

ryan king

---

**From:** terry heselton  
**Sent:** 01 November 2010 09:52  
**To:** ryan king  
**Subject:** FW: Draft Interim Housing Policy

**Terry Heselton BA (Hons), Dip TP, MRTPI**  
**Principal Planner (LDF Team)**

**SELBY DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
An 'Excellent' Council

Tel 01757 292091  
Fax 01757 292090  
Email [theselton@selby.gov.uk](mailto:theselton@selby.gov.uk)  
Web [www.selby.gov.uk](http://www.selby.gov.uk)

The information in this e-mail, and any attachments, is confidential and may be subject to legal professional privilege. It is intended solely for the attention and use of the named addressee(s). Its contents do not necessarily represent the views or opinions of Selby District Council. If you are not the intended recipient please notify the sender immediately. Unless you are the intended recipient, or his/her representative, you are not authorised to, and must not, read, copy, distribute, use or retain this message or any part of it.

Selby District Council, Civic Centre, Portholme Road, Selby, North Yorkshire, YO8 4SB - DX 27408 Selby

---

**From:** Jennifer Hubbard  
**Sent:** 29 October 2010 12:36  
**To:** terry heselton  
**Subject:** Draft Interim Housing Policy

Dear Terry,

I had hoped, for once, to beat or at least meet a deadline for consultation responses but once again I have run out of time - and am just heading off to Carlisle on nursing duties, a task for which I am singularly unqualified.

If you would accept the comments below as a summary of my thoughts on the draft Interim Housing Policy, I will expand on them in the early part of next week if necessary/if you are still taking comments.

Regards.

Jenny Hubbard  
**Sent on behalf of Jennifer Hubbard**

### **Comments on draft Interim Housing Policy**

1. If the Council were to apply Local Plan Policy H2A *as it is written* rather than on the basis of a convoluted interpretation for which there is no justification, there would be no need for an interim policy.

16/05/2011

Policy H2A is crystal clear in relation to Local Plan Phase 2 housing allocations and is silent in respect of windfall sites post 2006. There is sufficient guidance available to the Council in other Saved Local Plan housing policies, and national policy (principally new PPS3) together with the statutory duty to take *other material considerations* into account, to provide the context for determining housing applications relating to windfall sites prior to the adoption of the LDF.

### As to the detail of the proposed policy

2. Officers will, I am sure, be aware that little weight will be attached to the Interim Policy by Appeal Inspectors. Any such weight will be reduced if - as currently drafted - the policy seeks to change the settlement hierarchy from that in the adopted Local Plan.

### In detail

3. Draft policy Section 1 - first bullet point

a) Is there any reason why development to be permitted under this para should not also be *sensitive* (as required by the second bullet point?)

b) How is an *appropriate* scale of development to be determined?

c) The redevelopment of farmsteads (as well as the conversion) should be permitted. There are many farmsteads within villages where the buildings are utilitarian rather than traditional (especially pig farms - former or existing) where the removal of the agricultural activities and buildings would improve local amenity.

4. Draft policy Section 1 - second bullet point.

a) The *filling of small linear gaps in otherwise built up frontages* on greenfield land may be appropriate in linear villages but a significant proportion of the settlements described as "other villages" are partially or mainly nucleated. There is no reason why development in depth should be unacceptable as a matter of principle in such settlements.

b) Same comments re the *conversion* of farmsteads as set out at 3(c) above.

### Question

If the policy remains as drafted in relation to the conversion of farmsteads, how does the Council see the policy operating if, prior to the adoption of the LDF, farmsteads are re-defined as previously developed land (as has been forecast by the Government)?

### Conclusions

Presumably the Council would continue to treat applications for the removal of bad neighbour developments which fall outside the interim policy on the basis of *other material considerations* (cf Hares builders' yard at Kelfield considered at last week's Planning Committee). As indicated above, there is no need for an interim policy. PPS3 does not preclude the development of gardens and although, in principle, the development of previously developed land is more sustainable than the development of greenfield land, this may not necessarily be the case on a settlement/site-specific basis. Local Plan Policies H6/H7 do not *promote* the development of gardens. The Saved policies of the Local Plan together with PPS3 and *other material considerations* provide the Council with sufficient control and sufficient flexibility to span the period prior to the adoption of the LDF.