

Dear Mr Pike

RE: Inspector's letter of 10th May 2012 on windfalls.

This response clarifies the Council's position on windfall housing development in the context of the Core Strategy.

Definition of Windfall

PPS3 (June 2011) footnote 31 (to Paragraph 59) defines windfall:

“Windfall sites are those which have not been specifically identified as available in the local plan process. They comprise previously-developed sites that have unexpectedly become available. These could include, for example, large sites resulting from, for example, a factory closure or small sites such as a residential conversion or a new flat over a shop.”

SDC considers the PPS3 definition is ambiguous and was most likely to be written in this manner to reinforce the presumption against greenfield development elsewhere in PPS3.

The Council has consistently used a “definition” of windfalls simply to include all housing developments that come forward on non-allocated sites i.e. the first part of PPS3 definition (see SDCS Glossary “Windfalls - Those homes provided on sites, which are not specifically allocated for residential development and cannot be foreseen”. Although *most* windfalls in this District occurs on PDL due to other SDLP policies and PPS3, the Council does not make a link with PDL in its definition of windfall.

This view is reinforced by the NPPF which clarifies the PPS3 definition in Annexe 2, as:

“Sites which have not been specifically identified as available in the Local Plan process. They normally comprise previously-developed sites that have unexpectedly become available”. (Underlining is our emphasis).

Windfall trends in Selby District

For convenience the table below sets out the last seven years’:

- Total completions on allocated sites
- Completions on non-allocated sites (SDC windfall definition)
- Completions on windfall and PDL (PPS3 windfall definition)

Although it was suggested that the information is provided as an annotated version of the table in WS6 Appendix 2, it was felt that the one provided below is clearer. If this is unsatisfactory to you, I shall be pleased to provide an annotated version of the suggested table.

				Figures for non-allocated sites (SDC definition)				Figures for only those non-allocated sites which are also PDL	
Period	Completions total	Completions on allocated sites	% of completions On allocated sites	Completions on all other sites (windfall)	% of Completions on all other sites (windfall)	All completions on PDL	% of all completions on PDL	Of windfalls, how many on PDL *	% of windfall completions on PDL
2010-11	366	155	42.3	211	57.7	181	49.5	174	82.5
2009-10	270	107	39.6	163	60.4	125	46.3	117	71.8
2008-09	222	59	26.6	163	73.1	154	69.4	146	89.6
2007-08	583	240	41.2	343	58.8	299	51.3	271	79.0
2006-07	874	187	21.4	687	78.6	585	66.9	585	85.2
2005-06	633	53	8.4	580	91.6	473	74.7	473	81.6
2004-05	469	167	35.6	302	64.4	242	51.6	242	80.1
TOTAL 2005-2010	3417	968	-	2449	-	2059	-	2008	-
Average 2005-2010	488	138	30.7%	350	69.2%	294	58.5	286.9	81.4%

*All allocated sites with the exception of HAM/2 are Greenfield. HAM/2 has 51 of its 89 dwellings on PDL, delivered as follows:

- 2007/08 = 33 completions of which 28 on PDL
- 2008/09 = 16 completions of which 8 on PDL
- 2009/10 = 13 completions of which 8 on PDL
- 2010/11 = 28 completions of which 7 on PDL

All other PDL was from windfalls.

I trust that the above satisfies the queries raised.

We are aware that Mrs Hubbard has submitted correspondence that she considers that, following discussions with her colleagues, the figures in WS6 Appendix 3 regarding development in garden curtilages cannot be relied upon. In the absence of alternative figures or robust analysis, the Council is satisfied that its own figures are correct and must be treated as such.

A position statement is being prepared which covers a range of issues raised at the April EIP, including the Council's approach to windfall in the Core Strategy text.

Yours sincerely

Helen Gregory
Policy Officer