

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

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	Steve Smowton	
Organisation	Escrick Parish Council	
Address	c/o The Clerk 8 The Glade Escrick York Yo196JH	
Telephone No.		
Email address	chair@escrick.org	

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)

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:

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.

Escrick Parish Council Representations to Selby District Submission Draft Core Strategy Consultation on Further Proposed Changes (6th Set)

Re: Proposal to change the designation of Escrick from a Secondary Village to a Designated Service Village

We believe that the proposed change fails to meet the test of soundness, as set out in PPS12 and the NPPF, for the following reasons:

2.1 Positively Prepared

The village is currently and has always been a Secondary Village. All of the policies in the previous adopted Selby District Local Plan and now the LDF Core Strategy work to date maintained this status, including the Selby District Submission Draft Core Strategy of May 2011.

Only in the sixth revision was this changed. We have never been consulted or formally informed of this change or have ever had the reasons for this proposed change of status explained to us.

This is contrary to the guidance in the NPPF which requires meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods and the local community so that Local Plans reflect a collective vision and agreed set of priorities for an area. When we did hear of this, we immediately contacted the Planning Officer to ask that it be withdrawn, but a resolution was taken to Full Council by officers recommending the change of status. We asked for our concerns to be reported to Full Council, but again our views were ignored and the proposed change in status approved for this consultation.

In order to represent the views of Escrick village fairly and accurately, the Parish Council provided a briefing note and survey to all residents in the village, asking for their views. We received a huge response, rejecting the proposed change of status by 207 votes to 8.

There is therefore an overwhelming rejection of the proposed change in status by the local community, whose views we represent.

Continue overleaf

(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).

Escrick Parish Council represent the residents of Escrick. This Strategy seeks to change the planning status of the village from Secondary Village to Designated Service Village, a change strongly opposed by the Parish Council and the residents. we wish to make our point of view clear to the Inspector on behalf of our parishioners.

(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 Steve Smowton

Dated 19th July 2012

(7)

ESCRICK PARISH COUNCIL
Chair S.R. Smowton chair@escrick.org
Clerk V. Cumberland clerk@escrick.org

Escrick Parish Council Representations to Selby District Submission Draft Core Strategy Consultation on Further Proposed Changes (6th Set)

Re: Proposal to change the designation of Escrick from a Secondary Village to a Designated Service Village

We believe that the proposed change fails to meet the test of soundness, as set out in PPS12 and the NPPF, for the following reasons:

2.1 Positively Prepared

The village is currently and has always been a Secondary Village. All of the policies in the previous adopted Selby District Local Plan and now the LDF Core Strategy work to date maintained this status, including the Selby District Submission Draft Core Strategy of May 2011. Only in the sixth revision was this changed. We have never been consulted or formally informed of this change or have ever had the reasons for this proposed change of status explained to us.

This is contrary to the guidance in the NPPF which requires meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods and the local community so that Local Plans reflect a collective vision and agreed set of priorities for an area. When we did hear of this, we immediately contacted the Planning Officer to ask that it be withdrawn, but a resolution was taken to Full Council by officers recommending the change of status. We asked for our concerns to be reported to Full Council, but again our views were ignored and the proposed change in status approved for this consultation.

In order to represent the views of Escrick village fairly and accurately, the Parish Council provided a briefing note and survey to all residents in the village, asking for their views. We received a huge response, rejecting the proposed change of status by 207 votes to 8.

There is therefore an overwhelming rejection of the proposed change in status by the local community, whose views we represent.

2.2 Justified

- founded on a robust and credible evidence base

It is extremely difficult for us to believe that this proposal is founded on a robust and credible evidence base when the previous 5 revisions promoted strongly the opposite view. In February 2010, Selby District Council stated 'there are strong environmental and landscape constraints to development particularly south of the village which militate against expansion. The village has significant character with a Conservation Area' when recommending that Escrick remain in this category. We see no justification why this view should have changed, or had any explanation as to why this change of view has occurred. We therefore believe that the proposed change is not robust nor based on credible evidence.

- the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives

The NPPF requires that development should be located in sustainable locations whilst also emphasising the importance of Green Belts. Given the settlement hierarchy of Selby District and the availability of other larger DSVs which are more sustainably located and with greater service provision and employment opportunities nearby, we do not believe that upgrading Escrick to a DSV is the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, for the following reasons:

- There are extremely limited employment opportunities within reasonable walking / cycling distance.
- There is considerable congestion on the A19 both northbound and southbound, especially at peak times.
- Bus service frequency has been reduced in recent years, and the bus no longer comes into the centre of the village.
- We are entirely surrounded by the York Green Belt.
- The primary school is at maximum capacity.
- The village has significant character within a Conservation Area.
- The village has various listed buildings within settings that should also be preserved and protected, as well as other environmental constraints.

2.3 Effective

- deliverable

We believe that the change of status is unsound because, given the sensitive constraints on the village as stated above, an expanded village could not be delivered without considerable environmental harm.

It should be noted that there is considerable opposition within the village to the Escrick Bypass and associated Housing Development that was originally rejected by 90% of our residents in 2008 and has recently been re-introduced by the landowner. This proposal would effectively more than double the size of the village and significantly alter its character.

We are aware that simply a change of status does not mean that it will be approved; we are concerned that this change of status is necessary to assist its case and cause the village to be substantially enlarged.

- flexible

Due to the environmental constraints and geographical limitations discussed previously, there are very limited opportunities for potential development. It is therefore not possible for a flexible approach to be applied to Escrick should it become a DSV. The change in status would therefore not be sound as there is no certainty that the role of a DSV could be accommodated.

2.4 Consistent with National Policy

The NPPF clearly sets out that development should be directed to sustainable locations. Furthermore that environmental, social and economic considerations should be balanced and

that economic considerations should not predominate. The role of Green Belts, the Historic Environment, Listed Buildings and their settings are protected and their role emphasised in the NPPF. The York Green Belt is a longstanding policy and should not be overridden when other more suitable locations for development in the District are available. We believe that the change in status is unsound as it is inconsistent with National Policy and the NPPF because Escrick is not a sustainable location and other better alternatives exist, it has strong environmental limitations as to where development would be acceptable and, most importantly, it is clearly contrary to the wishes of the local community with whom there has been no consultation and who do not wish the character of the village to substantially change.

We confirm that Escrick Parish Council wishes to appear at the Core Strategy Hearing to explain these views more fully to the Inspector.

Steve Smowton

Chair, Escrick Parish Council