

SELBY DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION
Comments on PLAN Selby submitted by Sherburn in Elmet Parish Council 15
January 2015

Contact Details:

Name: Sherburn in Elmet Parish Council
 Address: Eversley Park Centre, Low Street, Sherburn in Elmet, North Yorkshire
 Postcode: LS25 6BA
 Telephone no: 01977 681024
 Email address: clerk@sherburninemet-pc.gov.uk

Comments:

- 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 Parish Council is of the view that no further housing or employment allocations will be required in Sherburn prior to 2027 purely on the basis of Core Strategy numbers (but please see response to question 24), as there is no logical reason to discount Sherburn allocations by 10% (see response to question 7). In Sherburn there is a need to consider how the services and facilities in the village can now be improved to address the existing shortfall and the proposed 30% increase in population and the vast over-provision of employment land.

The Parish Council wishes to be involved at all stages in the assessment of current services and facilities to meet current needs and those generated by the allocation of large housing estates.

We welcome the planning permission granted to ALDI on Low Street but would highlight the following matters that need to be addressed to ensure that there are adequate services and facilities to serve a population that is likely to reach 10000 within the plan period and will also need to serve the population of adjacent service villages that have already grown and are proposed for further growth (particularly South Milford and Church Fenton).

- The village is in need of indoor and outdoor leisure facilities. We would again highlight that we have no leisure centre whilst the High school pool is small and requires replacement. The community and the High School are working together to provide a large all weather pitch and it is understood that the District Council support this, but more needs to be done. There is also a need to look for an alternative location for an additional grass pitch and Club house for Sherburn Bears Amateur Rugby League club as they are growing fast and need a better quality pitch than that at Eversley Park
- There is a need to improve road links. Realistically the only option is to improve access to the A1 at Lumby and the road improvements needed to achieve this need to be considered.
- We have 2 railway stations, South Milford (should be Sherburn South) and Sherburn in Elmet and these could provide great links to Leeds, York, Selby and further afield. The District Council should support SADRUG to improve

both the quality of the stations and more importantly the services. Additional parking is also required (see answer to Q.25)

- There is a need for a Household Waste Re-cycling Centre to serve the south western part of Selby District. The logical location is Sherburn. Whilst this is a County matter the District Council should work with the County to achieve this.
- The cemetery at All Saints Church is nearly full. It is imperative that a new site is allocated and developed in the next two or three years if Sherburn residents are to be able to continue to be laid to rest in the village.

This Initial Consultation focuses on Six Key Topic areas which are discussed in turn in this chapter:

Topic 1 T1 Providing Homes

Topic 2 T2 Promoting Prosperity

Topic 3 T3 Defining Areas for Promoting Development and Protecting Key Assets

Topic 4 T4 Infrastructure Needs

Topic 5 T5 Climate Change and Renewable Energy

Topic 6 T6 Protecting and Enhancing the Environment

Q6 a) Are these the right topics?

b) Is this a comprehensive list?

c) Which ones are most important and which ones are less relevant?

The Parish Council is strongly of the view that the promotion of growth, whilst a relevant aspiration, should be carried out in a balanced way and protection of the environment, ensuring that infrastructure (and services and facilities) needs are equally important and should precede development.

3.16 The Core Strategy minimum targets above form the basis of this Initial Consultation, but as more evidence is brought to light as the Plan progresses (for example the new Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) which is programmed for later this year), there may need to be adjustments made to the minimum targets.

Q7 a) Do you agree with the proposed approach to the base date?

b) Do you agree with the broad principles of the calculation method?

Discounting of all planning permissions by 10% is not justified. Where large sites have detailed planning permission it is very unlikely that there will be a 10% shortfall – the whole site is likely to be developed with the specified number of houses within the plan period. We note that in Sherburn this 10% discount generates a further allocation of 60 dwellings. There is no logic to this approach – whilst typically smaller sites are sometimes not developed, large sites either aren't developed at all or are built out. We object to a further allocation of 60 units.

Q8 a) Should PLAN Selby over-allocate to allow for any non-delivery on the allocations? By what method and by how much?

- b) How should PLAN Selby seek to allocate sites in such a way as to secure delivery over the whole plan period?**
- c) Is there opportunity to have contingency sites in case others are not delivered elsewhere in the District? How might the contingency sites release be managed to maintain a 5 year housing land supply.**

We oppose the allocation of “contingency sites”. In practice these will just be the subject of early release. Whilst we accept that the Core Strategy figure is a minimum, it is pointless having any figure if large areas of additional land of are to be identified. If delivery occurs too quickly (which frankly is unlikely in the present climate) a proper review of the plan should be undertaken. Otherwise a potential outcome will be land-banking, a large number of partially developed sites, and a lack of choice of sites in any review.

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?

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

Percentage growth in Designated Service villages has little justification in planning terms. It is essential that allocations are based on a thorough assessment of settlement capacity taking account of constraints and availability of services and facilities. (This should have been the approach in the main settlements).

Q11 In Tadcaster, three phases are proposed.

Phase 1 and the contingency phase 2 are to be in Tadcaster and will follow the site selection methodology referred to in the previous section.

However, how should PLAN Selby determine where the contingency Phase 3 sites should be located?

The achievement of the District wide minimum requirement is not necessarily based on the need for sites in Tadcaster to come forward in total, particularly if a 10% contingency is to be built in anyway. In view of this there is likely to be no need for Phase 3 contingency, and as stated previously contingency sites are likely to be developed whether they are needed or not. If Tadcaster under-achieves, the starting point should be whether that impacts on the ability of the District as a whole to achieve the minimum requirement. If that is the case then clearly a Plan review will be required. Otherwise, it is a problem for Tadcaster, not Sherburn or other settlements, and there is no basis for other settlements to address the problem. In practice the Council should be ensuring that Tadcaster does meet it’s minimum requirement so that housing requirements (and in particular affordable housing needs) can be addressed in the location where Tadcaster residents want to live.

Paragraph 3.74: The Council also supports the reuse of the former Gascoigne Wood mine, provided this is directly linked to the use of the existing rail infrastructure at the site.

Sherburn Parish Council supports this approach. Unfortunately, the permissions granted on this site have failed to ensure this and we have no confidence that the District Council will ensure that this is the case.

Paragraph 3.92 In tandem with further housing and employment development at Sherburn in Elmet, it is critically important that there is sufficient infrastructure and facilities in place to cater for any growth.

Sherburn Parish Council has expressed this view on a regular basis for many years without the support of the District Council, and we are now in a position where there are planning permissions for large housing developments (meeting the minimum requirement) and employment development (at least 3 times greater than the Core Strategy requirement) but there has been little attempt to address the service and infrastructure requirements.

We live in hope that the District Council has now recognised that simply building houses and providing employment without appropriate infrastructure (including roads as well as services and facilities) is NOT sustainable development. We look forward to working with the County and District Councils to address their past mistakes.

Q22 Should the Development Limits be drawn tightly to maintain the settlement pattern, or loosely around the settlements to enable sympathetic development?

Development limits should be drawn on the basis of agreed criteria which enable them to reflect the situation on the ground. Sometimes these will be tight to existing development (e.g. adjacent to green belt,) and on other occasions much looser, to include degraded and derelict land where sympathetic development can improve the character of the area.

Q24 How should PLAN Selby determine how much Safeguarded Land should be designated for potential future use?

A good starting point would be to look at the capacity of existing safeguarded land. At present there are large areas of safeguarded land at Sherburn, far exceeding that required to meet the minimum requirement by 2027, even if the additional 60 units which have suddenly appeared in Plan Selby are allocated. There is no need to identify additional safeguarded land in Sherburn. The remaining safeguarded land should provide sufficient options long past 2027.

It is noted that the issue of Green Belt boundaries is to be the subject of further consultation but the Parish Council wish to comment on this issue in the context of its response relating to Safeguarded Land. Given the extent of safeguarded land it is our view that with 2 exceptions there is no basis for Green belt amendments at Sherburn. The exceptions are:

- The land between the railway and the by pass, south of the former Bacon Factory Pond, has been development as the By-Pass Business Park. This land is in the Green Belt. The Council considers this to be anomalous and would suggest a detailed assessment of the Green Belt boundary in this location to establish which parts of the site no longer fulfil a Green Belt function.

- Land west of Sherburn between Garden Lane and New Lane, adjacent to the High School, is occupied by Mytum and Selby, a recycling business. Part of the Mytum and Selby site is within the Green Belt and part is within the development limits. To the north of this site is an area of safeguarded land adjacent to Garden Lane, which is one of the few areas west of the village which is not in the locally important landscape area. The Council would support the allocation of the Mytum and Selby site for residential use, together with the adjacent safeguarded land, provided an alternative site could be found for the business on the industrial estate, and subject to an assessment of the traffic impacts on the village of such an allocation.

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

See references above (Q39A):

- The village is in need of indoor and outdoor leisure facilities. We would again highlight that we have no leisure centre whilst the High school pool is small and requires replacement. The community and the High School are working together to provide a large all weather pitch and it is understood that the District Council support this, but more needs to be done. See also comments at Q39A relating to Sherburn Bears Amateur Rugby League Football Club
- There is a need to improve road links. Realistically the only option is to improve access to the A1 at Lumby and the road improvements needed to achieve this need to be considered.
- We have 2 railway stations, South Milford (should be Sherburn South) and Sherburn in Elmet and these could provide great links to Leeds, York, Selby and further afield. The District Council should support SADRUG to improve both the quality of the stations and more importantly the services.
- The 2011 IDP described the provision of additional car parking as a priority at the South Milford Railway Station. The latest draft downgrades this to "The Railway Station will require improvements should its use be impacted upon by significant development in the surrounding area particularly in terms of additional car parking." There are already parking problems and it is clear that the additional housing will add significantly to the problem, so we think it needs to be addressed now, rather than waiting for the inevitable. The same issues applies to Sherburn in Elmet Station
- There is a need for a Household Waste Re-cycling Centre to serve the south western part of Selby District. The logical location is Sherburn. Whilst this is a County matter the District Council should work with the County to achieve this.
- The cemetery at All Saints Church is nearly full. It is imperative that a new site is allocated and developed in the next two or three years if Sherburn residents are to be able to continue to be laid to rest in the village.

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

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

necessary?

The Parish Council consider that detailed surveys and policies are required to protect environmental and heritage assets. There are a number of woods and other wildlife habitats that should be the subject of such protection in the Parish.

Q29 Is there a case for PLAN Selby to consider developing a Local List for heritage assets?

There are many heritage assets in Selby District that enjoy no protection. In Sherburn there is no conservation area and few listed buildings but that does not mean that there are no features that are important for retention for both aesthetic, cultural and community reasons. (The Old School on Kirkgate is a good example). Local communities should be consulted as to what they consider are the heritage assets worthy of protection in their area.

Q31 Should PLAN Selby include policies for setting specific house types and sizes, tenures and specialist housing such as care homes and Self builds?

Yes. These needs must be addressed.

Q33 a) Should PLAN Selby have more detailed general policies on design by being more specific about the minimum design standards it will seek to achieve, including policy on development density, environmental and quality design benchmarks (such as BREEAM, Lifetime Homes, Secure By Design etc.)?

b) Should PLAN Selby establish design requirements in the new allocated sites that consider the layout, orientation and aesthetic of development proposals?

Yes to both. Such policies are long overdue.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

The Practice Manager on behalf of the Doctors at the Sherburn Group Practice, The Medical Centre, Beech Grove, Sherburn in Elmet confirmed to us by email dated 8 January 2015 that the Partners were concerned that Plan Selby did not highlight the increased demands on the Healthcare provision within Sherburn in Elmet future developments. They specifically highlighted the lack of communication in regard to the provision of s.106 money to healthcare providers within future developments and stated that if future developments go ahead then provision must be made to all healthcare providers in the area to support the increase in population.

Signed: MARGARET GIBSON, Clerk to Sherburn in Elmet Parish Council
Dated: 15 January 2015.