

Gwilym Stephen Jones

PLAN Selby is a comprehensive and complicated document. Much of it relates to technical planning matters, methodology and practice and, as a layman, I am not in a position to comment on much of what it contains as I simply don't have that expertise. I suspect that the methodology and practice it refers to is valid as to be anything else would expose Selby DC to challenge and ridicule by those that do have the expertise to do so. Equally, I have little detailed knowledge of areas within Selby district other than Whitley and Eggborough.

I do, however, have comments and views on some specific elements and these are as under.

Chapter T1

Development in Designated Service Villages

Paragraphs 3.24 – 3.28

Questions 9a

A cap on new development of 8% over existing in Designated Service Villages may well be a reasonable starting point. However, any such development should be on small scale sites. The DSVs should not be 'swamped' by any development such that their identity is changed or lost altogether.

Question 9b

These criteria must be taken into account when assessing final figures but the amount of more recent development that has already taken place should also be a factor that is taken into account.

.....

Chapter T3

Green Belt

Paragraphs 3.98 – 3.113

Question 22

Yes, certainly, Development Limits should be drawn tightly to maintain the settlement pattern. To do otherwise negates the point of Green Belt.

Question 23b

I can only comment on the Strategic Countryside Gaps in Whitley as I have no knowledge of other villages but yes, they are appropriate here and should remain as to remove them would destroy the settlement pattern. I suspect that this will be the general/usual situation in other villages.

General Comment - Green Belt

Many of the sites included in PLAN Selby resulting from the 'Call for Sites' exercise are within existing Green Belt. PLAN Selby states that development in Green Belt can only be considered in very exceptional circumstances. Sites within the Green Belt should, therefore, not be included in the PLAN Selby document however this might be noted as 'for information only' as their inclusion gives a misleading impression of where *actual* development might take place. Brown field sites should form the basis of all future development and if it is, after all brown field sites have been considered, that a shortfall remains then release of Green Belt land should only occur with the agreement of residents and Parish Councils in the affected areas.

.....

Chapter 5 - Settlements

Designated Service Villages

Paragraph 5.67 – 5.69

Question 48a

PLAN Selby continues Selby DC's arbitrary linking of the separate villages of Eggborough and Whitley such that they consider them a Linked Designated Service Village. Traditionally, Eggborough was considered a Service Village and Whitley a Secondary Village but in the previous Draft Core Strategy Review, Selby DC stated that *'.....a number of consultees suggested that because Eggborough and Whitley are located in close proximity and share a number of facilities (the local primary school is situated in Whitley) there is a case for classifying them as 'Linked' Service Villages.*

This statement was incorrect. Only one consultee expressed that view. Other consultees including the Whitley Parish Council objected to the linking. These objections have never been responded to by Selby DC and Selby DC have never published any assessment of the suitability of Whitley to transfer from a secondary village to a Designated Service Village. The linking has never been tested or consulted upon and until that happens, the separate designation of Eggborough as a Designated Service Village and Whitley as a Secondary Village should be reinstated.

Where this becomes particularly important is when considering planned growth in Linked Designated Service Villages. Taking Eggborough/Whitley as an example and using the figures quoted in PLAN Selby (Table 4, Page 25), the approximate total number of dwellings in the two villages is 1276. An 8% growth on this figure amounts to an additional 102 dwellings. If this were to be confirmed as an acceptable total level of development for the two villages and Eggborough and Whitley continue to be considered as one then it is conceivable that this 8% growth figure might be achieved by building 102 dwellings in Whitley alone. This would be a totally inappropriate level of development yet would still meet the requirement of PLAN Selby all be it by what might be considered little more than a 'slight of hand'. It is inconceivable that this scenario is something PLAN Selby is designed to achieve or would want to encourage. At 9% growth, the situation would be even worse. I don't have detailed knowledge of other Linked Designated Service Villages but it is reasonable that this situation may well not be unique to Whitley.

Factual Error

In respect of the inappropriately linked Eggborough/Whitley Designated Service Village, Plan Selby states (Para 5.68) that *'Employment opportunities are available at Eggborough Power Station, the Saint Gobain float glass factory and Kellingley Colliery.'* There are no employment opportunities at Kellingley Colliery as its closure is immanent and the future of Eggborough Power Station remains very much in the balance. It is a concern that other, similar, errors of basic fact may be contained in the document that, if not corrected, will be 'taken as read' by those considering the proposals who have no detailed knowledge of the Selby DC area.

.....

Gwilym Stephen Jones 16 January 2015