



Policy and Strategy Team
Selby District Council
Doncaster Road
Selby, YO8 9FT

21st January 2015

PLAN Selby the Sites and Policies Local Plan, Initial Consultation

Thank you for consulting the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust on the above. The Yorkshire Wildlife Trust works across the Yorkshire and Humber region managing more than 95 reserves and with a membership of over 38,000. The YWT is the second oldest of the 47 Wildlife Trusts which work in partnership to cover the whole of the UK. The Trust's principal vision is to work for a Yorkshire rich in wildlife, valued and enjoyed by people.

Q1 Please refer to the Sustainability Appraisal report
http://www.selby.gov.uk/upload/FINAL_SEA_SA.pdf.

Please let us have your comments on the objectives and approach.

On page 1 the Plan Selby framework table point 13: "13. A bio-diverse and attractive natural environment" gives very little detail as to what this means. The information needs to be as detailed as point 12 on the historic environment. Sustainable development needs to protect and enhance sites and habitats important for biodiversity. The plan needs to enhance biodiversity generally and also mitigate for impacts. Without sufficient detail of what diversity is present in the district it will not be possible to monitor if biodiversity has been protected or lost.

Q2 Please refer to the Habitat Regulations Assessment report
http://www.selby.gov.uk/upload/FINAL_HRA.pdf.

Do you have any comments on the screening methodology?

The Trust would expect an assessment of the Lower Derwent Valley (LDV) plan which is being drawn up by all the authorities adjacent to the River Derwent. The plan will provide a framework for cross boundary working to protect the European sites. The LDV plan will need to be in place in order to ensure that significant impacts on the European site is prevented.

Q3 Please refer to the Duty to Cooperate Statement
http://www.selby.gov.uk/upload/FINAL_DTC_Statement.pdf
(Annex 4 to the Duty to Cooperate Statement)

http://www.selby.gov.uk/upload/Annex_4_Final_DTC_Statement.pdf

Please let us have your comments on the Duty to Cooperate Statement.

The Yorkshire Wildlife Trust is pleased to see that the Lower Derwent Valley Plan is mentioned in the document. It will be important that there is a clear timetable for the development and completion of the plan so that impacts are avoided or mitigated. The Trust is happy to continue to work with the local authorities and Natural England to



develop a robust plan.

The Trust would also like to see more detail of cross boundary working on Green Infrastructure and ecological networks in the document.

Q9 a) Is a simple percentage growth across all Designated Service Villages a fair and appropriate starting point for deciding the split between the DSVs?

A simple percentage growth is not an appropriate starting point for deciding on housing numbers in the DSVs. The impact on designated sites, from international to locally designated SINC sites will be an essential part of the decision making process for allocations in the service villages. Buffers to protect designated sites and areas which provide connectivity for biodiversity will also require protection from development.

National policy and the NPPF have a number of approaches which will assist with decision making:

Local authorities should ***'set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure..'*** (Paragraph 114)

Planning policies should ***'plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries', 'identify and map components of the local ecological network (including locally designated sites and therefore Local Wildlife Sites), wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation'***. (NPPF paragraph 117)

International sites in Selby District which include the Lower Derwent Valley and Skipwith Common have very strong protection in European Law and through the Habitats Regulations. National policy is *'The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where development requiring appropriate assessment under the Birds and Habitats Directives is being considered, planned or determined'* (NPPF Paragraph 119).

Nationally designated SSSI sites are protected with the hierarchy of "avoid, mitigate, compensate and refuse"; development *'should not normally be permitted'* if it is likely to have an adverse effect on SSSIs (individually or in combination with other developments).

Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) are protected through Policy SP18 of the Local Plan so it is particularly important that the authority ensures that the allocation of sites considers the impact of development on SINC. It will be vital that data from SINC is up to date with surveys and mapping accurately showing the value and extent of these sites. The Trust has checked the survey dates of the SINC in Selby District and it is a serious concern that out of the 108 sites 21 have never been surveyed, and 64 sites were last surveyed in 1998. There may be a variety of reasons for this such as lack of landowner permission for surveying. Up to date data will be essential to ensure that protecting local biodiversity can be robustly carried out by the authority and allocations which will impact SINC can be turned down.



Ancient Woodland and other irreplaceable habitats are protected from development leading to loss or deterioration of the habitat unless the need outweighs the loss (NPPF paragraph 118). Hence the allocation of land where developments will damage Ancient Woodland must be avoided.

Nature Improvement Areas should be included or mapped within local plans *'where Nature Improvement Areas are identified in Local Plans, consider specifying the types of development that may be appropriate in these Areas.'* (NPPF paragraph 117).

Policies should also *'promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and protection and recovery of priority species populations'* linked to targets in the plan. (NPPF paragraph 117)

Local plans should *'identify land where development would be inappropriate for instance because of its environmental....significance.'* and *'contain a clear strategy for enhancing the natural, built and historic environment and supporting Nature Improvement Areas where they have been identified.'* (Paragraph 157)

North and East Yorkshire Ecological Data Centre will be an important resource for the authority to ensure that SINC data and data on protected species and habitats is up to date and can be considered in the allocation process.

b) Bearing in mind issues such as land availability, flood risk and other technical constraints (e.g. highways capacity and access) are there particular criteria that should be taken into account in assessing the final *minimum target* for Designated Service Villages?

The Trust is concerned that development in North Duffield will have serious implications for impacting on the Lower Derwent Valley and hence fewer houses would be appropriate on areas further from the European sites and functionally connected habitat. Also a village such as Cawood has very serious issues around flooding which should limit development. Ulleskelf and Church Fenton are not so prone to flooding and have access to a main line station and hence sustainable transport options are available and new settlements could generate less private car use at peak times than in other villages. The authority will need to allocate development sites taking into account these issues to ensure the most sustainable allocations for housing growth.

Q15 a) What approach should be taken on the existing Established Employment Areas as defined in the Selby District Local Plan 2005?

b) Is there a need for a detailed policy to apply to the Established Employment Areas?

Q16 In the Selby District Local Plan, all Employment Allocations were considered suitable for all types of employment use (B1, B2 and B8). However in the light of the different roles of each of the towns, should PLAN Selby consider a different approach, for example being more specific about the types of employment uses on particular sites?

Q17 What should the approach to employment land be in the rural areas, including the Designated Service Villages?

The Trust would want to see the same approach to employment sites as housing sites in avoiding sites which will have impacts on international, national and local sites and on areas important for connecting up biodiversity. See answers to question 9.



Q21 a) Are there any such areas that should be safeguarded, allocated or designated to restrict or promote development?

b) What is the justification for such an approach?

There may be a need to restrict development on land which is important for the Lower Derwent Valley. Issues such as unseasonal flooding and impacts of climate change could mean that areas outside the designated European sites become very important for birds which are features of the designation. This could be particularly the case if the Lower Derwent Valley Plan takes some time to be drawn up. This approach could be justified within the HRA.

Q25 Are there any infrastructure requirements that have not been identified, including small scale and local needs?

The Yorkshire Wildlife Trust is pleased to see that there has been a thorough evaluation of the need for Green Infrastructure. Gaps in funding will need to be provided from CIL payments.

Q26 c) Including specific requirements for sustainable building design such as Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM, subject to local viability testing?

This could be very valuable as there can be a tendency for developers to choose the cheapest options rather than the ones which will have the greatest impact in reducing carbon emissions and supporting biodiversity.

Q26 d) Identifying suitable areas for renewable and low-carbon schemes by technology? e.g. wind, solar, hydro?

This could be a valuable exercise. It would also need to consider which areas are not suitable for particular types of development. For example the Lower Derwent Valley (LDV) is a Special Protection area, designated in order to protect internationally important birds. Birds from the LDV may also move between the Humber SPA and the LDV. Turbines in the LDV and some surrounding fields and also between the LDV and the Humber are not appropriate. It is also possible that large scale solar farm development may not be appropriate close to Skipwith Common as this could affect aquatic invertebrates on this site, this would be using the precautionary principle because research is ongoing on this issue.

The Trust has reservations about large scale use of biomass as it is frequently not possible to be certain that biomass fuel is truly sustainable, and the use of biomass could lead to deforestation and impacts on woodland habitat.

Q26 e) Identifying separation thresholds? What might they be?

Separation distances between individual turbines could be very valuable to prevent cumulative impacts. Separation distances to prevent impacts on wildlife might need to be backed up by detailed mapping and data on flight paths.

Q26 f) Incorporating more detailed development management policies for climate change and renewable/low-



carbon energy requirements? If so what do they need to cover? For example taking into account cumulative impacts of schemes?

The cumulative impact of turbines does need to be considered in sensitive areas.

g) What topics should instead be left to a subsequent SPD or guidance?

A renewable energy SPD could be useful in bringing together issues around the wide variety of technologies.

h) How should each of the site allocations (to be identified in later stages) deal specifically with climate change and renewable energy issues?

Appropriate and inappropriate technologies could be specified for larger allocations. For example turbines and microturbines could be inappropriate in areas which are important for bats and birds.

Q27 a) Is this comprehensive? Are there other environmental assets that should be afforded some protection or have a policy basis?

The evidence required for the Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity mapping in Table 8 is said to be the Leeds City Region GI map/ Strategy. This map does not seem to be easily available to download in order to check whether it is sufficiently detailed and appropriate for use in Selby District. The Trust would expect the mapping of GI within Selby District to use a similar methodology to that used for the Leeds mapping (<http://www.leeds.gov.uk/docs/CD27%20Green%20Infrastructure%20Background%20Paper.pdf>.) but include information of the SINC sites in Selby District, Sustrans cycle routes such as the York to Selby cycle path and other more local information. The Yorkshire Wildlife Trust Living Landscape mapping is also an important resource. Also listed in Table 8 are SINCs, SSSIs and European sites. As mentioned in answer to Question 9 the Trust is concerned that the data for SINC sites is not sufficiently robust and up to date. This could mean that the decisions based on this data will not be sufficiently robust to stand up to challenge by developers or if questioned by an inspector. The withdrawal of support by NYCC of the local sites system does mean that districts will need to set up and finance an alternative system of survey and monitoring to ensure that the local sites system remains viable and biodiversity is protected at the local level.

As mentioned earlier the Lower Derwent Valley Plan is at an early stage of development and there may be a need for further protection or the retention of earlier policies in order to protect this very sensitive area.

b) Are the existing policies in the Core Strategy sufficient to protect these environmental assets or are further detailed policies necessary?

The existing policies are probably adequate but in order to protect these assets it will be necessary to have up to date information and mapping to ensure they are fully protected, see above re SINCs.



It may also be necessary to consider policies for the Lower Derwent Valley if the Lower Derwent Valley Plan will not be complete for some time.

Q32 a) Should PLAN Selby include further policies for any of the following?

- travel plans
- parking standards
- active traffic management
- integrated demand management
- capacity improvements
- electric vehicle charging points
- cycle routes
- car parking

b) Are there other local transport schemes/issues that PLAN Selby should develop policies for?

Policies which increase sustainable modes of transport could be very valuable. Policies that increase connectivity to cycle routes would be excellent as Selby District already has long distance cycle routes such as the York to Selby cycle path and the Trans Pennine route crossing the district. Extending the network could reduce car use and support tourism.

Q36 How should the Council view large previously-developed sites in the countryside?

Some “brownfield” sites can develop very valuable habitat, a BAP priority habitat called “Open mosaic habitat on previously developed land” may be present on some sites and should be protected. For example the North Selby mine site has some valuable habitat and part has been designated as a SINC.

Q39 a) How should Sherburn in Elmet grow and develop – what could a vision say?

b) What else is needed in Sherburn in Elmet that could be allocated a site?

The Sherburn le Willows SSSI which is a Yorkshire Wildlife Trust reserve has very high quality grassland. Buffering and protection of the site will prevent deterioration due to disturbance with increased pressure from new residents.

Q40 a) How should Tadcaster grow and develop – what could a vision say?

b) What else is needed in Tadcaster that could be allocated a site?

Protection of the Wharfe river corridor could enable connectivity for wildlife and also help with flooding and other ecosystem services.

Designated Service Villages (DSVs)



Opportunities for protection and enhancement of biodiversity for all the service villages should be considered. Large allocations should have requirements for GI and biodiversity enhancement and connectivity. Some brief suggestions follow but much more detail needs to be worked out.

Appleton Roebuck.

The village is close to both the Ouse and Wharfe corridors and there will be opportunities for connectivity to these corridors.

Brotherton and Byram.

There will be opportunities for GI and connectivity to the River Aire corridor.

Carlton.

The village is close to the River Aire corridor and also close to SINC appropriate habitat creation and connectivity will be possible.

Cawood.

The village has a range of SINC some actually within the village and some to the north along the River Ouse, there will be good opportunities for habitat connectivity.

Eggborough.

In an area dominated by industry and energy generation high quality GI and habitat are particularly important. Connectivity to the River Aire corridor will be possible and the Aire and Calder Canal.

North Duffield.

The Trust is very concerned at the potential for impacts on the Lower Derwent Valley from developments around the village. Sensitive design and the allocation of only a small number of houses will be very important.

Q59 Do you have any comments on the evidence that the Council considers necessary?

Q60 Is there any other evidence that the Council should consider gathering?

As mentioned previously the Trust is concerned that the data on SINC is not up to date. A programme of surveying and monitoring the sites should be put in place to ensure that SINC data is robust. Survey data from 1998 or before, for a majority of the sites, cannot be seen as adequate.



Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

Sara Robin
Conservation Officer (Planning)
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
Telephone: 01904 659570
Email: sara.robin@ywt.org.uk