

PLAN Selby: Local Plan team
Selby District Council
Civic Centre
Doncaster Road
Selby,
YO8 9FT

By email to: ldf@selby.gov.uk

10 August 2015

Dear Sirs

Re: PLAN Selby - Summer 2015 consultation
Q6 (DL): Draft Method Statement for the identification of development limits

On behalf of Mr L Elcock

I write in response to the current public consultation regarding PLAN Selby and your request for further comments under the Let's Talk initiative. In particular, I would like to support the proposals to continue to have development limits for the majority of settlements, so that incremental growth to sustain both urban and rural communities will be permitted in a sustainable way in suitable locations.

As requested, I confirm our support for the approach taken, where development limits will be re-examined and new limits set for all settlements of Secondary Villages and larger. The previous consultation option proposal of loosening limits, again in Secondary Villages and above, but not necessarily allocating sites for development, would allow for sensitive small scale development in suitable locations to be developed. The NPPF encourages a healthy and sustainable rural economy as well as meeting housing needs for all and a review of boundaries with some loosening in suitable locations – including the re-examination of property boundaries to include the gardens of larger properties - would allow incremental development of much needed housing that would help keep rural communities within villages flourishing. By permitting the occasional building of additional homes on such sites, which would help meet the needs for both older people wishing to downsize and young people wishing to stay where they grew up and near to families, rural communities would be enhanced and village schools and services sustained. Whereas the Designated Service Villages would potentially be allocated new housing sites of a larger scale for development – depending on Green Belt and other environmental and economic considerations – the loosening of boundaries in the Secondary Villages would perform a similar function on a considerably smaller scale to ensure that such sites would be developed in accordance with the character of that particular settlement.

The consultation document 'Draft Method Statement for the identification of development limits' is unclear as to what development will be currently permitted within existing development limits in the Secondary Villages. In Table 1 (page 4) it summarises the acceptability of unallocated development Within Development Limits in Secondary Villages as '*Limited residential development may be acceptable as small scale rural affordable housing on rural exception sites*' and Outside Development Limits as '*Small scale rural affordable housing may be acceptable on rural exception sites adjoining Development Limits boundary. Other development generally resisted*'. By being abbreviated from the

original policy, this may be unintentionally contradictory as sites Within Development Limits are not rural exception sites and therefore should not be limited to small scale rural affordable housing.

Yet para 3.2.1 of the same document says that '*Policy SP4 states that in considering non-allocated development, certain types of residential development will be acceptable 'in principle' within the Development Limits of each settlement, with only **small scale rural affordable housing** potentially acceptable on sites **adjoining** (my emphasis) the Development Limits boundary in Designated Service Villages and Secondary Villages, and all other development in the open countryside generally resisted.*' This is the correct commentary on Policy SP4 and confirms that '**open market** residential development will be accepted 'in principle' **within** the Development Limits of Secondary Villages, although affordable housing may be permitted outside development limits on 'exception' sites. It is important that this document be amended to clarify this issue and provide clear guidance on what type of development will be permitted where.

In examining the criteria proposed to undertake the boundary review criteria (para 3.4) the re-examination of residential curtilages to include their gardens within the settlement limits is supported as, where such sites are well screened, they could potentially positively contribute to the economic well being and sustainability of the community by contributing sites for sensitive small scale development in Secondary Villages. Likewise for commercial or industrial premises. In particular, where there is a good relationship to permanent physical boundaries – such as mature trees and hedges – these opportunities should be exploited. This would enable the suggested approach to loosely draw limits to allow more sympathetic development to be achieved.

Regarding the process for undertaking the Review, I suggest one additional criteria. It is now some time since a call for sites was made, and essentially this was for proposed allocations. Therefore landowners of small areas of land adjoining Development Limits of Secondary Villages which meet the suggested criteria for review would not have put forward sites as they knew that no new allocations were being sought. To assist the process, it would therefore be appropriate for an additional period be granted for a call for sites in the designated Secondary Villages (or all settlements, if preferred) so that landowners can bring such sites to your attention for analysis. This would make the process fair and transparent for all, and reduce the potential risk of any future challenge on such an issue.

To summarise, we confirm the following:

- We confirm our support to set Development Limits for all settlements of Secondary Village size and above.
- We support the approach advocated to loosely draw limits to allow for more sympathetic development.
- We require amendment of the document to clearly confirm that small scale open market residential development will be supported within the set Development Limits of Secondary Villages.
- We support the criteria proposed that would allow the re-examination of Development Limits, especially where there is a functional relationship to the built-up area and / or physical boundaries.
- We suggest a 'call for sites', particularly in smaller villages such as the Secondary Villages, whereby landowners or their agents can put forward sites for your examination, in accordance with the criteria proposed

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information that will assist your consideration of the above.

Yours sincerely

Lilian Coulson