

Our ref: ZLH/05K/05791

Date: 10<sup>th</sup> August 2015

Selby District Council  
Civic Centre  
Doncaster Road  
Selby  
North Yorkshire  
YO8 9FT

Dear Sir/Madam

**Re: PLAN Selby Consultation**  
**Land at Scarthingwell Park, Barkston Ash, Tadcaster, North Yorkshire, LS24 9PG**  
**Our client: Miss K Pick**

I am writing on behalf of my client, Miss K Pick who has instructed me to propose the above property as a potential site for development. The site has previously been omitted from the Call for Sites in 2013 but it provides an ideal location for delivering rural housing in the District.

Please find enclosed a document submission detailing the consultation response, a site proposal application form and a plan of the above land being represented.

I trust that this will be assessed accordingly and should you require any further information then please do not hesitate to contact me.

I look forward to receiving acknowledgement.

Yours faithfully

Zoe L Harrison  
For and on behalf of  
Lister Haigh (Knaresborough) Limited

Enc.

LISTER HAIGH (KNARESBOROUGH) LTD.

# Selby District Council Local Plan Consultation

---

PLAN Selby

**Representation for Land at Scarthingwell Park,  
Barkston Ash, Tadcaster, North Yorkshire, LS24 9PG**

**Response submitted on behalf of:**

Name: Miss K Pick  
Address: c/o Lister Haigh (Knaresborough) Ltd  
106 High Street  
Knaresborough  
North Yorkshire  
HG5 0HN  
Tel: 01423 860322  
Fax: 01423 860513  
Email: [gileschaplin@listerhaigh.co.uk](mailto:gileschaplin@listerhaigh.co.uk)  
[zoe-harrison@listerhaigh.co.uk](mailto:zoe-harrison@listerhaigh.co.uk)

## Contents

1.0	Introduction .....	1
2.0	Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) .....	1
3.0	Development Limits .....	1
4.0	Status of Villages in the Green Belt.....	2
5.0	Site Allocations & Site Selection .....	2

## 1.0 Introduction

This report is submitted on behalf of my client, Miss K Pick and details a response to PLAN Selby produced by Selby District Council. It also acts as a representation for the land at Scarthingwell Park which was omitted from the Call for Sites held in 2013.

## 2.0 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)

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

- a. the housing market areas in and around Selby?
- b. trend based demographic projections?
- c. economic led projections?
- d. affordable housing need?
- e. market signals?
- f. need for different types and sizes of homes?
- g. housing needs for specific groups of the population?
- h. draft conclusions?

There should be a balance of housing over the whole district in response to local and district demand now identified as a housing need of 393 dwellings for the period 2014-2037. Affordable housing is a necessary requirement in the District but not on such a scale as to alter the character of settlements. Limited residential development should be allowed on the edge of smaller, rural based settlements that provides a sustainable environment and maintain village character.

A site identified at Scarthingwell Park, Barkston Ash (see plan) that qualifies is in a prime location adjacent to surrounding residential property and is ideally suited to the erection of up to 250 dwellings. The land could provide a small extension to the village and achieve much needed homes for local people without creating an unsustainable demand on local services and infrastructure. Areas that have well established communication links such as Barkston Ash that include the A1 and railway services at York and Leeds provide an ideal living situation for those wanting to live in the countryside but who can also easily access the larger settlements in close proximity for work.

The northern part of the District is closely linked to the house prices seen in the higher price "North Yorkshire" market. Therefore residential developments in this area would be of benefit, particularly in rural locations where property is more expensive than propose market housing to prevent inflationary pressures that prevent local people from migrating to the countryside. The estimated size of dwellings needed must not be disproportionately allocated so that it affects the scale and alters the character of rural settlements.

## 3.0 Development Limits

**Q6 (DL)** Do you have any comments on:

- a. the need to identify development limits in PLAN Selby?
- b. an alternative policy approach to protect the countryside?

- c. the proposed methodology for defining development limits?
- d. the conclusions about defining 'tight' development limits?

The draft method statement explains that:

*"Development Limits are currently applied to all Secondary Villages, Designated Service Villages (DSVs), Local Service Centres and Principal Town within Selby District."*

Potential sites that could fall within the Development Limits should be reviewed more frequently to ensure suitable sites are identified in and adjacent to the villages when the need for housing has never been greater. Defining the Development Limit around these villages over the next 20 years could prevent more suitable sites that are not included in the proposed potential sites from being developed.

#### **4.0 Status of Villages in the Green Belt**

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

Barkston Ash as a Secondary Village should be kept inset from the Green Belt and given more scope for development by re-defining the Development Limits around the village. Settlements other than Selby should draw more focus for residential development to increase the availability of rural housing.

#### **5.0 Site Allocations & Site Selection**

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

- a. The overall approach to the site selection process set out in section 6.3 of the study?
- b. The details of the site assessment work proposed in Appendix A of the study?

The criteria for the site selection process under stage 2 does not take into account the general decline in schools, GPs, local shops and bus services in the District's villages making the selection process heavily biased towards larger settlements. The District's rural settlements need the opportunity for growth which 'Stage 2: Quantitative Assessment' would not deliver.

Sites that do not fall within flood risk zone 2 or 3 should be favoured for site allocation. The site at Barkston Ash is one such site whereas other sites in the area, for example, at Church Fenton, fall within the flood risk zones.