



Land and Development Practice
CHARTERED TOWN PLANNERS

Our Ref: 9697A/MM/EM/1201

21 December 2012

Planning Policy Officer
Selby District Council
Doncaster Road
Selby
YO8 9FT

Dear Sir/Madam,

Comments on the Seventh Set of Proposed Changes to the Draft Core Strategy

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 These representations have been prepared by LDP Planning on behalf of our Client Bayford Developments Ltd.
- 1.2 Our Client is the owner of land at the former Monk Fryston Filling Station which has been identified as part of a larger potential mixed used development site in the Preferred Options Site Allocations Development Plan Document ("SADPD"). Representations were made on behalf of our Client in relation to the SADPD in December 2011.
- 1.3 Monk Fryston has been identified in the SADPD as a settlement that could potentially accommodate a shortfall in housing land provision identified elsewhere within the district. Our Clients land, together with adjacent land has been identified as a more suitable development site, despite it being situated within the Green Belt, than the currently safeguarded site which is not located within the Green Belt.
- 1.4 Representations were made on behalf of our Client in respect of the fifth set of proposed changes to the Draft Core Strategy in February 2012.



LDP Planning LLP registered in England and Wales
(Registered number OC365157)

1 Horsefair, Wetherby, Leeds LS22 6JG. Tel: 01937 588333; Fax: 01937 580358; Website: www.ldpplanning.co.uk; email: planning@ldpplanning.co.uk
A list of members' names is available for inspection at the registered address: 1 Horsefair, Wetherby, Leeds LS22 6JG

- 1.5 The soundness of the Core Strategy was questioned in its current format at the Examination in Public in September 2012. The examination is due to reconvene in 2013 and this representation makes comments on the seventh set of proposed changes to the Draft Core Strategy, specifically the alterations to Core Strategy Policy CPXX (Green Belt).

2.0 POLICY CPXX GREEN BELT

- 2.1 We continue to support the proposal to incorporate a Green Belt Policy within the Core Strategy ("CS").
- 2.2 We would continue to question the requirement for Part A of Policy CPXX given that it is clear that the extent of Green Belt will be defined on the Proposals Map. The overarching aim of the Policy would not be weakened by the removal of this part of the Policy.
- 2.3 Given that the CS must be consistent with the principles and policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") we would question whether it is necessary to state that it is in accordance with the Framework at Part B of Policy CPXX. Also historically Selby District Council, in terms of its detailed policy wording, has been more pragmatic in respect of 'appropriate' development in the Green Belt. Such pragmatism could not be continued into the SADPD or any other DPD if 'NPPF' is left in.
- 2.4 The removal of the PC6.19 revision of Part C of Policy CPXX and its replacement with PC7.3 is welcomed. This section of the Policy clearly outlines the circumstances in which Green Belt land will be released through the alteration of existing Green Belt boundaries. We would reiterate that criterion (iii) of Part C should be amended to **recognise that there may be planning/environmental/community benefits other than sustainability that justify the consideration of alternative options.** For example in the case of our Client's site it was demonstrated in our SADPD representations that there were significant benefits to the community (providing school parking, a cemetery extension together with alternative access and parking, public open space, an alternative traffic system which would alleviate existing congestion problems, a traditional form of linear development, retention of the existing gap in built development between settlements, reuse of previously developed land, removal of an eyesore and an opportunity to significantly enhance

the entrance to the village) that could be delivered by the development of this site but which would not be possible to achieve through the development of other potential site allocations currently outside Green Belt.

2.5 We support the contents of the revised Part D of Policy CPXX and consider that it offers flexibility by identifying safeguarded land to facilitate development beyond the plan period.

3.0 CONCLUSION

3.1 We fully support the provision of Policy CPXX within the CS to enable the local planning authority to carry out a comprehensive review of the existing Green Belt boundaries.

3.2 We consider that a review of Green Belt and development limit boundaries is necessary to ensure that housing delivery targets can be met in appropriate locations where there is an identified need and consider that the proposed policy is therefore justified.

3.3 However it is considered that the wording of the proposed policy CPXX requires amendment to remove unnecessary repetition of national policy and to recognise sites that have potential to deliver greater benefits than non Green Belt sites.

3.4 I trust that our comments will be given due consideration.

Yours faithfully
LDP PLANNING



Melissa Madge