

EXAMINATION HEARINGS

AGENDA

WEDNESDAY 21 SEPTEMBER 10.00am

The questions in italics are some (but not the only) specific matters which arise from the evidence and will assist in focusing the discussion.

MATTER 2. SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Settlement hierarchy

2.6(ii) Is the settlement hierarchy justified by the evidence and is it the most appropriate to achieve the spatial vision? In particular, is the evidence to justify the distinction between those settlements listed as Designated Service Villages (DSV) and the unlisted Secondary Villages (SV) robust and credible, notably with regard to Appleton Roebuck, Camblesforth, Eggborough/Whitley, Escrick, Fairburn, Hambleton, Hemingbrough, Kellington, Ulleskelf.

- *What is the justification for identifying the following as DSV rather than SV:*

Appleton Roebuck

Fairburn

Kellington

Hambleton

Whitley (via link with Eggborough)

Hemingbrough

Ulleskelf

Osgodby (via link with Barlby)

- *What is the justification for identifying the following as SV rather than DSV:*

Escrick

Camblesforth

Scale of growth in villages

2.9 Is there sufficient and credible evidence to support the contention that the scale of growth envisaged for Designated Service Villages, and the limited development permitted in Secondary Villages, is appropriate to support rural sustainability and meet local needs?

- *Is more new housing required in DSVs and SVs to meet local needs and support rural regeneration*

Selby District Core Strategy Examination

- *Is the amount of new housing likely in DSVs and SVs consistent with sustainability objectives and the strategy of focusing growth on the main towns*

Managing residential development - Policy CP1A

2.17 Is there robust and credible evidence that the types of residential development acceptable in Secondary Villages will result in an appropriate balance between maintaining vitality whilst restricting the amount of housing provided in less sustainable settlements? What is the scale of windfall development likely in Secondary Villages, and what impact will this have on the overall sustainability strategy?

- *Is the provision for greenfield development in Secondary Villages consistent with the Regional Spatial Strategy and national policy*
- *Is there evidence to demonstrate the implications of this policy*
- *Is the policy sufficiently robust to prevent large housing developments in unsustainable locations*

2.18 Has the Council reviewed the "Development Limits" for Secondary Villages (ie those settlements where Development Limits will not be reviewed in the Site Allocations DPD) to ensure that they are appropriate and up-to-date? If not, is there any mechanism proposed for such a review? How will the plans showing Development Limits for these villages be incorporated into the LDF?

- *Are Development Limits little changed over 20 years and, if so, are they in need of review*