



**Selby District Council  
Local Plan Consultation**

***"PLAN Selby"***  
***(The Sites and Policies Local Plan)***

**Initial Consultation Comments Form**

"PLAN Selby" is the Sites and Policies Local Plan which the Council is developing to deliver the strategic vision outlined in the Core Strategy that was adopted in 2013. When adopted, PLAN Selby will form part of the Local Plan for the District against which planning applications will be assessed.

This consultation is the first stage in our on-going dialogue with you and we hope that you will take time to respond to it and help us move forward. The responses to this consultation will help inform our work and shape the District for the future.

**Comments are therefore invited as part of this Initial Consultation.**

**Please use this form to make your comments.**

Please read the main document PLAN Selby and associated papers, which are available on the Council's website at [www.selby.gov.uk/PLANSelby](http://www.selby.gov.uk/PLANSelby) and at local libraries and Public Council offices.

You will need to see what is in PLAN Selby in order to make your comments. It contains a wide range of issues and specific questions on which we would like your views. Please make sure you are clear about which part of PLAN Selby you are commenting on and ensure we have your full contact details so we can take your comments into account and so that we can contact you about the next stages.

**Completed comments forms must be received by the Council  
no later than 5pm on Monday 19th January 2015**

**Contact Details** - Please provide contact details and agent details, if appointed

	Personal Details	Agent Details (if applicable)
Name	Councillor Ian Reynolds	
Address		
Postcode		
Telephone no.		
Email address		

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

## Comment(s)

Please ensure you provide reference to the Question and Topic area for each comment you wish to make.

Topic / Chapter

Question no.  Paragraph

The Plan Selby Topics are generally the right topics, although by far the most important is the provision of homes. I believe that the reference to climate change and renewable energy (T5) should be split. The jury is still out on climate change and there is no concrete evidence that it is happening at all. However, renewable energy is currently a Government requirement and is a very important subject for the residents of Selby District. I would comment further:-

### T1 Providing Homes.

I accept the need to deliver 7,200 new homes over a 16 year period ending in 2027 which clearly means enough land has to be allocated. Unfortunately, the current lack of a five year land supply and consistent under-delivery by Selby District Council means that by the time the Plan Selby is in place, the 2,000 dwellings needed in the designated service villages will have either been provided or will have secured planning permissions. In my opinion we have been wrong in the past to leave out secondary villages in consideration of housing provision. Unless there is housing provision within the secondary villages, they will simply die. There ought to be a provision for some limited development in the secondary villages. It would be fairly easy to define the village limits of each settlement and allow some expansion place on the basis that the settlement should not increase by, say, 10% in the number of dwellings over the plan period. Unfortunately, the new allocations needed in the designated service villages (2,000) will have secured planning permissions long before the Plan Selby is adopted. It is appreciated that these are minimum targets but I suspect that villages will consider that they have had enough development if the numbers of dwellings have been approved in the next two years greatly exceeds, say, 10% of the number of dwellings within the settlements in 2014. There is no doubt in my mind that the opportunity to have contingency sites in case others are not delivered is a critical requirement. These contingency sites should only be released to manage a five year housing supply, i.e. ensure that there is one, because otherwise planning will take place by appeal. The distribution of housing developments between designated is ..... please see attached continuation sheet marked Appendix 1

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

Topic / Chapter

Question no.  Paragraph

In my view, we should not be classing green belt as an absolute constraint. There are possible brown field sites within the green belt, or indeed sites such as former quarries which are particularly well landscaped already, which ought to be considered. This is subject to them meeting other criteria, i.e. access to facilities, schools and highways.

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

## Comment(s)

Please ensure you provide reference to the Question and Topic area for each comment you wish to make.

Topic / Chapter

Question no.

Paragraph

I accept that the major employment sites must be located in or around the three main settlements. However, the Council ought to undertake a strategy of encouraging small scale employment in the rural areas, particularly on the trunk road corridors. As has been indicated, the rural areas have been particularly successful at creating jobs over the past few years. In my view we also ought to examine in detail the former mine sites at Wistow and Stillingfleet. To refer to these as being remote is misleading. In the case of the Stillingfleet mine, it is within one mile of the A19 trunk road and has a particularly good access road from the Escrick to Stillingfleet Road. There is little or no prospect of these sites being restored to agriculture, and we therefore ought to grasp the nettle and use these as employment locations. Other brown field or land akin to brown field i.e. former glasshouses/nursery gardens, also ought to be considered for small scale rural employment development.

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

Topic / Chapter

Question no.

Paragraph

It is essential that strategic countryside gaps between settlements are maintained, but there is a crying need for a review of the green belt. The interim green belt in the City of York, which affects the northern part of the district, is particularly difficult to understand. It is there to protect the setting of the ancient City of York and to have drawn it tightly around settlements such as Escrick defies logic. I appreciate that the Council does plan to undertake a separate study to review green belt boundaries and countryside gaps.

Q22 - The development limits need to be tightly drawn to maintain the settlement pattern, although I believe that there ought to be strategic areas of land provided outside these limits. That would essentially mean that such strategic land would not come forward for development in the short term, provided Selby was able to demonstrate a five year supply of development land.

Q25 - There will be increasing problems with highways, simply because of the growth in car users. There are no chronic problems so far as I am aware in Selby District, and the report of the consultants refers to peak times in Selby Town. There is no great problem, however, in Selby Town compared with other conurbations in Yorkshire. I would however urge that local infrastructure needs are identified because the continued expansion of certain designated service villages does put pressure on these services, i.e. there may be a branch doctor's surgery which could well cope with a reasonably small population but which comes under pressure when the number of houses provided in that village substantially increase. There may therefore need to be provision for new facilities where the existing facilities cannot be expanded on the sites that are already occupied.

Please see additional document attached called Appendix 2 for further comments relating to further chapters.

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

**Additional Comments** - Please provide any additional comments you may wish to make.

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

### Comment Submission Statement

All comments must be made in an email or in writing if they are to be considered. Your comments and some personal identifying details will be published in a public register and cannot be treated confidentially. Where practical, personal identifiers may be redacted, however Selby District Council cannot guarantee that all identifiers will be removed prior to publication of consultation records.

Signed

Dated

19/1/15

**Please ensure you save a copy of your completed comments form to your computer before sending by email**

**Completed comments forms must be received by the Council  
no later than 5pm on Monday 19th January 2015**

Email: [ldf@selby.gov.uk](mailto:ldf@selby.gov.uk)

Post to: Policy and Strategy Team, Selby District Council, Civic Centre,  
Doncaster Road, Selby YO8 9FT

## Appendix 1

.....is a difficult topic. The 18 service villages can, as a generality, accept more housing but we should not simply be looking to increase the numbers in each settlement by 8 or 10% of the current number of houses. We really ought to look at each settlement historically, going back 30 – 50 years to look at a base figure. For example, the villages of Riccall, Barlby and Thorpe Willoughby have taken the brunt of development over the past 20 years, whereas villages such as Appleton Roebuck and Escrick have taken very little development. In the case of Escrick, this is because it is hemmed in tightly by the green belt. Each settlement should, therefore, be examined in turn by looking at its historic base of housing numbers and then deciding on an optimum number of dwellings to be provided. As a generality, the northern part of the district has had little development over the past 20 years compared with Selby itself and the villages south thereof. Very clearly, flood risk needs to be taken into account but there will be no issues for the most part with regard to land availability.

Tadcaster is an entirely different matter and we should provide contingency sites in Tadcaster together with three phases of sites to ensure delivery. Indeed, Tadcaster also ought to be looked at historically to find the number of dwellings from 20 – 50 years back and proceed accordingly. Tadcaster has suffered through non-delivery of new houses, as is painfully clear from the number of new dwellings built in the last two years.

## Appendix 2

### Chapter T5 – Climate Change and Renewable Energy

I entirely agree that further studies are required to inform future decisions about climate change. There is no empirical evidence that climate change is taking place, albeit that I support entirely the requirement to reduce carbon emissions.

Q26

I think the whole issue of renewable energy requires a far greater study than is provided for in Plan Selby. The topics seem to have been written by the Wind Industry. I would support efforts relating to sustainable homes and BREEAM subject to local viability testing. There is also good evidence to support the provision of solar panels to individual dwellings and commercial buildings. In my view we should, however, be opposing large scale solar farms and large scale wind farms. I believe that there will be suitable locations for wind turbines, but bearing in mind the renewable energy already generated in Selby District, we should be fighting against large scale provision of wind turbines. Even with single turbines, it is my view that there should be a stand-off distance of at least 10 times the height of each individual turbine. That distance would be between a turbine and a dwelling. We should not be providing site allocations for wind turbines. That, in my view, is a recipe for disaster.

### Chapter 4 – Development Management Policies Discussion and review of SDLP Policies.

I note that the Council intend to undertake a new strategic housing market assessment (SHMA) to inform the process of developing Plan Selby.

Q 31

I do not believe that Plan Selby should include policies for setting specific house types, sizes, tenures and specialist housing such as care homes and self-builds. There will never be a major demand for self-build in Selby District, but the exclusion of secondary villages from providing residential development opportunities generally preclude self-build because it is within those villages that single or double plots occur which would enable an individual to purchase a plot and construct his own dwelling.

Q33

I concur that Plan Selby should have more detailed policies on design by seeking minimum design standards. We should not, however, have a rigid density policy because that results in development of sites with low standards of space and open space around them. There is clearly a case for quality design benchmarks. However, I do not believe that Plan Selby should be establishing design requirements in the new allocated sites with regard to layout, orientation and aesthetic of development proposals. We should simply be encouraging good quality design and construction with adequate space requirements.

Q34

Plan Selby should be promoting tourist accommodation, bearing in mind that the Council has recently joined the Yorkshire Tourist Board. Selby is a very attractive place with many historic and other features well worth visiting. We ought to be therefore encouraging the provision of more tourist accommodation. We appear to me to be particularly well served with recreational open space and community and sports facilities. What is already in place could of course be enhanced.

Q35

There is no great need for a policy in this regard. Farm diversification already takes place and recently redundant farm buildings have been able to be converted to dwellings by a fairly simple Notice procedure.

Q36

The Council should review large previously undeveloped sites in the countryside with a view to establishing new settlement, new employment uses and the like. In particular, I would highlight the opportunities that clearly exist at the former Burn Airfield, the now virtually redundant Church Fenton Airfield and the mine site at Stillingfleet and Wistow.

#### Designated Service Villages

I think it is inappropriate for me to comment upon the growth of most villages. I would respond as follows thought:-

Q41

Appleton Roebuck should be allowed to grow in a northerly direction, principally because that avoids any flood risk areas. It is a popular location convenient for the A64. It is also convenient for both York and Tadcaster. The Tadcaster facilities, i.e. shopping and social, could benefit with an enhanced population in Appleton Roebuck.

Q47

Church Fenton should be encouraged to grow by using part of Church Fenton Airfield. It is very much a linear village and development in depth should now be encouraged to stop it spreading randomly.

Q49

Escrick is hemmed in tightly by the green belt of the City of York. That green belt has only ever been designated as interim but nevertheless it is artificially placed around Escrick because it serves no useful purpose. Subject to a green belt review, I believe that the growth of Escrick should be on the eastern side of the village. Only the southern part of this land is in flood zone 2. The land on the east side of the village has no green belt role whatsoever. It is bounded on its eastern boundary by a mature belt of woodland.

#### Chapter 6 – Question 60

I believe that the Council ought to instigate a comprehensive review of affordable dwelling requirements. I have so far in the last few years seen needs surveys in respect of South Selby (Staynor Hall) South Milford, Thorpe Willoughby, Barlby and Riccall and not one of them shows a housing need of in excess of 20%. Whether this is by means of a revised policy or a supplemental planning document, a new evidence base is required bearing in mind the last survey on behalf of the Council was carried out circa 2009. We should only be providing in the designated service villages affordable dwellings for local need, i.e. the designated service village in question and perhaps nearby secondary villages, but we should not be encouraging migration to those settlements from

elsewhere. I believe that the major need is within Selby Town, and that is where we should be concentrating our resources. Sherburn in Elmet has an over-provision of affordable dwellings. There will undoubtedly be a demand in Tadcaster, bearing in mind the very low number of dwellings that have been provided in the recent past.