

**Selby District Submission Draft Core Strategy
Consultation on Further Proposed Changes (6th Set)
June 2012
Representation Form**

An Examination in Public (EIP) into the soundness of the Submission Draft Core Strategy (SDCS) was held between 20 and 30 September 2011 and between 18 and 19 April 2012 in front of an Independent Inspector.

The Independent Inspector has adjourned the EIP until 5 September 2012 in order to consider the implications of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on the Submission Draft Core Strategy and for the Council to consult on any further Proposed Changes to the Submission Draft Core Strategy.

Selby District Council is now publishing and inviting comments on a 6th Set of Proposed Changes to the Submission Draft Core Strategy (and associated documents) in order that all parties can make their views known.

The September and April EIP's have already heard the duly made representations on the Submission Draft Core Strategy which were submitted during the formal Publication stage and subsequent consultation on the first 5 Sets of Proposed Changes. The adjournment should not be used as an opportunity to revisit matters which have been fully considered during the September 2011 and April 2012 hearing sessions.

Representations are therefore invited as part of this consultation on the 6th Set of Proposed Changes to the Submission Draft Core Strategy and associated documents.

Please complete separate copies of Part B of this form for each of your separate representations. 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 Thursday 19 July 2012**

Email to: ldf@selby.gov.uk

Fax to: 01757 292229

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



Part A

79

The Tests of Soundness

The Independent Inspector's role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. The tests to consider whether the plan is 'sound' are explained under paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012) and states a sound Core Strategy should be:

Positively prepared

- the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;

Justified

- the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;

Effective

- the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and

Consistent with national policy

- the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

Contact Details (only complete once)

Please provide contact details and agent details, if appointed.

	Personal Details	Agents Details (if applicable)
Name	CLlr Liz Casling	N/A
Organisation		
Address	4, 1949 Cottages, Skipwith Rd, Escrick, York YO19 6JU	
Telephone No.		
Email address		

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

You only need to complete this page once. If you wish to make more than one representation, attach additional copies of Part B (pages 3-4) to this part of the representation form.

Part B (please use a separate sheet (pages 3-4) for each representation)

79

Please identify the Proposed Change (which can be found on the Published Schedule, CD2f) to which this representation refers or paragraph number of the NPPF Compliance Statement:

PC6.12 and PC6.32

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:

- 2.1 Positively Prepared (Please identify just one test for this representation)
- 2.2 Justified
- 2.3 Effective
- 2.4 Consistent with national policy

Question 3: Please give details of why you consider the Proposed Change is not legally compliant or is unsound and provide details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Proposed Change to the Submission Draft Core Strategy legally compliant or sound.

It is considered that the proposal to change the status of Escrick from that of a secondary Village to a Designated Service Village would be unsound in relation to the test of justification for the following reasons:-

1. There is no land available within the current village development limits of Escrick for future development and as such the designation of this settlement as a Service Village would increase pressure for the review of the village development limits and Green Belt in this area.
2. There is no evidence of need for additional housing within Escrick and as such there is no requirement to expand the village or to allocate additional land in this location.
3. There are no obvious sites adjoining the existing built area of the village (which primarily to the west of the east of the A19) that would easily lend itself to be developed. The land to the north of the village falls within the administrative area of City of York Council. The housing estates to the north east of the village provide no means of access to the land beyond. Land to the south and south east of the village is constrained by designated areas of recreational open space, sites of importance for nature conservation and historic gardens. This leaves only the land to the west of the A19 which is largely undeveloped and as such would have significant impact on the character and appearance of the village.
4. The large area of land to the west of A19, which is identified in the Councils's Strategic Housing Land Availability document (ref PHS/10/001) would require a major new access or accesses on to the A19 and also a pedestrian crossing for future residents to safely cross to access such facilities as the school and post office. This would create traffic problems and queuing on the A19. Although the possibility of a bypass has been suggested in the past a significant scale of development would be required in order to make this viable. A development of such scale would double the size of the village.

For the above reasons it is considered that the proposed change should not be made and that Escrick should remain a Secondary village as previously proposed by the council

Continue overleaf

Question 3 continued

[Empty box for question 3 continuation]

(Continue on a separate sheet if submitting a hard copy)

Question 4: 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?

- 4.1** Written Representations
- 4.2** Attend Examination

4.3 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).

[Empty box for question 4.3 response]

(Continue on a separate sheet if submitting a hard copy)

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 (including on the Council's website) 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 liz casling

Dated 19/7/12