

63

ryan king

From: Eamonn Keogh [ekeogh@turleyassociates.co.uk]
Sent: 15 February 2012 16:58
To: ldf
Subject: 5th Set of Changes to Submission Draft
Attachments: 120215 Reps Letter.pdf; FINAL_SDCS_rep_form_Jan_2012.pdf

Dear Sirs,

Please find representations to the above on behalf of Potter Group.

Regards

Eamonn Keogh

Director

TURLEYASSOCIATES

33 Park Place, Leeds, LS1 2RY

T: 0113 386 3800 | F: 0113 244 3650

M: 07500 012 094

ekeogh@turleyassociates.co.uk

www.turleyassociates.co.uk

Think of the environment, please do not print unnecessarily

This e-mail is intended for the above named only, is strictly confidential and may also be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient please do not read, print, re-transmit, store or act in reliance on it or any attachments. Instead, please notify the sender and then immediately and permanently delete it. Turley Associates is a limited company registered in England and Wales Registered No 2235387 Registered Office 1 New York Street, Manchester, M1 4HD.

Selby District Submission Draft Core Strategy

Consultation on Proposed Changes

January 2012

Representation Form

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 and (Amendment) Regulations 2008 and 2009

Part A

An Examination in Public into the soundness of the Submission Draft Core Strategy (SDCS) was held between 20 and 30 September 2011 in front of an Independent Inspector.

The examination has been suspended to allow the Council to address the following three topics, as set out in the Inspector's Ruling:

- (i) The strategic approach to Green Belt releases;
- (ii) The scale of housing and employment development proposed for Tadcaster and the implications for the Green Belt;
- (iii) The overall scale of housing development over the plan period.

The Council is now carrying out a consultation directly with participants on the changes to the Core Strategy arising from its consideration of these three topics.

Subject to the outstanding matters above, the examination into the other "Matters and Issues" identified by the Inspector has been completed. All parties have had the opportunity to participate in the hearing sessions and the Inspector has the information necessary to enable him to prepare his report. Consequently no further evidence should be submitted to the examination at this stage; any further evidence received by the Programme Officer is likely to be returned.

When the examination resumes, hearing sessions will be arranged which will focus solely on the above matters. As already stated, the suspension should not be used as an opportunity to revisit matters which have been fully considered during the September 2011 hearing sessions.

Representations are therefore invited as part of this consultation on the Proposed Changes to the Submission Draft Core Strategy.

Please complete separate copies of Part B of this form for each of your separate points. It would be helpful if you could focus on the "tests of soundness" and indicate if you are objecting on a legal compliance issue.

Completed representation forms must be returned to the Council no later than 5pm on Wednesday 15 February 2012

Email to: ldf@selby.gov.uk

Fax to: 01757 292229

Post to: Policy Team, Selby District Council, Civic Centre, Doncaster Road, Selby YO8 9FT

The Tests of Soundness

Soundness is explained in PPS12 (Planning Policy Statement 12) in paragraphs 4.36 - 4.47, 4.51 and 4.52 and the boxed text. Specifically paragraph 4.52 states that to be sound a Core Strategy should be:

1 Justified

PPS12 provides that to be 'justified' a DPD (in this case the 'Core Strategy') needs to be :

- founded on a robust and credible evidence base involving:
 - evidence of participation of the local community and others having a stake in the area
 - research/fact finding - the choices made in the plan are backed up by facts
- the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives

2 Effective

PPS12 states that Core Strategies should be effective. This means:

- Deliverable - embracing:
 - Sound infrastructure delivery planning
 - Having no regulatory or national planning barriers to delivery
 - Delivery partners who are signed up to it
 - Coherence with the strategies of neighbouring authorities
- Flexible
- Able to be monitored

3 National Policy

The DPD (in this case the 'Core Strategy') should be consistent with national policy. Where there is a departure, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) must provide clear and convincing reasoning to justify their approach.

Contact Details (only complete once)

Please provide contact details and agent details, if appointed.

Personal Details		Agents Details (if applicable)
Title		Mr
First Name		Eamonn
Last Name		Keogh
Job Title (where relevant)		Director
Organisation	The Potter Group	Turley Associates
Address Line 1	Melmerby Industrial Estate	33 Park Place
Address Line 2	Green Lane	
Address Line 3	Ripon	Leeds
County	N Yorks	W Yorks
Postcode	HG4 5HP	LS1 2RY
Telephone No.		0113 3863800
Email address		ekeogh@turleyassociates.co.uk

You only need to complete this page once. If you wish to make more than one representation, attach additional copies of Part B (pages 4 - 6) to this part of the representation form.

It will be helpful if you can provide an email address so we can contact you electronically.

Part B (please use a separate sheet (pages 4 - 6) for each representation)

Please identify the topic to which this representation refers:

- (i) The strategic approach to Green Belt releases;
- (ii) The scale of housing and employment development proposed for Tadcaster and the implications for the Green Belt;
- (iii) The overall scale of housing development over the plan period.

Please state the specific Proposed Change number: **PC**

(which can be found on the Published Schedule, CD2e)

Question 1: Do you consider the Proposed Change is:

1.1 Legally compliant Yes No

1.2 Sound Yes No

If you have entered No to 1.2, please continue to Q2. In all other circumstances, please go to Q3.

Question 2: If you consider the Proposed Change is unsound, please identify which test of soundness your representation relates to:

(Please note you should complete separate Part B (pages 4 - 6) of this form for each test of soundness you consider the Core Strategy fails.)

(Please identify just one test for this representation)

- 2.1 Justified
- 2.2 Effective
- 2.3 Consistent with national policy

Question 3: Please give details of why you consider the Proposed Change is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Proposed Change, or provide any other comments please also use this box to set out your comments:

See attached letter ref POTY2000 dated 15th February 2012

(If you are submitting this form as a hard copy please ensure all text is visible and continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 4: Please provide details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Proposed Change to the Submission Draft Core Strategy legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in Q2 where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Core Strategy DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

See attached letter ref POTY2000 dated 15th February 2012

(If you are submitting this form as a hard copy please ensure all text is visible and continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

PLEASE NOTE your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original. **After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he identifies for examination.**

Question 5: Can your representation seeking a change be considered by written representations, or do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

5.1 Written Representations

5.2 Attend Examination

5.3 If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary

(Your request will be considered by the Inspector, however, attendance at the Examination in Public is by invitation only).

(If you are submitting this form as a hard copy please ensure all text is visible and continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Representation Submission Acknowledgement

I acknowledge that I am making a formal representation. I understand that my name (and organisation where applicable) and representation will be made publically available during the public examination period of the Core Strategy in order to ensure that it is a fair and transparent process.

I agree with this statement and wish to submit the above representation for consideration.

Signed

Eamonn Keogh

Dated

15 February 2012

33 Park Place
Leeds
LS1 2RY

T: 0113 386 3800
F: 0113 244 3650

www.turleyassociates.co.uk

15 February 2011

Delivered by Post

Policy Officer
LDF Team
Selby District Council
Doncaster Road,
Selby
YO8 9FT

Our ref: POTY2000
Your ref:
E: ekeogh@turleyassociates.co.uk

Dear Sir

**SELBY SUBMISSION DRAFT CORE STRATEGY
FIFTH SET OF FURTHER PROPOSED CHANGES
THE POTTER GROUP, BARLBY ROAD, SELBY**

I write on behalf of the Potter Group in respect of their representations on the fifth set of further proposed changes to the Submission Draft Core Strategy.

Our comments relate specifically to the overall scale of housing over the plan period. The Potter Group welcome the changes proposed to Policy CP2 to increase the housing requirement across the district from 440 dwelling per annum to 450 per annum. However we consider the proposed increased will not be adequate to address the future housing needs of the district.

The Arup report "The Scale of Housing Growth in Selby" argues that previous rates of housing completions combined with the current economic recession and predicted slow economic recovery justify the use of the 2004 based GLG household projections to arrive at a housing requirement of 450 dwelling per annum for the district.

However, such an approach is unduly negative about the future prospects for the district and, more particularly, by adopting an unduly prescriptive low figure, reduces the flexibility of the district to respond to an increased housing requirement that would result from improved economic circumstances.

The most up to the CLG household projections (2008 based) indicate that for the Core Strategy period household growth will be:

2011 -2013	600 per annum	1200 total
2013 -2026	538 per annum	7000 total
2026 – 2027	500 per annum	500 total
2011 -2027	544 per annum	8,700 total

The provision of 450 dwellings per annum recommended by the Arup report is a significant departure from the 2008 based CLG projections and represents a significant risk of undersupply of housing in the event the pessimistic assumptions in the report are not realised.

Government guidance in PPS3 emphasises the importance certainty of housing delivery. Paragraph 52 of the guidance specifically states:

The Government's objective is to ensure that the planning system delivers a flexible, responsive supply of land.

In this context, the Core Strategy should embrace a flexible and positive approach to the provision of housing in the district by adopting the 2008 CLG household projections and making provision for 545 dwelling per annum in the plan period.

As a starting point the distribution of the additional requirement should be based on the distribution set out in proposed revised policy CP2A

Yours sincerely


Eamonn Keogh
Director

CC: