maintain distance between settlements

- Protect Strategic sites E & F as within a countryside gap, which should be protected and enhanced as part of Green Infrastructure
- Build in Green Infrastructure to new developments
- New woodland creation may be needed to link existing sites and provide access where lacking
- Create a linear park
- Plant trees and hedges to replace those lost in the past
- Link Green Infrastructure with new public transport, walking and cycling routes that link up locations people need to visit regularly
- Increase level of well maintained ROS, sporting facilities and green space, and look after and improve the spaces that exist, together with improved access and public awareness
- Increase level of Green Infrastructure and protect from future development

- Comments on the mental health and well being benefits of green space
- Developer contributions should pay towards such provision as a 'green levy'
- Need for a policy in the core Strategy, in conjunction with stakeholders and Natural England – should help provide positive image to protect and enhance existing assets and plug deficit gaps. (Natural England)
- Best way to enhance Green Infrastructure would be to not overdevelop Selby and preserve the nature of the rural area
- Suggest using land with no practical use – such as flood plains.
- Ensure decent garden space for housing
- Carry out appraisal of existing green allocations
- Should be used to create connectivity between nature areas – linking different habitats. 'Living Landscapes' project interested in plans for Selby (Yorkshire Wildlife Trust).

11.3 Natural England comments include the wish to see a Green Infrastructure policy in the Core Strategy – covering provision, protection and enhancement of Green Infrastructure including public open space, green wedges and links, wildlife corridors and stepping stones. They refer to a sub – regional Green Infrastructure mapping project which Selby is involved with.

11.4 Several respondents have concerns about how Green Infrastructure will be enhanced, but only one comment disagreed with the principle of Green Infrastructure, making the following point:

- Green Infrastructure is a paper exercise, with only lip service to green issues – exploiting the word 'green'

Comments

11.5 The majority of those who commented gave their support to the principle by making suggestions. Some of the suggestions would require significant funding, or relate to responsibilities held by other bodies e.g. highway works. In addition, a number of comments relate to the need to maintain strategic gaps, which impacts on two of the suggested strategic sites for housing.

11.6 It is proposed to seek advice from English Nature and Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, prior to developing an appropriate Core Strategy policy

Qu.12

Do you consider that;

- a) More housing should be in the form of small dwellings (flats and terraced housing)? or**
- b) More housing should be in the form of 3-4 bedroom family houses?**

Summary of Responses

- 12.1 a) 33 respondents agree, and 42 disagree that we need more smaller dwellings.
b) 54 agree that more 3/4 bedroomed family houses are required and 26 disagree.
- 12.2 Of those respondents making comments 35 indicated there should be a good mix and balance of all types; 29 indicate that the mix should be determined by market demand/local need or local site circumstances and 18 consider that more evidence is required, particularly through an up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA).
- 12.3 A number of respondents said that different sizes and types of dwellings are appropriate in different locations (towns versus rural locations). In addition specific needs should be met such as flats for young and bungalows for older people.

Comments

- 12.4 Policies to influence mix should be based on proper assessment of evidence and should aim to provide for different needs of single, families with children and older persons to attain sustainable communities.
- 12.5 The recent SHMA provides substantial evidence on housing needs which will assist in formulating a general policy and in its subsequent detailed implementation through other Development Plan Documents and the development control process.
- 12.6 Comments on this issue overlap with comments made in other parts of the questionnaire on the design of new housing. Size and types of dwellings provided need to reflect local character especially taking into account rural and urban differences (See Part 4 – Environment Related Comments in the Other Comments section below).

Qu. 13

In making appropriate provision for gypsies and travellers, do you agree or disagree with the following options

- A New sites should be spread across the District.**
- B New sites should be located in or close to the towns and primary villages.**
- C Expanding the existing sites.**

Summary of Responses

- 13.1 112 of the 176 respondents commented on this question

Option	Yes	No
A	36	70
B	27	80
C	69	35

13.2 A small number of comments have been received backing up choices made, particularly that the expansion of existing sites makes the most sense as they already exist, and that sites should be provided where most need exists.

13.3 Reasons for responses

- a. Three suggestions of new site locations were made – these were all town centre based.
- b. One respondent gives the view that they do not consider that additional sites will be made use of as gypsies prefer to camp by the roadside as a part of their culture.
- c. 'Friends, Families and Travellers' recommend that consultation between the Council and the Gypsy and Traveller community needs to take place, in the form of direct outreach communication, to ensure that plans meet their needs.
- d. The Yorkshire and Humber Regional Assembly comment on the RSS policies H5 & H6, regarding the need to make pitches available to cover shortfall, and to carry out local assessments.

13.4 A number of responses commented on the existing Gypsy and Traveller site in Burn – unhappy with the state that site is kept in – recommend the Council to visit site before creating more.

Comments

13.5 The choice to expand existing sites received the most support, however, it is seen to be important to provide sites where there is a need in the district, supported by local assessments. To this end, the Gypsy and Traveller interest group recommends directly targeted consultation

13.6 In terms of establishing need in parts of the District, the North Yorkshire County Council traveller education data could tell us where Gypsies and travellers with children live – evidence of some value. More importantly, North Yorkshire County Council has recently appointed a Gypsy and Traveller project officer who has agreed to facilitate meetings with the gypsy and traveller community and travelling showpeople to refine information already available through the Gypsy and Travelers survey

Qu. 14

Do you agree with the following options:

- A - Sites should be sought that accommodate between eight and twelve pitches.**
- B – Individual pitches should be encouraged to allow flexibility and choice for gypsies and travellers distributed across the District.**
- C – A combination of A and B; one site of between eight and twelve pitches plus individual pitches.**

Summary of Responses

14.1 113 of the 176 respondents commented on this question.

Option	Yes	No
A	58	41
B	14	81
C	24	71

14.2 Option A received the highest support, however the proportion was around 60%, so not overwhelming. Options B & C received a low level of support, peaking slightly for a mix of a larger site and individual pitches. However several comments also consider option B to be the most sustainable.

Reasons for responses

14.3 Few individual comments were made to this question.

- Families, friends and travellers repeated their comments that the council need to develop local consultation techniques to ensure that Gypsy and Travellers are consulted as part of the ongoing planning process.
- Questions are considered speculative, with a lack of a Gypsy Conservation Document and its findings. Gypsies should be asked what they would prefer.
- The Yorkshire and Humber Assembly repeat their comment referring to the need to make pitches available to cover a shortfall, and the need to comply with RSS policies H5 & H6.
- Support for larger sites as give more opportunity for spaces to become available – promoting gypsy nomadic lifestyle.
- Comment given that there seems to be no logical reason for the prescriptive size of communal sites.

14.4 Other comments made in the FFT(Friends, Family and Travellers) response have been outlined in Part 10 of the Other Comments section below.

Comments

14.5 The option of a larger site has the most support, but option C gives the flexibility to provide for different needs.

14.6 Considering the lack of comments from the Gypsy and Traveller community – a need exists to target consultation to the group itself, perhaps using Planning Aid/ the North Yorkshire County Council Gypsy and Traveller Project Officer. A meeting has been arranged to discuss this matter with the County Council to seek the appropriate way forward for the Core Strategy.

Qu. 15

The indications are that only limited provision is required for travelling showpeople. If provision is required, should an area of search be:

A – In or close to the Towns of Selby, Tadcaster or Sherburn in Elmet?

B – In close proximity to the strategic road network (such as M62, A1 and A64)?

15.1 111 of the 176 respondents commented on this question.

Option	Yes	No
A	31	67
B	70	32

15.2 Very few individual comments were made. Those that were made mostly fell into two camps – those who felt that no provision is required in the District and those that consider that the best location was the most sustainable location – however, there varying interpretations of ‘sustainable’.

15.3 Reasons for responses:

- As showpeople travel with heavy transport, proximity and easy access to the primary road network is essential.
- The main towns of the District are considered to be well connected to the road network, as well as providing services unlikely to be available to sites only close to the strategic road network.
- Not convinced of a need – showpeople are capable of sorting their own needs out. A site in Burn closed down due to no longer being viable.

Comments

15.4 According to the 2007/08 North Yorkshire Gypsy and Traveller Assessment there are too few showpeople living in the district to quantify a need – however when asked to rank the locations that they would prefer to live in, Selby came out with the top ranking. Therefore it could be said that a need is being masked, by showpeople having their over winter yards where they can find a suitable location, rather than where they would chose to be located.

15.5 Work has been commissioned by the North Yorkshire County Council Gypsy and Traveller Project Officer to assess the barriers to showpeople living in their preferred location of Selby District.

Other Comments

15.6 This section relates to comments made in the questionnaire (particularly the last section which gave an opportunity for additional comment) and in other responses made through letters and e-mails, which couldn't be attributed directly to a particular question but which were nevertheless relevant to the Core Strategy process.

15.7 The additional comments made were many and varied which makes summary difficult. However the main themes emerging from the general comments are as follows:

General

1. The Consultation Process
2. General Core Strategy Issues

Topics not covered within Questions

3. Overall amount of new housing being planned
4. Environment related comments
5. Transport related comments
6. Regeneration and Employment related comments
7. Climate Change
8. Infrastructure comments
9. Minerals and energy related comments
10. Gypsies and Travellers
11. Other issues

1. The Consultation Process

15.8 Four respondents who commenting on this recent consultation process criticised the questionnaire on the basis that they found it difficult to understand and complete. Another 3 respondents also mentioned the lack of publicity given to it. One respondent considered that it should not have referred to the comments received on the Interim Housing Policy consultation and one respondent referred to the lack of previous consultation.

Two respondents, one of which is Government Office, considered that further consultation was necessary before submitting the Core Strategy.

Comments

15.9

- Although some shortcomings in both the questionnaire and the consultation process are readily acknowledged, overall the response received represented a wide range of individuals, organisations and commercial interests and a corresponding range of well argued views. Bearing in mind the limited resources which could be made available for this exercise, the results are considered to have produced a satisfactory response to inform further policy decisions on the consultation issues.

- 15.10 • Although the recent consultation on the possible introduction of Interim Housing Policies was not technically a Local Development Framework Consultation, the subject matter had a substantial overlap with the housing issues of this consultation. It was considered appropriate to make reference to this consultation to explain the outcome and to indicate that the response received to it had assisted in the production of the further options for housing policies presented in this consultation.
- 15.11 • Government Office's indication that a further round of consultation prior to submission is acknowledged and accepted. It is proposed to undertake a fuller consultation on a draft Core Strategy early in 2010. Lessons learnt from this recent consultation will be implemented as far as resources allow in the next consultation.

2. General Core Strategy Issues

- 15.12 Within their response Government Office included a raft of standard general advice on the content of Core Strategies, which is not summarised here.
- 15.13 With regard to the elements of the proposed strategy as contained in the consultation report, four respondents expressed regret at the lack of more contextual material e.g. vision, aims and objectives and one respondent wished to see a more place based strategy.
- 15.14 Another respondent wished to see the strategy adopt a more serious appreciation of the current recession and the enormous cost-challenge of global warming. Suggests a much greater emphasis on self-sufficiency, low carbon initiatives and a generally more sustainable way of life.
- 15.15 Government Office indicated that the Core Strategy should state that an Ecotown within the District is not currently within the Government's programme and the strategy would need to be revised if this position changed in the future. Government Office also mentioned the need to consider options for the topics included in the consultation report such as renewable energy and green infrastructure.
- 15.16 The need for a more comprehensive and up to date evidence base was mentioned as a general comment by three respondents. The need for a SHLAA, SHMA and an affordable housing viability study were particularly mentioned.

Comments

- 15.17 • Government Office' standard general advice on the content of Core Strategies can be found in their response on the Council's website or is available with all the responses received in the Members' Room.

- 15.18 • With regard to contextual material, respondents did not always appreciate that this was only a partial consultation primarily aimed at obtaining views on the strategic development sites, but also filling gaps in previous consultations. A conscious decision was made not to burden this report and its readers with material which had been the subject of consultation at the Issues and Options Stage. On balance it was decided to focus the consultation on those issues where a public view was required before moving to the final stage of preparation.
- 15.19 • The current downturn in the economy has tended to make forecasting more difficult and focuses attention even further on local sustainability. It is intended that the final strategy will reflect the Government's wish that Local Development Frameworks encourage sustainable development in a local context and provide a policy framework flexible enough to meet the greater uncertainties of many aspects of the social, environmental and economic circumstances over the next fifteen years or so.
- 15.20 • It is acknowledged that it is appropriate in the Core Strategy to clarify the current situation with regard to recent proposals for Eco-towns in the District.
- 15.21 • The need for an up to date evidence on important topics such as housing markets and affordable housing, housing land availability and flood risk is acknowledged. Most of these are now completed or nearing completion. One or two studies have yet to be completed e.g the affordable housing viability study, landscape assessment of potential development areas around settlements and the retail study.

3. Overall amount and distribution of new housing being planned

- 15.22 Eight respondents expressed concern over the total number of houses being proposed in the Strategy, a number citing the current economic downturn as a reason to be sceptical on the number required.
- 15.23 On the other hand four respondents considered that the strategy fell short of meeting the requirements being set, with two mentioning the proposed RSS review. Government Office clearly indicated that the recent high levels of house building during the first four years of the RSS period (64% over the minimum requirement) should not influence the need to demonstrate a continued delivery of the full RSS requirement in future years.
- 15.24 Although the issue of the distribution of new housing is covered relatively thoroughly in the questionnaire's housing section, two respondents raised concern in a general way that, in considering the role of villages, the analysis had been too theoretical and did not sufficiently take into account the individual needs and circumstances within each village.
- 15.25 One respondent also considered that the distribution as published did not adequately reflect the distribution sought by Policy and Resources Committee.

Comments

- 15.26
- It is perhaps inevitable that concern has been expressed at the level of house building envisaged in the light of the current downturn. However, the housing requirement is a long term one 2008 – 2026 and is a guide to the allocation of housing land to ensure that land availability is not a restriction on achieving the at least the minimum 'ball-park figure' for house building set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy. The recent downturn has, however, demonstrated that land supply is only one factor in the delivery of housing. If lower market trends provide a limitation on meeting this requirement in the short term then either higher market conditions in the medium to long term may compensate, or otherwise land supplies set out in current documents will last beyond the Plan Period without the need to be supplemented further.
- 15.27
- The main point is that the housing requirement provided for in Development Plans aims to ensure adequate land availability over the Plan Period to ensure the forecast need can be met. However, its take-up may vary over that period. At this point in time it is not known how this current downturn will affect the long term forecasts of housing need. Even the most recent national and regional forecasts at regional level anticipate an even higher requirement for new dwellings and authorities are being advised to treat the existing requirement as a minimum option. It would therefore be unwise to revise housing land targets downwards in response to what may be a relatively short term reduction in market demand. The current downturn may more appropriately impact on the timing and content of the next review of the Plan when more information on the length and depth of this downturn will be available.
- 15.28
- Despite a 64% oversupply in the delivery of housing within Selby District over the first four years of the Regional Spatial Strategy, Government guidance demands that the Core Strategy still makes provision for the full annual requirement between now and the end Plan Period. Although this interpretation of guidance has been resisted in the past because, if the high rates of development of the recent past had continued they would have substantially increased the burden of demonstrating an adequate supply of land over the Plan Period - in effect penalising the authority for achieving high development rates. The reduction of the housebuilding during the last two years, as a result of the downturn, eases this concern, particularly if the low rate continues for a further year. However, if past delivery is to be ignored in the calculation, an increase of approximately 750 dwellings in the minimum total housing requirement being sought to 2026 will be included in future documents.

- 15.29 • The issue of assessing the role and growth of villages has been fully responded to in the response to Questions 1 and 2a.
- 15.30 • Although one respondent considered the distribution did not fully reflect all the views of members of the Council, the distribution as published was accepted as an appropriate distribution for consultation purposes at that point in time. As indicated in the comments on Questions 1 and 2a, it was always recognised that the final distribution would continue to evolve from the consultation responses and particularly in the light of the additional and more up to date evidence which continues to be collected. The distribution as published provided a basis for consultation and obtaining feedback as part of an ongoing process.

4. Environment Related Comments

- 15.31 Four respondents referred in general terms to concern over the loss of greenfield land and loss of countryside and a further four referred in general terms to concern of flood risk. Both these issues were often mentioned in other parts of the questionnaire in the more specific context of the strategic sites.
- 15.32 On the other hand, two respondents considered that the Core Strategy should refer to a Green Belt review (with a view to development sites being made available) and a further respondent suggested an assessment of areas designated as of landscape value and or Strategic Countryside Gap with a view to checking whether the constraint was still relevant. (Again references to Strategic Countryside Gap have also been made in connection with individual strategic housing sites.)
- 15.33 Protecting the rural character of villages featured in three general comments, one of which specifically referred to inappropriate high density and three storey housing in a village environment.
- 15.34 Other individual requests for more emphasis/policy inclusion include water quality protection, biodiversity, whilst Sport England wish to ensure that there is no loss of formal recreational facilities occurring as a result of development proposals.
- 15.35 The Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment included some general advice which centred on design featuring as a cross-cutting issue at all levels of LDF policy making from the strategic to the detailed, and the creation of 'hooks' in policies which enable development of other design.

Comments

Greenfield/Green Belt

- 15.36 Whilst there was some general concern over the loss of countryside / Green belt, this is balanced by those wishing to ensure that an open mind is retained with regard to Green Belt sites and Strategic Countryside Gap where these might assist in meeting development needs. While it is not considered necessary that there should be a comprehensive review of Green Belt boundaries which were established and tested relatively recently at the District Local Plan stage, the Strategy could refer to undertaking localised green belt reviews in those circumstances where housing delivery is affected by unavailability of non-Green belt land. Any localised amendments which may be considered appropriate in documents making more detailed allocations will need to be fully justified by exceptional circumstances. Similarly the principle of the Strategic Gaps was also established in that Plan. Notwithstanding that broad commitment, it is important not to blindly close off options which arise out of current circumstances, without full consideration – hence the inclusion of potential Strategic Residential Sites within the Strategic Gap for consultation.
- 15.37 Above all, it is intended that the Core Strategy will follow national and regional policy guidelines and fully encourage the optimum use of previously developed land. In recent years well over 60% of development has occurred on previously developed land and Core Strategy policies will foster this trend. However, it is inevitable that greenfield sites will also be required to meet the land requirements upto 2026. Discussion on the outcome of the consultation on the strategic sites and the general distribution of development will establish the need in more detail.

Design Issues

- 15.38 The concern of a number of respondents with regard to ensuring good design is fully shared. Detailed design policies are more appropriately placed in more detailed planning documents e.g. Village Design Statements and Development Control policy documents. However, it is intended that the general vision of improved design and respect for the local visual environment is set out in the Core Strategy in a way which will provide 'hooks' for these more detailed policies.

5. Transport Related Comments

- 15.39 There was a request for by-passes for Hambleton and Monk Fryston from one respondent.
- 15.40 Two respondents mentioned the need to develop the Selby rail station area and one respondent suggested a new rail station west of Selby.
- 15.41 A further respondent indicated there should be an emphasis in the Core Strategy on better public transport generally.

Comments

- 15.42 The concern to improve transport, particularly transport, is fully acknowledged. Liaison is taking place with the appropriate transport authorities to ensure that the linkage between the Strategy's development objectives and proposals and transport issues is fully explored and appropriately recognised.
- 15.43 The importance of Selby rail and bus stations, as a transport interchange, is recognised in the Regional Spatial Strategy and will be endorsed in the Core Strategy. More detailed proposals will be included in the Selby Area Action Plan, and the Local transport Plan which is the responsibility of North Yorkshire County Council.
- 15.44 Liaison over the implications of the Strategy's development proposals on the highway system, including the possible Monk Fryston and Hambleton by-passes, is being tested by the Highway's Agency and North Yorkshire Highways.

6. Regeneration and Employment Related Comments

- 15.45 The need to support regeneration and improve town centres was mentioned by seven respondents, with particular reference to Tadcaster in two cases. Three responses also mentioned a perceived threat from larger supermarkets to smaller independent traders in centres.
- 15.46 Two respondents mentioned a need to link the Core Strategy with the Council's Community Strategy and the Renaissance programme.
- 15.47 In terms of comments with regard to general employment issues, two respondents were concerned about the lack of/need for employment opportunities in the light of the amount of new housing being proposed.
- 15.48 Yorkshire forward raised a concern over a potential conflict between their own employment projections and those in the District Council's Employment Land Survey.
- 15.49 One response highlighted the need to assist and promote existing businesses and another requested that the tourism industry be given more emphasis.
- 15.50 The Highways Agency raised a concern over the development of B1 business uses adjacent to the Strategic Road Network.
- 15.51 A submission on behalf of Drax Power Ltd. wishes to see objectives/policies in Core Strategy to support the energy and infrastructure development at Drax Power Station. Objectives should not detract from Policy EMP 10 in the Selby District Local Plan which is a permissive policy that facilitates development relative to the process of generating energy at Drax. Policies should also recognise the need to address energy provision in a regional/national context.
- 15.52 The respondent considers that the above objectives should be implemented through site specific policies and land use allocations for energy/infrastructure development in subsequent LDDs.

Comments

- 15.53 The importance of improving the vitality of town centres is a recognised aim of both national and regional policy. It is intended that the Core Strategy will endorse this approach and ensure that it is supportive of initiatives such as the Renaissance Programme.
- 15.54 The importance of expanding the economy of the District is seen as central to the achievement of other objectives such as reduced commuting and greater self-sufficiency and future sustainability of life within the District. It is intended that facilitating the economy of the District wherever possible will be an important part of the Core Strategy. This will include assisting existing businesses as well as encouraging new ones.
- 15.55 The Highways Agency comments relate to the general presumption in favour of B1 uses to be located in town centres rather than at major highway junctions. However, it is suggested that in the Selby context any development will be on a relatively limited scale and such locational differences will be far less significant than on the scale of such developments in and adjacent to the larger towns within the conurbation. Whilst efforts will be made to encourage B1 development within and close to the centre it is considered that the overriding need for more employment within the Selby area as a whole to assist in limiting long distance commuting movements, indicates a degree of flexibility in providing a range of sites and locations.
- 15.56 The important role played by the electricity generation industry within the District is fully recognised. It is intended the Core Strategy will be supportive of the industry and encourage associated developments.

7. Climate Change Related Comments

Issue raised by respondents:

- 15.57 In addition to comments received in response to questions about the 10% 'renewable energy' requirement raised in Question 9 of the Consultation, respondents raised related climate change issues. All renewable energy related comments are dealt with at Q9 above and all other climate change issues are dealt with below.
- **Energy Efficiency, Sustainable Construction and Design Techniques**
- 15.58 Respondents considered the Core Strategy should include a policy to reduce predicted CO2 emissions in new development.
- 15.59 A number of respondents suggested that the policy on renewable energy should also include requirements to reduce energy wasted and encourage higher energy efficiency and developments should be properly carbon neutral. The policy should promote use of sustainable construction and design techniques.

- 15.60 The policy should refer to particular means of achieving national and regional targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions through mandatory design features or encouragement of Combined Heat and Power (CHP), water heating storage, grey water recycling, higher thermal insulations in buildings, green roofs, SUDS.
- 15.61 Yorkshire Forward particularly highlighted that it would be helpful to highlight how the Local Development Framework would contribute towards achieving both the energy efficiency targets outlined in the Housing Green paper (July 2007) (Code for Sustainable Homes and zero carbon homes by 2016) and the government aspiration for all non-domestic buildings to be zero carbon from 2019. (YF)
- 15.62 The representation from the British Wind Energy Association recommends the inclusion of an over-arching climate change policy within the Core Strategy document with detail and commitment to energy efficiency, renewable energy, minimisation of waste and pollution for example and the inclusion of discreet, proactive policies on the individual topics in the Development Control DPD.

Other Related Policies

- 15.63 One substantial submitted representation referred to the need to promote Coal Bed Methane extraction and Carbon Capture technologies, especially associated with the disused mine sites within Selby District. That response has been dealt with separately elsewhere in Part 9 of 'Other Comments' below.

Comments

- 15.64 The Further Options Report itself set out that the Core Strategy will include policies that "will cover energy conservation, renewable energy and flood risk management. In terms of energy conservation the policy will aim to manage the design and location of development to: reduce the need to travel, especially by private car; improve the energy efficiency and minimise resource consumption of developments; and promote use of sustainable design and construction techniques" (Para 5.4).
- 15.65 In addition it stated that "Other Core Strategy policies will support renewable energy projects within the District subject to their local impact being proportionate to their importance as energy generators, and support micro-generation proposals wherever possible, again subject to there not being an unacceptable impact on the locality" (Para 5.5).
- 15.66 As such and in response to the wider and related comments on renewable energy, low-carbon energy, energy efficiency and climate change issues raised by submissions, it is intended that further research will help determine the range of policies and appropriate level of detail or single over-arching policy we ought to include in the Core Strategy (as opposed to a future Development Management DPD).

- 15.66a The range of policies which may be appropriate to include in the Core Strategy could be:
- ❖ Supporting the achievement of the Regional Spatial Strategy targets
 - ❖ Investigating the community heating opportunities near Selby
 - ❖ Supporting micro-generation proposal not connected to the national grid
 - ❖ Improving energy efficiency
 - ❖ Promoting sustainable design and construction techniques

- 15.67 Officers will prepare a Background Paper on renewable energy and climate change issues prior to consideration in the draft document. (*also see section above at Question 9*)

8. Infrastructure Related Comments

- 15.68 A number respondents made reference in a general way to the need to fully address the infrastructure issues associated with the scale of new development being proposed. Highway and drainage issues were particularly mentioned but capacity and provision of educational, medical and recreational facilities were also cited.

Comments

- 15.69 Government guidance on the production of Core Strategies indicates the need to produce an Infrastructure Plan. It is intended to seek further guidance on this from GOYH and the Planning Inspectorate and to produce an infrastructure Study and delivery Plan as the Strategy proposals become firmer.

9. Minerals Related Comments

- 15.70 One respondent made a substantial submission on the need to include reference to the potential within the District to exploit coal bed methane (CBM). The respondents wish see a new section on CBM inserted in the Core Strategy and include areas on the Proposals Map to allocate areas of potential CBM development.

Comments

- 15.71 The potential for the exploitation of Coal Bed Methane is of interest. The development issues associated with such a proposal are primarily a matter for the County Council's Minerals Plan and development control responsibilities. At this stage it is not known what the full implications of such exploitation would be, but, there would clearly be a degree of new employment associated with it and the proposal is worthy of encouragement subject to appropriate environmental safeguards. The extensive reference requested by the respondent would be more appropriately included in County Council Minerals Planning documents.

10. Gypsies and Travellers

15.72 The FFT (Friends, Family and Travellers) Planning response indicates that government guidance it is quite clear that the Core Strategy should contain a criteria based policy for other sites which may come forward that have not been allocated to ensure that small, private, family sized sites and unexpected demand are covered in the policy. A rural exceptions policy should also be included to ensure that affordable land can come forward to enable these sites to be delivered.

15.73 The Core Strategy should also consider mechanisms to deliver sites, including the use of Section 106 obligations, to ensure that implementation of policy is being achieved.

15.74 The FFTs suggests there will need to be direct and accessible communication between local Gypsies and Travellers and the local authority to ensure that plans meet people's needs. There should be outreach consultation directly with those affected. Paper based consultations with national organisations like FFT, though useful, cannot be considered as a substitute for direct local consultation with Gypsies and Travellers.

Circular 1/2006 provides advice about the location of sites and one of the issues of importance to inhabitants of future sites is access to a range of services which the rest of the population take for granted.

Comment

15.75 It is intended that the Core Strategy provides a criteria based policy for the consideration of new proposals for sites for Gypsies and Travellers and every effort will be made during the next more extensive consultation phase to make contact with the local Gypsy and Traveller communities. (*also see section above at Question 13*)

11. Other Issues

15.76 Individual representations also referred to other topics/policy areas where more emphasis is requested. These are;

- Recycling
- Tackling crime
- Cultural facilities and provision for faith based activities.
- Prison provision

Comments

15.77 Because the last consultation was only a partial one it did not cover wider issues such as recycling, cultural and crime issues. The final Core Strategy will make reference to these issues where appropriate.

15.78 It is considered that it would not be appropriate to include a policy on new prison development which may never be used. Any proposals coming forward for such rare and specialist development should be treated on their merits.

Resolved:

- I. That the Core Strategy be developed in accordance with the comments and recommendations, and in particular:-**
- II. The consultation response, the conclusions in the report, and the new evidence available be taken into account in reviewing the distribution of housing.**
- III. The comments made with regard to the Strategic Housing Sites in paragraphs 3.45 –3.46a be noted and the way forward as outlined in the report be supported.**
- IV. That in the light of comments made in response to this consultation and other considerations, no allocations for general market housing be made in villages other than those identified as capable of accommodating additional growth, but the existing policy be extended to include small scale allocations for 100% affordable housing, as well as redevelopment / development of previously developed land. Officers were also requested to investigate ways of ensuring that windfall development in smaller villages was more tightly controlled than in those villages considered capable of accommodating additional growth.**
- V. Policies for affordable housing continue to be developed in the light of the recent Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the currently ongoing Affordable Housing Viability Study.**
- VI. That the Strategy reflects national and regional policy with regard to economic growth through appropriate cross – referencing and that further research be undertaken to establish whether there is a need for a dedicated local policy.**
- VII. That the difficulties in collecting sufficient, sound evidence on a local basis to support detailed policies on the issue of targets for local energy generation be noted and the approach to the issue being advocated be supported.**
- VIII. That the recommended approach to the Community Infrastructure Levy be supported.**
- IX. That advice be sought from Natural England prior to developing an appropriate policy for Green Infrastructure.**
- X. That a general policy on housing mix be formulated in the light of the most recent evidence in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.**
- XI. Continued efforts be made to liaison more closely with the gypsy and traveller community within the District, with a view to including an appropriate strategic policy within the Core Strategy.**
- XII. That a further round of public consultation be arranged prior to formal publication and submission stages in accordance with comments received from Government Office.**

- XIII. In accordance with advice from Government Office and the most recent advice from the (former) Regional Assembly, the Core Strategy continues to be based on the minimum housing requirement set out in the RSS, but without any allowance for recent high house building rates.**
- XIV. With regard to Green Belt, reference be made to undertaking a Green Belt review in future allocations DPD's if it is not possible to satisfy the housing requirement**
- XV. In order to minimise the use of 'greenfield' sites, the Core Strategy should emphasise the priority to be given to the use of previously developed land wherever possible.**
- XVI. Adequate references be included within the Core Strategy to encourage a high standard of design and to facilitate its achievement through subsequent Development Plan Documents.**
- XVII. Liaison should be continued with the appropriate transport authorities and operators to ensure that transport issues are fully integrated within the Core Strategy and Local Transport Plan.**
- XVIII. The Core Strategy should be fully supportive of improving the vitality and viability of the three town centres and of regeneration initiatives such as Renaissance.**
- XIX. The Core Strategy should place significant emphasis on developing all aspects of the economy of the District as increased employment is central to the general sustainability theme of self-sufficiency and reduction in longer distance commuting.**
- XX. The Core Strategy should acknowledge the importance of the energy generation industry within the District and make adequate strategic provision for its support and development, including the development of biomass facilities particularly where supported by rail transport.**
- XXI. That further research be undertaken in order to develop a sound policy(ies) on climate change issues.**
- XXII. The ongoing liaison with infrastructure service providers, and GOYH and PINs to support the production of an Infrastructure Study and Delivery Plan to accompany the core Strategy, be noted**
- XXIII. Whilst reference could be made in the Core Strategy to the possibility of Coal Bed Methane extraction within the District within the Core Strategy, it is primarily an issue to be included in the County Council's Minerals Development Plan. Sites identified by the County Council will be incorporated in the LDF Proposals Map.**
- XXIV. Although not central to the Core Strategy's purpose, reference to issues such as recycling and tackling crime should be included in as they are an integral part of the wider topic of delivering, more sustainable and healthy communities in the District.**
- XXV. The request to include a policy to deal with the locations of prison facilities be not supported as this is not considered necessary or appropriate for the Core Strategy.**