

Mr R P Dixon
 Wood Farmhouse
 Doncaster Road
 Whitley
 Nr Goole
 DN14 0JF



Reference: SHLAA Site Reference :- WHITLEY PHS/42/005
 SITE name Land Opposite FIRS FARM
 Field NO :- 8535

Dear Sir/Madam,

in response to your consultation request please find my comments on the changes that you propose to the SADPD document.

You will be aware that I have written before to offer my land in Whitley for future development and my comments are submitted both in principle and with specific reference to that offer. The land is currently listed as Green Belt, although as stated previously it is actually a gap in the frontage to the A19 which splits the village of Whitley in two.

I have listed my comments as much as possible in following your document order.

I broadly agree with the amendments suggested in yellow throughout the document, in particular those points that are directly relevant to Selby and Tadcaster where specific changes to policy as a result of insufficient land supply may be necessary to provide for sustainable development through to 2027.

I feel that this approach should also be carried over into DSV's (and in certain cases to Secondary Villages) where there are either shortages of suitable sites or where an "appropriate" development is identified that will enhance the local community and economy:

"Development in the countryside (outside Development Limits) will be limited to the replacement or extension of existing buildings, the re-use of buildings preferably for employment purposes, and to proposals of an appropriate scale which would diversify the local economy which would contribute towards and improve the local economy (PC1.20) where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities (PC6.27), or meet affordable housing need (which meets the provisions of Policy CP6), (PC6.29) or other exceptional special (PC6.28) circumstances."

I also support the principle of protection of the Green Belt with the proviso that certain anomalies and exceptions are addressed in a consistent manner across the District.

In line with this it is clear that there are parcels of land within Whitley which could be assessed within the Green Belt policy below, specifically with reference to the infill of frontage and the degree of physical and visual separation of settlements.

Additionally, I would hope that the provision of the ability to re-designate Green Belt for development would be applied to my parcel, as my proposal addresses both the need for genuine affordable housing in the area and the ability to diversify the local economy with the creation of small business start-up and technology friendly units alongside the much-needed small retail and services units. The key to the retail, service and business potential is the frontage on the A19 which is at the physical mid-point within the village, enjoys the best visual road access and simply fills in the obvious gap in the building line:

"The review may also consider the relationship between urban and rural fringe; and the degree of physical and visual separation of settlements.

This could supply a schedule of areas for further investigation where sites may be considered for suitability for development and subject to a sustainability assessment.

Policy CPXX Green Belt

- A. Those areas covered by Green Belt are defined on the Proposals Map.
- B. In accordance with higher order policies, within the defined Green Belt, planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development unless the applicant has demonstrated that very special circumstances exist to justify why permission should be granted. The Green Belt review and Sustainability Appraisal would then undergo public consultation.
- D. To ensure the Green Belt boundaries endure in the long term, a review of the Green Belt will be undertaken through The purposes of the review will be to:
 - 1. address anomalies
 - 2. review washed-over villages
 - 4. ensure that there is sufficient land available to meet development requirements throughout the Plan period for allocations, and the need for growth beyond the Plan period by identifying Safeguarded Land.
- F. Any site considered for removal from the GreenBelt under Criterion D4 (above) will be subject to a sustainability appraisal and assessed for their impact upon the following issues (non-exhaustive):
- C. Within Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt (as defined on the Proposals Map), some limited infilling and/or, redevelopment to support economic development of existing uses will be permitted in line with higher order policies.
- E. Under Criterion D4 (above), land may be taken out of the Green Belt only in exceptional circumstances, where
 - 1. there is an over-riding need to deliver the Vision, Aims and Objectives of the Core Strategy by accommodating the housing development identified in the established settlement hierarchy as set out in CP2, and/or employment development identified in CP9, and
 - 2. where such need cannot be met on non-Green Belt land, or where Green Belt land offers a significantly more sustainable option overall.
- E. Under Criterion D4 (above), the SADPD may in exceptional circumstances remove land from the Green Belt and allocate it to deliver the Policies, Vision, Aims and Objectives of the Core Strategy by accommodating the identified development needs in the established settlement hierarchy, where such need cannot be met on non-Green Belt land, or where removal of land from the Green Belt offers a significantly more sustainable option overall. Safeguarded land may also be identified to secure options for delivery in future plans. (PC6.20)
- C) Development in the countryside (outside Development Limits) will be limited to the replacement or extension of existing buildings, the re-use of buildings preferably for employment purposes, and to proposals of an appropriate scale which would diversify the local economy which would contribute towards and improve the local economy (PC1.20) where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities (PC6.27), or meet affordable housing need (which meets the provisions of Policy CP6), (PC6.29) or other exceptional special (PC6.28) circumstances.
- d) In Green Belt, including villages washed over by Green Belt, development must conform to Policy CPXX and (PC5.9) national Green Belt policies. Development Limits of settlements, other than exception sites for 100% affordable housing in villages will be brought forward through specific allocations in a Site Allocations DPD and in accordance with Policy CP3 (Managing Housing Land Supply) set out later in this chapter (PC5.18). A review of current Development Limits will be undertaken in the case of the Local Service Centres and Designated Service Villages wherever more detailed investigation through the Site Allocations DPD reveals a lack of deliverable sites within them. In certain cases where the settlement is within or adjoining Green Belt a localised review of that boundary may also be undertaken in accordance with Policy CPXX (Green Belt) (PC5.19). Where necessary the Council will explore pro-active measures such as negotiating with landowners, and Compulsory Purchase Order procedures, in order to secure an appropriate supply of housing land

This may include localised Green Belt reviews as indicated in Section 4 and Policy CPXX (Green Belt)"

I fully support the inclusion of the need to reduce travel and support more energy-friendly modes of transport within the SADPD.

Within my proposal I have already assessed the ability to provide electric vehicle recharging points specifically outside the retail/business units, with the additional possibility to provide additional units within both affordable and market housing areas:

"While it is important that economic growth is concentrated on Selby and the Local Service Centres, it is also important that opportunities are provided in rural locations to maintain the viability of rural communities and to reduce the need to travel. This could include the redevelopment of existing businesses, the redevelopment or re-use of rural buildings for suitable employment purposes, as well as farm diversification activities. Proposals for appropriate forms of recreation and tourism activity will also be encouraged. (PC6.7) 7.31a

Despite the Core Strategy approach to reduce the need to travel, it is inevitable that some travel will always occur. Wherever possible, modern technology should be incorporated in to developments to reduce the impacts of development. Most recently the availability of electric cars means that charging points will become more widespread, and provision of these or other new technologies is encouraged."

I fully endorse the key requirements outlined below and have incorporated this approach into my proposed development, specifically by addressing the needs for easy accessibility to the population, the close proximity of new retail, services and employment opportunities with reduced travel impact, plus the provision of donated land to the village in the shape of open recreation space and sports fields plus plans for a Village Hall and flexible meeting area. The development layout would also support the need for a more secure and safe environment with housing arranged to support overview of the outdoor amenity and meeting areas. Energy efficiency and reduced carbon footprint are also fundamental elements of the plan:

Spaces between built developments are equally important and new open spaces should improve the quality of the public realm

Both residential and non-residential development should meet the following key requirements:

- a) Make the best, most efficient use of land without compromising local distinctiveness, character and form.*
- a) Positively contribute to an area's identity and heritage in terms of scale, density and layout;*
- b) Be accessible to all users and easy to get to and move through;*
- c) Create rights of way or improve them to make them more attractive to users, and facilitate sustainable access modes, including public transport, cycling and walking which minimise conflicts;*
- d) Incorporate new and existing landscaping as an integral part of the design of schemes, including off-site landscaping for large sites and sites on the edge of settlements where appropriate (PC4.41);*
- e) Promote access to open spaces and green infrastructure to support community gatherings and active lifestyles which contribute to the health and social well-being of the local community;*
- f) Have public and private spaces that are clearly distinguished, safe and secure, attractive and which complement the built form;*
- g) Minimise the risk of crime or fear of crime, particularly through active frontages and natural surveillance;*
- h) Create mixed use places with variety and choice that complement one another to*

encourage integrated living, and

i) Adopt sustainable construction principles in accordance with Policies CP12 and CP13

In summary, as a layman and a taxpayer I support the majority of the yellow amendments to the Consultation Document and hope that it will make planning and development within the District more streamlined and consistent whilst addressing the more obvious historical anomalies

As both a land-owner and a life-long village resident in Whitley I also hope that my comments and specific proposal to improve the social and economic outlook in the village via my development plan are taken seriously and in the spirit that they are offered. I believe they position a win/win situation for all parties.



R.P. DIXON

A handwritten signature consisting of a horizontal line with a large, sweeping flourish underneath.