Helen Gregory

From: wadsworth stephen [redacted]
Sent: 27 December 2012 16:50
To: LDF
Subject: core strategy letter
Attachments: Selby DC letter 7th changes.docx

To LDF Team,

Please ensure the Inspector receives this attachment in full.
Please acknowledge receipt.

Thanks

S & T Wadsworth

Orchard Croft,
Caudle Hill,
Fairburn,
Knottingley,
WF11 9JQ

27th December 2012

To The Inspector, **Selby DC Submission Draft Core Strategy 7th Set Proposed Changes.**

We would first like to tell the Inspector that the 7th set of proposed changes are unsound and probably unlawfull as it is not providing for the need for development in many of the villages including Fairburn, therefore it is at odds with NPPF 14 that states there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Selby DC is proposing to concentrate the vast majority of development on Selby, Tadcaster, Sherburn, Brayton, Thorpe Willoughby and Barlby/Osgodby when it should be seeking to disperse development to both help sustain rural villages and their services and not worsen the overload of aforementioned settlements with infrastructure deficit that already exists, eg. The lack of recreational/sports halls, swimming facilities etc etc.
Much of this land is also waterlogged and suffers from surface ponding and should not ever be built on as this will only worsen flooding and drainage problems this also applies to villages such as Cawood, Ulleskelf, Church Fenton and other low lying villages.
The towns and villages on the magnesian limestone ridge running from Tadcaster in the north of the district to Kirk Smeaton in the south of the district do not have that problem as the land is free draining and they are therefore more suited to development as per NPPF section 10.

Fairburn was a designated sustainable village throughout the previous Selby DC plans and all the way through this plan until proposed 7th changes, that makes no sense, we and everyone who we have spoken to is disgusted with Fairburn being removed from the list of designated service villages and demand that it be reinstated immediately as a Designated Service Village.
Fairburn needs development it has been restricted for too long by the village envelope being drawn too tightly around the village and Selby DC restricting what would be sustainable development in the village.

Proposed Core Strategy 4.39oo states, 'Define the Green Belt Boundary using landmarks and features that are easily identifiable on a map and on the ground' we ask whose map? Maps are often incorrect and out of date, it should use NPPF 85 that says 'define boundaries clearly using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.'

Regarding Annex D we consider it to be unsound as it is including windfalls in the projections when it should not include windfalls for the first ten years according to the NPPF. Also the figure of 450 dpa is way too low as Selby DC should be planning for at least 620 dpa not including windfalls to meet demand that has been restricted in the past and according to the 2011 Census can be expected in the plan period.
Selby DC is counting windfalls already granted planning permission and future windfalls towards the overall total and is therefore restricting development and not following the 'Golden Thread' of the NPPF of a presumption in favour of sustainable development.
Selby DC has always sought to restrict numbers to around 450dpa, in the last plan 2005, the figure they used was 440dpa, nothing changes!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Yours sincerely
Steve and Trisha Wadsworth