

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

Section 1 - Introduction					
ID No.	Name/ Company/ Organisation	Paragraph/ Policy	Agree/ Disagree	Issues Raised	Decision
DCS/80	The Grimston Park Estate	Paras 1.1 - 1.14	Yes	The current version of the Core Strategy is considered to be a significant improvement on the previous consultation. Paras 1.1 - 1.14 are particularly helpful in explaining the 'story so far'.	For noting.
DCS/145	Mr David Brewer	Paras 1.6 - 1.14	No	Objects to Paras 1.6 - 1.14 on the grounds that the Council has ignored the results of the previous consultation when the majority of respondents preferred a more dispersed distribution of development. This is considered contrary to the spirit of the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. Further concerned that para 1.14 also suggests that there will not be any fundamental changes following this consultation.	There was no overwhelming view in favour of any of the options and decisions on the spatial distribution of development must also be balanced with sustainability and other considerations as well as public opinion. The provisions of the SCI have been complied with. Para 1.14 refers to the next 'Publication ' stage when respondents have an opportunity to comment on the 'soundness' of the document at which time changes would normally only be made where the document is demonstrably unsound. In comparison numerous changes (including minor changes) are likely to be recommended as a result of the previous consultation in order to improve the document. It may help to clarify this in the text.
DCS/319	The Grimston Park Estate	Paras 1.17 & 1.18	Yes	Agrees with the pragmatic approach to progress the Core Strategy on the basis of current RSS, but concerned that the overarching planning framework for the District is also influenced by the Selby Sustainable Community Strategy and the North Yorks Sustainable Community Strategy neither of which is subject to public scrutiny in preparation and operation. Also points out that the current Selby	SCS are subject to consultation. The Selby SCS is currently under review and will be aligned with the Core Strategy.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				Sustainable Community Strategy runs only until 2010.	
DCS/320	The Grimston Park Estate	Paras 1.19 & 1.20 - Section 1	Partly	Suggests that in addition to managing finite resources and climate change it is important not to lose focus on localised concerns such as (fluvial) flooding, mitigation and risk management.	These issues are considered to be addressed in the paragraphs referred to.
DCS/321	The Grimston Park Estate	Place making agenda (omission)	Omissions	Suggests that the overarching issues covered in Section 1 should also refer to the 'Place Making Agenda' which is at the heart of the spatial planning process.	Agreed this would be in line with best practice and national advice. Other stakeholders including GOYH have commented on this issue elsewhere in the document.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

Section 2 – Key Issues and Challenges					
ID No.	Name/ Company/ Organisation	Paragraph/ Policy	Agree/ Disagree	Issues Raised	Decision
DCS/85	Land 4 New Build Ltd	Whole Section	Partly	Generally supports the intention to concentrate growth in Selby and adjoining villages, but questions whether the Strategy offers the level of flexibility required to enable the SAAP to deal with the provision of housing allocations.	Issues raised concerning housing land availability and strategic development sites suggest that it would be appropriate to produce a district wide Allocations DPD rather than an SAAP which will address this representation.
DCS/262	Drax Power Ltd	Whole Section	Partly	Considers that the priority of reinvigorating the economy will require both the retention and creation of jobs, matching the skill sets and aspirations of residents with opportunities, while ensuring the District is attractive to investment.	Para 2.16 could be expanded to address this point.
DCS/275	English Heritage	Whole Section	General Comments	Background data supplied in support of DCS/49 includes reference to archaeological remains, medieval sites, Newton Kyme Henge, Skipwith Common, Tadcaster Roman Heritage, ecclesiastical history (Selby Abbey, Cawood Castle, Bishops Canal), Towton Battlefield, 19th Century farming heritage and 20th century military heritage (RAF Burn, Riccall and Church Fenton).	Incorporation of the additional evidence provided would compliment the place shaping agenda referred to by other stakeholders.
DCS/322	The Grimston Park Estate	Paras 2.1 - 2.9	Partly	Suggest it would be useful to include a contextual map to support the 'District Portrait' identifying features and the proximity to major centres such as Leeds and York, along with major transport routes.	This would be a helpful improvement to help explain the context and develop the 'story', and compliments advice offered by GOYH and other stakeholders.
DCS/49	English Heritage	Para 2.3	Partly	Advises that more should be said about what makes Selby distinctive from other places, which could help establish a rationale for the Aims and Objectives of making the most of its distinctive character and protection of the environment.	This would be a helpful addition to the Strategy, which would compliment the place shaping agenda referred to by other stakeholders.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/167	Environment Agency	Para 2.6	Yes	Pleased to see that risk of flooding in some areas of the District is highlighted.	For noting.
DCS/12	Mr David Lewis	Para 2.7	Partly	The District portrait should more accurately refer to the scope for improving the rail services between Selby and York, Sherburn and Sheffield, Sherburn and York, and the potential for Church Fenton to act as a Park and Ride for York and Leeds.	The District Portrait is intended to paint a picture of current circumstances - opportunities for improvement could be identified elsewhere in the document. This is also an issue for the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
DCS/323	The Grimston Park Estate	Paras 2.10 - 2.19	Partly	Agrees with the pragmatic approach to increase the Districts self containment by moderating travel patterns, developing the economy and promoting affordable housing, but concerned that decisions are being put off to a later date eg through the Selby Area Action Plan.	Issues raised concerning housing land availability and strategic development sites suggest that it would be appropriate to produce a district wide Allocations DPD as a priority rather than an SAAP which will address this representation.
DCS/117	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	Paras 2.12 - 2.13	Yes	Agree with the need to ensure the majority of development is located within and adjacent to Selby, which will be a key challenge in view of the high risk of flooding.	For noting.
DCS/168	Environment Agency	Para 2.13	Partly	The paragraph should be updated to take account of the findings on the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	Updating required.
DCS/118	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	Para 2.14	No	Seek clarification on the scope of the proposed Area Action Plan and the relationship between the AAP and the Core Strategy, since para 1.14 implies that decisions on the amount of new development will be dealt with through an AAP, although the draft Core Strategy also advances a number of strategic sites.	Issues raised concerning housing land availability and strategic development sites suggest that it would be appropriate to produce a combined Allocations DPD as a priority rather than an SAAP which will help clarify the position. On the advice of GOYH and others, details regarding the Councils requirements for the development of strategic sites will also be included in the Core Strategy.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/211	Jennifer Hubbard	Para 2.15	No	Reference should be made to the fact that the housing growth figure of 440 dpa is a minimum requirement to be consistent with Policy CP2. Clarification should also be provided regarding the criteria that will be used to determine in what circumstances housing growth in excess of 440 dwellings per annum will be approved.	Referred to elsewhere in the document but minor amendment to para 2.15 would satisfy part of the point raised. Clarification on the second point can best be addressed in conjunction with Policy CP3 (Managing Housing Land Supply)
DCS/326	The Grimston Park Estate	Para 2.15	General Comments	Considers the delivery of affordable housing could be increased in line with need identified in the strategic housing market assessment by permitting additional house building (with a 40% affordable target).	This issue needs to be considered within the context of the proposed abolition of RSS.
DCS/93	Natural England	Para 2.17 - 2.19	Partly	While acknowledging that a broad range of issues has been identified in the Strategy, consider that insufficient coverage has been given to environmental issues such as increasing biodiversity, achieving a net gain in green infrastructure and protecting and enhancing natural habitats and local landscapes. Recommend that under 'Other Challenges' environmental enhancement should be included as a vital part of improving the image of the area and contributing to the regeneration of coal mining areas.	Minor amendment required to satisfy this concern but care needed to avoid association with West Yorkshire mining issues.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

Section 3 – Vision, Aims and Objectives					
ID No.	Name/ Company/ Organisation	Paragraph/ Policy	Agree/ Disagree	Issues Raised	Decision
DCS/58	Yorkshire Water	Whole Section	General Comments	Supports the Vision, Aims and Objectives identified particularly Objectives 6 and 16.	For noting.
DCS/263	Drax Power Ltd	Whole Section	Partly	Considers that the Vision, Aims and Objectives should be expanded to include support for the provision of energy and infrastructure development at Drax, and that the Core Strategy should make provision for energy and infrastructure development at Drax, through specific policies and land use allocations as well as generic policies.	It is not appropriate to refer to site specific issues or single out specific locations in the Core Strategy Aims and Objectives. Neither would Drax be an appropriate location for a strategic development allocation. Site specific issues will be addressed through future Allocations and Development Management DPD's. The range of land use activities identified in the first Aim (Para 3.4 bullet point 1) could usefully be extended to include 'infrastructure' development'.
DCS/328	The Grimston Park Estate	Whole Section	Partly	Considers that the number of objectives should be reduced or merged where possible and that it is not clear whether they are of equal weight.	Merging objectives risks losing clarity, and no indication is given of objectives which are considered superfluous. It would be helpful to emphasise that the objectives are not in priority order.
DCS/170	Environment Agency	3.5 (Objective 3)	Partly	Advise that in determining the most sustainable locations for concentrating new development, account must be taken of the spatial distribution of flood risk areas and other environmental constraints throughout the District. Suggest the following rewording: - "concentrating new development in the most sustainable locations, taking full account of local	This would be a reasonable improvement except reference should still be made to opportunities and to public transport.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				needs and environmental, social and economic constraints".	
DCS/171	Environment Agency	3.5 (Objective 6)	Partly	Advise that the word 'either' should be deleted to reflect the sequential approach advocated in PPS25, and that it should be made explicit that development will be acceptable in flood risk areas only where it complies with the full requirements of PPS25, ie "locating new development first in areas of lowest flood risk, but when development cannot be steered from flood risk areas, only permitting development where it can be made safe and where the development is proved to be important to the wider sustainability arms of the plan".	Deletion of the word 'either' would bring the objective in line with PPS25 guidance. The Core Strategy generally reflects national guidance and it is not necessary to repeat the detailed wording of national guidance.
DCS/172	Environment Agency	3.5 (Objective 7)	Yes	Welcome the promotion of brownfield redevelopment, as a mechanism for the remediation of historically contaminated land.	For noting
DCS/174	Environment Agency	3.5 (Objective 14)	Partly	Welcome the promotion and extension of Green Infrastructure and suggest enlargement of the objective: "Protecting, enhancing and extending the Green Infrastructure of the District, including sensitive natural habitats and the wider countryside for its important landscape, amenity, biodiversity, flood management, recreation and natural resource value, in accordance with the emerging Leeds City Region Green Infrastructure Strategy".	This will strengthen the wording but reference to LCRGIS is an inappropriate detail in an objective.
DCS/173	Environment Agency	3.5 (Objective 16)	Partly	Suggest the wording is amended to include the protection of existing water resources from over-exploitation. "Protecting against pollution, improving the quality of air, land and water whilst avoiding over- exploitation of water resources".	This would strengthen the wording
DCS/79	Mr & Mrs M Waddington	Para 3.1	Yes	Supports the overall vision which is pleasantly brief.	For noting
DCS/276	English Heritage	Para 3.1 (Vision)	Partly	Supports the overarching vision and the intention that the District will be distinctive and environmentally attractive, although also considers the vision is somewhat generic and applicable in other rural authorities.	Other stakeholders consider the Vision to be refreshingly concise. The desire to increase the level of self containment is special (if not unique) to Selby.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/438	Natural England	Para 3.1 (Vision)	Partly	Whilst not disagreeing with the vision considers it is brief and not specific to Selby District. Would like to see more coverage of how the national environment would be protected and enhanced and the opportunities for a net gain in green infrastructure, improvements to open space provision and countryside recreation.	Other stakeholders consider the Vision to be refreshingly concise. The desire to increase the level of self containment is special (if not unique) to Selby. The topics suggested for inclusion in the Vision are covered through the Aims and Objectives. Inclusion of specific examples would lead to imbalance.
DCS/385	Sport England	Para 3.1 & 3.4 Vision & Aims)	Partly	Supports the Vision and Aims with reference to the health and wellbeing of existing communities and considers this should be extended to include new communities created through residential growth.	This would be an appropriate amendment in line with the creation of inclusive communities.
DCS/497	North Yorkshire and York Primary Care Trust	Para 3.1 - 3.5	Partly	Supports the Vision which successfully describes the shared vision developed with the involvement of wider agencies. Comments that Objective 3 is likely to place demands on public transport systems particularly from an older population in accessing specialist clinical skills technology.	For noting.
DCS/120	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	Para 3.1 and 3.5	Yes	Generally support the Vision and 16 Strategic Objectives which provide a useful overall context for growth in Selby and key issues to be addressed.	For noting
DCS/439	Natural England	Para 3.2 - 3.5	Yes	Broadly agrees with the strategic aims and objectives particularly 12 and 14.	For noting
DCS/169	Environment Agency	Para 3.4	Yes	Pleased that environmental considerations are pursued through the aims of the Core Strategy.	For noting
DCS/277	English Heritage	Para 3.4 (Strategic Aims)	Partly	Welcomes the third bullet point to ensure that new development protects and enhances the built and natural environment and suggests this could be strengthened by	This would strengthen one of the key aims in line with the Place Making Agenda advocated in

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				referring to the fact that this will help reinforce the district identity of the District, ie "To ensure that new development and other actions protects and enhances the built and natural environment, reinforces the distinct identity of towns and villages, and supports the wellbeing of existing communities".	national guidance and best practice.
DCS/359	Mr & Mrs M Waddington	Para 3.5	Partly	Questions the number of objectives which have been outlined.	No indication is given of objectives which are considered superfluous.
DCS/121	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	Para 3.5 (Objective 1)	Yes	Support Objective 1 and particularly agree it is important to emphasise Selby's role as a Principal Town.	For noting.
DCS/210	Jennifer Hubbard	Para 3.5 (Objective 4)	Partly	Questions whether it is a function of the Core Strategy to prevent coalescence of settlements since coalest settlements are already represented and accepted as part of the Districts settlement pattern.	The prevention of coalescence of settlements is a long established local principle, embodied in 'saved' SDLP policy. As this is a strategic issue it is an appropriate subject for the Core Strategy and further elaboration should be provided. The fact that a number of settlements have close links, or have previously become joined should not preclude the objective of protecting the character and distinctiveness of other settlements.
DCS/122	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	Para 3.5 (Objective 6)	No	Object to Objective 6 which is considered contrary to PPS25 which indicates LPA's should prioritise land with lowest flood risk and only apply the exceptions test if no sequentially preferable sites are available, whereas Objective 6 suggests the council is attaching equal weight to other sustainability considerations. Suggest the following amended wording to make the document sound: "Prioritising new development in those areas at lowest risk of flooding".	The changes in response to EA comments above (under DCS / 171) will address these concerns.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/1	The Coal Authority	Para 3.5 (Objective 7)	Partly	Would like to see Objective No 7 re-worded slightly to comply with PPG14 in relation to ground stability issues - "Promoting the efficient use of land including their re-use of appropriately remediate previously developed land for appropriate use in sustainable locations".	This is a site specific issue raised in the context of former mine sites and could be addressed through the planning application process or through site specific DPD's if necessary. The majority of pdl does not require remediation prior to re-use/redevelopment. Not considered relevant for a Core Strategy objective.
DCS/101	Ye Fraternite of Olde Selebians	Para 3.5 (Objective 7)	Yes	Supports the preference for redeveloping brownfield sites in Objective 7.	For noting.
DCS/504	Jennifer Hubbard	Para 3.5 (Objective 7)	Partly	Considers this objective is likely to be harmful/ counter productive to the well being of rural settlements.	The objective is consistent with national policy.
DCS/505	Jennifer Hubbard	Para 3.5 (Objective 8)	Partly	Accepts that principal rail and bus links are likely to remain unchanged but considers that bus services are a poor indicator of long term sustainability in rural areas because they are subject to constant change. Suggests an alternative approach of identifying centres where growth is desirable and targeting bus subsidies to maintain or enhance services at these locations.	Changing bus timetables are monitored and it is accepted that public transport is just one of a number of key indicators. This is an issue which may be considered within the context of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan in order to influence the investment programmes of other organisations.
DCS/13	Mr David Lewis	Para 3.5 (Objective 8)	Partly	Supports the point about non car usage in Objective 8 but feels there should also be explicit mention of improvement to cycling facilities.	The examples of 'non car' transport referred to could usefully be extended to include both cycling and walking.
DCS/386	Sport England	Para 3.5 (Objective 10)	Yes	Supports Objective 10, which has links with protecting and improving form sporting opportunities which is a key objective of PPG17.	For noting.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/280	English Heritage	Para 3.5 (Objective 12)	Yes	Supports objective 12 which will help deliver that aspect of the vision relating to the creation of a distinctive rural District.	For noting.
DCS/200	The Theatres Trust	Para 3.5 (Objective 13)	Partly	Support objective 13 to improve the range and quality of cultural and leisure opportunities.	For noting.
DCS/506	Sport England	Para 3.5 (Objective 13)	Support	Supports Objective 13 which has links with protecting and improving formal sporting opportunities which is a key objective of PPG17.	For noting.
DCS/507	Sport England	Para 3.5 (Objective 14)	Support	Supports objective 14 in relation to the recreational potential of green infrastructure and suggests that playing fields, which perform open space functions as well as formal sport, should be specifically recognised.	Add reference to urban greenspace, playing fields and recreational land,
DCS/137	Highways Agency	Para 3.5 (Objectives 3, 8 & 16)	Partly	Supports the inclusion of objectives 3, 8 and 6 which are in line with the Highways Agency's approach/Circular 02/2007.	For noting.
DCS/398	South Milford Parish Council	Para 3.5 (Objectives 4 & 7)	Yes	Supports objectives 4 and 7.	For noting.
DCS/123	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	Para 3.5 (Omission)	Omissions	Suggest an additional Objective to strengthen the Core Strategy "To provide land for at least 440 net additional homes per year in the District to meet the challenge of increasing housing delivery".	It is not considered appropriate to establish housing targets within Core Strategy objectives. These are clearly referred to elsewhere in the document.
DCS/279	English Heritage	Para 3.5 (Objective 11)	Partly	Welcomes the objective of protecting and enhancing the historic environment but suggests this involves more than buildings and open spaces and that the objective be rewritten to refer to "buildings, areas and archaeology" and to acknowledge the contribution of the historic environment	This would be a helpful addition.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				toward "local distinctiveness" as well as economic prosperity and community well-being.	
DCS/327	The Grimston Park Estate	Paras 3.1 - 3.4	Yes	Pleased to see the inclusion of an overarching and suitable concise Vision, Aims and Objectives, and comments that the aims are directly derived from the Vision.	For noting.
DCS/73	Jennifer Hubbard	Vision	Partly	Considers that achievement of the vision would be dependent on a wider distribution of jobs, housing and investment than provided for in the Core Strategy.	This issue needs to be considered within the context of the proposed abolition of RSS
DCS/278	English Heritage	Para 3.5 (Objective 7)	Partly	Welcomes the objective of promoting the efficient use of land but suggests that since a significant amount of waste generated comes from construction and demolition, as part of a holistic approach to Waste Management the Strategy should positively encourage the re-use of buildings in preference to demolition and redevelopment.	This issue required further investigation.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

Section 4 – Spatial Development Strategy					
ID No.	Name/ Company/ Organisation	Paragraph/ Policy	Agree/ Disagree	Issues Raised	Decision
DCS/139	Highways Agency	Whole Section	General Comments	If current work and travel patterns continue then they are likely to impact on the Strategic Road Network. Are checks and balances in place to ensure the desired change in work and travel patterns occurs? The infrastructure requirement of the continuation of existing patterns compared with that proposed in the Core Strategy would be quite different.	see separate schedule
DCS/503	Local Government Yorkshire and Humber	Whole Section	Partly	<p>The main points raised relating to the Spatial Development Strategy are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Spatial Development Strategy generally reflects the RSS strategy. 2. Recommend that further evidence and clarity be provided to deal with the fact that SHMA points to higher numbers of housing within Sherburn in Elmet. Need to link the outcomes of the SHLAA with chosen strategy so that the Selby Town focus can be robustly defended. 3. Recommend that further thought be given to the reasons for restricting housing delivery in the west of the District. Consider basing such decisions on the presumption it would encourage further commuting to Leeds City Region seems at odds with Selby's role in the Leeds City Region. Albeit this relationship is still in its infancy and further work on the North Yorkshire and York and Leeds City Region Sub-regional Strategies should provide more evidence as to the functional links. 4. Ultimately such evidence should help provide further flexibility to the Core strategy in the event of Selby Town being unable to accommodate as much housing as intended. The potential for a Plan B is 	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>important to the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>Discussions around LCR aside, LCR and LGYH supports the District in providing a better balance between housing and employment growth, whilst also providing a range and choice of employment opportunities.</p>	
DCS/361	Mr & Mrs M Waddington	Fig 4	Yes	<p>1. Concerned that LDF programme with regard to the Selby Area Action Plan may change which may cause delays and uncertainty in bringing development sites forward.</p> <p>2. There appears to be a lack of an overarching policy framework which prioritises how the Council will deliver the RSS targets across the District (see also DCS/373).</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/119	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	Figure 4/SAAP Boundary	No	Question the extent of the proposed boundary for the Selby Area Action Plan in figure 4 which does not appear to be justified and covers a much larger area than Selby.	see separate schedule
DCS/69	The Diocese of York	Key Diagram	Partly	Concerned that the Key Diagram illustrates the Strategic Countryside Gap between Selby and Brayton which may prejudice future consideration of potential housing sites in the Selby Area Action Plan. It is therefore premature to preclude certain forms of development, without more detailed consideration. The final version of the Strategy should reflect any final Proposals Map and Site Allocation Documents.	see separate schedule
DCS/128	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	Key Diagram	Partly	<p>1. Would wish to see a more detailed version perhaps with an inset for Selby, given the importance of the Town as a centre for growth.</p> <p>2. Request that the Strategic Gap be deleted as the Council has not produces any evidence to support the retention of this Local Plan policy.</p> <p>3. The Core Strategy will need to ensure that it accords with the Selby Area Action Plan in terms of the same area for the Selby AAP and the same Development Limits for Selby.</p>	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/296	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	Key Diagram	Partly	The inclusion of more detail in the Key Diagram would help illustrate how places within the District will change over time. This could include annotations to indicate housing and employment land distribution in different settlements - for example translating the information in Policies CP" and CP9.	see separate schedule
DCS/331	The Grimston Park Estate	Key Diagram	Omissions	Suggest an additional contextual plan which identified features outside the District.	see separate schedule
DCS/223	Land 4 New Build Limited	Section 4 - Figure 4	No	<p>1. Support the identification of Thorpe Willoughby as a Designated Service Village and its inclusion within the Selby Area Action Plan.</p> <p>2. Suggest Part B of Policy CP1 is reworded as follows:</p> <p>i. Previously developed land and buildings within the settlement</p> <p>ii. Suitable greenfield land within the settlement (Selby, Sherburn in Elmet, Tadcaster and designated Service Villages only)</p> <p>iii. Extensions to the settlement (Selby, Sherburn in Elmet, Tadcaster and designated Service Villages only) priority will be given to locations which are sustainable and will deliver environmental and amenity enhancements to the settlement being extended.</p> <p>iv. Undeveloped greenfield land.</p> <p>3. Consider the approach to the identification of land should take account of the potential environmental benefits of using under-utilised land and agricultural buildings prior to undeveloped agricultural land.</p> <p>4. Consider that due care should be taken to ensure a suitable level of appropriate housing allocations can be achieved to meet targets in service villages whilst ensuring that small scale previously developed sites, do not hold back the delivery of suitable greenfield sites, which would support sustainable development objectives.</p>	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				5. Supports the approach advocated in Secondary Villages.	
DCS/86	Drax Power Ltd	Para 4.2	Partly	Should now refer to most recent version of PPS4	see separate schedule
DCS/387	Sport England	Para 4.2	Partly	Planning Policy Guidance 17 - Open Space, Sport and Recreation should also feature in this list.	see separate schedule
DCS/357	DPP LLP	Paras 4.6 - 4.13	Yes	Support the settlement hierarchy in Paragraph 4.13. The proposed hierarchy will help create sustainable patterns of economic growth.	see separate schedule
DCS/124	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	Para 4.13	Yes	Supports the proposed settlement hierarch, with Selby the key location for growth.	see separate schedule
DCS/399	South Milford Parish Council	Para 4.13	No	Question the exclusion of Church Fenton Airbase, Barkston Ash and Ulleskelf from the Secondary Villages with Defined Development Limits settlement classification given their sustainable access to local amenities and transport links which are comparable with South Milford.	see separate schedule
CP1 - Spatial Development Strategy					
DCS/92	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Para 4.13 + 4.26	Partly	Future DPDs should take into account that some of the Designated Service Villages are close to areas that are important for wildlife and conservation. Development on the land surrounding these areas should be avoided as this may have a negative effect on biodiversity. Hemingbrough and North Duffield are close to the Lower Derwent Valley National Nature Reserve. Because of increased flood risk, birds may need to use habitats further away from the river for nesting/feeding in the future and so a buffer zone around the NNR would be beneficial to prevent these areas being lost. Other designated sites and local wildlife such as Hagg Lane Green in Hemingbrough and The Wildlife Habitat Protection Trust's sites in Church Fenton would also benefit from zone/corridor to allow connectivity between sites.	see separate schedule
DCS/56	Kelfield Parish	Para 4.27	No	Considers the restrictions on development within Secondary Villages is likely to strangle progress in terms of turnover of	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

	Council			population, influx of new blood and development of facilities.	
DCS/329	The Grimston Park Estate	Paras 4.29 - 4.40	Yes	Supports the locational principles outlined in Paragraphs 4.29 -4.40.	see separate schedule
DCS/175	Environment Agency	Para 4.33	Partly	It may also be useful to offer further clarity in relation to the PPS25 Sequential and Exception Test as this would apply to, and restrict, many such developments across Selby. In fact, we would strongly recommend the production of a specific SPD or local guidance note detailing how the Test will be applied. This would be of benefit by promoting consistency, transparency and robustness on this complex issue.	see separate schedule
DCS/176	Environment Agency	Para 4.34	Partly	Support the inclusion of this paragraph but feel more reference should be made to Sustainable Drainage Schemes and drainage restrictions in accordance with Appendix D of the Level 1 SFRA.	see separate schedule
DCS/246	Drax Power Ltd	Para 4.35	Partly	Add the following to the first sentence. "...; regional guidance also seeks to make the best use of existing transport infrastructure and capacity and to maximise the use of rail and water for uses generating large freight movements."	see separate schedule
DCS/45	Townsend Planning Consultants	Para 4.39	No	Considers the currently proposed review of the Green Belt is inadequate and that either a full review is undertaken or that it recognises there are current anomalies which should be explicitly referred to as requiring correction. In the case of a full review, reference is made to the decision of the Inspector in the case of the Wakefield MDC Core Strategy. The Inspector instructed the Council to undertake a full review. If the Council is not persuaded to undertake a full review it should undertake partial reviews, not only to accommodate growth but equally to address anomalies. A rewording of Paragraph 4.39 as follows: "Whilst the strategy aims to maintain the overall extent of Green Belt, in locations where there are difficulties in accommodating the scale of growth required, consideration will be given to undertaking localised Green Belt boundary reviews in	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				accordance with the principles established in the RSS. Further reviews will be undertaken where it can be demonstrated that the inclusion of land within the Green Belt is clearly anomalous with the purposes of including land within Green Belt."	
DCS/299	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	Para 4.39	No	The Core Strategy is the place for making decisions on localised Green Belt reviews, if these might be needed to achieve delivery of housing numbers.	see separate schedule
DCS/400	South Milford Parish Council	Para 4.39	No	Urge the Council to seek a greater percentage of new dwellings on previously developed land to prevent the expansion of smaller settlements beyond their clear and defined green development boundaries. Note the reference to the Strategic Countryside Gap between Sherburn in Elmet and South Milford, which is fully supported but request that all the surrounding countryside around the parish is recognised in a similar fashion. Therefore, do not support the strategy of 4.39.	see separate schedule
DCS/443	Natural England	Para 4.39	Partly	Consider that localised boundary treatment should be informed by detailed assessment of the purposes of Green Belt as well as its wider positive benefits, such as benefits for landscape, biodiversity, access to the natural environment and climate change adaptation. We would be happy to provide advice on this issue.	see separate schedule
DCS/91	Mr John Taunton	CP1	Partly	Notes that North Duffield is a Designated Service Village but that services may be lost in the future. If village has DSV status could the services be given special protection.	Designation as a Service Village and some limited growth should help maintain and attract investment in services.
DCS/6	Mr Steve Cobb	CP1	Partly	Tadcaster's contribution to the District's housing needs could be met by developing the many empty properties in and around the town centre owned by Samuel Smith Old Brewery.	see separate schedule.
DCS/8	Councillor	CP1	No	1. Although Hemingbrough may have a relatively large	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

	James Thomas Deans			<p>population, it is severely lacking in an adequate bus service to meet the needs of its existing population. Since October 2009 the bus service has been reduced. The service to and from Selby terminates at 4.30 pm. Therefore, considers Hemingbrough should not be Designated Service Village.</p> <p>2. Considers Osgodby to be a separate village to Barlby. Osgodby is considered to be part of the Hemingbrough Ward. Osgodby has very few services and being on the A63 it is poorly served by public transport, as the last bus in or out of the village is early afternoon. It is poorly served with shops and children have to attend schools in Barlby or Selby. The village is entirely different in character from Barlby. Osgodby should be reclassified as a Secondary Village.</p>	
DCS/9	Mr H Robin Poskitt	CP1	No	<p>Considers it inconsistent that Wistow is included as a Designated Service Village and not Cawood. When Cawood floods so does Wistow. The drainage system is poor in Wistow and cannot take any more capacity. Cawood has all the services, whereas Wistow has 1 public house and a temporary Post Office which will probably not survive. Notes that Wistow has supposedly got a number of businesses. Suggests the majority are probably registered offices or people working from home, which are not likely to have employment benefit or growth.</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/36	Mr Jonathan France	CP1	Partly	<p>Disagrees that Wistow should be a Designated Service Village. There is a pub and a fish shop, but no general store. Accessibility to higher order services and employment is no higher than any other village on the bus route. It should be designated the same as Cawood which has more services, and Kelfield.</p>	see separate schedule.
DCS/38	Jas Bowman & Sons Ltd	CP1	Partly	<p>Considers Whitley Bridge should be included in the Designated Service Village category, along with Eggborough, as the two villages share a number of services and facilities. In particular, there are a number of employment opportunities in both Whitley Bridge and Eggborough which residents of both communities use.</p>	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				There is a shared primary school and the rail station is at Whitley Bridge. Consider that Eggborough and Whitley Bridge combined offer a wide range of services, facilities and employment opportunities that serve the needs of the surrounding rural area, including the villages of Kellington, Whitley, Great Heck and Hensall. Consider Eggborough and Whitley Bridge should at least be identified as a single Designated Service Village.	
DCS/41	Mr Stephen Wadsworth	CP1	Partly	For Service Villages in the Green Belt there is not enough scope for development, there should be provision to redraw the village envelopes to include suitable land at the edges of those villages to accommodate small scale developments of 1-5 dwellings to round off the envelope.	see separate schedule
DCS/42	Chapel Haddlesey Parish Council	CP1	Yes	Agrees that the village should be one with no extra development and defined boundaries.	see separate schedule
DCS/48	Mr Philip Johnson	CP1	No	<p>1. Considers the methodology of assessing overall sustainability is flawed. Considers it is wrong in the case of Wistow. Considers it should score 3 in terms of services rather than 2, as in Background Paper No.5. It hasn't a general store and only a part-time post office in the local pub. It does have a school but no doctor's surgery. Considers access to Selby is via the B1223 is poor and village should be designated as a Secondary Village.</p> <p>2. Hambleton should not be a Designated Service Village. It does not have a village shop, a Post Office or doctor's surgery.</p> <p>3. Makes the general point that some villages have only part time doctor's surgeries which is not reflected in the analysis. Considers all villages should have limited growth allowed provided the location has services available or is close to existing services and meets all other planning criteria.</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/50	Hemingbrough Parish Council	CP1	Partly	Parish Council considers that Hemingbrough should be designated as a Secondary Village rather than a Service Village. Notes that Cliffe (Secondary Village) has the same	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				bus service as Hemingbrough and that Hemingbrough should not be classed as a Service Village until there is an improved bus service.	
DCS/54	Wistow Parish Council	CP1	No	Object to designation of Wistow as a Designated Service Village. Brayton, Riccall, Hemingbrough and Thorpe Willoughby have larger populations, better shops and transportation and are on A roads. For a number of years Wistow has had no shops, garage or medical facilities. It has a poor bus service, which has been heavily subsidised for the past few years. Projected growth for the village of 20% is totally unreasonable. No account has been taken of flooding issues including poor drainage. More housing will increase drainage problems. Viability of services is affected by proximity to Selby. The Wistow Mine site is only possibility of significant employment. Large scale growth would prejudice the quiet, rural character of the village.	see separate schedule
DCS/60	Appleton Roebuck and Acaster Selby Parish Council	CP1	Partly	<p>Wish to see Appleton Roebuck included as a Designated Service Village, which they consider vital to the sustainability of the settlement and of surrounding settlements which rely on Appleton Roebuck for a range of services.</p> <p>Apart from the 16 new houses in the village (4 of which are almost ready for occupation) there are no other sites within the Development Limits within the criteria set out in Policy CP1A.</p> <p>The Parish Council are not seeking any significant expansion of the village but to ensure that modest growth can occur over the timescale of the LDF to provide affordable housing, to meet local housing needs and to at least maintain the population base of the village. It is necessary to do this to sustain existing services as household size reduces.</p> <p>The Core Strategy does not identify any Service Village in the north-west of the District. National policy recognises that in rural areas service centres can comprise a group of settlements not just a single settlement and the parish Council suggests that in the north-west sector of the District the settlements of Acaster Selby, Bolton Percy, Colton, Bilbrough and Appleton Roebuck can properly be treated as</p>	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>a group of settlements for the purposes of promoting sustainable patterns of development. The settlements have close links with each other and for their continued well-being it is necessary to maintain services by targeting new development in the most efficient way possible.</p> <p>The school at Appleton Roebuck is at the centre of the community and the centre for primary education for the group of settlements listed above. The current school roll shows 39% of children live in the villages listed above or in the surrounding countryside outside Appleton Roebuck. The importance of modest growth over time is also demonstrated by the fact that 20% of the children attending the village school live in houses built in Appleton Roebuck since 2000.</p> <p>The objector lists the service facilities and employment opportunities, the community facilities and community groups in Appleton Roebuck. These are considered to be comfortably in excess what is available in the surrounding settlements. Appleton Roebuck should therefore be regarded as a service village for the group of settlements in the north-west of the District.</p> <p>A comment is also made on the bus services, which the Parish Council wish to see improved and on the options for the provision of village shop in the future.</p>	
DCS/61	Mr Philip Johnson	CP1	Partly	<p>1. Whitley/Eggborough</p> <p>Wish to see Whitley and Eggborough treated as linked villages and included as a joint Designated Service Village.</p> <p>Whitley no longer has a petrol station but is served by Fulham House Farm Shop, which provides a reasonable range of convenience goods and includes a butchers and café. In addition it is noted that there are current plans for the expansion of Whitley and Eggborough School.</p> <p>Note that Eggborough provides significant employment opportunities for residents of both Eggborough and Whitley residents.</p> <p>2. Wistow</p> <p>Considers that Wistow should be downgraded to a</p>	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				Secondary Village because of it poor public transport accessibility.	
DCS/62	Hambleton Parish Council	CP1	Partly	<p>1. Would welcome more houses and amenities in the village.</p> <p>2. However, consider that lack of amenities in the village places the village in the Secondary category. The reasons for this are:</p> <p>i. In the past 5 years over 50 dwellings have been constructed with another 50 presently under construction. This has increased the role of the village as a commuter village for Leeds and York.</p> <p>ii. No additional public or private amenities, apart from one very small play area, have accompanied the development.</p> <p>iii. The local school is reaching capacity.</p> <p>iv. The village lacks local services such as: general store, post office, newsagent and surgery with little or no prospect of re-establishment.</p> <p>v. Public transport is limited and there is no effective integration between bus and train services and high reliance on the private car.</p> <p>vi. There is little scope for further development without having to encroach onto surrounding agricultural land. Wish to maintain the green spaces within the village.</p> <p>vii. Note that other villages with Secondary status have better local services, just as good access by public transport and also have limited flood risk.</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/65	Mr Jason Brownbridge	CP1	Partly	Hemingbrough should have an improved bus service in order to be classified as a Designated Service Village. It is not possible to travel to York for work purposes by public transport.	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/66	Sherburn In Elmet Parish Council	CP1	Partly	<p>1. Agree that Selby should take the bulk of the development.</p> <p>2. Sherburn in Elmet is designated to have 680 new dwellings, however, existing commitment of 200 is to be taken into consideration and therefore the new allocation between now and 2026 is 480.</p> <p>3. We acknowledge that Sherburn in Elmet is one of the larger settlements in the District and should take a reasonable amount of housing, but Selby District Council need to bear in mind the excessive development over the past 20 years.</p> <p>4. Current developments appear to include excessive affordable housing.</p> <p>5. There is a need to take into account the relative lack of services in the village compared with others. We question whether the locations of the current allocations are sensible because we need to take account that Sherburn in Elmet is at the centre of a group of villages, including South Milford and Monk Fryston, who rely on Sherburn in Elmet for services.</p> <p>6. We stress the level of past growth has been excessive given the lack of facilities and services, e.g. Fire Station, Police Station, Recycling facility, leisure and sports centre etc.</p> <p>7. We have no objection to the level of growth suggested provided that the shortfall in facilities and services is addressed before any building takes place.</p> <p>8. Any future locations for developments should be subject to public consultation.</p> <p>9. Concerned that windfall developments should be included in the allocations.</p> <p>10. The level of rail services from Sherburn to York is totally inadequate and the service from South Milford to Leeds and Selby is poor in terms of frequency and reliability. The bus service to Leeds and Selby is poor and to York is non-</p>	see separate schedule
--------	----------------------------------	-----	--------	--	-----------------------

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				existent. Residents will therefore continue to rely heavily on the private car.	
DCS/68	The Diocese of York	CP1	Partly	<p>1. Supports the designation of Selby, as a Principal Town, and Brayton, Hemingbrough and South Milford as Designated Service Villages.</p> <p>2. Request a degree of flexibility in Secondary Villages such as Birkin and Chapel Haddlesey, to include market housing as well as 100% affordable schemes. Relying on 100% affordable schemes may result in the smaller settlements becoming unsustainable. More innovative approaches to housing delivery could be considered in these villages to ensure that affordable housing is brought forward to meet local needs and also ensure that schemes are viable.</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/70	Redrow Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd	CP1	No	<p>1. Considers CP1 places too much emphasis upon growth in Selby, as Principal town and its lower tier settlements defined as Service Villages, and fails to provide sufficient growth in Local Service Centres (YH6).</p> <p>2. Agree that Selby should be the main focus of development in accordance with RSS policy YH5. However, it is not considered appropriate to include reference to allowing complementary growth within the villages of Barlby, Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby. Including these lower tier settlements, designated as Service Villages, within the spatial strategy approach to the Principal Town falls contrary to RSS policy YH7 (which cross references to Policies YH5 and YH6) and suggests a level of growth beyond that anticipated under the Policy. As worded, Policy CP1 Suggests that these settlements will accommodate growth both as Service Villages and as part of the Principal Town, contrary to the RSS core approach. Whilst this is to some degree clarified in respect of housing growth by paragraph 5.19 and Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy, the wording lacks clarity and the approach is completely at odds with RSS Policy YH7.</p> <p>3. Agree Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster should be designated Local Service Centres, however Policy CP1 should better reflect RSS Policy YH5 by clearly differentiate</p>	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				between the Local Service Centres and Service villages in terms of intended growth. Part A of policy CP1 should reflect this core approach and clearly state that, outside the Principal Town, the focus for additional development should be on the Local Service centres in order to support and service not only the sustainability of the settlement but also the wider rural hinterland. Development within Service Villages should, reflecting the commentary in paragraph 2.47 of RSS, be clearly expressed as being that essential to support the smaller settlements.	
DCS/74	Yorkshire Forward	CP1	Yes	Support the proposed distribution of growth. Particularly concentration of growth in Selby and the main service centres is crucial in ensuring that development is directed towards the most sustainable locations and reduce the need to travel.	see separate schedule
DCS/75	Whitley Parish Council	CP1	No	Villagers in Whitley have mixed views about being designated a Secondary Village. Some residents are relieved that future development will be very limited. Others think that it might be better to be designated as a service village because this will draw in investment in much-needed facilities in the village. There is currently no shop, no doctor's surgery, no pharmacy and no community hall. Regardless of the designation, suggest that the Core Strategy should include commitments to improve facilities in villages where there are none currently.	see separate schedule
DCS/81	Mrs June Langhorn	CP1	Yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the settlement hierarchy in Policy CP1 which identifies Osgodby as part of the Selby urban area and as a linked village with Barby. 2. Supports the identification of Osgodby as within the Selby Area Action Plan . 3. Welcomes the recognition and crucial role Barby and Osgodby have in serving the communities of the surrounding hinterland. 	see separate schedule
DCS/82	Mr Stephenson	CP1	Yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the settlement hierarchy in Policy CP1 which identifies Osgodby as part of the Selby urban area and as a 	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>linked village with Barlby.</p> <p>2. Supports the identification of Osgodby as within the Selby Area Action Plan.</p> <p>3. Welcomes the recognition and crucial role Barlby and Osgodby have in serving the communities of the surrounding hinterland.</p>	
DCS/87	Mr S Sahota	CP1	Partly	<p>Support the majority of development being focussed on Selby, however the significant restrictions placed on development within the District's villages is considered to be detrimental to the Council's house building and affordable housing targets. Secondary villages are considered to be capable of accommodating growth and development which can bring various benefits, including improved visual amenity, economic prosperity and meeting RSS and LDF targets.</p> <p>Church Fenton Airbase could provide a large amount of brownfield land which can make a large contribution to RSS housing targets and also revise the Council's residential delivery on previously developed land. The current proposed uses are not considered to be viable in this location.</p> <p>The Airbase is made sustainable by the village's proximity to Church Fenton, Selby Tadcaster and Sherburn in Elmet. Church Fenton provides a number of services, employment opportunities, recreational uses and good public transport links, including a railway station with direct access to Leeds and York.</p> <p>The Airbase does not have any flood risk or Green Belt issues and should be linked to Church Fenton (eg Monk Fryston and Hillam).</p> <p>Of the SHLAA allocations totalling 12157 dwellings within Selby, Tadcaster and the primary villages 58.6% fall partly, or wholly within Flood Zone 3, which raises doubts over the deliverability of these sites.</p>	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/88	Mr Bradley	CP1	Partly	<p>Support identification of Designated Service Villages and particularly Church Fenton. Church Fenton has excellent public transport links and local facilities and high element of provision should be made in the village relative to others.</p> <p>Support CP1 Part A in general terms which aims to direct the majority of new development towards the towns and more sustainable villages. Church Fenton is one of the more sustainable villages.</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/89	Olympia Park	CP1	Yes	<p>Support the settlement hierarchy in Policy CP1 of the Draft Core Strategy which directs the majority of new development to the towns and most suitable villages with Selby identified as the Principal Town and first priority for growth. The sequential approach underlines the approach adopted in the RSS.</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/90	Samuel Smith Old Brewery	CP1	Partly	<p>1. Agree that Selby should be the main focus for growth and new development.</p> <p>2. Disagree with the wording of Policy CP1 in relation to the intended level of development that is to be directed towards the Local Service Centres. As currently worded the policy is in conflict with RSS Policy YH6 because it fails to state that development in these centres should meet only locally generated need for both market and affordable housing. A level of development above that which meets locally generated need, without justification, would be in conflict with Policy YH6. The proposed wording is not sufficiently explicit in this regard and calls into question the soundness of the Strategy.</p> <p>3. We agree the proposed settlement hierarchy (Para 4.13). Agree that further planned growth would not be appropriate in the following settlements: Appleton Roebuck, Bolton Percy, Colton, Stillingfleet and Stutton, because of their poor levels of sustainability. Furthermore, the quality of the character and setting of these settlements and the limited highway infrastructure are such as to militate against further</p>	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>growth.</p> <p>4. Agree that particular attention should be paid to controlling development within garden curtilages (Para 4.27)</p>	
DCS/95	D & J Poulter Buildings Contractors / Wrigley Property Development / Mr Geoff Lunn / Daniel Gath Homes / Penny England	CP1	Partly	<p>1. Accept Selby as the focus for significant development.</p> <p>2. Consider the significant restrictions placed on development in villages is detrimental to house building and affordable housing targets.</p> <p>3. Support expansion of Stutton which can help to bring prosperity to Tadcaster whilst locating development in a sustainable location for services and jobs.</p> <p>4. Similarly Church Fenton Airbase provides a large number of new dwellings in a location made sustainable by the village's proximity to Church Fenton, Selby, Tadcaster and Sherburn in Elmet. Church Fenton provides a number of services, employment opportunities, recreational uses and good public transport links, including a railway station with direct access into Leeds and York.</p> <p>5. Consider that control of development in Secondary Villages should not be at the expense of meeting housing demand and contrary to market forces. Do not agree with any policy to restrict development within garden curtilages. Developments coming forward within curtilages which are acceptable subject to all material considerations should be approved.</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/96	Connaught Consultancy Services LLP	CP1	Partly	<p>1. Agree with the overall settlement strategy to focus development in Selby, followed by the two Local Service Centres, then the Designated Service Villages. However, within the settlement hierarchy, Sherburn should be distinguished for increased development above Tadcaster as a more sustainable Local Service Centre with available land to accommodate new growth.</p> <p>2. Support the sequential approach to direct development firstly to previously developed land and land within the lowest flood risk areas. However, this approach should take</p>	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				into account the suitability and availability of land in each settlement across the district. The Core strategy should acknowledge that sustainable greenfield sites can provide a valuable source of land for meeting development needs.	
DCS/98	Ms Irene Newton	CP1	Partly	Disagrees with Kellington as a Designated Service Village.	see separate schedule
DCS/104	Jas Bowman & Sons Ltd	CP1	No	<p>1. Supports in principle the priority given to re-use of previously developed land in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>2. However, objects to the Strategy stating that priority will be given to the development of suitable greenfield sites in the settlements of Selby, Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster before previously developed land in the Designated Service Villages and smaller settlements. PPS3 Paragraph 36 states that the priority for development should be previously developed land. It is therefore, considered that the re-use of previously developed land should be prioritised regardless of the settlement. As such, previously developed land in the Designated Service Villages and smaller settlements should be prioritised for development over greenfield sites in the larger settlements.</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/136	Highways Agency	CP1	General Comments	<p>1. It is Government policy to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>2. The Highways Agency recognises that some employment sites identified already have extant planning permissions which include B1 office use. The Agency fully supports the location requirements for office use set out in PPS6 and the RSS Policy E2A. Thus for those employment sites in the vicinity of the Strategic Road Network for which planning applications will be needed, the Agency will seek to oppose proposals including B1 office use other than as ancillary to the main employment use.</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/146	Mr David Brewer	CP1	No	1. It is difficult to see how the Strategy is going to enable people living in Secondary Villages to enjoy a better quality of life when there will be zero inward investment in either housing or jobs for 17 years. This lack of investment will	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>have a profoundly negative effect on the quality of life for future generations and does not accord with Section 3.3 of PPS1.</p> <p>2. Considers the Strategy ignores the statement in PPS3 that there is a need to create and maintain sustainable, mixed and inclusive communities in all areas, both urban and rural. For example the whole of the Northern Housing Sub-area will be devoid of investment.</p> <p>3. Criticises the Strategy for not proposing a higher target for development on previously developed land and ignoring PDL in Secondary Villages.</p> <p>4. Considers the Strategy restricts the availability of new jobs to only half the population of the District, in contradiction to PPS4 advice.</p> <p>5. Considers the Strategy does nothing to raise the quality of life in the majority of the rural areas of the District contrary to the first objective of PPS7 (first objective page 6) or meet the criteria in PPS7 Section 2 (Page 8) in Secondary Villages.</p> <p>6. Concerned that Strategy does not comply with the objectives of PPS25 with regard to flood risk, particularly in the case of the Strategic Sites.</p>	
DCS/177	Environment Agency	CP1	Partly	<p>Support the emphasis on the sequential approach within Policy CP1, however, consider that greater detail should be provided. The policy should make explicit reference to the need for the Sequential Test, Exception Test and the necessity for the development to be made safe. The sequential approach should also be applied within development sites. The final paragraph of the policy should be reworded as follows:</p> <p>"Sequential approach outlined in PPS25 will be adopted to direct development to areas with the lowest flood risk identified through the Selby Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Only where no reasonably available sites are identified in lower flood risk areas will development in higher flood risk areas be considered. In these circumstances the most vulnerable uses steered to the lowest risk parts of sites</p>	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				and then the most vulnerable uses steered to upper floors where possible. Some developments must then also be subject to the Exception Test. This will ensure that preference is given to previously developed sites and that developments can be made safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. It must also be demonstrated that a development's wider sustainability benefits to the community outweigh the flood risks, by assessing it against the Sustainability Appraisal's objectives. All opportunities to reduce flood risk overall, such as through the provision of new/improved flood defences, sustainable drainage schemes, rainwater harvesting and green roofs, will also be explored and implemented wherever possible."	
DCS/214	Jennifer Hubbard	CP1	Partly	<p>Considers there is need for a more flexible approach to the levels of and criteria for development in the Designated Service and Secondary Villages. This can be achieved without significantly affecting the success of a fundamental general change of direction to more sustainable patterns of development since this will only be achieved by major changes of emphasis in the larger urban areas. The levels of development envisaged in the rural areas of the District are insignificant in relation to existing development and proposed levels of growth in the region's urban areas but failure to take proper account of the needs of the rural settlements will fundamentally affect their long term sustainability.</p> <p>Greater weight should be attached to maintaining the sustainability of these settlements by, wherever possible, maintaining existing levels and this should apply to both housing growth and provision of employment opportunities in or proximate to the settlements.</p> <p>Directing new development to previously developed land in the rural settlements needs to be reconsidered, particularly in the Secondary Villages where there appears to be no intention to reconsider Development Limits. Previously developed land in rural settlements tends to comprise land and premises which provide existing or potential services and facilities to the existing community. Any encouragement under the Core Strategy for such premises to close in favour</p>	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>of residential development will diminish the service base of the settlements, encourage higher levels of out-commuting and make the settlements increasingly unsustainable.</p> <p>The reliance on existing Development Limits is not helpful. Policy CP1 should make it clear that the Development Limits of service villages will be reviewed as part of the LDF process and employment sites of an appropriate size will be identified for each service village: also that there will be an opportunity to review Development Limits for secondary villages where appropriate to include the opportunity to bring potential rural exception sites within their boundary to facilitate cross-subsidy housing - as discussed below.</p> <p>Provision should also be made within CP1 to facilitate the development of farmsteads within villages. It is understood that a change to PS3 definition of previously developed land in this respect is already in prospect. This would enable farms to relocate where current opportunities and use of increasingly large machinery or which rely on livestock enterprises are no longer compatible with village environments. This would provide opportunities for new residential development within Development Limits and reducing pressure to redevelop services e.g. public houses.</p> <p>Levels of housing and employment growth in excess of that needed merely to sustain the existing service base should be provided for all services villages, which may well mean at the Allocations DPD stage identifying additional housing and employment sites within, on the edge or outside of current Development Limits.</p>	
DCS/221	Jennifer Hubbard	CP1	General Comments	<p>Although numerous changes to the Strategy have been proposed, with the exception that Tadcaster should retain its Local Service Centre designation but should not be expected to contribute significantly to the wider housing and employment needs of the District, none of the other suggestions materially weakens the overarching spatial strategy or objective of promoting sustainable patterns of development: rather, the suggestions involve a different and more sympathetic way of looking at the needs of the rural areas of the District to ensure that they and the communities</p>	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				within them sustainable.	
DCS/222	Land 4 New Build Limited	CP1	Partly	<p>1. Support the identification of Thorpe Willoughby as a Designated Service Village and its inclusion within the Selby Area Action Plan.</p> <p>2. Suggest Part B of Policy CP1 is reworded as follows:</p> <p>i. Previously developed land and buildings within the settlement</p> <p>ii. Suitable greenfield land within the settlement (Selby, Sherburn in Elmet, Tadcaster and designated Service Villages only)</p> <p>iii. Extensions to the settlement (Selby, Sherburn in Elmet, Tadcaster and designated Service Villages only) priority will be given to locations which are sustainable and will deliver environmental and amenity enhancements to the settlement being extended.</p> <p>iv. Undeveloped greenfield land.</p> <p>3. Consider the approach to the identification of land should take account of the potential environmental benefits of using under-utilised land and agricultural buildings prior to undeveloped agricultural land.</p> <p>4. Consider that due care should be taken to ensure a suitable level of appropriate housing allocations can be achieved to meet targets in service villages whilst ensuring that small scale previously developed sites, do not hold back the delivery of suitable greenfield sites, which would support sustainable development objectives.</p> <p>5. Supports the approach advocated in Secondary Villages.</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/228	Land 4 New Build Limited	CP1	General Comments	The concentration of development into the main settlement and designated service villages is supported as this represents the most sustainable form of development. It is inappropriate to define the SAAP boundary at this stage	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				without proper consideration of the implications of those boundaries for the accommodation of development. The use of historic Parish boundaries which exclude clear development opportunities on an arbitrary basis is clearly unsound.	
DCS/229	Appleton Roebuck and Acaster Selby Parish Council	CP1	General Comments	<p>The objector lists the service facilities and employment opportunities, the community facilities and community groups in Appleton Roebuck. These are considered to be comfortably in excess what is available in the surrounding settlements. Appleton Roebuck should therefore be regarded as a service village for the group of settlements in the north-west of the District.</p> <p>A comment is also made on the bus services, which the Parish Council wish to see improved and on the options for the provision of village shop in the future.</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/234	Barlby Parish Council	CP1	Partly	<p>1. Accept the role of Selby as the main focus for growth as long as development is accompanied by adequate provision of facilities and services, such as improved public transport, as part of the sustainability agenda.</p> <p>2. Concerned that the linking of Osgodby with Barlby does not reflect the fact that Osgodby has few services, development should therefore be confined to infill and very small windfall sites.</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/237	Mr Wainwright	CP1	Yes	Agrees with the classification of Sherburn in Elmet in the second tier alongside Tadcaster and below Selby - the Principal Town. Development should be distributed in accordance with the hierarchy.	see separate schedule
DCS/244	Mr S Sahota	CP1	General Comments	Church Fenton Airbase does not have any flood risk or encroach into the Green Belt. (It is noted that of the 12,157 dwellings recorded in the SHLAA within Selby, Tadcaster and the Designated Service Villages, 7128 of these are wholly or partly sited within flood zone 3.) The site would provide a large number of houses towards the District's RSS targets and also provide a substantial number of properties on previously developed land, again working towards the	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				Council's brownfield target. The Airbase can be linked to Church Fenton which would improve sustainability and allow the effective growth of Church Fenton without loss of Greenfield land.	
DCS/264	Drax Power Ltd	CP1	Partly	<p>1. Paragraph 5 - see DS/246</p> <p>2. Core Strategy should have regard to national planning policy statements relevant to energy having regard to the statement in Para 2.8 that the existence of Drax and Eggborough affords a certain prominence to energy.</p> <p>3. Paragraph 7 - see DS/86</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/330	The Grimston Park Estate	CP1	Partly	<p>1. Agree with the settlement strategy focusing on development in Selby, followed by the two Local Service Centres.</p> <p>2. Uncertain of the status of Ulleskelf. This is one of the few settlements in the District to be served by direct rail services to both Leeds and York. Material in Appendix 1 of the Background Paper identifies Ulleskelf but is not included in the list in Appendix At the preferred Options stage Ulleskelf was identified as a Primary Village. Consider the rejection of Ulleskelf on flooding grounds as a subjective appraisal. Therefore Ulleskelf should be identified as a Designated Service Village.</p> <p>3. Consider that strict adherence to the approach set out in RSS of "no development in the countryside" is too narrow and detrimental to available and healthy rural economy.</p> <p>4. Concerned that there is a lack of an overarching framework within Policy CP1 with regards to the review, consideration and designation of Development Limits and a review of the Green Belt.</p> <p>5. Concerned at the 50% target for dwellings on previously developed land and question whether it is achievable and whether attempting to achieve it will prejudice overall housing delivery. Therefore, suggest the target be amended to secure a target proportion across the Selby Urban Area - i.e. exclude the Local Service Centres and countryside.</p> <p>Reduce the target or remove it from the policy altogether</p>	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				along with reference in the justification. Preference is for the latter.	
DCS/356	Kelfield Parish Council	CP1	Partly	Approves of the overall strategy of the document subject to the undue restriction on development in Secondary Villages.	see separate schedule
DCS/360	Mr & Mrs M Waddington	CP1	Partly	<p>1. Concerned that possible alterations to the LDF programme may create delays and uncertainty in bringing development sites forward.</p> <p>2. Agree with the sequential approach giving first priority to previously developed land.</p> <p>3. Consider it may be appropriate to set an indicative target for PDL in the Selby Urban Area (possibly covered by the AAP), but that it is inappropriate across the wider rural District where brownfield opportunities are scarce.</p> <p>4. Welcome the acceptance that greenfield land releases will be necessary to meet the housing requirement.</p> <p>5. There appears to be a lack of an overarching policy framework which prioritises how the Council will deliver the RSS targets across the District.</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/374	Yorkshire Water	CP1	Yes	Supports the settlement hierarchy and the methodology in the Village Growth Potential background document and the aim to direct development to areas with infrastructure capacity and avoid areas with existing constraints on the local infrastructure.	see separate schedule
DCS/423	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	CP1	Partly	The spatial development strategy outlines the principles for the location of future development but does not include any consideration of how valuable the land is for biodiversity.	see separate schedule
DCS/440	Natural England	CP1	Partly	Broadly supports the spatial strategy and agrees the proposed hierarchy of settlements is appropriate and offers protection to the open countryside. However, concerned about the environmental impacts of larger housing developments.	see separate schedule
DCS/473	Bayford Development	CP1	Partly	The Designation of Monk Fryston as a Service Village is supported. Consider the tight Green Belt and Development	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

	s			Limit boundaries appear to be discouraging developers from promoting sites within the village and will need to be reviewed if the village is to accommodate growth.	
DCS/238	Mr Bradley	CP1	General Comments	Strong support for ensuring that the Designated Service Villages, and Church Fenton in particular, make adequate provision for identified requirements.	see separate schedule
DCS/486	Bartle & Son	CP1	Partly	<p>Agree with the broad thrust of the policy but raises the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CP1A the matter of flood risk requires further recognition or at least to appear earlier in relation to sub para (a). 2. Sub para (c) requires widening and a recognition of the possibility of local infill opportunities arising in non service villages along with positive approach to the conversion of vernacular farm buildings. 3. CP1B requires adjustment to bring forward the references to flood risk to the introduction to the item. 4. Policy CP1(C) specifying 50% allocation to targeting previously developed land is too restraining and given the limited resource for this and the expectation that many of these opportunities may well have developed means that the target and dates may be unrealistic. In practice also many of the sites may not be readily deliverable whereas greenfield may generally be more readily available. It is proposed that a percentage figure should be replaced with a monitoring brief. 5. Likewise care is required to not rely on earlier over-provision in supply which has not been discounted for earlier years. 	see separate schedule
DCS/498	North Yorkshire and York Primary Care Trust	CP1	Partly	Notes the settlement hierarchy will assist in assessing the capacity of health services required to meet the needs of local people.	see separate schedule
DCS/126	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	CP1(A)	Partly	Welcomes and supports the need to focus on Selby and the service villages. Note that Selby cannot accommodate all of the RSS growth within the settlement boundary and add as	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				such we consider that Policy CP1 should reflect this. Suggest the following wording be added to the first bullet point in Policy CP1(A); "To accommodate the growth extensions to the built up area required."	
DCS/127	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	CP1(B)	Partly	<p>1. Support the general approach but note that Policy CP1 as drafted does not set any framework for how sites will be prioritised for development, given the time delay before an adopted Area Action Plan is in place.</p> <p>2. Note that it is entirely feasible for a well located, sustainable greenfield site falling into Flood Zone 1, to be held from coming forward at this stage despite a contribution to housing land supply at a time of short supply, purely because CP1as drafted includes the broad approach to locations to be identified within the SAAP.</p> <p>3. To make Policy CP1 sound also suggests that the Council should set out the general location principles for development within Policy CP1 and then to refer to the SAAP as a separate note.</p> <p>4. Policy CP1 also suggests that the Council will adopt a sequential approach to direct developments away from the lowest flood risk areas. This is not a strategy which has been adopted by the Council. There are strategic site options that out perform the Council's preferred development options.</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/76	Barlby Parish Council	CP1 - Olympia Park	Partly	<p>1. Accept the role of Selby as the main focus for growth as long as development is accompanied by adequate provision of facilities and services, such as improved public transport, as part of the sustainability agenda.</p> <p>2. Concerned that the linking of Barlby and Osgodby does not reflect the fact that Osgodby has few services and therefore development should be confined to infill and very small windfall sites.</p>	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

Section 5 – Creating Sustainable Communities					
ID No.	Name/ Company/ Organisation	Paragraph/ Policy	Agree/ Disagree	Issues Raised	Decision
DCS/402	South Milford Parish Council	Whole Section	Disagree	The figure of 20% growth for designated villages is misleading and refers to gross growth across the plan period, whereas after netting off of current extant permissions the Designated Service Villages will have to absorb 25% of the new build requirement.	It totals to the same amount of new development whether in allocations or commitments.
DCS/421	Mr John Taunton	Whole Section	General Comments	<p>1. What sort of support will be given to the Parish Council during the period of future expansion?</p> <p>2. Will the Parish be given priority and support in producing a Parish Plan and implementing it?</p> <p>3. Wishes to see parishes be given a greater voice in the planning process. Recent developments have changed the village from being a 'green' place to live into looking increasingly like a housing estate with ridiculously small gardens.</p>	<p>The Council is always looking to improve its consultation process. Full consultation will take place through the Allocations DPD.</p> <p>The Coalition Government has announced its intention increase community involvement in the planning process. Parish Plans</p>
CP2 - The Scale and Distribution of Housing					
DCS/424	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Para 5.4	Partly	Hope that the economic case for the provision of extra homes would be fully tested as being reasonable given the current economic climate. An oversupply of land for development could have a detrimental effect on biodiversity.	Noted.
DCS/332	The Grimston Park Estate	Paras 5.4 - 5.26	Partly	<p>1. Considers Paragraphs 5.4 -5.26 are useful and welcome the recognition of the Regional spatial Strategy target, the decision not to include windfalls in the housing supply and the use of completions to monitor the supply position.</p> <p>2. Take issue with Paragraph 5.12 which outlines the decision to allocate the strategic sites as urban extensions. Consider this approach is too prescriptive and does not provide flexibility should circumstances change. The most appropriate strategy for providing housing land should be determined through the</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. the approach is in line with national policy and is supported by GOYH</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>Site Allocation DPD.</p> <p>3. Makes reference to Harrogate's Core Strategy where the Inspector agreed with areas of search for urban extensions but proposed modification to Policy CS2 to allow the consideration of smaller site to add flexibility and certainty to the policy.</p>	<p>3. The Core Strategy promotes strategic sites in line with national policy where delivery of the housing requirement is dependant on one or more key sites. Smaller sites will be brought forward through an Allocations DPD.</p>
DCS/178	Environment Agency	Para 5.10	General Comments	<p>Pleased to see the recommendations of the SFRA feeding in to the spatial distribution of housing.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
DCS/325	The Grimston Park Estate	Para 5.11	General Comments	<p>Considers that possible change future changes in the LDF may cause delays and uncertainty in producing specific allocations.</p>	<p>Noted the suggested preparation of an Allocations DPD in preference to a SAAP will overcome this concern.</p>
DCS/401	South Milford Parish Council	Para 5.16	Partly	<p>Request the Council acknowledge the amount of recent development and current outstanding commitments within the village. Recent expansion of the village has generated a large percentage of inward migration and a lot of those residents commute out of the village daily, particularly to Leeds.</p>	<p>It is not a function of the Core Strategy to provide detailed guidance on specific villages. These issues will be fully debated in an Allocations DPD.</p>
DCS/333	The Grimston Park Estate	Paras 5.16 & 5.17	Partly	<p>Suggest that the contrasting recent development histories of Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster mentioned in Paragraphs 5.16 and 5.17 should be explained in the spatial portrait of the District in Chapter 1.</p>	<p>It is suggested elsewhere in response to GOYH and comments by other stakeholders that the next version of the Strategy should include more emphasis on 'Place Making' and the role of settlements.</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/297	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	Para 5.23	Partly	Advises that if strategic sites are allocated in the Core Strategy there will not be a need for an AAP and that masterplans/SPD will suffice, although more detail will be needed in the Core Strategy.	see separate schedule
DCS/300	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	Para 5.24	No	The Core Strategy is the place for making decisions on localised Green Belt reviews if these are required to achieve delivery of housing numbers. In this circumstance, it is suggested that a background paper is needed focusing on priority development areas in the Green Belt to provide justification for the housing numbers in these locations.	see separate schedule
DCS/26	Roderic Parker	CP2	Yes	Welcome the statement in Para 5.17 regarding previous lack of development in Tadcaster. Hope that existing commitments will be brought forward, not necessarily by relying on the goodwill of a major landowner to do so.	Noted.
DCS/64	Mr A Cawood	CP2	Partly	Whilst not objecting to development in Selby and adjacent villages, considers it will lead to a substantial increase in commercial and other traffic on the A63 westwards through Hambleton and Monk Fryston, which will be detrimental to the quality of life for residents of those local communities.	Further consultation will be held with NYCC to ensure that current safeguards for by-passes remain in place.
DCS/83	Sanderson Weatherall	CP2	Partly	Policy directs a disproportionate level of development to the Selby AAP area. Figures should be subject to change following more detailed assessment of deliverability at the SAAP/Allocations DPD stage.	see separate schedule
DCS/108	Ye Fraternite of Olde Selebians	CP2	No	Concern that the number of new jobs would not be adequate to support the proposed housing growth. New housing growth should be related to the growth in the local economy.	see separate schedule
DCS/161	Redrow Home (Yorkshire) Ltd	CP2	No	1. Policy CP1 retains a disproportionate focus upon Selby and its surrounding villages and fails to reflect the RSS Core Approach in respect of growth within the Local Service Centres. 2. Considers that the allocation to Selby has not taken into account the flood risk issues and provides a comparison table of the percentage of areas within Flood Zone 3 with the	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

			<p>proposed housing distribution in those areas. Whilst it is acknowledged that, in order to secure the spatial objectives of the Regional Spatial Strategy, flood management will be required within Selby to accommodate growth, it is the level of growth proposed which is questioned with regard to the known flood risk. It is recommended that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment be widened to consider the ability of the Local Service Centres, in particular Sherburn in Elmet to accommodate additional growth.</p> <p>3. The role of the Local Service Centres has not been adequately reflected in the proposed housing distribution. The SHMA Final Report indicates that the supply remains below current need in respect of affordable housing and well below market demand for open market housing within Sherburn. This becomes more pronounced on future need figures. Notably current need for affordable housing in Selby is outstripped by short term supply, the reverse of the position for Sherburn where such a situation is used as the basis for restricting housing growth.</p> <p>4. Considers that emphasis on commuting to Leeds from Sherburn is inconsistent with the evidence base and has not been applied in Tadcaster which has a marginally higher percentage of out-commuting. Percentages are also higher within the majority of the other sub-areas where housing growth within the Service Villages will exceed that for Local Service Centres. The figures produced should also be cross referenced to the modes of transport available, for example the Principal Town and Local Service Centres will have better accessibility to public transport. Their own evidence indicates 5% of new home sales in Sherburn originated in Leeds market area and this is the same percentage as that for Staynor Hall in Selby. Considers that in sufficient account has been taken of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and that growth, particularly in Sherburn should be increased.</p> <p>5. Considers that Sherburn has better sustainability credentials than Tadcaster with employment park, two train stations with links to Leeds York and Selby, two Primary Schools, one Secondary School and Sixth Form College, shops and health facilities. Tadcaster has been constrained for many years for land ownership reasons. On this basis a greater balance of the</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				allocation to the Local Service Centres should be directed to Sherburn in Elmet.	
DCS/191	Mrs June Langhorn	CP2	Yes	Supports Policy CP2 and the allocation to the Selby SAAP area. To meet these requirements Osgodby should be a priority for development.	Noted.
DCS/193	Mr Stephenson	CP2	Yes	Supports Policy CP2 and the allocation to the Selby SAAP area. To meet these requirements Osgodby should be a priority for development.	Noted.
DCS/198	The Diocese of York	CP2	No	<p>Welcome to the approach to direct development to the main settlements but consider it unduly specific to identify where such development will come forward (e.g in Paragraph 5.12).</p> <p>Consider it premature to dismiss development of land between Selby and Brayton, (Paragraph 5.14) ahead of more detailed consideration within the Selby AAP. It has yet to be proven that these sites are deliverable.</p> <p>Request that Section 5 is amended to reflect that specific sites will be discussed and considered in the SAAP context. The Policy CP2 does reflect a broad approach without necessarily ruling out specific sites at this strategic stage. The supporting text should be along the same lines.</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/219	Jennifer Hubbard	CP2	Partly	Although Tadcaster meets the description of a Market Town, that is no justification in itself for proposing significant (or any growth), nor is this required by Regional Spatial Strategy policy. In the absence of firm evidence that the proposed policies for Tadcaster can be delivered within the LDF period, growth should be limited to that necessary to maintain the existing level of services and further housing and economic development "redistributed" elsewhere within the District.	see separate schedule
DCS/224	Land 4 New Build Limited	CP2	Partly	Concerned that potential development sites within Designated Service Villages should not be constrained prior to investigation in the Selby Area Action Plan. Particularly concerned that the boundary of the SAAP as shown in the Key	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				Diagram should be subject to review at a later stage in order not preclude potential adjacent sites.	
DCS/239	Mr Bradley	CP2	Partly	After considering the average figure for allocations in Designated Service Villages, considers Church Fenton should provide 100-150 dwellings, or perhaps more, given its inherent level of sustainability. Will put forward potential sites at the appropriate stage.	Noted.
DCS/240	Mr S Sahota	CP2	Partly	<p>1. Considers there is no evidence to indicate that commitments are developable and are likely to contribute to housing delivery. As such commitments should not reduce the future housing requirements of the District.</p> <p>2. Considers Paragraph 5.26 disregards the fact that housing delivery targets within the RSS should not be treated as a ceiling.</p> <p>3. Concerned that the SHLAA sites in the Designated Service Villages are constrained by high flood risk and that it will not be possible to find the necessary deliverable allocations.</p>	<p>1. For the most part commitments are the firmest sites from a delivery point of view. Harrogate Borough Council have found that 94% of commitments are delivered in the longer term.</p> <p>2. Accept that the requirements are minima this will be made even clearer in the final version.</p> <p>3. A degree of flood risk occurs in many settlements. The worst affected villages have been excluded from DSV category on flood risk grounds.</p>
DCS/226	Land 4 New Build Limited	CP2	General Comments	Concerned that potential development sites within Designated Service Villages should not be constrained prior to investigation in the Selby Area Action Plan. Particularly concerned that the boundary of the SAAP as shown in the Key Diagram should be subject to review at a later stage in order not preclude potential adjacent sites.	Issues raised concerning housing land availability and strategic development sites suggest that it would be appropriate to produce a district wide Allocations DPD as a priority rather than an SAAP which will address this representation.
DCS/334	The Grimston Park Estate	CP2	Partly	Considers the proposed distribution represents a pragmatic approach. Suggests the requirement for Tadcaster represents a minimum requirement in line with guidance in the Regional Spatial Strategy.	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/362	Mr & Mrs M Waddington	CP2	Partly	Supportive of the approach in Policy CP2B but consider that the identification of actual numbers within the extensions may be too prescriptive.	see separate schedule
DCS/375	Yorkshire Water	CP2	Partly	<p>1. It would be beneficial to have more details on the proposed strategic sites within the Core Strategy, particularly given they will account for two thirds of the total housing requirement. For example show boundaries on the Key Diagram, their proposed phasing and what is needed to ensure the sites can take place in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>2. Request more information on the distribution between villages of the designated Service Villages allocation.</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/394	South Milford Parish Council	CP2	Partly	Land between Tadcaster and the A64 should be available for development bearing in mind some is Wharfe flood Plain	Noted.
DCS/409	Samuel Smith Old Brewery	CP2	No	<p>1. Considers the scale and distribution of new housing is in conflict with both the RSS and Core Strategy evidence base. Consider it is not the most appropriate strategy and furthermore not deliverable.</p> <p>2. The level of housing distribution in Tadcaster does not accord with the requirements of Policy YH6 of the Regional Spatial Strategy, whereby the level of housing should be based on locally generated needs. There is no methodology for reaching this figure. Consider the allocation of housing based on historic lack of development runs contrary to both the RSS and each of the three approaches, A-C upon which the distribution is purported to be based.</p> <p>3. Considers Tadcaster's proportion of development based on affordable housing need should be 3.9% of the overall requirement. Disagree with allocating the need from the Northern area parishes, which can be met in the villages from 100% affordable housing.</p> <p>4. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) does not give confidence that the level of new housing in Tadcaster is achievable and realistic without compromising the character and landscape quality of the town's surroundings or the integrity of the Green Belt.</p>	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>Consider there is only capacity for 224 dwellings identified in the SHLAA which are not within the Green Belt, existing commitments or an existing employment land allocation. Consider there is insufficient justification to use Green Belt sites or the Employment Land allocation.</p> <p>5. Considers the figures in Background Paper No.1 equally justify a reduction in development because of outward commuting similar to that applied in Sherburn. On the evidence of Background Paper No1 the amount of housing allocated to Tadcaster should be reduced and that for Selby increased.</p> <p>6. Consider the methodology behind the Previously Developed Land distribution is very crude and does not take account of the actual availability of previously developed land sites. It is noted that the SHLAA contains no potential housing sites consisting of previously developed land.</p> <p>7. Accept that the scenario maximising the amount of development in Selby is not realistic at 100% but consider Policy CP2 does not go far enough in making best use of Selby town as the most sustainable location for housing growth within the District.</p> <p>8. Considers that PPS3 permits the inclusion of a windfall allowance in the period beyond the first 10 years. Windfalls have accounted for a substantial proportion of the supply in recent years and should not be ignored in the future.</p>	
DCS/444	Natural England	CP2	Partly	Consider an assessment of the sensitivity of the landscape to change should be undertaken to assist with any decisions about the location of sustainable urban extensions.	see separate schedule
DCS/457	D & J Poulter Buildings Contractors / Wrigley Property Development / Mr Geoff Lunn / Daniel Gath Homes /	CP2	Partly	<p>1. Considers it is contrary to PPS3 to include commitments as part of the allocations. Considers there is no evidence that these commitments are deliverable. The 10% reduction for non delivery is not justified by national guidance.</p> <p>2. Considers Paragraph 5.26 disregards the fact that housing delivery targets within the RSS should not be treated as a ceiling.</p> <p>3. From viewing the SHLAA concerned that the majority of</p>	<p>1. For the most part commitments are the firmest sites from a delivery point of view. Harrogate BC for example found that 94% of commitments are delivered in the longer term.</p> <p>2. The Draft Core Strategy acknowledges that the RSS requirements are minima. This</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

	Penny England			<p>potential allocations are likely to be unviable or have significant restraints to development. In order to meet delivery targets it is considered that some of the Secondary Villages should be promoted to Designated Service Village. It is contended that Byram, Brotherton, Camblesforth, Cawood, Church Fenton Airbase, Escrick, Stutton and Ulleskelf should be promoted to the Designated Service Village Category. It is not considered acceptable to allow Secondary Villages to stagnate without any planned residential growth given their size and relative sustainability. The opportunity should be available for potential sites to come forward and be fully assessed for acceptability. For example Camblesforth has been classified as a Secondary Village because of flood risk within the area. PPG25 advises that residential development is acceptable within flood zone 2 and this level of flood risk can be mitigated at design stage. By not classifying Camblesforth as Designated Service Village potential development sites are being disregarded with no definite restriction to development. Furthermore Kellington, Carlton, Fairburn and Wistow have been classified as Designated Service Villages despite few of their SHLAA allocations being deliverable.</p> <p>4. The Council must accept that many of the allocated sites around Selby may never be delivered because of flood risk issues.</p> <p>5. The growth of Tadcaster has been restricted by limited availability of land around the town. The promotion of Stutton to Designated Service Village would serve to ensure sufficient housing in the area and support the town's role as a Local Service Centre.</p> <p>6. 58% of all allocations have serious flooding issues which irrespective of other factors will raise doubts over the deliverability of the sites.</p> <p>7. Recommends upgrading some Secondary Villages to Designated Service Villages and providing some allocations within Secondary villages, as a minimum reinstating the provision of 21 dwellings per year to again allow for a more wide ranging consideration of potential residential sites.</p>	<p>will be made even clearer in the core strategy.</p> <p>3. A degree of flood risk occurs in many settlements. See Background Paper No.6 and Policy CP1 report for discussion of Designated Service Village selection.</p> <p>see separate schedule</p>
DCS/474	Bayford	CP2	No	1. Considers there is no evidence provided to indicate that the	1. For the most part

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

	Development s			<p>existing commitments are deliverable and will contribute. The 10% reduction in the level of commitments for non-delivery is not justified by national guidance.</p> <p>2. Housing delivery in the District will be further restricted by windfall sites as, it is suggested these will reduce residential quotas accordingly. This disregards the fact that housing delivery targets within the RSS should not be treated as a ceiling to development. Not considered necessary to deduct windfall sites from future housing allocations. Overprovision caused by the development of windfall sites is acceptable and should not reduce future residential development and allocations. Annual house building within the District should be maintained at Regional Spatial Strategy requirements.</p>	<p>commitments are the firmest sites from a delivery point of view. Harrogate Borough Council for example have found that 94% of commitments are delivered in the longer term.</p> <p>2. Windfalls will not reduce residential quotas. Their impact may only be to defer the need to bring forward some allocations into the Five Year Supply not to eliminate them.</p> <p>3. Over-provision caused by windfalls is accepted and is a clear indication that, as they come forward, the total land supply over the timescale of the Strategy will be well in excess of that provided through allocations.</p>
DCS/478	Connaught Consultancy Services LLP	CP2	Partly	<p>1. The distribution of new housing does not promote Sherburn in Elmet sufficiently and reflect its suitability for growth.</p> <p>2. Sherburn has a good range of services and employment opportunities and has accessible transport links including rail facilities. It has suitably located potential residential sites which are free from flooding.</p> <p>3. Further development will support both the employment development of recent years and make viable further service and facility provision to further enhance the sustainability of the town.</p> <p>4. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment shows strong demand for market and affordable housing in Sherburn in Elmet which outstrips supply. The demand for housing is not as great as in Sherburn and therefore more housing should be allocated to Sherburn.</p> <p>5. Tadcaster does not have the employment and service</p>	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>provision to support the allocated growth. Importantly it does not have the available land to accommodate the proposed growth.</p> <p>6. Sherburn has approximately one third of the employment of Selby which should be better reflected in the housing allocation to Sherburn. There may also be problems of delivery on the strategic sites in Selby which are longer term and have a number of constraints.</p> <p>7. Disagree with the allocation to Designated Service Villages which will encourage dispersed development. It will encourage journeys by car to meet even basic day to day needs and will put pressure on villages for infill development.</p> <p>8. Suggest a distribution as follows: Selby 50%, Sherburn in Elmet 20%, Tadcaster 15% and Designated Service Villages 15%.</p>	
DCS/487	Bartle & Son	CP2	Partly	<p>1. Considers the 1000 dwellings at Crosshills and the industrial allocation to the east (Olympia Park) are likely to be candidates for careful scrutiny and possible discounting for flood risk. There is no recognition of this. The BOCM site and river hinterland should be discounted in recognition of the unquantified flood risk.</p> <p>2. The housing allocation at Tadcaster is not supported on the ground and primarily it seems any provision and recent considerable under-provision should be more fully factored into the document.</p>	see separate schedule
DCS/499	North Yorkshire and York Primary Care Trust	CP2	General Comments	<p>Proposal for strategic sites at Selby will require some additional for doctor and dental services. Registration with GP services has remained steady in recent years. Consider proposed distribution of the majority of new housing will be well within the District boundary and should not see local health care resources moving outside the North Yorkshire boundary through patient choice.</p>	Noted.
DCS/245	Mr S Sahota	CP2	Partly	<p>Wish to highlight that most allocations brought forward in Selby ~district are on Greenfield sites and targets for previously developed land are unlikely to be met. Bringing more allocations forward in a greater number of villages can</p>	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				solve the potential shortfall in developing previously land by providing a more diverse range of sites and increasing the potential for PDL sites to come forward. The Council's attempt to restrict development on residential curtilages is also likely to hinder the delivery of brownfield sites. The Council's justification to Policy CP1 does not need to draw upon the disadvantages of developing residential curtilages when such development also brings many benefits such as reducing the need to extend urban areas and ensuring PDL development targets are met.	
DCS/477	Bayford Developments	CP2	No	Most allocations brought forward in Selby District are 'Greenfield' sites and targets for previously developed land are unlikely to be met. Bringing more allocations forward in a greater number of villages can solve the potential shortfall by providing a more diverse range of sites and increasing the potential for previously developed sites to come forward.	see separate schedule
DCS/129	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	CP2(A)	Partly	<p>1. Broadly supports the suggested housing distribution set out under Policy CP2(A).</p> <p>2. It should be clear as to whether the contribution of the Designated Service Villages within the Selby Area Action Plan have been taken out of the Designated Service Village category in order to avoid double counting.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. This may be superseded by the suggested preparation of a district wide Allocations DPD in preference to a SAAP</p>
DCS/125	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	CP2(B)	Partly	There is confusion as to whether the Council is promoting broad areas of search (as referred to in para 4.16 and Policy CP2) or 'Strategic Sites' (as referred to in the Key Diagram and the accompanying evidence base which examines 'strategic development site options').	see separate schedule
DCS/130	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	CP2(B)	No	Objects to the strategic development site allocations on the following grounds: 1. Due to the time taken to prepare an SAAP for smaller sites the council is effectively relying on 2 sources of housing in the short-medium term. 2. The lead time for bringing strategic sites forward could be up to seven years	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				as there are currently no consents or masterplans in place; there are significant contamination, highways and flood risk issues to address; and the proposals will require consensus from several landowners, and 3. The Core Strategy fails to set out detailed site specific criteria for the development of the sites. Suggested that the Core Strategy will therefore not meet short term housing targets.	
DCS/105	Jas Bowman and Sons Ltd	CP2 (B)	No	Object to Policy CP2 (B) and the use of urban extensions to the existing built up area of Selby. Core Strategy should use previously developed land by distributing this development amongst the smaller settlements of the District. It will provide a higher rate of growth in settlements such as Eggborough and Whitley Bridge, To be consistent with the Regional Spatial Strategy the Strategy allow for an increased level of housing development on PDL within Designated Service Villages, before the use of urban extensions to Selby.	There is insufficient previously developed land which can be identified as 'deliverable' at the present time. If more PDL does come forward it will be given priority and may result in some allocations being deferred.
DCS/298	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	CP2 (B)	Omissions	Advises that if the strategic development sites are essential for housing delivery in the early years then they need to be planned as quickly as possible to achieve the necessary lead times for infrastructure development and should be shown on the Proposals Map.	see separate schedule
DCS/302	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	CP2 (B)	Omissions	For each strategic site the Core Strategy should include the key principles, scale and general disposition of proposed land uses, including infrastructure and development requirements, to enable more detailed planning to be undertaken subsequently in SPD. If the sites are not needed until later in the plan period the identification of broad locations in the Key Diagram followed by an AAP will suffice.	see separate schedule
DCS/43	Ye Fraternite of Olde Selebians	CP2 (B) - Crosshills Lane	Partly	Concerned that the low lying southern part of the Crosshills Lane Strategic Development site floods regularly and if this site is built up this will deflect flood water onto properties in Leeds Road.	see separate schedule
DCS/99	W A Hare & Son Ltd	CP2 (B) - Crosshills	Partly	Considers that: 1. The proposed extension to the Selby District Local Plan allocation (SEL/1) is not justified and unnecessary, and will result in an awkward shape to development with harm	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

		Lane		to the surrounding countryside and entrance to Selby. 2. The original access via Meadway which was agreed by the SDLP Inspector will cause less harm and has been designated for this purpose. The Company threatens to seek a judicial review if an alternative is promoted.	
DCS/103	Ms K M Middleton	CP2 (B) - Crosshills Lane	Partly	Supports the Crosshills Lane strategic site but considers this land is 'flood plain' and so could have problems.	see separate schedule
DCS/233	Barlby Parish Council	CP2 (B) - Olympia Park	Partly	1. Not opposed to Phase 1 (between the railway and the A19) provided: >no ground floor bedrooms in domestic dwellings; > the maintenance responsibility for jetties and other riverside structures is agreed; > education provision is specified, and > new infrastructure such as sewage treatment and drainage is specified. 2. Opposed to Phase 2 residential development as there should be employment opportunities in place before further housing. Also concerned about flood risk, and other than Phase 1 which is a sustainable development consider that there should be no further residential development on land which previously flooded.	see separate schedule
DCS/40	Ms K M Middleton	CP2 (B) - Olympia Park	Partly	Supports Olympia Park Strategic site because it will improve the entrance to Selby and make the area look better.	see separate schedule
DCS/203	Olympia Park	CP2 (B) - Olympia Park	Partly	A delivery framework document has been submitted in support of the site which indicates land is available to meet short term demand rather than medium term as suggested in the Council's SHLAA. Consider that both the Crosshills Lane and Olympia Park strategic development sites should be clearly identified as site specific allocations and the policy should make it clear how the development will be advanced. eg a masterplan or AAP.	see separate schedule
DCS/209	Olympia Park	CP2 (B) - Olympia Park	General Comments	The Olympia Park landowners recognise the importance of the site and are committed to delivering the site, including continued active engagement in the LDF process.	see separate schedule
DCS/113	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	CP2 (B) - Strategic Development	No	Objects to the fact that: 1. Two strategic options in the strategic countryside gap (between Selby and Brayton) have been discounted on the basis of landscape importance without	see separate schedule

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

		Sites		the benefit of structured landscape and visual impact assessment, and that there is no justification for retaining the existing landscape designations, and 2. These sites outperform other sites in terms of flood risks but that more weight has been given to the retention of the strategic gap.	
DCS/281	English Heritage	CP2 (B) - Strategic Development Sites	Partly	Concerned that both strategic sites affect Conservation Areas (the south western extremity of Olympia Park falls within the Selby Conservation Area and Crosshills Lane is adjacent to the Leeds Road Conservation Area). Recommend that evidence will need to be produced to demonstrate that the development of both sites can be achieved in a manner which safeguards the character of the Conservation Area. It is further suggested that the Council should prioritise the production of Conservation Area Assessments for these particular areas to assist this process.	see separate schedule
DCS/301	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	CP2 - Phasing + Boundaries on Map	Partly	Policy CP2 should indicate the timeframe in which housing is expected to be developed on different sites and in different parts of the District. PPS3 advises that a split into three 5 year phases, with less detailed information required in each phase is appropriate. In particular, you need to identify when the two strategic sites in Selby are likely to be needed, because this will affect the way they are treated in the LDF. Background Paper No7 concludes that Residential Sites A and D and Employment Site G are the best options. Policy CP2 B identifies these sites, with numbers but the updated proposals map at Figure 4 does not show the boundaries of these sites. Need to give some indication of broad phasing of these sites and how they will fit into the delivery of the overall housing numbers, so that the appropriate approach can be selected.	Accept that more information with regard to deliverability will need to be included. It has to be recognised, however, that information to provide specific information on smaller sites will only become available through an Allocations DPD.
CP3 - Managing Housing Land Supply					
DCS/39	Ye Fraternite of Olde Selebians	Para 5.28	No	The data appears flawed and based on completions at the peak of the housing boom. 400 houses per annum for 13 years seem over-stated, with neither the jobs nor the infrastructure capable of supporting it.	see separate schedule
DCS/335	The Grimston Park Estate	Para 5.34	Partly	Concerned Paragraph 5.34 suggests annual targets will be considered for individual settlements or groups of settlements.	Annual targets are no more specific than those in Policy CP2.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				This would appear prudent in securing a balanced approach to development across the District; however, we consider it may be too prescriptive and overly complicated to enforce. It gives the impression that once a settlement has had its "share", then there will be an embargo on future development. Granting of planning permission is not a guarantee and does not indicate development will progress.	They provide a broad guide to the target distribution.
DCS/376	Yorkshire Water	Para 5.37	Yes	Support the point in Paragraph 5.37 that sites must have the necessary infrastructure to enable delivery if it is brought forward from its original phase and into the five year supply.	Noted.
DCS/179	Environment Agency	Para 5.37	General Comments	We are pleased to see flood risk as an important consideration in the analysis of housing supply.	Noted
DCS/425	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Para 5.39	Partly	Previously developed land can have a high value for biodiversity. Sites should be looked at on an individual basis as some brownfield sites may be of much higher value for biodiversity than intensively managed arable land.	Noted
DCS/458	D & J Poulter Buildings Contractors / Wrigley Property Development / Mr Geoff Lunn / Daniel Gath Homes / Penny England	CP3	Yes	Strongly support Paragraph 4.39 but would recommend a full review of the Green Belt and Development Limit boundaries of all settlements in the District. Reviewing Green Belt boundaries and Development Limits will ensure housing delivery targets are met without compromising CS objectives. A prime example of this being Tadcaster, which is severely restricted by the Green Belt and the lack of sites within current Development Limits. Currently the SHLAA indicates no delivery in the first 7 year period.	see separate schedule
DCS/27	Roderic Parker	CP3	Yes	I would be happier with the sentiments expressed in this policy if the District Council had been more successful in getting allocations used for housing, in particular the brownfield site on Mill Lane, Tadcaster.	Noted
DCS/131	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	CP3	No	1. The housing trajectory indicates a shortfall in its housing delivery up until 2014 and has not sought to identify how an increased output could make up that shortfall. On this basis	1. It is inevitable that there will be variations in the level of housing delivery over the period

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>alone consider there is no justification for having Policy CP3 at all.</p> <p>2. Given that Selby itself has identified such a shortfall in its housing delivery and major constraints such as flooding, consider there is no justification for Policy CP3 and this should be deleted.</p> <p>3. Considers there is likely to be a highly probable housing shortage and Policy CP3 provides no mechanisms at all for addressing this.</p>	<p>of theCore Strategy. The most recent downturn has been more exaggerated than is usual but provided the recovery occurs as predicted the under delivery between the years 08-09 and 12-13 will still be less than the over-target delivery in the first four years of the RSS period. (Completions in 09-10 were 270 which is 20 dwellings in excess of that predicted in the trajectory.) Provided this trend continues there will not be a shortfall in provision over the medium term.</p> <p>It has to be remembered that the trajectory represents the minimum target delivery to meet the average requirement over the RSS period. The allocation provision is based on 440 dwellings per annum in the future regardless of whether anticipated delivery is below that figure in certain years. In addition maintenance of a 5 year supply ensures a continuous supply of land to sustain construction at levels dictated largely by the market. In any event the fact that in 06-07 there were over 800 completions in the District with virtually the same land supply available as in 08-09 when there was only 220, illustrates that financial considerations are paramount. Local authorities have only limited resources to directly influence housing investment levels.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

					Policy CP3 aims to meet the requirements of PPS3 to set out a housing implementation strategy.
DCS/162	Redrow Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd	CP3	No	The policy wording and justification for Policy CP3 should be amended to better reflect Regional Spatial Strategy guidance on early years housing delivery in respect of existing housing allocations, in this case those identified under policies H2A/H2 of the Selby District Local Plan. Table 2.2 and Paragraph 12.18 indicates that in early years the focus should be on "making the best use of existing allocations and already identified urban potential in cities and towns" and this should be reflected in interim SPD and reference made to the SHLAA in respect of early years sites.	It is considered that the wording of Policy CP3 is sufficient for the Core Strategy document. Work has already begun on the Allocation DPD and it is anticipated there will only be a limited period of approximately 12 months between adoption the Core Strategy and its adoption. Any reference in Policy CP3 to the interim period is therefore expected to have a limited life and is likely to have been superseded by earlier action since release of some of the Phase 2 sites will be necessary prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy in order to maintain Five-Year Supply. The existing reference is therefore considered to be appropriate. The Core Strategy will provide more detail of the proposed timing of development in general terms.
DCS/192	Mrs June Langhorn	CP3	No	Considers Policy CP3 needs to acknowledge the role that both Greenfield land and under utilised land can play in the achievement of the housing requirement, in the event of a shortfall in the target for housing on previously developed land being identified.	Noted. It is anticipated that the majority of new allocations will be on Greenfield land. The timing of delivery on Greenfield may be retarded depending upon the amount of brownfield land coming forward which has not already been identified in allocations.
DCS/194	Mr Stephenson	CP3	No	1. Considers the approach to Policy CP3 is ambiguous and needs clarification. Consider that the delivery of Greenfield sites could overcome the immediate shortfall in delivery, plus a robust assessment of delivery and the acceptance of the	1. The Council is monitoring the land supply and will maintain a Five-Year Supply. As Policy CP3 indicates Selby District Local Plan Policy H2

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>Regional Spatial Strategy target as a minimum to be achieved.</p> <p>2. The approach to land supply calculations in the Core Strategy needs to be clarified as the Council appear to have discounted their overprovision in previous years, which is not in accordance with Government guidance. Adopting this approach is unsound and will artificially reduce what the Council needs to achieve in future years and inflates housing land supply.</p> <p>3. Suggests that the Core Strategy should include reference to the role Greenfield underutilised land can play in the achievement of the housing requirement in the event of a shortfall in the target for housing on previously developed land being identified.</p>	<p>Phase 2 sites will be utilised in the first instance.</p> <p>2. It is not clear how the respondent is interpreting the calculations. However, the Table in Policy CP2 indicates that the Council is making provision for 440 dwellings per annum in the future despite estimating an over-provision in the years prior to 2014.</p> <p>3. At this strategic level it is not considered appropriate to draw a distinction between the varying qualities of Greenfield land. This will be more pertinent at the Allocations DPD stage.</p>
DCS/212	Jennifer Hubbard	CP3	Partly	<p>The policy does not indicate at what point above the indicative targets the Council will take action to "damp down" the supply and what form that action might take. It is important to be clear on this to enable the development industry to take forward investment decisions, without which a continuous supply of land will not come forward.</p>	<p>In the face of Government guidance which has in recent past encouraged a degree of over-provision it was not considered appropriate to include specific target maximums in the policy itself. PPS3 focuses more on correcting under-provision rather than over-provision. However, it does mention an acceptable performance range of 10 – 20 % of requirement and this is quoted in Paragraphs 5.31 and 5.33. It is considered that the trigger points for management action should be included in the policy. (See also</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

					DCS/303).
DCS/225	Land 4 New Build Limited	CP3	Partly	<p>1. Support the approach in Paragraph 5.35 that more detail on the location of future allocations should be provided in the Selby area Action Pan and the Allocations DPD.</p> <p>2. Generally support Policy CP3. However, highlight concern that the RSS figures are minimum levels. Overprovision in itself need not be a cause for concern. The last sentence in Part A requires redrafting to emphasise this fact.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. It is clear that every effort should be made to ensure that housing delivery requirements are being met as far as possible. However, PPS3 refers to an acceptable performance range of between 10 -20 % outside of which management action may be required. It is not, therefore considered necessary to amend the policy.</p>
DCS/303	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	CP3	Partly	<p>1. Need to be able to demonstrate at examination that your approach seeks to deliver at least the Regional Spatial Strategy requirement without relying on future windfalls. Stress that the figure in RSS are not a ceiling and it is not possible, therefore to over-deliver. It is also important that the right types of housing are delivered in the right places, and these sites are backed up in the SHLAA.</p> <p>2. Consider that for clarity, the trigger points for management action, which are referred to in the text, should be included in the policy.</p>	<p>1. Accepted that the minimum aim must be to at least meet the housing requirement. However, PPS3's reference to an acceptable performance range (Paragraph 64) implies that there may be excessive provision where management action may be required.</p> <p>2. Trigger points will be moved from the text to the policy.</p>
DCS/336	The Grimston Park Estate	CP3	Partly	It would be helpful if Policy CP3(A) made reference to the AMR and any indicative parameters wherein action would be	Trigger points for management action will be moved from the text

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				triggered.	to the policy.
DCS/363	Mr & Mrs M Waddington	CP3	Partly	<p>1. Consider approach in CP3 is acceptable but would remind the Council that Regional Spatial Strategy targets are minima and can be exceeded.</p> <p>2. Suggest that one way of meeting affordable housing targets is to simply permit the construction of more housing.</p> <p>3. Question the achievability of the suggested density on Olympia Park and indicate the need to find a number of smaller sites involving changes to Development Limits. However, there is no clear guidance on what matters will be taken into account for reviewing Development Limits.</p>	<p>1. Accept. The text will be modified to improve the clarity on this point.</p> <p>2. This point is noted but unless it is 100% affordable housing, substantial further provision, even if marketable, would have considerable implications for the overall and the role of the District within the Region.</p> <p>3. More guidance will be included within the Core Strategy on reviewing Development Limits. (See Main Report, which is in any case a matter for further DPD's.)</p>
DCS/378	Yorkshire Water	CP3	Yes	Yorkshire Water has made provision for those sites allocated in the Selby District Local Plan in our five year investment programme. Therefore, there will be sufficient capacity to accommodate the Policy H2/H2A sites.	Noted.
DCS/460	D & J Poulter Buildings Contractors / Wrigley Property Development / Mr Geoff Lunn / Daniel Gath Homes / Penny England	CP3	Partly	1. Policy CP3 is generally supported, although need to be aware that the RSS targets are minima. It is accepted that the aims and objectives of the plan need to be safeguarded and housing delivery should only be reduced if the Strategy's objectives are likely to be compromised.	Accept that targets are minima, this will be made even clearer in the Core Strategy.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/479	Connaught Consultancy Services LLP	CP3	Partly	<p>1. Consider that reference to Local Plan Policy H2/H2A Phase 2 sites is flawed because there is only one site of 3.48ha allocated in Tadcaster, which is only a three year supply.</p> <p>2. It is not clear what the purpose of Part (C) of the policy is and what remedial action can be taken. Given that most previously developed land arises from employment sites, it will be interesting to understand how the Council will "facilitate" the creation of brownfield sites as suggested in Paragraph 5.39.</p>	<p>1. It is not intended that the Selby District Council Policy H2 Phase 2 should necessarily provide a full five years supply. These sites are intended to supplement existing commitments to ensure maintenance of the Five Year Supply until such times as the Allocations DPD is adopted. It is anticipated that this provision of the policy will only be of relevance for a period of approximately 12 months between adoption of the Core Strategy and adoption of the Allocations DPD.</p>
CP4 - Housing Mix					
DCS/337	The Grimston Park Estate	Paras 5.49 - 5.53	General Comments	<p>Considers the findings from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment which indicate a need for providing more family houses and accommodation for the elderly have implications for the amount of land that may need to be identified, given that flats can be provided at a greater density than large homes and bungalows.</p>	<p>The actual number of houses committed and completed is monitored through the annual monitoring report. Proposed Policy CP3 outlines the ways in which housing land supply may be addressed if there is an under-supply identified over the Plan period. Recent changes to PPS3 will affect the amount of land required.</p>
DCS/180	Environment Agency	Para 5.55	Partly	<p>Whilst it is accepted that there must be a varied housing offer to appeal to different sectors of the community, the spatial distribution of different housing types should be informed by the findings of the SFRA. In areas of high flood risk, it should be noted that bungalow and other single storey development may be unable to reasonably provide sufficient flood risk mitigation measures. Consideration should be given to the effect this may have on the delivery of the desired mix of</p>	<p>The various material considerations will be considered at the time of planning applications – there will be a wide range of factors which will determine the precise mix and layout of schemes. This policy seeks to establish the principle of</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				housing types.	matching provision with identified need. It would unduly dilute or confuse the policy if all other factors are to be highlighted. The policy is to be read alongside all other policies in the development plan in any case.
DCS/158	The Diocese of York	CP4	Yes	Policy CP4 is supported. Rigid targets should not be imposed for the mix and type of dwellings required. The preference for different house types can change with market conditions and should not be pre-determined. Each site has its own constraints and developments should be considered on a site by site basis taking account site specific circumstances and sustainability criteria.	Noted.
DCS/195	Mr Stephenson	CP4	No	Object to Policy CP4. Consider that this policy should recognise local needs can often change over time and the policy should not include a level of detail which may become outdated and subject to change over time.	It is considered that the policy has inbuilt flexibility as the requirement relates to identified need from the most recent evidence available.
DCS/204	Olympia Park	CP4	No	Object to Policy CP4. Consider that this policy should recognise local needs can often change over time and the policy should not include a level of detail which may become outdated and subject to change over time.	It is considered that the policy has inbuilt flexibility as the requirement relates to identified need from the most recent evidence available.
DCS/338	The Grimston Park Estate	CP4	Yes	As drafted Policy CP4 is appropriate compared with the alternatives which are too prescriptive and may be difficult to enforce. It is appropriate for house builders, be it in the private sector or as Registered Social Landlord (RSL), to determine the nature and type of housing required (to create sustainable communities) rather than the Council seeking to prescribe a mix.	Noted.
DCS/364	Mr & Mrs M Waddington	CP4	Partly	Consider Policy CP4 represents a flexible approach. An important consideration is also the commercial view of housing providers both private sector and Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) in what is viable upon a site. The policy should be amended to include such consideration.	There are various requirements set out for the development of sites, both through the development plan and other statutory pre-requisites. The

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

					viability of each scheme will be determined on a site by site basis.
DCS/461	D & J Poulter Buildings Contractors / Wrigley Property Development / Mr Geoff Lunn / Daniel Gath Homes / Penny England	CP4	Yes	Policy CP4 meets the aims and objectives of Planning Policy Statement 3 and is therefore supported.	Noted.
DCS/480	Connaught Consultancy Services LLP	CP4	Yes	Support Policy CP4. It is important that the housing mix is determined by market demand and local need based upon up-to-date evidence. It should also factor in the character and appearance of the surrounding area.	Noted.
DCS/488	Bartle & Son	CP4	No	Determination of the housing mix should be fully market led and developers should expect to have a relatively free hand to identify where demand lies.	Clearly marketability is a key factor in bringing housing sites forward. However, it is the function of the planning system to ensure other factors are brought to bear, which is backed up by national policy and implemented through the development plan in an appropriate manner.
DCS/517	Selby PSI Reference Group	CP4	Partly	Housing needs of whole community: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - bungalows - homes for larger families - homes for older people Must cater for mixed communities Not sufficiently targeted on community's needs Disability needs higher profile Parish Councils can be opposed to social housing Need to have system which is responsive to changing needs and circumstances	Comments from the experienced viewpoint of the group appreciated, and will be considered, in terms of the suggested disability-focused content that is highlighted as required.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>Bungalows not always suitable anyway eg need for 2-3 bedrooms to accommodate visitors. Selby has too many 1 bedroom bungalows.</p> <p>Size and type of bungalow are key</p> <p>Planners and architects need to work together to deliver well designed/ appropriate accommodation</p> <p>Location of housing is also important; need to feel integrated with rest of the community;</p> <p>Important to avoid ghettos of disabled/elderly people</p> <p>Retirement villages? – mixed views</p> <p>Ease of moving within community is important (to avoid (leaving community)</p> <p>What about family visiting needs in supported accommodation?</p>	
CP5 - Affordable Housing – also see separate schedule for general commentary / further decisions on Policy CP5					
DCS/132	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	Para 5.89	No	<p>Concerned in respect of the last two sentences of Paragraph 5.89 which suggests that even if sites prove to be unviable, the Council will ignore such testing and require at least some contribution to affordable housing in some way, except in the most exceptional circumstances. Such a comment ignores the Council's own approach to affordable housing, its evidence base and suggests a mistrust of developers generally. It is not helpful and should be deleted.</p>	<p>Disagree with the respondents' interpretation of these sentences. Because developments may be shown to be unviable at the levels being requested does not mean that lower levels of contribution cannot be negotiated and met. However, accept that the last sentence does not particularly add any further point and to avoid any ambiguity the last sentence should be deleted.</p>
DCS/28	Roderic Parker	CP5	Yes	<p>There is an argument for having a higher proportion of affordable housing built in Tadcaster, given the present pressures on such housing and the need for the town to house those who, given more choice, might prefer to live in local villages.</p>	<p>Noted. Tadcaster's housing allocation does reflect some of these concerns.</p>
DCS/116	Barratt and	CP5	No	<p>1. Concerned in respect of the Council's Economic Viability</p>	<p>1. Respondents are effectively</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

	David Wilson Homes			<p>Assessment (EVA) prepared by DTZ. Dispute the claims that affordable housing in Selby is realistic at somewhere between 0 and 50%. Our client disputes these claims depending on the market at a particular time.</p> <p>2. Concerned by the statement that broad agreement was reached as part of the Economic Viability Assessment. Both Barratts and David Wilson Homes (and Persimmon Homes) have both raised concerns about the DTZ assumptions, which appear to have been ignored.</p> <p>3. Specific concerns are as follows: a) The Executive Summary (3rd bullet) suggests that the current market is 'abnormal'. No definition is provided as to what this means.</p>	<p>objecting to the overall finding of the EVA as drafted. Responses to the detailed points made below should answer the main concerns.</p> <p>2. Appreciate from their subsequent challenges to the Wakefield EVA that Barratt Homes disagree with the methodology being utilised by DTZ. However the full extent of their disagreement with the Selby EVA was not manifest in the discussions at the working group and no written comments or suggestions for improvement were made at the time. Amendments were made at the time in the light of comments from Persimmon. Both DTZ and the Council representatives left the working group with the view that, although further comments would be submitted, the EVA was not totally unacceptable and that the key issue was the development of an appropriate policy which balanced the conflicting aims of flexibility to accommodate market conditions, whilst providing the maximum certainty for developers.</p> <p>3a) The description of the current market as 'abnormal' has been used by PINS (presentation to HBF and CLG on 7 Jan 2009) without any qualifying definition. It is considered that it is not</p>
--	--------------------	--	--	---	---

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>b) Assuming as an arbitrary point, a 'normal' market involves 3 x Household income + 10% deposit = price, what does this imply for current price levels and thereby selling prices? Has this been inputted into the model?</p> <p>c) Table 3.2 includes an error as it suggests a lower area of sq ft for 5 bed house types and consequential values.</p> <p>d) At paragraph 3.43, suggest that use of £2000 per unit for S106 costs is unrealistically low. Council's own SPD equates to a total potential S106 cost of £6,205 without taking into account any developer costs for either community facilities or a health contribution. S106 cost assumption is likely to be woefully short. Would question whether the suggested figure is based on all units as DTZ may have failed to take account only the qualifying units (i.e. those above each threshold).</p> <p>e) Not clear whether the 'green', 'amber' and 'red' categories relate to sites or dwellings. More explanation is required as it could be read that a larger proportion of sites are viable, rather than to reflect a true picture of on the number of dwellings that would be viable. Amber is described in itself as only marginally viable. The counting of Amber as acceptable therefore cannot be supportive of the Council's Policy.</p>	<p>unreasonable to describe the recent general economic and market conditions as 'abnormal'.</p> <p>3b) The revenue assumptions (Appendix 4 to the EVA report) have been determined by analysing the current/recent sold and asking prices. DTZ consider this to be a more accurate indication of house prices than the calculation in the representation.</p> <p>3c) DTZ accept the error.</p> <p>3d) The calculation of £2,000 reflects the average figure currently being achieved through negotiation with developers. Each site has varying circumstances which often lead to it being inappropriate to request the theoretical maximums for all purposes as set out by the respondent. Significant variations from this Section 106 figure being sought by the Council could be taken into account in any site by site negotiations over the affordable provision.</p> <p>3e) The colour codes refer to the theoretical sites tested. There has been no comment made on the final rates of return used which would suggest they encompass most developers' target rates. Acceptable internal rates of return are specific to individual developers and each will</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>f) The 50% 'pass rate' is not acceptable (EVA Paragraphs 5.8 and 5.9). It has no factual support or justification and is not supported. It is not credible that a policy is acceptable if it is only half compliant.</p> <p>g) In respect of the scenarios presented, a decrease in building costs scenario is not credible. The Code for Sustainable homes will push up building costs over the next 6 years. Therefore, to suggest a model based on decreasing build costs is naive.</p>	<p>approach viability of sites in different ways. Local housebuilders or RSLs, may take a different view to that of national developers. It is therefore likely sites with marginal rates of return will prove viable for the given proportion or within a negotiable range of it. It has to be remembered that any requirement set by the authority is negotiable on a site by site basis. The EVA can only provide a general guide.</p> <p>3f) As the DTZ explains (Para 5.8 it is a matter for the local authority to translate the results EVA into an appropriate negotiating requirement and illustrates the extremes of the policy range possible. Paragraph 6.9 explains the aims being sought when establishing a requirement and DTZ in Paragraph 5.9 suggest that 50% is a fair and robust approach. 50% has received support from other consultees.</p> <p>g) The baseline assumption for the study was that all homes will be delivered to Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3. At the time of completing the study the position on build costs was not as firm as it is now and there are some circumstances on some sites where developers will be able to delivery schemes for less than baseline £psf. This approach</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>h) In respect of the scenario suggestion rises in revenues, we note the irony of increases in house prices making affordable housing more deliverable. The position appears to ignore the fact that the gap in income and affordability would widen. Consider that, in the light of evidence from Savills that a 25% increase in revenue is unlikely to be achieved until 2016 (probably 2018), provision at 40% of market housing would not be achievable for 27% of dwellings (all other things being equal) at that point.</p> <p>i) Under Scenario 5, at the height of the market, even though S106 is under-estimated in the baseline, only 57% of dwellings met the Council's affordable housing Policy (70/30 tenure split) or 62% (30/70 tenure split) according to the tables on pages 37 and 38. A 40% policy does not work even in height of the market circumstances.</p> <p>j) From the baseline of 2009 (50/50 split) if an optimistic viewpoint is taken: 1. Assuming S 106 costs at £5000, increase in build costs of 25%, increase in revenues of 25%, increase in revenues of 25%, as a proxy for the future then sites are at green 50%. This is less than the 61% position at the height of the market when it is alleged the policy worked. 2. for a 30/70 split (the most favourable) green sites are 52% compared to 62% at the height of the market. In short the policy does not work for the next 7 or 8 years at least.</p>	<p>follows the best practice guidelines and is aimed at testing options across the life of the Core Strategy</p> <p>h) The objective of the study is to test a range of circumstances. However the longer term future situation can only be relatively theoretical and speculative. Remodelling using more contemporary assumptions for all variables will be necessary to assess their interaction on affordability in a future context. It should also be noted that the 40% in Policy CP5 is an overall target for the Council and not a requirement for developers.</p> <p>i) The figures in the scenario are well in excess of the 50% green + amber deliverability criterion proposed.</p> <p>j) It should be noted that the 40% in Policy CP5 is an overall target for the Council and not a requirement for developers. 40% falls well short of the requirement for affordable housing as assessed in the SHMA but in the current economic situation will be a challenging percentage with funding from government sources likely to be reduced. The policy is intended to be accompanied by an SPD containing a percentage requirement from developers which reflects current affordability levels and is reviewable as and</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>k) The conclusion that anywhere between 0- 50 % affordable is viable dependent on the assumptions is not a basis for a sound development plan policy.</p> <p>l) Note that there is nothing in the appraisal that sets out what the resultant land value is or establishes if that value is sufficient to encourage an owner to sell.</p>	<p>when significant changes to affordability occur.</p> <p>k) It is accepted that the figures only demonstrate the potential range of viability depending upon economic conditions. It is this variability which has led the Council to develop a policy which contains the ability to be flexible, through accompanying SPD(s).</p> <p>l) The minimum land value was set at 25% of GDV revised upwards by 5% following initial consultation. 25% of GDV was determined through stakeholder consultation to be the minimum requirement to enable a land owner to release their land for residential development compared to an alternative use</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>It is considered that the above comments do not detract from the DTZ report as a transparent statement of affordable housing viability and the manner in which it could be translated by the Council into policy.</p> <p>The respondents criticise the inclusion of 40% within the policy but should recognise that this is an overall target for the Council and not a once and for all requirement from developers which ignores viability levels. The EVA only forms part of the evidence base and the balance</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

					<p>between needs and delivery has been carefully considered in forming the target</p> <p>It is proposed that, besides minor changes to improve clarity, a further paragraph be added explaining the philosophy which will govern the setting of affordable housing requirement at reviews. It is hoped that the publication of the accompanying SPD at the time of submission will demonstrate the Council's willingness to be flexible in accommodating potentially changing levels of viability.</p>
.DCS/159	The Diocese of York	CP5	No	<p>The first part of Policy CP5 seeks to achieve a target of 40% affordable housing, which is considered too onerous and unachievable, particularly in the current market. As land values are currently depressed it is important that housing policies are flexible enough to deal with changes in market conditions to ensure the optimum level of housing is delivered across the plan period. In addition, meeting the Code for Sustainable Homes will place further costs on developers. Whilst accepting that some of the policy wording allows for flexibility, it is considered the policy could make it clearer that a lower proportion and/or different tenure mix of affordable housing may be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the development would otherwise be financially viable. There should be room for negotiation on both the extent and method of providing affordable housing which should be dependant on the constraints of a site. It is important that site constraints are considered against factors such as affordable housing requirements to protect the viability of the scheme. It is requested that the provisions of Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3) with regard to possible off-site provision are incorporated into the policy.</p>	<p>The respondent appears not have appreciated that the 40% is an overall target for affordable housing from all sources not only via private sector construction (See Paragraph 5.80 and 5.81). It is therefore a target for the Council as a whole and is not a 'one-off' requirement for private sector contributions. The Strategy indicates in Paragraph 5.84 and Part B of CP5 that a flexible approach will be taken to the requirement to provide affordable housing on normal market development sites. The recent downturn in market activity makes it clear that the viability of providing affordable housing extremely variable. The Strategy aims to recognise and provide an approach which allows a regular review of the target requirement from developers. The approach</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

					<p>attempts to compromise between providing a degree of certainty for developers whilst acknowledging the potential variability of viability owing to market conditions.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>It is considered that the policy does meet many of the above concerns of the respondent. However, it is evident that there is a need to set out what is a different approach to most plans hitherto as clearly as possible in order to avoid misinterpretation. It is considered that the approach will become much more apparent at submission stage when it is accompanied by Supplementary Guidance outlining the initial requirement, as this is likely to be considerably different to the overall 40% in the policy. The differing approach is in direct response to the significant variations in economic viability which have occurred recently.</p> <p>It is proposed that, besides minor changes to improve clarity, a further paragraph be added explaining the philosophy which will govern the setting of affordable housing requirement at reviews.</p>
DCS/163	Redrow Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd	CP5	No	<p>1. Consider the target percentage of 40% affordable housing from qualifying schemes is unrealistic in current market conditions and this is supported by the Council's Affordable Housing Viability Study. The current low levels of viability as evidenced in the Economic Viability Study are likely to remain in the short to medium term. On this basis there is a clear</p>	<p>1. It is considered the respondents have misinterpreted the definition of the 40% figure included in the policy. See response to DCS/159.</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>need for a realistic and flexible policy to reflect changing market conditions and review the affordable requirement regularly over the period covered by the Strategy. Recommend that the target is lowered to 30% as more reflective of the current market. The target should be expressed as a maximum and be balanced by overall scheme viability and the level of other developer contributions. As worded, having regard to the Viability Study, negotiation would be required on viability issues on 96% of housing sites coming forward.</p> <p>2. Considers the approach to thresholds fails to reflect the role of Selby in meeting the affordable housing needs of its settlement and rural hinterland. Thresholds should therefore be set consistently between the two settlement types.</p>	<p>The respondents consider the target should be expressed as a maximum and be balanced by overall scheme viability and the level of other developer contributions.</p> <p>Conclusion As per DCS/159 above.</p> <p>2. The threshold set for Selby is based on the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selby is the Principal town and the area where most encouragement is given in the Strategy to the provision of market housing. Selby will generally have larger development sites which will generate higher absolute numbers of affordable housing. <p>There is however, an alternative argument that the absolute need for affordable housing, as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, is such as to justify not missing opportunities to provide affordable housing wherever it can be achieved within the District. A lower threshold would then therefore be appropriate.</p> <p>Conclusion Other respondents (particularly DCS 462 below) have also raised issues on thresholds. Further</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

					evidence is to be collected on lower threshold and viability and this will inform the need to change the policy(See DCS 462 for more detail)
DCS/196	Mr Stephenson	CP5	Partly	The policy adopts a prescriptive approach which is very specific in regards to the level and tenure mix of affordable housing on sites, which does not recognise the need to permit a degree of flexibility as local needs can often change over time. In this respect, the currently drafted Core Strategy is unsound. In order to make it sound, the policy should be amended to reflect the evidence base and should be flexible and incorporate flexibility taking account the viability of sites.	It is considered that the policy adopted is as prescriptive as suggested by the respondent. The affordable housing percentage requirement will be reviewed regularly to reflect changing viability levels and Part D of the policy indicates that the tenure split and type of housing being sought will be based on the Council's latest evidence on local need in that area. Conclusion No change in the policy on these grounds but greater clarification included.
DCS/205	Olympia Park	CP5	Partly	The policy adopts a prescriptive approach which is very specific in regards to the level and tenure mix of affordable housing on sites, which does not recognise the need to permit a degree of flexibility as local needs can often change over time. In this respect, the currently drafted Core Strategy is unsound and not consistent with the evidence base. In order to make it sound, the policy should be amended to reflect the evidence base and should not be fixed and incorporate flexibility taking account the viability of sites.	It is considered that the policy does reflect the evidence base and is flexible. (See response DCS/159) Conclusion No change in the policy on these grounds.
DCS/215	Jennifer Hubbard	CP5	Partly	The respondent has three broad but inter-related observations on the affordable housing issue. 1. The first is self-evident that unless there is a significant increase in total housing provision within the District, only a small proportion of the identified affordable housing needs will be met.	1. It is accepted that if more houses were built it would also increase the amount of associated affordable housing. However the market for new housing within Selby has historically been relatively limited, although there was a particularly high level of

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>2. Unless there is to be increases in housing provision outside Selby and the Local Service Centres, no significant affordable housing will be provided in the rural areas other than on exception sites. This is incompatible with the objective of meeting affordable housing requirements as close as possible to where they arise.</p>	<p>completions between 2005 and 2008, largely, but not entirely, because of the spate of smaller apartment completions in Selby in that period. The Council has maintained a healthy Five-Year Land Supply in recent years and will not be unduly restrictive on the number of houses constructed. However, it is unlikely that market levels will result in significant increases in house building beyond those forecast, certainly in the shorter term.</p> <p>2. The objective of meeting affordable housing as close to where it arises as possible has to be tempered by compatibility with other sustainability objectives. Although some potential occupants of affordable housing may wish to remain within their local village, many may also wish to live in locations better served by local facilities, services and public transport. Occupants of affordable housing may often be those most likely to depend upon local services and appreciate the lower costs and easier access associated with living in a larger more sustainable settlement. Other than 'exception sites' the provision of affordable housing generally relies on the provision of an even larger quantity of market housing.</p> <p>On balance it is considered that the benefits of providing affordable housing at an individual</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>3. The proposed 40/60% affordable general market split and the thresholds for the provision of affordable housing at Policy CP5 are likely to be a disincentive to development.</p> <p>4/5 The affordable housing policies should facilitate more innovative ways of providing affordable housing both within market housing developments and particularly on rural exception sites including, on the latter, the opportunity for cross-subsidy and to permit restrictions and limitations in affordable housing Section 106 agreements including tenure mixes to be varied over time, to reflect changing circumstances. There is appeal evidence to indicate that it is not always necessary to ensure affordability in perpetuity and government support for encouraging new means and new</p>	<p>village level are insufficient to warrant any relaxation of current policy for Secondary Villages and that it is preferable to focus development in rural areas on a smaller network of villages which have the capability of modest organic growth. It is considered that a more focussed, rather than a dispersed policy, will encourage more investment in services and, possibly employment within the rural areas in a more sustainable manner.</p> <p>3. The 40/60% split is an overall target which arises from evidence of need indicated by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. As the Draft Strategy states in Paragraph 5.89 it is open for developers to discuss the requirement on a site by site basis. It is accepted that it is inherent within a system which relies on market housing for its implementation that there will be occasions when there may be a need to compromise between meeting the needs and maintaining an incentive.</p> <p>4. See separate schedule (Policy CP1) – Control in Secondary Villages for decision on ‘exception sites’.</p> <p>5. Section 106 agreements. The Council is already operates a flexible policy in changing section 106 agreements to reflect changing circumstance</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				providers of affordable housing.	No change to the policy on these grounds
DCS/339	The Grimston Park Estate	CP5	Partly	Overall the policy provides a flexible and adaptive approach to affordable housing. However, we would suggest that the Council seeks a lower threshold of affordable housing across the District.	Further evidence is being obtained on threshold size and viability and this will inform whether thresholds in the policy should be amended
DCS/365	Mr & Mrs M Waddington	CP5	Yes	Support the proposal for a regular review of the economic viability considerations.	Noted
DCS/395	Mr Steve Cobb	CP5	Partly	Tadcaster's contribution to the District's housing needs could be met by developing the many empty properties in and around the town's centre owned by SSOB.	The respondents comments are noted. Although it is important to use existing properties as efficiently as possible there are limitations on the Council's ability to influence individual property owners operations and on what policies can be included in a Strategy of this nature which would effectively alter the situation. The requirement for affordable homes in Tadcaster is, in any event, significantly larger than that achievable from within existing properties.
DCS/462	D & J Poulter Buildings Contractors / Wrigley Property Development / Mr Geoff Lunn / Daniel Gath Homes / Penny England	CP5	No	<i>N.B For increased completeness , Points 1 have been added to the summary since the schedule was first submitted to Task and Finish Group in July.2010.</i> 1 Requests that the responses from within the development industry are given considerable weight as the issues of viability and deliverability are of paramount importance.	1.At the previous Further Options Stage responses from the development industry reserved their position because of the limitations of the evidence base at that time. Since then both the SHMA and EVA have been completed allowing the development industry to participate in their production through the respective Working Groups and to comment on the

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>2. Contends that amendments to affordable housing thresholds are not made on a sound evidence base. The Council's Economic Viability Study makes no reference to demonstrate at what threshold a sites size or yield needs to be viably deliver affordable housing. In order to test the thresholds, calculations need to be made based on the delivery of three houses in all Secondary Villages, the sites of five dwellings in Designated Service Villages and ten dwellings in Selby. Without these there is no evidence that affordable dwellings are capable of being delivered in such small yields of development. Study does not distinguish between sites in Selby, Designated Service Villages and Secondary Villages. Considers there is no evidence to explain why the Council consider that affordable housing is less viable in Selby where land values are significantly less than in some of the Designated Service villages. The approach should be to establish a viable threshold to apply a relevant proportion to, rather than varying thresholds dependant upon the area and the desirability to have affordable housing in that locality.</p>	<p>Draft Strategy in the light of this evidence. It is fair to say that most if not all the changes made post-consultation on the EVA were made as a result of comments from private developers.</p> <p><i>2. Threshold viability</i></p> <p>The EVA can only provide a representative sample of theoretical cases from which policy has to be interpreted. The study considered sites of 0.25 hectares which is approximately 10 dwellings depending upon the density, but it is accepted that it has not tested sites as low as 3 dwellings and providing greater robustness at the lower end of the range. The EVA was produced as a basis for, and in advance of policy formulation, and therefore their are unanticipated gaps in the evidence base.</p> <p>With regard to Selby, the report does indicate that residential land values are lower in Selby than in surrounding villages. Lower land values make the delivery of affordable housing less viable. However, ability to deliver affordable housing increases on larger sites as there are larger potential revenues.</p> <p>Finally the respondent suggests that thresholds should be more closely related to viability and the percentage being sought; pointing out that smaller sites are less</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>3. Due to the current economic climate, an up-to-date survey is required in order to demonstrate that the Council's objectives can be achieved through the proposed policies. Considers the flexible approach conflicts with the guidance in the DTZ report which states that 'any affordable housing target must have been tested'. Agree that 50% is a reasonable figure for the number of schemes which should be viable. The respondent discusses a number of the scenarios tested in the Economic Viability Study and concludes that a delivery figure of 40% for affordable housing should be reviewed.</p>	<p>viable than larger ones.</p> <p>This point is accepted. It is considered that the thresholds and percentage requirement should be chosen in close association. Further evidence is being obtained on viability at lower thresholds and this will inform whether the policy should be changed to include flexibility on thresholds and percentage requirements</p> <p>3. Accept that any figure put forward for the proportion of affordable housing should be based on reasonable evidence. However, there are resource and data implications which limit the degree of detail of such evidence. Any requirement figure has to cover a range of circumstances and is negotiable. The EVA can only provide a general guide to viability - not a definitively tested viability on every site.</p> <p>The respondent appears not have appreciated that the 40% is an overall target for affordable housing from all sources not only via private sector construction (See Paragraph 5.80 and 5.81). It is therefore a target for the Council as a whole and is not a 'one-off' requirement for private sector contributions. The Strategy indicates in Paragraph 5.84 and Part B of CP5 that a flexible approach will be taken to the requirement to provide affordable</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

					<p>housing on normal market development sites.</p> <p>The Council will keep the percentage requirement under review through a Supplementary Planning Guidance process in order to put forward a figure (or figures) which will have, on the basis of the best evidence available, an expected acceptance across a majority of developments and developers across the District for the near future. Thus reducing the need for expensive individual viability assessments to be undertaken. The Strategy leaves it open for developers to discuss the requirement if they consider individual circumstances make it an unreasonable burden.</p>
DCS/481	Connaught Consultancy Services LLP	CP5	Partly	The requirement for a split of 40% affordable housing needs the flexibility to take into account local need, site specific viability and other infrastructure needs. We therefore support section B of the policy which states that the target will be negotiated to reflect the housing market and viability.	Support Noted
DCS/489	Bartle & Son	CP5	Partly	The idea of commuted sums in areas outside Selby is supported but the extent of provision of affordable housing by corollary makes the remainder less affordable and care should be taken to reduce the ration to the absolute minimum and subject to very strict assessment on needs and subsequent adjustment.	Noted
DCS/514	Planning Aid	CP5	Partly	<p>Affordable housing was welcomed but only if it was regulated to stop first time buyers “making a killing” as had happened in some areas of Selby. The housing must be of a good mix with a % of bungalows and ground floor flats for disabled people.</p> <p>Fernbank Court, a development of 2 year old Independent Living units was put forward has a success and should be</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>used as a point of reference for Good Practice. The landlords are Hanover Housing.</p> <p>A Council planning officer is working on Affordable Housing and attempting to map suitable areas of need and the appropriate mix for those areas. The group wondered how this can be done when there are no statistics in the Strategy showing the numbers and impairments of disabled people throughout the Borough. This should be included in the Strategy.</p>	<p>The North Yorkshire Supporting People Strategy provides detailed information on the characteristics of current provision and future requirement for a range of specialist client requirement.</p>
DCS/133	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	CP5 (E)	No	<p>Object to Part E which suggests that on larger schemes the affordable housing provision will be reviewed at each phase. Considers this approach provides no definition of what constitutes a 'larger' scheme and would cause delays to completions. No policy basis for the operation of such a requirement has been included which appears at odds with affordable housing guidance.</p>	<p>The Council wants to ensure that there is an opportunity to re-negotiate affordable housing requirements on large sites which are built over a period of several years if the economic climate should change which could be reflected in the amount of affordable housing delivered. Policy wording to be revised</p>
CP6 - Rural Housing Exception Sites					
DCS/160	The Diocese of York	CP6	Partly	<p>More innovative approaches to housing delivery could be considered in rural villages to ensure that affordable housing is brought forward to meet local needs and also ensure that schemes are viable. Such approaches could include sites on the edge of villages which are predominantly affordable housing, but where an element of market housing can be accommodated to make the scheme viable.</p>	<p>If a more relaxed approach to housing provision in these villages was adopted which permitted some market housing to cross-subsidise affordable housing on exception site extensions to the village, it is possible that more schemes would be considered to be financially attractive and therefore more affordable housing provided locally to meet that village's need.</p> <p>The potential drawbacks of operating such a scheme are:</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In satisfying identified local needs, the net result would be more overall housing development within Secondary Villages in less sustainable locations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tight control would be required to ensure that the affordable housing element of schemes was not squeezed out. More rigid requirements would be needed than for normal affordable housing policy, to ensure the affordable element remained the priority provision. <p>On balance it is considered that the benefits of providing affordable housing at an individual village level are insufficient to warrant any relaxation of current policy for exception sites in Secondary Villages. It is considered that focussing affordable housing on the more sustainable settlements with easier access to public transport and local services may often be a preferable policy choice.</p>
DCS/216	Jennifer Hubbard	CP6	Partly	Policy CP6 will repeat the unsatisfactory form of development which resulted from the post-war period of Council housing which were typically built at the end of or beyond the existing built up areas of villages in an un-integrated manner. A more appropriate response would be to consider small scale changes to the Development Limits of villages where there is an identified affordable housing need to enable mixed affordable/market schemes to come forward within Development Limits. It is known that there are many owners of land adjacent to village Development Limits who would	As per DCS/160 above.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				consider cross-subsidy of mixed housing scheme but who are not prepared to make land available for 100% affordable housing schemes. This form of cross-subsidy approach (on a site outside a settlement Development Limit) has been adopted with success by Ryedale District Council).	
DCS/282	English Heritage	CP6	Partly	Support the requirements that any sites permitted under Policy CP6 should be sympathetic to the form and character of the village and its landscape setting and that the site would not have an adverse impact upon the historic environment.	Noted
DCS/340	The Grimston Park Estate	CP6	No	Opposed to the principles of Policy CP6. In order to create sustainable communities it is not appropriate to restrict housing sites to affordable tenures only. Rather the Council should identify appropriate sites within the smaller settlements capable of accommodating both market and affordable housing to ensure a balanced provision remains. Consider an element of market housing in such schemes would ensure that more affordable housing as there would be some is provided to provide some cross-subsidy.	Policy CP6 is operated in accordance with PPS3. As indicated in response to DCS/160 above it is not considered appropriate to relax the conditions within which this policy is operated.
DCS/377	Yorkshire Water	CP6	Yes	Supports Policy CP6 that ensures affordable rural exception sites still have to be in accordance with normal development management criteria.	Noted
DCS/426	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	CP6	Partly	Consideration should be given to the value of sites for biodiversity before exceptions are made for affordable housing in rural areas. Although sites protected for nature conservation will not be used for development, the areas surrounding these sites may also be important for movement between sites and therefore buffer zones should be established to protect these areas.	This request is noted and is accommodated through Policy CP15 of the Core Strategy and other Development Management Policies saved from the Selby District Local Plan.
DCS/463	D & J Poulter Buildings Contractors / Wrigley Property Development / Mr Geoff Lunn / Daniel	CP6	Partly	Consider it not necessary to restrict this policy to settlements of less than 3000 residents. There is a lack of affordable housing development throughout the District and the policy should be applied throughout the District. Given that the larger settlements are more sustainable, 100% affordable housing should be determined more possibly in these locations.	The policy restriction is in accordance with national guidance. It is not considered appropriate to apply an exceptions policy in the case of the three towns.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

	Gath Homes / Penny England				
CP7 - The Travelling Community					
DCS/84	Towton Action Group	CP7	Partly	Support this first step in enabling future sites to be allocated to ensure accommodation is provided in a strategic manner, rather than on an ad hoc basis. Support making allocation of sites through a future DPD, however of high importance to maintain timetabling so that the Core Strategy and Allocations documents are adopted prior to the expiry of temporary consents that exist for individual G&T sites in the district, due to a lack of available sites. Consider that provision should be made within the Core Strategy for an SPD to be devised to provide for any new provision and prevent any further unauthorised/temp sites should the timetable for the Allocations DPD slip. Suggest SPD is accommodated in the way that CP3 makes provision to bring forward residential sites. Regarding availability of pitches on new sites, need to ensure that the residents of temporary sites are given first preference on new allocated sites, as this will ensure that there is not pressure on temporary sites to be maintained on a more permanent basis. Recommend that the policy is extended to ensure that a phasing scheme for the occupancy of new sites is implemented to ensure that occupant of temporary sites are accommodated first. Policy supported, but also recommend that an assessment of any other allocations should be made and included where appropriate e.g. restriction of sites adj' to conservation areas and historic battlefields.	Comments to be noted. Gypsy, Traveller and Show people's accommodation sites to be dealt with through the future site allocations DPD. Consider it not to be feasible for the work programme to accommodate an additional SPD, as the full resources available to LDF production will be employed in making sure that the site allocations DPD is brought forward expediently. Comments relating to details suggested for inclusion within a future G&T policy noted.
DCS/181	Environment Agency	CP7	Partly	Suggest amendment to policy to ensure flood risk is considered an important constraint in site selection. Such development is classed as highly vulnerable in table D2 of PPS25, and should not be permitted in areas of flood zone 3, and only in zone 2 following an exception test. Recommend adding further point to policy - 'vi. The pitch must be located within Flood Zone 1 or where no reasonably available sites exist in Flood Zone 1, in Flood Zone 2, subject to application of	This would be an appropriate amendment in view of the safety issues raised.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				the Exception Test. No pitches shall be permitted in Flood Zone 3 because of the high sensitivity of caravans and other similar structures to flooding.'	
DCS/305	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	CP7	Partly	Agree with the general presumption against G&T sites in the green belt, as inappropriate development through Circ 1/06 and PPG2. However suggests policy reflects government guidance relating to allowing case of G&T pitches in green belt where very special circumstances might support development.	GOYH to be consulted further about the evidence supporting 'very special circumstances'. Policy to be updated to reflect most recent guidance.
DCS/403	South Milford Parish Council	CP7	Partly	Request a change to the second para of the policy to read 'New pitches....close to a settlement containing a primary school, other local services with sufficient capacity to accommodate growth and suitable local amenities such as shops etc.'	The Council regularly liaises with the Education department of NYCC, to ensure that planned growth can be catered for by school funding plans.
DCS/427	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	CP7	Partly	Support the policy protection of sites of acknowledged nature conservation importance when allocating G&T sites, but comment on the importance of areas surrounding sites for movement between nature conservation sites and suggest that buffer zones should be established to protect these areas.	Consult further with Yorkshire Wildlife Trust on how buffers may be evidenced.
DCS/500	North Yorkshire and York Primary Care Trust	CP7	General Comments	Comment that the PCT could arrange for advice to be provided on the needs of the travelling community.	For noting and following up.
DCS511	Showperson Focus Group	CP7	Partly	The following comments were made in relation to the draft policy:- Gypsy & Traveller rather than gypsy and traveller, There is currently no mention of Showmen within the policy and no consideration of their specific needs; "Close to a settlement" need to be more closely defined, eg in terms of a minimum acceptable distance; Site criteria of importance to Showmen include: -adequate land for living and equipment storage/maintenance; -adequate land for temporary pull-ons;	Typographical error to be rectified Further consideration required regarding suggested amendments to policy wording

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				-yard size minimum of 0.5-1 acre with maximum of ten yards per site.	
CP8 - Access to Services, Community Facilities, and Infrastructure					
DCS/428	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Para 5.111	Partly	GI hugely important for biodiversity as can allow connectivity between designated sites, buffer sites and improve circumstances for wildlife. An ecological input into new development and management of existing GI can have a positive impact on biodiversity. Management plans important to ensure that new GI on developments continues to be of value.	Comments noted.
DCS/389	Sport England	Para 5.120	No	Concerned that the sustainability appraisal has identified shortfalls of ROS in the district. Needs to be evidenced through a full PPG17 compliant study, rather than being SA led - though helpful to flag issues through the SA. Note on website that Retail, Commercial and Leisure Study covers commercial aspects of leisure provided by the private sector that can have sporting benefits - however does not address needs and opportunities as intended by PPG17. Aware of the 2006 ROS Strategy, but considers the approach used to be non-compliant with PPG17 and companion guide, as not based on local research of need and demand for playing pitch sports.	Comment to be noted. Consideration needs to be given to updating / undertaking a PPG17 study to inform future DPD's.
DCS/446	Natural England	Para 5.120	Partly	We note that at paragraph 5.1.20, in the text accompanying policy CP8, draws attention to the shortfall in recreational open space identified in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. One of Natural England's objectives is to increase the availability of green space and to this end we promote a series of standards to ensure that people, wherever they live, can relax, play, exercise or just escape in their neighbourhood green space. We would therefore like to see specific mention of Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards within the core policy, or subsequent DPD's, as these advocate that every home should be within 300m of accessible natural greenspace of at least two hectares (ha) which is equivalent in size to two football pitches. Each home should also have access to:	Subject to be addressed in an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which is being prepared to accompany the Core Strategy.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>> at least one accessible 20ha site within 2km</p> <p>> at least one accessible 100 ha site within 5km.</p> <p>Natural England would also wish to see key green infrastructure corridors displayed in a map within the Core Strategy (ideally within the key diagram).</p>	<p>Suggest adding reference to point 3 of CP15 and investigate the best way to display GI corridors on a map.</p>
DCS/138	Highways Agency	Para 5.122	Yes	<p>Support the inclusion of para 5.122 of highway works and public transport infrastructure and request to be involved in the development of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan - in line with circular 02/2007 ' ..the Agency will also provide guidance for the incorporation in the plan, on the scale and nature of improvements to the strategic road network and demand management measures that will be considered in order to facilitate development.'</p>	<p>The Highway agency will be consulted on the IDP</p>
DCS/515	Selby PSI Reference Group	CP8	Partly	<p>Generally the settlements on the main corridors provided good access for transport e.g. A19 route, however, there was not always the full range of services available and people still had to travel into Selby etc to access medical services etc.</p> <p>No new developments should be built without proper consultation and an agreement using S106 or similar. Developments over a certain size must have a full range of services available and private companies e.g. cinemas, restaurants. Also, leisure should be encouraged to go there. Where there were smaller new settlements, transport must be fully inclusive e.g. low floor, community bus services etc.</p> <p>Should housing be built first and then encourage people to live there or should employment be there first and housing built for the employees. The latter was felt very strongly to be the correct way, or otherwise the houses would purchased by people working in Leeds and York, and the Selby district would just become an even larger commuter belt, with no industry and little hope of attracting private companies to provide facilities, as the money would be spent elsewhere.</p>	<p>Comments to be noted.</p> <p>Noted. Relevant for Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Noted. The strategy aims for future development to be employment led.</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/482	Connaught Consultancy Services LLP	CP8	Agree	Support the policy, but the Council must ensure transparent and consistent approach to make the impacts of a development acceptable. Contributions should be determined on a site by site basis, taking into account local circumstances and viability.	Comments to be noted.
DCS/10	Ouse & Derwent Internal Drainage Board	CP8	General Comments	<p>As far as the Strategy is concerned the Boards prime interest is in the management of surface water discharges from development sites. There is no specific mention within the strategy of the management of surface water from any new development sites.</p> <p>Within the Strategy the principal town of Selby and the Local Service Centres of Sherburn in Elmet are not within the Boards area. A very small area of Tadcaster lies partly within the North Wharfe area.</p> <p>Designated Service Villages</p> <p>The following villages are within the Boards areas Barlby/Osgodby, Hemingbrough, North Duffield and Riccall. All of these villages have Board maintained watercourses adjacent to them which receive surface water discharges from the existing development. Additional surface water discharges from new development within these villages will have an impact on these watercourses. Also a number of the watercourses rely on a final pumped discharge to the River Ouse. These pumping stations are generally considered to be at capacity and cannot accept increased flows to them.</p> <p>It is therefore imperative that when sites are allocated for development within these locations the management of surface water discharge is given the necessary high priority. It is essential that appropriate schemes be designed such that additional strain is not placed on the existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Secondary Villages with Defined Development Limits</p> <p>There are a number of villages within this group, which are within the Boards area. The comments made above can generally be applied to these locations.</p>	<p>Management of surface water is considered to be part of the infrastructure that needs to be in place or provided in phase with development - as mentioned in the policy</p> <p>Comments to be noted.</p> <p>Comments relating to the capacity of surface water drains and pumping stations in certain settlements to be noted. Information to be fed into the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and future Allocations and Development Management DPD's</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/17	North Wharfe Internal Drainage Board	CP8	General Comments	<p>As far as the Strategy is concerned the Boards prime interest is in the management of surface water discharges from development sites. There is no specific mention within the strategy of the management of surface water from any new development sites.</p> <p>Within the Strategy the principal town of Selby and the Local Service Centres of Sherburn in Elmet are not within the Boards area. A very small area of Tadcaster lies partly within the North Wharfe area.</p> <p>Designated Service Villages</p> <p>The following villages are within the Boards areas Barlby/Osgodby, Hemingbrough, North Duffield and Riccall. All of these villages have Board maintained watercourses adjacent to them which receive surface water discharges from the existing development. Additional surface water discharges from new development within these villages will have an impact on these watercourses. Also a number of the watercourses rely on a final pumped discharge to the River Ouse. These pumping stations are generally considered to be at capacity and cannot accept increased flows to them.</p> <p>It is therefore imperative that when sites are allocated for development within these locations the management of surface water discharge is given the necessary high priority. It is essential that appropriate schemes be designed such that additional strain is not placed on the existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Secondary Villages with Defined Development Limits</p> <p>There are a number of villages within this group, which are within the Boards area. The comments made above can generally be applied to these locations.</p>	<p>Management of surface water is considered to be part of the infrastructure that needs to be in place or provided in phase with development - as mentioned in the policy</p> <p>Comments to be noted.</p> <p>Comments relating to the capacity of surface water drains and pumping stations in certain settlements to be noted. Information to be fed into the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and future Allocations and Development Management DPD's.</p>
DCS/44	Mr Barry Hague	CP8	No	<p>Disappointed that services to support major development have only passing mention made to them in the document. People very concerned about adequate provision of schools, healthcare, older people's services and employment opportunities etc - in relation to new development and</p>	<p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the Core Strategy. Future Allocations and Development Management DPD's will also address this</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				population growth.	subject.
DCS/140	Highways Agency	CP8	Partly	Policy needs to identify any infrastructure critical to the delivery of the Core Strategy and how necessary improvements will be funded - otherwise these are merely aspirations and the Core Strategy would be found unsound if realistic funding sources for critical delivery are not identified.	An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will accompany the Core Strategy.
DCS/153	Sherburn in Elmet Parish Council	CP8	Partly	Prior to any building attention should be paid to renewing infrastructure, particularly sewers and mains drainage.	An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will accompany the Core Strategy. While this will deal with the infrastructure necessary to support new development the Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers through the IDP and the LSP to upgrade existing infrastructure where appropriate.
DCS/182	Environment Agency	CP8	Partly	Consider that the policy wording does not actively promote Green Infrastructure. Objective 14 is positive, but does not translate into aspirations and local specificity in the policy. Suggest a more positive re-wording 'In all circumstances opportunities to protect, enhance and better join up existing Green Infrastructure, as well as creating new Green Infrastructure will be strongly encouraged, in addition to the incorporation of other measures to mitigate or minimise the consequences of development'. Encourage drawing on GI evidence base to identify GI in most need of strong policy protection and the best opportunities to improve and extend GI where proactive intervention would be best pursued - to be translated into this or other policies.	Consider inclusion of suggested wording and prepare enhanced GI wording.
DCS/197	Mr Stephenson	CP8	Partly	Object to policy wording that Infrastructure and community facilities 'must' be in place in phase with development, as too onerous. Policy should permit a degree of flexibility in the contribution and commitment to infrastructure being in place, as this could in some cases affect the viability of a scheme. Consider Core Strategy to be unsound as drafted and suggest	The policy has built-in flexibility to enable the provision of infrastructure 'in phase with the development', which allows for certain elements to be provided part way through a development.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				changes to make it sound - 'should' to replace 'must' and wording amended to reflect evidence base and flexibility to take account of development viability.	In view of the importance of ensuring adequate infrastructure provision it is not considered that the policy should be weakened. The viability of schemes can be assessed on a case by case basis as part of the application process.
DCS/201	The Theatres Trust	CP8	Partly	<p>Suggest the policy should include enhancement and protection of established local cultural facilities, loss of a facility will be resisted unless demonstrated that it is no longer needed or that the service provided by the facility can be served in another location or manner that is equally accessible to the community.</p> <p>Also suggest description of 'community facility' in the glossary as 'community facilities provide for health, welfare, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community.'</p> <p>Note no policy on Developer Contributions, although mentioned at various points in the document. Suggest inclusion of policy on a general approach to the subject with reference to strategic sites and clear links to these details set out in the DCSPD.</p>	<p>The suggested level of detail is inappropriate to a Core Strategy. Issue to be considered at Development Management DPD production.</p> <p>Inclusion of the suggested glossary definition would be a helpful addition.</p> <p>The suggested level of detail is inappropriate for the Core Strategy. A review of the DCSPD may accompany the production of a Development Management DPD.</p>
DCS/206	Olympia Park	CP8	Partly	Object to policy wording that Infrastructure and community facilities 'must' be in place in phase with development, as too onerous. Policy should permit a degree of flexibility in the contribution and commitment to infrastructure being in place, as this could in some cases affect the viability of a scheme. Consider Core Strategy to be unsound as drafted and suggest changes to make it sound - 'should' to replace 'must' and wording amended to reflect evidence base and flexibility to take account of development viability.	The policy has built-in flexibility to enable the provision of infrastructure 'in phase with the development', which allows for certain elements to be provided part way through a development. In view of the importance of ensuring adequate infrastructure provision it is not considered that the policy should be weakened. The viability of schemes can be assessed on a case by case basis as part of the application process.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/235	Barlby Parish Council	CP8	Partly	Important for villages such as Barlby & Osgodby to be able to access and target S106 funds. The document should state that 'S106 monies remain available for projects within villages where development takes place. Commuted sums from developments below 5 dwellings will also be available for projects within villages as well as to provide affordable housing'.	This detailed issue is more appropriately addressed through development management policy or a review of the Developer Contributions SPD.
DCS/283	English Heritage	CP8	Partly	Support requirements for Green Infrastructure, but Policy should also include reference to providing improvements to existing areas of GI where it is not possible to add on-site or where it would be more appropriate to enhance an area of existing open space in the area. This would allow for flexibility instead of automatically requiring on-site ROS. Particularly relevant where existing open space is likely to be regularly used by the occupants of a new development. Suggest 6th line of policy to read 'provision of new or improvements to existing green infrastructure.'	The suggested additional wording would strengthen the policy.
DCS/306	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	CP8	Partly	Section needs firming up in the period up to publication, as currently not clear if sufficient background work on Infrastructure Delivery to support the Core Strategy. Essential that the key infrastructure elements upon which the strategy depends are in the document itself. e.g. - transport infrastructure and its capacity and any flood alleviation works are likely to have a major impact and will need to be an integral part of the spatial strategy. Also, if it intends that development will fund the infrastructure, then viability evidence will be needed to support this.	Comments to be noted. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the Core Strategy.
DCS/341	The Grimston Park Estate	CP8	Partly	Supports the principle of the policy and national guidance that new development should not be required to address existing deficiencies in the network. Evidence base does not make clear where there are weaknesses and gaps in current Infrastructure provision - except Open Space. Appropriate for the Council to set out its position on the Community Infrastructure Levy, given recent legislation LA's required to adopt the CIL process within 4 years.	An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan could also consider the Council's position on CIL.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/368	Mr & Mrs M Waddington	CP8	Partly	Infrastructure and community facilities to be delivered for Selby through a separate IDP. With uncertainty surrounding the Area Action Plan it would be appropriate for the Council to clarify this position.	An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared to accompany the Core Strategy.
DCS/388	Sport England	CP8	Yes	Support the references to developer contributions to open space and note that it will be delivered through a separate Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Approach supported in principle, however more detail will be required through later documents to reflect a robust evidence base to seek such contributions.	Support noted.
DCS/445	Natural England	CP8	Yes	Encourage the provision of GI as an integral part of creating sustainable communities. Networks of multi-functional GI providing a wide range of benefits should be identified through regional and local plans and designed into all new major development and regeneration schemes from the outset. Wish to see an overall net gain in GI and development proposals which improve the quality and quantity of accessible green space, where appropriate. Strongly support the policy and the recognition it gives to the GI network in the District and the consideration of Natural England document (GI Guidance 2009) in its preparation. Agree with the findings of the SA that GI can mitigate consequences of development, provide ROS and alternative transport routes for non-car users.	Support noted.
DCS/464	D & J Poulter Buildings Contractors / Wrigley Property Development / Mr Geoff Lunn / Daniel Gath Homes / Penny England	CP8	Yes	Policy fundamental and supported as meets the aims and objectives of national planning policy.	Support noted.
DCS/490	Bartle & Son	CP8	Partly	Policy should not be so explicitly worded with substitution of 'must' with 'expected' and which should look interalia at	The policy has built-in flexibility to enable the provision of

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				schemes economics in each case and the judgement of viability as a consequence.	infrastructure 'in phase with the development', which allows for certain elements to be provided part way through a development. In view of the importance of ensuring adequate infrastructure provision it is not considered that the policy should be weakened. The viability of schemes can be assessed on a case by case basis as part of the application process.
DCS/19	The Woodland Trust	CP8	Partly	<p>As discussed in our submission at the Further Options stage, we welcome the commitment to ensuring that residents have access to green infrastructure in new development. However, we would like to see the Council adopt access standards to ensure that this happens. These could include the Natural England Access to Greenspace (ANGST+) standard and the Woodland Trust's Access to Woodland Standard, which states that:</p> <p>No person should live more than 500metres from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size and</p> <p>There should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20ha within 4km of people's homes</p> <p>In our previous submission, we supplied statistics on how Selby and neighbouring authorities perform against the Woodland Access Standard and we can supply these figures again on request. They show that people in Selby have significantly less access to smaller woods close to their homes than do people in Harrogate or York and that there is a need for significant new woodland creation in Selby to make up the shortfall.</p> <p>Our Woodland Access Standard is used as an indicator in the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Spatial Strategy, so it would be appropriate to include it in your core strategy or in one of the supporting LDF documents.</p>	Further investigation of the points raised is required. This may be more appropriately addressed in conjunction with the IDP, a DCSPD review and / or future development management DPD.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

--	--	--	--	--	--

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

Section 6 – Promoting Economic Prosperity					
ID No.	Name/ Company/ Organisation	Paragraph/ Policy	Agree/ Disagree	Issues Raised	Decision
DCS/265	Drax Power Ltd	Whole Section	Partly	Amend para 6.4 (see DCS/248) and incorporate additional reference to highlight the need for investment in energy infrastructure in line with PPS4 and Policies E1 and E3 in RSS as a prominent contributor to economic prosperity.	References to PPS4 and RSS to be reviewed in the light of new PPS4 and the proposed cancellation of RSS. Additional references to the energy sector and energy infrastructure could be incorporated in the Core Strategy to help illustrate the planned modernisation and expansion of the local economy.
DCS/344	The Grimston Park Estate	Whole Section	Partly	Would like to see the Core Strategy supporting the provision of infrastructure such as broadband which would be complimentary to supporting rural diversification as well as contributing to reducing the need to travel.	This would help demonstrate the importance of broadband to the rural economy but it should be noted that the Core Strategy cannot directly influence the provision of broadband. Also an issue for the Infrastructure Delivery Plan
DCS/355	Peel Environmental Ltd	Whole Section	Partly	Considers that proposals for Gascoigne Wood should not prevent re-use of the site as a whole for employment purposes, and suggests the following wording "The Council also supports the redevelopment of the former Gascoigne Wood mine including the re-use of buildings where appropriate provided this is directly linked to the use of the existing rail infrastructure that exists at the site".	Gascoigne Wood is not an appropriate location for business park type development, and the current consent (granted on appeal) specifically restricts development to the re-use of existing buildings.
DCS/396	Mr Steve Cobb	Whole Section	General Comments	Considers that the economic prosperity of the District would benefit from improvement of the A64, A162 junction and connection with the A1.	The Highways Agency has no current plans to upgrade this junction, which may be achieved through contributions from developers if sufficient development takes place in

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

					Tadcaster.
DCS/404	South Milford Parish Council	Link Road	Omissions	Although the Parish Council supports job creation in the local area it is concerned that further employment growth will add to already high road traffic volumes and suggests that a link road from the northern end of Sherburn bypass towards the A1/M1 should be a strategic objective.	This issue will be referred to NYCC as Highway Authority. Also a relevant matter for the IDP.
DCS/354	Peel Environmental Ltd	Proposed Specific Site Use	Omissions	Suggests reference should be made to the site being appropriate for renewable energy uses, utilising existing infrastructure and connection to the nearby 50MW electricity line.	This would be an appropriate reference.
DCS/493	South Milford Parish Council	Railway Station	Omissions	Suggests that the impact of a new East Leeds Rail Station (at Micklefield) on villages and parishes that border Leeds should be properly investigated. For example there are concerns that if the new station leads to rail electrification, car parking facilities at other stations would not be able to accommodate additional demand.	There is no evidence that this will be the case. A matter for consideration as part of the IDP.
CP9 - Scale and Distribution of Employment Growth					
DCS/342	The Grimston Park Estate	Paras 6.1 - 6.23	No	Concerned that no reference is made to the various drafts of PPS4 during the preparation of the Core Strategy. Considers this is a significant procedural failure and that the Strategy should be based on new PPS4.	Acknowledged that the Strategy should be consistent with the most up to date guidance. Not considered necessary to explain the history in the next 'submission' version of the Strategy which guidance indicates should be more succinct document.
DCS/247	Drax Power Ltd	Para 6.3	General Comments	Insert additional reference to the energy sector, and to the need to reinvigorate and develop the Districts economy.	Reference to restructuring and modernising the economy is made in para 6.5 and the range of employment activities in tended to be catered for in the future could usefully be expanded to include reference to supporting the energy sector . Para 6.5 in any case needs to be reviewed within

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

					the context of the proposed abolition of RSS .
DCS/248	Drax Power Ltd	Para 6.4	General Comments	Replace text with reference to new PPS4 and revised requirements set out in PPS4 regarding the approach to sustainable economic growth.	For action.
DCS/309	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	Para 6.4 (PPG4 - PPS4)	Partly	Advise that references to PPG4 should be replaced with new PPS4.	For action.
DCS/249	Drax Power Ltd	Para 6.5	General Comments	Insert additional reference to 'energy development'.	See response to DCS/247 above.
DCS/250	Drax Power Ltd	Para 6.21	General Comments	Incorporate additional reference to supporting the utilisation of energy sites (such as Drax and Eggborough) for infrastructure purposes related to energy/rail connection.	This would demonstrate continued support for the energy industry which is a significant employer in the District. However, care is needed to ensure this would not encourage non energy related activity.
DCS/393	Coal Authority	Para 6.22	Partly	Considers that appropriate remediation measures may be required to facilitate beneficial use of the mine sites and developers should be made aware of this. Suggests either adding the following wording at the end of para 6.27 or that this issue is addressed through a future allocations DPD "It will be necessary for any re-use of these former mine sites to consider and remediate any mining legacy issues that may be present to ensure that no public safety issues arise from their beneficial re-use." .	This is a site specific issue which is more appropriately addressed through the planning application process or through site specific DPD's if necessary. A brief comment alerting developers to the need for remediation of former mine sites could usefully be incorporated in para 6.22.
DCS/14	Mr David Lewis	CP9 Para 6.23	Yes	Support the promotion of existing rail facilities at Gascoigne Wood.	Noted.
DCS/2	Coal Authority	CP9	Yes	Supports the recognition of the contribution that the re-use of former mine sites can make to economic prosperity.	For noting.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/55	Peel Environmental Ltd	CP9	Yes	Supports the development of activities linked to the existing rail infrastructure at Gascoigne Wood in order to revitalise the local economy.	For noting
DCS/141	Highways Agency	CP9	Partly	Supports the approach to reduce out commuting. Request additional information on split of land use types (B1, B2, B8 etc) proposed to enable different trip patterns and the impact on the SRN to be modelled, particularly in relation to the A19 corridor.	Information supplied and awaiting response
DCS/154	Hambleton Parish Council	CP9	Partly	Concerned that potential employment land identified on major routes/Selby bypass should not result in bottlenecks at roundabout junctions. Also do not consider that additional logistics/storage activities can be attracted within the Core Strategy timescale.	No concerns have been raised by NYCC highways and the traffic modelling of the impacts of potential strategic employment development sites has demonstrated spare capacity on the bypass roundabout junctions. Highways Agency modelling is also relevant to this issue (see DCS/141)
DCS/164	Redrow Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd	CP9	No	Consider that the proposed approach at Sherburn of renewal and intensification, does not reflect the status of the town, and that an additional employment allocation should be identified at Sherburn in Elmet eg an extension to Sherburn Enterprise Park, in view of flood risk constraints in Selby. This would be in line with the 2007 Employment Land Study which identifies the Sherburn in Elmet /A1(M) / A63 corridor as a complimentary location to Selby, in line with the Core Strategy objective of reducing outward migration.	Additional allocations at Sherburn are not supported by the 2007 ELS. However this needs to be reviewed within the context of the 2010 ELS update, the proposed cancellation of RSS and new Allocations DPD.
DCS/231	Yorkshire Forward	CP9	Partly	<p>1. Any de-allocations or change of use that reduce the supply of employment land should be compensated for through new sites for both new and expanding businesses, particularly in growth sectors such as renewable energy/technology and science.</p> <p>2. Supports the approach to re-use Gascoigne Wood but would like to see Gascoigne Wood identified as a key strategic</p>	<p>1. This is a matter to be addressed through future site specific DPD's.</p> <p>2/3 Gascoigne Wood and Burn airfield have previously been rejected as less sustainable</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>employment site.</p> <p>3. Also promoting Burn Airfield as a key strategic employment site (in addition to Olympia Park) because it is ideally suited and located for inward regional investment.</p> <p>4. Supports Olympia Park as a potential science park to diversify the local economy in line with RSS Policy YH1B (supporting the benefits of York's economic success).</p>	<p>options and there is no evidence to support the identification of more than one strategic site - may need reviewing within the context of the 2010 ELS update and the proposed cancellation of RSS.</p> <p>4. For noting</p>
DCS/266	Drax Power Ltd	CP9	Partly	Amend CP9 to make it clear that Drax is an important site for economic growth.	It is not accepted that Drax is an economic growth site.
DCS/217	Jennifer Hubbard	CP9	Partly	The aspiration to provide a range and choice of employment opportunities across the District is not reflected in policies which make no provision for rural areas. Over provision in Selby is unsuitable. There should be a more flexible approach outside development limits to meet locally generated demand. (See also DCS/218).	May be appropriate to refer to the identification of rural employment sites through future site specific DPD's. This issue in any case will need to be reviewed within the context of the proposed cancellation of RSS.
DCS/310	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	CP9	Partly	Suggests that the policy may need review to ensure compliance with new PPS4 eg B1 offices should be located in town centres if sites are available. Also advise that the Core Strategy should not repeat PPS4 which is the first new style PPS which includes policies which can be applied directly in decision making.	For action.
DCS/366	Mr & Mrs M Waddington	CP9	Yes	Support measures to improve and enhance the viability of Selby as the commercial focus of the District.	For noting.
DCS/343	The Grimston Park Estate	CP9	Partly	Supports CP9 as an aspirational approach to economic development but question the merits of policies aimed at curbing outcommuting to York and Leeds eg how has the success of the previous SDLP been monitored in this respect and are there any measures to correlate employment growth with reduced outward migration. (Links with DCS/324).	Comments to be taken into account in reviewing indicators included in the AMR.
DCS/410	Samuel	CP9	Partly	Supports the re-use of buildings at Gascoigne Wood provided	Para 6.22 and CP9 (ix) are not

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

	Smith Old Brewery			this is linked to rail infrastructure. Object to Policy CP9 (viii) which suggests the Council would accept wider development of the site not linked to re-use of any building. Object to bullet point (viii) of CP9 which does not reflect the wording of para 6.21 nor the Secretary of States decision in relation to planning application 2005/0673/FUL for the retention and re-use of buildings. Consider the wording of (ix) should also be changed to reflect para 6.22 which makes a distinction between former mine sites at Whitemoor and Riccall which already have planning permission and Stillingfleet and Wistow which have had refusals and are relatively unsustainable.	inconsistent and read together give a clear sheen on the Councils intentions. Gascogine Wood has previously been discounted as a strategic development site and the point about restricting future activity to re-use of buildings is accepted.
DCS/465	D & J Poulter Buildings Contractors / Wrigley Property Development / Mr Geoff Lunn / Daniel Gath Homes / Penny England	CP9	Yes	Supports CP9 which accords with PPS6 and PPS7.	For noting.
DCS/491	Bartle & Son	CP9	Partly	Comments on the Policy criteria as follows: (i) flood risk should be highlighted. (iii) should include for encouraging any business opportunity in Tadcaster; (iv) is self -defeating with intensification generally constraining vehicular access and service provision; (v), (vi) and (vii) supported; (ix) requires adjustment so that re-use is not supported with these sites generally unsustainable. Also considers specific provision should be made for more flexible medium scale development at Sherburn.	i) Flood risk is highlighted throughout the Core Strategy and specific reference in the policy is not necessary; iii) Incorporate reference to encouraging economic growth particularly high value knowledge based etc. iv) A balance is required between maximising the efficient use of land in line with national policy and avoiding development management problems. No change required. (v) (vi) and (vii) Noted

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

					(ix) Further explanation could be provided in the test to emphasise the low key nature of acceptable proposals.
DCS/483	Connaught Consultancy Services LLP	CP9	Partly	Supports the development and revitalisation of the economy. Consider that reference should also be made to ongoing support for economic growth at Sherburn to build on the success of recent years to assist in reducing out commuting. Policy should support high value business development to enhance it as a place for business and support its growth as a sustainable settlement.	Additional allocations at Sherburn are not supported by the 2007 ELS. However this needs to be reviewed within the context of the 2010 ELS update and the proposed cancellation of RSS.
DCS/207	Olympia Park	CP9 - Olympia Park	Partly	Olympia Park landowners support the approach to identifying an additional 45 ha of employment land as part of a mixed strategic housing/employment expansion to the east of Selby. However the Core Strategy should justify the identification of this strategic site and refer to this urban expansion site because it is widely recognised.	Additional information concerning the selection of the strategic employment site is provided in a separate background paper.
DCS/106	Jas Bowman and Sons Ltd	CP9 (v)	No	Objects to CP9(v) (safeguarding of existing and allocated employment sites). Consider that the Core Strategy should allow for re-use of employment sites to alternative uses (including housing) where these are located in inappropriate locations particularly in medium sized settlements and residential areas such as Eggborough/ Whitley with negative effects/local amenity issues. New employment growth particularly office development should be directed to Selby, Sherburn and Tadcaster where there are transport and accessibility advantages in line with national policy, the 2007 Employment Land Study and RSS Policy YH5.	There is an inherent inconsistency in the Core Strategy which promotes both the retention of employment land and the re-use of previously developed sites. This could be overcome by identifying specific employment sites considered appropriate for safeguarding through future DPD's and amending the Core Strategy accordingly.
DCS/251	Drax Power Ltd	CP9 (viii)	Partly	Incorporate additional reference to supporting activities directly linked to rail infrastructure at power stations.	Unqualified support for business activity linked to rail infrastructure, could encourage a range of inappropriate economic activities.
DCS/77	UK Coal	CP9 - viii and	Partly	Supports CP9(viii) insofar as it supports the development of economic activities at Gascoigne Wood Business Park which	CP9(viii) Comments noted.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

		ix		<p>is a strategically important site, with opportunities for utilising existing rail infrastructure and connecting to the national grid. Suggests there is interest from waste and recycling operators, and that there are opportunities for generating low carbon and renewable energy.</p> <p>Supports CP9 (ix) but considers the current wording is not sufficiently flexible to enable accommodation of a range of employment opportunities in line with national guidance eg Policy EC6 of PPS4 (conversion and re-use of buildings in the countryside).</p>	<p>Do not accept the point about CP9(ix) in view of the scale of the premises and the scope for creating unsustainable travel patterns if future activity is not restricted to low key issues with relatively small traffic generation.</p>
CP10 - Rural Diversification					
DCS/312	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	Para 6.26	Partly	Advise that references to PPG4 should be replaced with new PPS4.	For action
DCS/29	Roderic Parker	CP10	Yes	Considers the policy is weak with respect to encouraging tourism, and fails to exploit the links with major tourist centres in Leeds and York. Suggests specific support should be given for small scale tourism developments, such as local bed and breakfast establishments and exploitation of Towton battlefield site. Regards the use of former mining sites for tourism as laughable.	Core Strategy policies will be complimented by extant SDLP development control policies in the short term and by development management DPD policies in the longer term.
DCS/155	Hambleton Parish Council	CP10	Partly	Policies to improve and increase rural diversification should be robust and enforceable enough to prevent piecemeal development, and over development.	Core Strategy policies will be complimented by extant SDLP development control policies in the short term and by development management DPD policies in the longer term.
DCS/218	Jennifer Hubbard	CP10	General Comments	Considers there should be a more flexible approach outside development limits to meet locally generated demand. Requests clarification on whether the Council considers 'farm diversification enterprises can include non- agricultural based	Further consideration needs to be given to this point.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				activities or whether they must be linked to existing agricultural operations / skills / buildings / machinery.	
DCS/313	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	CP10	No	Advise that the policy is not locally specific and that Policies EC6 and EC7 in PPS4 provide more detailed guidance for economic development and tourism in rural areas.	Review justification for the policy in the light of new PPS4.
DCS/466	D & J Poulter Buildings Contractors / Wrigley Property Development / Mr Geoff Lunn / Daniel Gath Homes / Penny England	CP10	General Comments	Supports the diversification of rural premises where this would not harm the character and appearance of the area.	For noting
DCS/447	Natural England	CP10	Partly	Supports the policy because it encourages development of the rural economy, while ensuring that rural diversification should be of an appropriate scale and type and will not harm the rural character of the area. Suggests reference be made to the Selby Landscape Character Assessment to ensure development is in keeping with its surroundings.	For noting / action.
CP11 - Town Centres and Local Services					
DCS/408	Mr David Lewis	Para 6.30	Omissions	This section talks about the economic vibrancy in Selby town centre. The appointment of a Town Centre Manager is vital. This person could liaise with retailers and re-invigorate the Monday Market. The role could encourage the use of the new public spaces at the Market Place and the riverside amphitheatre, to improve foot-fall for all commercial premises.	This is not a matter for the Core Strategy.
DCS/358	DPP LLP	Paras 6.34 - 6.46	Partly	References to PPS6 should be deleted and the appropriate paragraphs amended to take into account policies within PPS4.	This section will be reviewed in the light of PPS4.
DCS/314	Government	Para 6.39	Partly	The relevance of the saved policies will depend upon how long	It may be appropriate to include

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

	Office for Yorkshire and the Humber			they are saved; policies will gradually become out of date and lose weight even if not replaced. You may need to consider at some stage if it is better to rely on PPS4 (new style written in the form of policies) and RSS.	some additional reference to PPS4. Explanation of the continuing role of 'saved' policy and the reducing weight that may be attached to it is a matter for the introductory sections of the Core Strategy.
DCS/347	The Grimston Park Estate	Para 6.39	Partly	An intention is stated to update the relevant development management policies in the saved SDLP through a Development Management DPD and Allocations DPD. It would be helpful if the role of these documents could be clarified.	This section will be updated in the light of the LDS review.
DCS/346	The Grimston Park Estate	Para 6.42	Partly	It should be noted that Tadcaster serves a catchment beyond the immediate District boundary serving adjoining parts of Harrogate, Leeds and York Districts which is more diverse than indicated at Para 6.42. The broad hierarchy is considered suitable and that the spatial vision provided through CP11 is appropriate.	It may be useful for completeness to include reference to the wider catchment of Tadcaster after reviewing the RCLS09.
DCS/367	Mr & Mrs M Waddington	CP11	Yes	Measures to improve and enhance the viability and vitality of Selby as the commercial focus of the District in CP11 is generally supported.	Noted.
DCS/57	DPP LLP	CP11	Yes	Support policy as it will encourage economic growth in Selby and maintain vitality and viability of the town centre. Selby should be the focus for retailing and welcome strengthening role of Local Service Centres by encouraging wider range of services to meet local needs.	Noted.
DCS/202	The Theatres Trust	CP11	Partly	The policy should include the protection and enhancement of existing established local cultural facilities. It should also resist the loss of and existing facility unless it can be demonstrated that it is no longer needed or that the services can be provided at an alternative location or manner that is equally accessible by the community.	Such detailed policy requirements would be more appropriate for a future Development Management DPD rather than as part of a strategic policy.
DCS/199	The Theatres Trust	CP11	Yes	This policy is sound and is supported.	Noted.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/311	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	CP11	Partly	Need to make sure there is no conflict between CP11 and CP9. Both policies should make clear that B1 offices are town centre uses and should be located in town centres if sites are available. PPS4 replaces both PPG4 and PPS6. It will not be necessary to repeat or reformulate these policies unless there are locally specific factors justifying variation.	Further clarification within the policy may be required for B1 offices. The policy needs reviewing in the light of new PPS4 and updating/amending as necessary. A locally distinctive/spatial focus is required, using local evidence from the RCLS09 to avoid repetition of national policy.
DCS/315	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	CP11	Partly	Need to ensure this policy is in accordance with PPS4.	The policy needs reviewing in the light of new PPS4 and updating/amending as necessary. A locally distinctive/spatial focus is required, using local evidence from the RCLS09 to avoid repetition of national policy.
DCS/345	The Grimston Park Estate	CP11	Partly	A number of renaissance studies have been completed which support the improvement of all three of the District's town centres. It is appropriate Policy CP11 builds upon these themes. Provision B(b) should make reference to the sequential approach.	Provision B(b) refers to office uses in town centres and office park locations. It may be useful to add the further clarification of the sequential approach that town centres are the preferred location and only then should other locations be considered appropriate.
DCS/484	Connaught Consultancy Services LLP	CP11	Yes	Support policy to strengthen and enhance the existing centres to promote vitality and viability. In particular the role of Sherburn should be safeguarded and enhanced to continue to support the residential and employment role of the town. It should be promoted for the development of further services and facilities in order to keep pace with growth of the town for employment development (as stated at para 4.22) and to support the day to day needs of the residential population.	The comments essentially support the existing policy as CP11 promotes the strengthening of the role of Sherburn through encouraging a wider range of services and facilities to meet the needs of the area served. Consideration could be given to a more spatially focussed vision for the centres.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/467	D & J Poulter Buildings Contractors / Wrigley Property Development / Mr Geoff Lunn / Daniel Gath Homes / Penny England	CP11	Yes	The vitality and viability of the primary service centres needs to be improved. The focus on the 3 centres is supported.	Noted
DCS/407	Mr David Lewis	CP11 (Selby)	Omissions	The Objectives at Section 3 refer to improvements in cultural life. There is clear scope and demand for a heritage and arts centre to serve the District, and a perfect opportunity at Abbot's Staithe in Selby. This is the finest medieval monastic warehouse in Europe but lies unwanted and derelict in the heart of Selby. It would take relatively little money to turn this hidden gem into a thriving arts/heritage centre to the cultural and economic benefit of the District's residents.	Noted. Not an issue for the Core Strategy.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

Section 7 – Improving the Quality of Life					
ID No.	Name/ Company/ Organisation	Paragraph/ Policy	Agree/ Disagree	Issues Raised.	Decision
DCS/16	Mr David Lewis	Whole Section	General Comments	Nowhere in the document does it refer to 3 vital positions: 1) a town centre manager - to invigorate economic life; 2) a conservation officer; and 3) a tree officer. The 'jack of all trades' approach by planning officers does not provide the expertise which is required for both the built and natural environment. The appointment of such officers would mean a slight increase in council tax but given the socio-economic context of the District, would be welcomed.	Noted. Not an issue for the Core Strategy.
DCS/51	Hallam Land Management Ltd	Whole Section	Partly	This policy fails the tests of soundness: It makes no reference to national and regional targets expressed as minimum targets. It is not clear enough that the targets are not ceilings. The Strategy is inconsistent as the aim to reduce carbon emissions by a switch to renewable energy is not followed through in the policy, and the objective to positively promote RE is not evident in the policy. National and regional policy does not require evidence to justify higher targets. The policy needs to be more explicit that delivery above the minimum targets is acceptable and desirable.	The Strategy could be amended to clarify the highlighted links and provide a more positive approach to promoting renewable energy and to emphasise that targets are not a ceiling. Further research is required on the issue of evidencing the targets, especially given the anticipated cancellation of RSS figures.
DCS/143	Highways Agency	General CP8 & CP12	Omissions	The document makes no reference to the emerging North Yorkshire third Local Transport Plan (LTP3). This is an important delivery mechanism for the Selby Core Strategy. The Highways Agency would like to see evidence of partnership working with the emerging LTP3. This is particularly important if Selby are to successfully achieve the Policy CP12 (Reducing the need to travel especially by private car) and CP8 Access to Services, Community Facilities and	Reference and description of the relationship to the LTP (including LTP3 which is in the early stages of preparation) should usefully be added. Links to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan could also be included.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				Infrastructure.	
DCS/267	Drax Power Ltd	General Comments	General Comments	Drax PL set out a list of documents and summaries that are relevant to the consideration of renewable and low carbon energy policies; which set the context for their comments on various parts of the supporting text and draft policies.	The list will be reviewed and added to Background Paper 8 and referred to in any proposed revisions to the Core Strategy in response to DPL's other comments.
DCS/429	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Para 7.12 and 7.53	General Comments	Priority Living Landscapes are being identified and the Trust would be pleased to work with the Authority in developing these. The Strategy seeks to provide connectivity between important areas for wildlife to provide corridors for dispersal which will improve the resilience of habitats and wildlife to climate change.	Suggest adding reference to Living Landscapes in supporting text and ensure ongoing liaison with YWT in order to keep up to date of ensuring best practice.
CP12 - Climate Change					
DCS/348	The Grimston Park Estate	Paras 7.1 - 7.13	Partly	We are concerned with the introductory section of this chapter which appears to confuse "climate change" with "sustainable development". As a starting point it is necessary for the justification to distinguish between the contents of PPS1 "Sustainable Development" and the contents of the PPS1 Supplement on Climate Change. Within the introductory paragraphs there is also selective use and quotation of the Energy White Paper. For example, it refers to "energy security" and focuses upon this, but fails to make reference to the other three strands of reducing fuel poverty, diversity of supply and energy efficiency. There needs to be a clarification in the text between what are international and local issues. Another aspect is the need to separate adaptation and mitigation; PPS1 provides a definition for each. Paragraph 9 of the PPS Supplement also provides guidance on what should be contained in LDF Core Strategy policies.	The introductory text will be reviewed in the light of these comments (and all others relating to this section).
DCS/100	Ye Fraternite of Olde Selebians	Para 7.4	Partly	Paragraph is overstated. It does not give balanced view.	Whilst noting the views submitted, cannot agree given the evidence available that climate change is not a serious issue which the Core Strategy must tackle.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/149	Whitley Parish Council	Para 7.6	Omissions	The Strategy sets out plans to reduce carbon emissions and increase the use of renewable energy sources. Although it mentions fuel poverty, it does not make any commitments to improving energy infrastructure in villages like Whitley where we have no mains gas. We would like to see investment in mains gas in our village as a way of reducing fuel poverty and improving quality of life. We suggest that this commitment is included in the Core Strategy.	The Council is also producing an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will consider requirements for the future development of the District. However, the Council cannot commit utility providers to tackle existing perceived deficiencies.
DCS/253	Drax Power Ltd	Para 7.7	General Comments	Insert in the paragraph, the underlined text: “Thus, both national and regional policies and strategies require that planning addresses the causes and potential impacts of climate change through reducing energy use, promoting water efficiency, reducing emissions (including CO2), promoting renewable and low carbon energy use, influencing the location and design of development and promoting sustainable and inclusive patterns of urban and rural envelopment.”	This would be a useful addition which would strengthen the justification for the policy.
DCS/183	Environment Agency	Para 7.13	Partly	There are significant pressures on surface water availability within Selby which may impact on its ability to dilute pollution. Due to historic over-abstraction from the Sherwood Sandstone aquifer, it is unlikely that new abstraction licences will be granted by the Environment Agency close to Selby. This could be highlighted through the addition of the following comment to the end of the paragraph: "Due to historic over-abstraction there are significant pressures on water resources throughout the district. Protection of this resource may influence the location of certain development within the district, particularly uses which have a need for large quantities of water for such things as industrial processing or cooling."	In corporation of the additional test would improve understanding of the issue. Need to clarify 'close to Selby'.
DCS/379	Yorkshire Water	Para 7.13	Partly	Para 7.13 – The first sentence in this paragraph should be amended to read “Climate change may put pressure on water resources”. There is a great deal of uncertainty over climate change and this statement should reflect that fact. Please see our Water Resources Plan for further details at:	Noted – would be a reasonable addition to the text.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				http://www.yorkshirewater.com/our-environment/water-resources/managing-water-resources.aspx	
DCS/67	Rural England	Para 7.15	Yes	There is a statement about the preservation of the natural environment and wildlife habitats with which we would wholeheartedly agree.	Noted.
DCS/150	Rural England	Para 7.17	Partly	Reference is made to short term extraction of shallow coal seams in the Selby Coalfields and this can only be achieved through opencast mining. We oppose this on environmental grounds but more particularly as a danger to the Sherwood Aquifer which underlies much of Selby District. CCS is very expensive and has not been achieved on a large scale. Production of electricity by non-fossil fuels is being promoted but is unreliable. Co-firing in the power stations should be encouraged but not all fuels are environmentally friendly e.g. orirmulsion.	Noted.
DCS/254	Drax Power Ltd	Para 7.17	General Comments	Insert in the paragraph, the underlined text: "Respondents to the Further Options Report outlined the need for an overarching climate change policy, to reduce predicted CO2 emissions in new development, how we will achieve national and regional targets, encourage higher energy efficiency, how we will meet zero carbon targets, promotion of sustainable construction and design techniques, encouragement of specific technologies such as Combined Heat and Power (CHP), clean coal and the need to promote Coal Bed Methane extraction and Carbon Capture technologies, especially associated with 'un-worked' shallow reserves, or short term extraction from the abandoned Selby mine sites within Selby District."	Subject to confirming this is appropriate, add this reference to clean coal as suggested.
DCS/255	Drax Power Ltd	Para 7.18	General Comments	Insert, at the end of the paragraph, the underlined text: "However, Government energy policy has highlighted security of supply issues arising from planned closures of a number of older coal fired and nuclear power stations in the period to 2020, requiring greater reliance on continuing use of fossil fuelled generating plants and new investment in renewable and low carbon forms of energy generation; implementation of this policy is demonstrated at Drax by the co-firing of biomass and the proposal to develop a biomass fuelled electricity	This highlights the wider issues of future energy supply which are key to the District. It has been suggested elsewhere that it is appropriate to give more prominence to this in the Core Strategy. Subject to analysing the detailed wording, add the suggested text.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				generating plant. The policy recognises that energy is vital to economic prosperity and social well-being and so it is important to ensure the country has secure and affordable energy. (Also provides footnotes).	
DCS/184	Environment Agency	Para 7.19	Partly	<p>The regional strategic importance of the Sherwood Sandstone aquifer has been highlighted however, the Magnesian Limestone aquifer provides a vital supply which supports the brewing industry in Tadcaster. Any pollution reaching this aquifer may impact quickly upon existing abstractions in Tadcaster and Sherburn-in-Elmet. The paragraph should make specific reference to the need to preserve this resource. ".....RSS Policy ENV2. In addition, the Magnesian Limestone aquifer provides a vital supply for the brewing industry in and around Tadcaster."</p> <p>Furthermore, in the south of the district, there are a number of wells for potable water abstraction which form part of a larger well-field operated by Yorkshire Water Ltd for public supply. In some areas the protective drift material is missing and therefore the public water supply is very susceptible to contamination. Consideration must be given to the prevention of pollution to the groundwater supply.</p>	It would be useful to add this local context to the supporting text. (Omitting reference to RSS).
DCS/185	Environment Agency	Para 7.20 - 7.25	Partly	<p>Paragraph 7.20 - 7.25 - The content of these paragraphs should be updated to reflect the findings of the Level 2 SFRA</p> <p>Paragraph 7.23 - The paragraph should make reference to the need for the Sequential and Exception tests as outlined in PPS25, rather than developments being acceptable in flood risk areas 'provided appropriate flood risk management measures are in place'.</p>	All points are accepted and text will be updated as appropriate.
DCS/186	Environment Agency	Para 7.26	Partly	The provision of SuDs should be added to the list of climate change mitigation measures promoted by the Core Strategy. It should also be made clear that another related benefit to SuDS is their promotion of groundwater recharge. This is particularly relevant in this over-abstracted area.	It would be appropriate to add reference to SUDs here.
DCS/256	Drax Power Ltd	Para 7.26	General Comments	Insert in the paragraph the underlined text: "Increasing renewable and low carbon energy capacity, by supporting stand alone schemes from all 'green' technologies,	It is appropriate to add low carbon here.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				to meet established targets (but especially from biomass and energy from waste which are being promoted locally)".	
DCS/257	Drax Power Ltd	Para 7.26	General Comments	Insert in the paragraph the underlined text: "Supporting coal bed methane, clean coal technology, carbon capture and storage technologies and environmental improvements to existing generating plant", where appropriate.	It is appropriate to add this wording.
DCS/4	Coal Authority	Para 7.26 (Coal Bed Methane)	Partly	Supports the recognition in this paragraph of the potential future role the extraction of coal bed methane may have within the District.	Noted.
DCS/268	Drax Power Ltd	Paras 7.7, 7.17, 7.18 and 7.26	Partly	<p>Against the background of Government's energy policies and recent reports published by Ofgem and DECC it is necessary, for reasons of consistency and to avoid ambiguity, to make alterations:</p> <p>7.7 Clarify that reduction of emissions including CO2 and that both renewable and low carbon energy use is to be promoted</p> <p>7.17 Include reference to clean coal alongside other sustainable technologies such as coal bed methane extractions and carbon capture</p> <p>7.18 When referring to existing coal fired power stations as contributing to the emission of GHGs, there should be recognition of the need to retain certain fossil fuelled generation plants while investing in other forms of renewable and low carbon energy as is occurring at Drax.</p> <p>7.26 Clarify that both renewable and low carbon energy generation is consistent with policy and that clean coal and other environmental improvements to existing generation plant should be supported alongside CCS.</p>	References to low carbon should be included. More research is required in relation to the implications of incorporating 'clean coal'. Also research is needed into the appropriate reference to retention of fossil-fuel power generation within the Core Strategy context.
DCS/3	Coal Authority	CP12	Partly	Support re-use of previously developed land, including that utilised for mining activity. However it should be appropriately remediated so development is not affected by ground instability or other hazards, in order to comply with national advice in PPG14. Propose to add "APPROPRIATELY	As previously commented in responses to Policy CP9 this is a site specific issue to former coal sites rather than the wide range of pdl sites. Reference in the Core

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				REMEDIED" to criterion (b).	Strategy is inappropriate.
DCS/20	The Woodland Trust	CP12	Partly	Welcome statement in para 7.12 regarding climate change and its detrimental effect on biodiversity, and the reference to the England Biodiversity Strategy Climate Change Adaptation principles. Also welcome CP12 (h) regarding the need to protect, enhance and create habitats to enable adaptation to climate change. The Government's Low Carbon Transition Plan is clear in outlining the benefits of woodland creation both in order to sequester carbon from the atmosphere and also enable adaptation to climate change as well as providing a range of other "ecosystem services". The Woodland Trust has an aspiration to double native woodland cover over 50 years. As such the Core Strategy should contain a commitment to a significant amount of new woodland creation.	Previous research highlighted a variety of conflicting evidence about the benefits of tree planting to 'catch' carbon. However, subject to checking the Low Carbon Transition Plan, it may be appropriate to add a criterion or amend (h) encouraging planting of trees for climate change ends in addition to their habitat and amenity benefits.
DCS/53	Selby Area Internal Drainage Board	CP12	Yes	Support conserving flood storage capacity and encourages the use of sustainable drainage systems to ensure developments do not result in an increase in flood risk and do not overload existing drainage systems.	Noted
DCS/142	Highways Agency	CP12	Partly	Support inclusion of policy to reduce the need to travel. A key mechanism is to encourage developers to provide a range of sustainable travel options through Travel Plans (in conformity with prevailing guidance). The requirement for Travel Plans and Transport Assessments should be more strongly reflected in Core Strategy policies. The HA will advise developers on Travel Plans and consider tri-partate agreements with Councils and developers as appropriate. Active traffic management and integrated demand management interventions are preferred to capacity improvements. Any costs of capacity measures to be met by developers.	Generally, criteria (a) meets the HA requirements but it would meet their objections to add particular reference in the supporting text to the need for Travel Plans and the preference for active traffic management measures and integrated demand management in preference to additional network capacity.
DCS/151	Rural England	CP12	Partly	In consideration of flood risk areas, there is no definition of what constitutes risk. It is usual to define a risk as "1 in x years" but we see no evidence of what "x" is likely to be and it would reduce in value with climate change.	The level of flood risk varies across the District as evidenced in the Selby Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and other data from the Environment Agency. It is not possible to define the risk in terms of every so many years here. Assessment of risk will be

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

					undertaken in association with the EA for any proposed new development in the light of its location and type as appropriate.
DCS/156	Hambleton Parish Council	CP12	No	No energy policy has yet to emerge from Whitehall other than setting targets for emissions it would be unlikely that developers will have the technology or the desire to comply with the requirements.	The policy is based on Government requirements through various Acts, Strategies and PPSs.
DCS/165	Redrow Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd	CP12	No	There is inconsistency between the proposed spatial distribution and the requirement to reduce flood risk and direct development away from areas at risk of flooding. This should clearly be set out as the starting point within CP12 in order to conform with the RSS stated approach. RSS ENV1 confirms that flood risk management will be required within Selby urban areas in order to facilitate growth. This approach does not however sanction development in high risk areas without a robust SFRA, sequential and exception testing and justification based upon a clear sustainability case. This should be better articulated within CP12.	Consideration of revised wording in relation to sequential and exception testing, discussed above (Environment Agency DCS/187) may meet this objection.
DCS/187	Environment Agency	CP12	Partly	<p>CP12 (d) needs rewording and suggests the following wording: "Ensure that development in areas of flood risk is avoided wherever possible through the application of the sequential test and exception test" and "Ensure that where development must be located within areas of flood risk that it can be made safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere".</p> <p>CP12 (e) - Welcome the inclusion of water resource protection but it only gives limited guidance on protecting water quality. Many water courses in the District are failing to achieve targets. The Council should refer to the River Basin Management Plans and relevant actions to improve water quality in the District. Would like to see more emphasis on the measures which could be implemented and suggest rewording: "Protect existing water courses by encouraging water-efficient design in all new development and encouraging sustainable drainage systems which promote groundwater recharge."</p>	<p>CP12(d) - It is appropriate to reword the criterion in line with advice from the EA.</p> <p>CP12 (e) - Further research will confirm what elements of water quality should be covered by the Core Strategy or left for other legislation. However, reference to water quality would be helpful here. Regarding the inclusion of text for SUDS it should be noted that criterion (g) refers to this. It may be beneficial to review the wording.</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>CP12 (g) The Council should require rather than promote SUDS, especially given the risk of flooding to large areas of the District. This is backed through PPS1, PPS25 and building regulations. Add a further criteria as follows: "Require the use of sustainable drainage systems on all developments unless it can be demonstrated to be unfeasible or would present an unacceptable pollution risk. There must be a reduction in surface water run-off from brownfield development sites in line with PPS25". The supporting paragraphs should also refer to the 30% reduction in run-off from brownfield sites in order to mitigate the predicted effects of climate change. The accompanying text at 7.23 should be added to as follows: "Where development is proposed on greenfield sites, run-off must be limited to the existing, undeveloped run-off rate; known as agricultural run-off rate. Where development is proposed on brownfield sites, drainage systems will be required to reduce existing run-off rates by a minimum of 30% in order to account for predicted impacts of climate change".</p> <p>CP12 (h) Further clarification should be given in the supporting paragraphs as to what is meant by "improving biodiversity resilience to climate change" along with details on the mechanisms needed to achieve this.</p> <p>Furthermore would like to see support for sustainable flood management measures such as water storage areas, and schemes promoted through local surface water management plans, to provide protection from flooding and biodiversity and amenity improvements.</p>	<p>CP12 (g) -It is considered that there is sufficient reference in this strategic level document to SUDs and surface water run-off. Such detailed policy wording is more appropriate to other development management documents.</p> <p>CP12 (h) - Paragraph 7.12 and the Background Paper cover issues in more detail. A balance must be made between providing sufficient detail whilst still retaining a succinct document. Further consideration needs to be given to the level of detail appropriate in the Core Strategy for Submission stage.</p> <p>CP12 Gen - It may be helpful to include reference to local surface water management plans which come into force in 2011. Also a matter for a Development Management DPD.</p>
DCS/258	Drax Power Ltd	CP12	Partly	Add an extra criterion to CP12: "Support the provision of renewable and low carbon forms of energy generation."	This would effectively cross-reference this policy to CP14 and make CP12 more comprehensive.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/316	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	CP12	Partly	Paragraph 18 of the Planning and Climate Change Supplement to PPS 1 suggests that planning authorities should consider the opportunities for the Core Strategy to add to the policies and proposals in the RSS, such as where local circumstances would allow further progress to be made to achieving the Key Planning Objectives set out in the PPS. We note that you have looked at making this policy more locally distinctive, however, as written it does not add significantly to the Planning and Climate Change Supplement to PPS 1.	It is recognised that this is not a locally distinctive policy but does provide an over-arching policy that establishes the Council's commitment to climate change issues in a spatial plan. In view of the anticipated cancellation of RSS it is perhaps even more important to retain this policy.
DCS/349	The Grimston Park Estate	CP12	Partly	We have fundamental problems with this policy. The provisions set out in this policy provide an overarching framework to the principles of sustainable development consistent with PPS1 but should however set these matters out as they reflect the needs of the District. We would suggest that the title of the policy should refer to "promoting sustainable patterns of development" and that this is included in the text. It repeats a number of the key locational principles (para 4.29 onwards) which are also listed as objectives (para 3.5). A number of matters are listed and then duplicated in subsequent policies whereas some matters are not taken further at all. In terms of the latter some reference is made to green infrastructure, although grey infrastructure and blue infrastructure appear to be given limited coverage. It would be appropriate (if retained) for the policy to cross refer to an efficient transport system, transport improvement, demand management along with making broader reference to utilities, the water quality framework directive, etc.	It is recognised that this is not a locally distinctive policy but does provide an over-arching policy that establishes the Council's commitment to climate change issues in a spatial plan. It would however be beneficial to set out the primary issues within the District as suggested.
DCS/373	Mr & Mrs M Waddington	CP12	No	There are significant concerns with Policy CP12 which reflect upon a concern with the document as a whole; there appears to be no specific policy or overarching strategy which sets out the principles of development and site selection /allocation for development. Policy CP12 deals with "climate change". We would suggest that this is a misnomer as the provisions within the policy relate to the principles of sustainable development. As worded the policy is too generic, simply repeating national policy without specific reference to the locality and	It is recognised that this is not a locally distinctive policy but does provide an over-arching policy that establishes the Council's commitment to climate change issues in a spatial plan. It would however be beneficial to set out the primary issues within the District as suggested.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				characteristics of Selby District contrary to the guidance in PPS12. We would suggest the policy as worded be deleted. It should be replaced by an overarching policy which sets out the primary issues within the District.	
DCS/380	Yorkshire Water	CP12	Partly	Yorkshire Water supports this policy, however it would benefit from some further details. Part g encourages the use of sustainable drainage systems, an additional point to part g, or it may be better as a separate part to this policy, would be to ensure a 30% reduction in surface water discharges from existing brownfield sites. This is a policy supported by both the Environment Agency and Yorkshire Water.	This level of detail suggested is not appropriate for the Core Strategy.
DCS/430	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	CP12	Partly	The authority can also encourage designing biodiversity into SUDS and green roofs and walls. Tree planting and green spaces within developments should be encouraged as it can reduce the 'urban heat island effect' which will increase with global warming. Promotion of SUDS also reduces run-off and thus the risk of flooding. There should be an assumption that SUDS are designed to enhance biodiversity which is a requirement of PPS9 (e.g. balancing ponds with shallow areas and scalloped edges can increase the value for wildlife).	Re-wording of criteria (g) and (h) could meet this objection, in association with other comments above (DCS/20 AND DCS/187 for example).
DCS/448	Natural England	CP12	Partly	Natural England strongly supports this policy and are particularly glad to note that the adaptation of natural habitats to climate change has been included in this policy at (h). We also note that the Sustainability Appraisal commends this policy because of the provision to improve biodiversity resilience to climate change. We note that flood risk has been included in the context of climate change and we would also advise that this policy should explain how flood waters can be accommodated without harm to the built environment by creating natural flood water sinks such as wet woodlands, reedbeds and low lying pastures in flood risk areas. This both helps to prevent flooding and creates a wider range of natural habitats.	A reformatting of the policy could take into account this issue (criteria (d), (g) and (h)).
DCS/468	D & J Poulter Buildings Contractors /	CP12	General Comments	This is a common policy supported by national planning policy.	Noted

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

	Wrigley Property Development / Mr Geoff Lunn / Daniel Gath Homes / Penny England				
DCS/406	Mr David Lewis	CP12(a) Justification	Partly	The District is crossed by national routes 65 and 66. Also given the flat terrain cycling journeys for both work and pleasure should be encouraged by construction of cycle lanes and incentives given for cycle facilities at civic buildings.	In the light of these comments and those at DCS/349 above, it may be appropriate to review the purpose of this over-arching policy and potentially include sustainable transport issues within its remit.
DCS/284	English Heritage	CP12 (b)	Partly	Given the embodied energy within existing buildings coupled with the energy which would be expended in the demolition of those buildings and the removal of the waste materials, the LDF, as a whole, should encourage the reuse of existing buildings in preference to their demolition and the redevelopment of a cleared site. Under such an approach, the starting point for consideration of a proposal would be whether it would reuse or adapt an existing building. Only where this was not practicable or could it be demonstrated that this was a less sustainable solution, would the demolition of the building and the reuse of existing site be considered. Amend criterion (b) to give greater weight to reusing existing buildings.	It is considered that re-use should be encouraged in the light of these arguments and as such text needs including within the Core Strategy, and criterion (b) could usefully be modified in this regard.
CP13 - Improving Resource Efficiency					
DCS/508	Drax Power Ltd	Para 7.29	Partly	Add to the end of para 7.29; "furthermore the energy can be generated from dedicated biomass fuelled power stations or co-firing with coal and with CCS in large power stations".	Subject to checking the accuracy of this statement it may be usefully added here.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/509	Drax Power Ltd	Para 7.40	Partly	Add at para 7.40; "Selby District" and "clean coal technology".	This would be appropriate in this context.
DCS/431	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Para 7.42	Partly	Support development of sustainable energy but windfarms can have a negative effect on some bird and protected bat species therefore the location of each proposal needs to be considered carefully before permission is granted and advice from an ecologist should be sought.	Noted. These issues are more appropriately dealt with as part of the more detailed development management policies.
DCS/510	Drax Power Ltd	Para 7.44	Partly	Amend para 7.44 to read "Both Eggborough Power Station and Drax Power Station produce energy from co-firing biomass. Drax Power has received planning permission for additional biomass handling equipment and infrastructure which will provide the capability to deliver a target of 500 MW; i.e. 12.5% of its output from renewable fuels. In addition, Drax has applied to the Department of Energy and Climate Change for permission to build a dedicated biomass-fired renewable energy plant on land adjacent to Drax Power Station capable of producing nearly 300 MW of grid-connected electricity."	This is essentially an update with further information, and it may be helpful to include this in the submission version if consent is been granted by DECC.
DCS/21	The Woodland Trust	CP13	Partly	Support inclusion of this policy with reference to biomass technologies but should include wood fuel specifically. It is a useful source of renewable energy where the timber is grown and used locally for small scale heat and power generation (supported by regional work).	Unless there is evidence that wood fuel is a particular local issue it would mean adding a list of all the different types of potential fuels which would not be appropriate in the Core Strategy.
DCS/134	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	CP13	No	Object to requiring developers to 'employ the highest viable level in respect of the Code for Sustainable Homes'. This suggests that the Council will seek viability assessments from developers demonstrating that any scheme delivers the absolute highest Code level. Such an approach is not aligned with Government guidance. The Council itself has rejected specific requirements for developers on the basis of changes to the Government's approach on the Code for Sustainable Homes and its own conclusions that there is no robust local	Further investigation as to the reasonableness of asking for viability work from developers needs to be undertaken, especially in the light of recent draft consultation PPS1 Supplement which suggests that LPAs should prove viability before introducing the policies. The 10%

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				evidence to support such requirements. We also note that the Consultation Draft PPS suggests that authorities should assess their area for opportunities for decentralised energy. It is not clear whether such evidence based work has been completed to support the Core Strategy policy. We therefore consider part a) to be unsound as there is no evidence to suggest the 10% target for reduced energy from decentralised and / or renewable sources is realistic.	requirement was based on sound evidence from proven good practice nationally and the adopted RSS policy. Consideration needs to be given to the timing of the introduction of statutory higher standards for the Code.
DCS/157	Hambleton Parish Council	CP13	Partly	Stillingfleet mine has gas engines producing electricity from methane. Carbon capture technology is still being developed, biomass deliveries to Drax will hopefully still being developed and the development of water borne routes.	Noted.
DCS/188	Environment Agency	CP13	Partly	A: We welcome the promotion of renewable energy, but wish to see an iterative policy which seeks to increase the requirements for decentralised energy step-by-step, over the plan period. The policy should initially suggest a high threshold and low percentage, with the threshold dropping and the percentage increasing iteratively over time. This will promote the use of renewable technology and help the council to take small, gradual steps towards the government's 2016 target for carbon-neutral developments, whilst allowing the development industry time to build its experience and expertise in the use of such technology. These principles are well-established in best practice throughout the UK. (NB Use % reduction in the predicted carbon emissions, rather than the predicted energy use). B: Strategic energy development may require large amounts of cooling water and this may be limited in some locations due to groundwater supply. This is likely to impact upon the location of such developments.	A. This is a detailed proposal which requires further investigation, as to whether in principle it is an effective way forward. If the Council consider it appropriate, then a considerable amount of further detailed evidence could potentially be needed. B. Noted
DCS/208	Olympia Park	CP13	Partly	The Olympia Park landowners object to the wording which refers to strategic development sites identified in the Core Strategy and key sites identified in future DPDs as currently drafted it is unsound and not consistent with PPS12 and does	It is considered that 'majority' does provide a minimum figure as it also means 'more than 50%'. Section (b) of the policy as

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>not reflect the evidence base.</p> <p>This policy is too onerous and use of the word “majority” is ambiguous and should be replaced with a minimum figure.</p> <p>Section b) of this policy should permit a degree of flexibility in the total energy needs derived from a combination of local biomass technologies, energy from waster, combined heat and power schemes and community heating projects, given this requirement could in some circumstances affect the viability of some schemes.</p>	<p>drafted <i>does</i> provide flexibility between a combination of the technologies identified. However, it is also recognised that it may be appropriate to consider amending the wording to refer to <i>all</i> renewable energy technologies, rather than restricting the options to those currently identified.</p> <p>It should be noted that energy from waste, biomass, combined heat and power and community heating projects are specified in the policy as they are known to be locally available already or are considered to be potentially available locally. It is considered that key sites should reasonably be required to employ these locally available technologies where feasible. In this way the policy provides a locally distinctive dimension.</p> <p>Further work will be undertaken covering the requirements for the strategic development sites policies within the Core Strategy and more research on viable technologies will be explored through updating the Background Paper 8 and/or the forthcoming Allocations DPD.</p>
DCS/220	Jennifer Hubbard	CP13	Partly	<p>Objectives of Policy CP13 are supported but (b) and (c) are not realistic and cannot be justified. The advice of the BRE to developers on strategic allocated sites elsewhere in the region is that the technologies mentioned in CP19(b) are insufficiently tested at the present time to be relied on and that for the foreseeable future, large residential schemes should proceed on the basis of proven technology.</p>	<p>It is considered that 'majority' does provide a minimum figure as it also means 'more than 50%'.</p> <p>Section (b) of the policy as drafted <i>does</i> provide flexibility between a combination of the</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>With respect to CP13(c) the Code for Sustainable Homes levels are to be achieved through Building Regulations and there is no need for a CS policy on this topic. There is ample evidence that whereas the developers of single dwellings or small schemes are prepared to exceed current Building Regulations' requirements, the volume builders are not and will only do so as Building Regulations progressively change to require higher CSH levels. Non-residential developers appear more willing to embrace energy efficiency measures since the financial benefits to them are more easily demonstrated.</p>	<p>technologies identified. However, it is also recognised that it may be appropriate to consider amending the wording to refer to <i>all</i> renewable energy technologies, rather than restricting the options to those currently identified.</p> <p>It should be noted that energy from waste, biomass, combined heat and power and community heating projects are specified in the policy as they are known to be locally available already or are considered to be potentially available locally. It is considered that key sites should reasonably be required to employ these locally available technologies where feasible. In this way the policy provides a locally distinctive dimension.</p> <p>Further work will be undertaken covering the requirements for the strategic development sites policies within the Core Strategy and more research on viable technologies will be explored through updating the Background Paper 8 and/or the forthcoming Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Consideration needs to be given to the timing of the introduction of statutory higher standards for the Code.</p>
DCS/232	Yorkshire Forward	CP13	Yes	<p>Welcome reference to CHP in CP13. The inclusion of CHP within new developments helps increase cost effectiveness of CHP schemes and contributes to RSS targets.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/261	Drax Power Ltd	CP13	Partly	The present document has paid insufficient regard to DPL's support for Government energy policy. There is a lack of recognition of the important economic and energy role performed by Drax and insufficient regard paid to the lead taken by Government in relation to renewable and low carbon energy.	Other comments from Drax Power Ltd in relation to CP12 are dealt with above and new text is suggested for incorporating into the Core Strategy. However, it is considered that as the power stations are very important to the District, (employment, traditional energy supplies and future renewable energy potential), it would be appropriate to include more specific reference to them in order to provide the special, local issues focus for this spatial strategy.
DCS/285	English Heritage	CP13	Partly	Whilst we support the principle of requiring all new development to meet a target for on-site renewable energy generation, in the case of the conversion of historic buildings and for developments within Conservation Areas, the Policy needs to take account of the guidance provided in PPS22 that permission for renewable energy projects should only be granted where the objectives of the designation will not be compromised. This is not currently reflected within the Policy. Amend line 2 of Policy CP13 to read:- "...demonstrably unviable or it could be shown to be impracticable, the Council will..."	Subject to checking PPS22 this seems a reasonable approach.
DCS/317	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	CP13	Partly	North Yorkshire County Council is the waste planning authority and is producing a Waste Local Development Framework, which will contain waste allocations and strategic and development management policies. Any waste policies in Selby's Core Strategy will need to be in conformity with the approach being taken by the County Council.	This refers to part (b) ii of the policy (Energy from Waste). The NYCC Waste LDF is currently being formulated and advice needs to be sought to ensure CP13 does not conflict with proposed policies contained therein.
DCS/369	Mr & Mrs M	CP13	Yes	The generality of this policy is supported.	Noted.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

	Waddington				
DCS/405	South Milford Parish Council	CP13	Partly	Support approach to tackling climate change and sustainability but wants all new houses to be built to secure by design standards and ensure they are big enough to accommodate today's households by meeting housing quality indicator standards and sustainability standards.	The secured by design principles are incorporated into Building for Life standards in any case and Policy CP4 requires a mix of housing types and sizes to meet identified needs shown in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
DCS/449	Natural England	CP13	Partly	Natural England supports the approach set out in this policy as we promote the concept of sustainable design and construction in our own work. We would suggest that an additional point should be added regarding sustainable design that development should minimise the consumption and extraction of minerals by using recycled materials in new construction and by making best use of existing buildings.	Although CP13 is about improving resource efficiency, it may be more appropriate to include this reference to use of recycled materials and re-use of existing buildings in the over-arching, reformatted CP12 (although CP16 also refers to sustainable construction techniques).
DCS/469	D & J Poulter Buildings Contractors / Wrigley Property Development / Mr Geoff Lunn / Daniel Gath Homes / Penny England	CP13	Partly	This policy is based upon policy successfully implemented elsewhere in the country. It is supported and its link to the viability of schemes. However few schemes are likely to include RE given the constraints of CP5 (affordable housing) - even in a buoyant housing market schemes would struggle to provide 50% affordable housing (evidence provided in viability appraisal and elsewhere in submission). If the % of affordable housing sought was reduced the effectiveness of CP13 would be increased.	Noted.
DCS/485	Connaught Consultancy Services LLP	CP13	Partly	The requirement for 10% of energy needs to be from renewable or low carbon sources should be an aspiration rather than a requirement to ensure the policy does not hinder development unnecessarily. The policy needs to consider	The policy already sets out in the opening paragraph that the requirement stands as long as it is not demonstrably unviable.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				individual site circumstances and viability in order to ensure that sites can still viably be developed.	
DCS/501	North Yorkshire and York Primary Care Trust	CP13	Partly	Suggest adding reference to reducing fuel poverty through delivery of CP13, particularly in the context of an aging population.	It is difficult to see how tackling fuel poverty can be incorporated into CP13. However, Paragraph 7.6 refers to fuel poverty and it may be beneficial to provide more about these aspirations there.
DCS/381	Yorkshire Water	CP13 (c)	Yes	Yorkshire Water supports part C of this policy.	Noted.
CP14 - Renewable Energy					
DCS/5	Coal Authority	CP14	Partly	Supports the recognition in this policy of the future role the extraction of coal bed methane may have within the District. Happy to be involved in developing detailed wording. Wishes to continue to be consulted on all future stages.	Noted.
DCS/30	Roderic Parker	CP14	Yes	This policy is welcomed, but the Council must demonstrate that its own planning process do not interfere with requests from homeowners for microgeneration facilities. Local policy might do more to encourage the use of local rivers for small-scale electricity generation.. The Council should not lose its nerve over wind turbines - they are only a short term measure until more reliable and less intrusive methods becomes available.	The policy supports micro-generation. Renewable energy from small-scale hydro-electric schemes is covered in the sub-regional studies and further research may identify if such schemes are a particular issue for Selby District; otherwise a general reference to include in the supporting text may be appropriate.
DCS/259	Drax Power Ltd	CP14	Partly	Amend the policy, to read: "The Council will support new sources of renewable and low carbon energy generation provided that development proposals c) Clean Coal Bed Methane extraction, Clean Coal Generation and Carbon Capture and Storage technologies."	Further consideration required. GOYH refer to this as a County Matter in relation to Minerals DPD.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/271	Drax Power Ltd	CP14	Partly	Include reference to low carbon energy generation as well as renewable energy generation and clean coal generation as well as CCS and coal bed methane extraction.	Accepted, in line with national policy.
DCS/273	UK Coal	CP14	Partly	Support in principle but suggest amended wording regarding minimising negative impacts on the environment. UK Coal suggest that re-use of existing grid connections and existing energy infrastructure such as those at former mine sites offers the potential to do this. New wording for the end of CP14 (a) is put forward: ", prioritising those which re-use existing energy infrastructure,".	It is considered utilising existing infrastructure is a positive way forward and further consideration should be given to incorporating appropriate wording here.
DCS/318	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	CP14	Partly	Clean Coal Methane Extraction is a minerals matter. North Yorkshire County Council is the minerals planning authority and is producing a Minerals Local Development Framework, which will contain minerals allocations and strategic and development management policies. Any minerals policies in Selby's Core Strategy will need to be in conformity with the approach being taken by the County Council.	The NYCC Minerals LDF is currently being formulated and advice needs to be sought to ensure CP14 does not conflict with proposed policies contained therein.
DCS/350	The Grimston Park Estate	CP14	Partly	Provisions within this policy are generally robust and suitable for a Core Strategy when read together with Policy CP14. A major concern with this policy is within Provision B which effectively suggests that more than half of the total energy needs for major development and strategic sites should be derived from a number of sources which are principally heat generators. This policy falls where the development does not require heat generation or carries a zero heat load, and fails to account for the general position that only 40% of the energy requirements of buildings relate to heat generation. We consider that in its present form this policy is not operable and effectively makes many developments unviable.	The first 2 points in B are biomass and energy from waste and relate to energy generation rather than use of waste heat (last 2 points). The policy requires a one or a combination of the sources so it is considered the policy is workable contrary to the view submitted.
DCS/351	The Grimston Park Estate	CP14	Partly	Within this policy we are concerned with the approach which assumes that renewable energy generation will cause harm. Careful consideration also needs to be given to Provision B and how it fits with the recently published Permitted Development Rights for domestic micro generation and the	Noted. Further research into PD rights is required.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				proposals for similar guidance for business premises.	
DCS/370	Mr & Mrs M Waddington	CP14	Yes	The generality of this policy is supported.	Noted.
DCS/432	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	CP14	Partly	Micro-turbines are a relatively new technology and as yet the effect of them on protected bat species is not fully understood, however there is anecdotal evidence of bat mortality caused by micro-turbines. As with larger turbines, an ecologist should be consulted before planning permission is granted to ensure that their location will not have a negative effect on local bat populations.	Noted.
DCS/450	Natural England	CP14	Partly	We support the principle of sustainable energy generation. However as well as the climate change mitigation benefits of renewable energy schemes, there can also be significant adverse effects on landscapes, nature conservation and people's enjoyment of the countryside and landscape. We therefore consider renewable energy proposals on the basis of the extent to which they conserve and enhance the existing natural environment. We recommend the Core Strategy's approach to renewable energy should include a stronger provision for protecting the natural environment and local amenity.	The policy requires that the benefits outweigh harm to the natural environment and local amenity. Consideration needs to be given as to whether this can be more positively expressed as a stronger provision for protection.
DCS/470	D & J Poulter Buildings Contractors / Wrigley Property Development / Mr Geoff Lunn / Daniel Gath Homes / Penny England	CP14	Yes	This policy is supported.	Noted.
CP15 - Protecting and Enhancing the Environment					

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/433	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Para 7.52	General Comments	Regarding the NERC (Natural Environment and Rural Communities) Act - vital that the Council has input from an in-house ecologist or an outside source such as the Wildlife Trust.	Comments to be noted.
DCS/15	Mr David Lewis	Para 7.55	Partly	Bullet points mention historic buildings, but none by name e.g. two mercantile buildings in Selby - the finest monastic warehouse in Europe (Abbot's Staithe) and the Railway Station (Yorkshire's first, 175 years old). Both ought to be major tourist attractions.	Considered to be more detailed information than is appropriate. Possibly more appropriate for a conservation or tourism based document.
DCS/286	English Heritage	Para 7.55	Partly	Whilst this is a factual list of some of the designated assets in the District, it does not give much of a flavour about what are the elements which make Selby distinctive from other parts of the Region (see comments in relation to Paragraph 2.3, above). As such, this does not adequately reflect the advice set out in Paragraph HE3.4 of PPS5. In addition, although this Section is entitled "local issues" it does not provide much evidence about what are the specific issues which the environment of the District faces. In terms of the historic environment, the District faces the following challenges:- > there are known to be significant, although currently undesignated archaeological remains along both the Southern Magnesian Limestone Ridge and within the Humberhead Levels. > The Registered Battlefield at Towton (the bloodiest engagement ever fought on British soil) has been identified as being at high risk. It has consistently been targeted by metal detectorists and has been subject to deep ploughing. > 22 of the District's 45 Scheduled Monuments have been identified as being at Risk in the 2009 Heritage at Risk Register. 14 of these monuments are moated sites. > Of the five Buildings at Risk on the Register, three are at Huddleston Hall and have been on the Register since its inception in 1999. > The installation of flood defences poses a potential threat to the historic environment of Tadcaster.	Further work required to consider the implications of this detailed comment.
DCS/434	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Para 7.55	No	Correction - Sites of Scientific Interest should read 'Sites of Special Scientific Interest'.	Correction to be made.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/452	Natural England	Para 7.57	Yes	Supportive of partnership approach described and reference to Selby BAP and LCR GI Strategy.	Support noted.
DCS/435	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Para 7.58	Yes	Welcome the protection of sites identified in the SDLP until further assessment of the sites can be made.	Comments noted.
DCS/453	Natural England	Para 7.58	No	Concerned that LILA's still being mentioned. Have previously commented regarding PPS7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas) recommends an approach to landscape protection based on LCA's, with less emphasis on local designations such as LILA's. Understand that designations will be discussed in future DPD's but consider that the principal of LCA's should be established in the Core Strategy.	Investigate wording changes to reflect this comment.
DCS/22	The Woodland Trust	CP15	No	<p>We welcome inclusion in the policy of para 2a, which states that international, national and locally protected sites for nature conservation will be protected from inappropriate development. However, we do not believe that this gives sufficient protection to irreplaceable semi-natural habitats such as ancient woodland.</p> <p>In para 7.49 of the sub-text you state that: "many of these resources (ie wildlife habitats) are irreplaceable and their loss, depletion or fragmentation should be avoided". In para 7.51, you refer to Policy ENV6 of the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Plan which gives strong protection to ancient woodland. You could also have referred to the strong protection given to ancient woodland in national policy by way of PPS9.</p> <p>The problem with the wording in para 2a of the policy is that "protection from inappropriate development" implies that there is some type of development which would justify the destruction of ancient woodland. We strongly disagree with this view and would like to see ancient woodland given absolute and unambiguous protection in your core strategy.</p> <p>We do welcome the commitment in para 3 of policy CP15 that developments should contribute to green infrastructure by</p>	Further work required to consider this detailed comment.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				improving the network of linked open spaces and green corridors. This paragraph could be improved by including a specific reference to natural greenspace and woodland, because of the wide range of ecosystem which they are able to provide.	
DCS/189	Environment Agency	CP15	Partly	The policy should make clear that where there are unavoidable impacts on biodiversity on new sites, that cannot be satisfactorily mitigated or compensated for, the application will be refused in accordance with PPS9. Welcome the promotion of GI in the policy, consider it should go further to address the requirements of YH8 (RSS), in terms of identifying areas for enhancement relating to connectivity and multi-functionality. Suggest wording to be added to point 3 - 'Wherever possible a strategic approach will be taken to increase connectivity of the Districts Green Infrastructure and to promote its multi-functionality. This will be informed by the emerging Leeds City Region Green infrastructure Strategy.' The need to reduce waste has not been set in the context of the waste hierarchy which defines and summarises PPS10's overarching aims for waste management. Would like to see such a commitment to prioritise waste reduction over re-use, over re-cycling and composting, over energy recovery and finally over disposal. Understand that waste planning will be dealt with in NYCC doc and feel this should be made explicit in the Core Strategy.	Additional work required to address suggested additions and possible re-wording.
DCS/236	Barlby Parish Council	CP15	Partly	There should be safeguards for countryside/biodiversity areas and protection for strategic gaps.	Comments noted. Reference is made elsewhere in response to comments on this Partial Development Strategy and Core Strategy Objectives to the desirability of confirming the continuing role of strategic countryside gaps in the Core Strategy.
DCS/260	Drax Power Ltd	CP15	Partly	Suggest an addition to the end of the policy (underlined) 'The high quality of the natural and man-made environment will be sustained by - 7. Encouraging the re-use of secondary aggregates such as ash, which may contribute to the	Point accepted but too detailed for the Core Strategy and already operational

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				production of building materials from a sustainable source.'	
DCS/272	Drax Power Ltd	CP15	Partly	In protecting the environment, supports the re-use of secondary aggregates by the re-use of ash, where practicable.	Comments to be noted.
DCS/287	English Heritage	CP15	Partly	<p>Refer to PPS5 (para HE3.1) and the emphasis on the historic environment that is suggested for inclusion in the LDF, together with the RRS Policy ENV9 (Historic Environment). Agree that the Core Strategy recognises the important contribution that is made by the historic environment towards a sense of place, quality of life and economic well being. Also, the need to protect and utilise historic assets is recognised within the vision and a strategic objective. However, do not consider that as currently drafted, the policy framework for the management of historic assets is adequate or appropriate, due to not according with national guidance or the upper tier of the development plan. Need exists for an overarching policy for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment of Selby - with specific reference to its locally-distinctive buildings, areas and assets. This is important for the Core Strategy as it will provide a strategic context for more detailed historic environment Policies contained in other DPD's and also sets out the context for the production of subsequent AAP's and SPDs.</p> <p>Recommend Including an additional Strategic Policy within Section 10 dealing with the management of the historic assets of the plan area, perhaps along the following lines:- "POLICY CP? The historic assets of the District will be protected and enhanced and their potential to contribute towards economic regeneration, tourism, education and local distinctiveness of the area fully exploited. In particular - Selby Abbey will be the focus for regeneration and tourism initiatives in the town and a sustainable future will have been secured for Abbot Staithes as part of the renaissance of the riverside area. Development proposals around Tadcaster will safeguard the distinctive historic character of the town, especially its historic street layout and reflect the limited palette of building materials used in the town centre. The town's flood defences will relate sensitively to the character of the river valley and safeguard the character and setting of the Listed Buildings and</p>	Further consideration of the points raised required.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>monuments in the area. A sustainable future will have been secured for the assets on the Heritage at Risk Register, particularly its moated sites, the buildings at Huddleston Hall, and the buildings at Abbots Staith, The Registered Battlefield at Towton and its setting will be protected from inappropriate development, appropriately managed, and a programme of access and interpretation implemented. The archaeology and historic landscapes of the Southern Magnesian Limestone Ridge and the Humberhead Levels will be better understood, appreciated and managed and their potential as a tourist, educational and economic resource realised. The Council will work with local communities to identify those elements of their historic environment which they consider to be important and develop a strategy for the appropriate management of those assets. The justification to the Policy should set out:- what is distinctive about the District's historic environment; The issues facing it for example, the need to reconcile the need for development with the protection of Selby's historic assets; 22 of the District's 45 Scheduled Monuments have been identified as being at Risk in the 2009 Heritage at Risk Register. 14 of these monuments are moated sites; of the five Buildings at Risk on the Register, three are at Huddleston Hall and have been on the Register since its inception in 1999. The role which the historic environment can play in the delivery of the wider objectives for the District. How this resource will be managed – e.g. local lists; SPDs etc.</p>	
DCS/352	The Grimston Park Estate	CP15	Partly	<p>Agree with the protection and enhancement section of the policy. It would be appropriate to consider the contents of PPS5 on the Heritage Resource which seeks an integrated approach - removing the distinction between buildings, archaeological resources and landscape.</p>	<p>Additional research needs to be carried out.</p>
DCS/371	Mr & Mrs M Waddington	CP15	Yes	<p>The generality of the policy is supported.</p>	<p>Comments to be noted.</p>
DCS/382	Yorkshire Water	CP15	Yes	<p>Yorkshire Water supports this policy, in particular Part 6 which aims for protect water resources from pollution. This is particularly important in parts of Selby due to the presence of groundwater used to resource the public water supply. These</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>are protected by the Environment Agency's Source Protection Zones. These are split into three zones.</p> <p>Zone 1 (Inner Protection Zone)</p> <p>Any pollution that can travel to the borehole within 50 days from any point within the zone is classified as being inside zone 1. This applies at and below the water table. This zone also has a minimum 50 metre protection radius around the borehole. These criteria are designed to protect against the transmission of toxic chemicals and water-borne disease.</p> <p>Zone 2 (Outer Protection Zone)</p> <p>The outer zone covers pollution that takes up to 400 days to travel to the borehole, or 25% of the total catchment area - whichever area is the biggest. This travel time is the minimum amount of time that we think pollutants need to be diluted, reduced in strength or delayed by the time they reach the boreholes.</p> <p>Zone 3 (Total Catchment)</p> <p>The total catchment is the total area needed to support removal of water from the borehole, and to support any discharge from the borehole.</p>	
DCS/521	English Heritage	CP15	No	<p>Table 5:</p> <p>A large number of the assessments of the Policies have predicted an uncertain impact against SA Objective 15 (Historic environment). In these cases, Policy CP15 has been put forward as the way in which any adverse impacts will be mitigated. However, in terms of the management of the historic environment, Policy CP15 is deficient as it does not set out a robust framework for this resource (see English Heritage's comments upon the Emerging Preferred Approach). Consequently, we do not consider that the current Policy CP15 is appropriate to mitigate any adverse impacts that might arise from the plan's housing and employment Policies.</p>	Additional work required to formulate appropriate wording or addition to policy – in conjunction with response to DCS/287.
DCS/390	Sport England	CP15	Partly	<p>May be worth including reference to playing fields that similarly should be protected and enhanced in line with PPG17.</p>	Suggest the addition of the words 'and playing fields' to point 4.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/436	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	CP15	Partly	<p>As well as safeguarding protected sites, important to ensure an adequate buffer zone around the areas - including NNR's, SINC's, SSSI's and SAC's. Especially important in the Lower Derwent Valley, as due to increased flood risk birds may need to use habitats further from the river for nesting/feeding.</p> <p>Agree with the need to produce a net gain in biodiversity on new developments, but consider this almost impossible to achieve without a planning ecologist to advise on the achievability of proposals. Ecologist also necessary to assess whether mitigation for a development is adequate. Vital for the Council to have ecological input in-house or from an outside source such as the Wildlife Trust. Important to translate the Biodiversity Opportunities map in RSS into the local level within the LDF. Suggest a guide called 'A guide to identifying and mapping biodiversity opportunity areas and ecological networks' by Y&H Regional Assembly, in order to map Local Ecological Networks' and 'Local Biodiversity Opportunity Areas' in LDF docs. The guidance will specifically assist with a) identifying areas at a local level that can contribute towards regional targets for restoration and creation of priority habitats, while ensuring they link to regional planning at landscape-scale. b) to write and use appropriate policies.</p> <p>Ecological/habitat networks allow species to move between habitat areas, and their creation or enhancement is a key conservation action to assist biodiversity in adapting to climate change. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas are areas where conservation action is likely to have the greatest benefit for biodiversity. Existing areas offering strategic opportunities for habitat restoration and expansion, and can contribute to UKBAP targets identified in the Y&H Regional Biodiversity Strategy. GI is a network of green and natural spaces that intersperse and connect settlements. Valuable for wildlife movement, help clean air and water, open spaces for health and amenity opportunities. The natural environment is the core element and ecological networks need to be assessed in their own right & the LDF should confirm links between GI planning and Local Opportunity Mapping. PPS 9 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) emphasises enhancement as well as conservation of biodiversity including the need to identify 'areas or sites for restoration or creation of new priority</p>	<p>Further advice required from YWT on buffer zones.</p> <p>Budget implication if Ecologist is to advise. Further consideration of implications of the comments required.</p>
---------	--------------------------	------	--------	--	---

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				habitats' and 'to maintain networks' which is echoed by Regional and National strategies as a priority to reverse many years of loss of habitats and species. A new YWT project has been established in the Selby Area and a Living Landscape Officer appointed for the Magnesian Limestone area who may be able to assist with ecological issues such as habitat creation & a planning officer to assist with planning related issues.	
DCS/442	Natural England	CP15	Partly	In general Natural England agrees with the policy of "urban concentration with regeneration". However, some brownfield sites can be very important to wildlife and can support significant biodiversity interest. Brownfield sites can therefore make positive contributions to the quality of life for local people through access to open spaces with wildlife interest. Request that policy wording is included in the Core Strategy concerning the retention of natural interest of brownfield sites as far as possible; and where this is unrealistic, to ensure provision is made off-site which allows the interest to be retained or enhanced i.e. a 'net gain' approach to development.	Consider the possibility of this changed wording, given the tension between this sentiment and the need to develop brownfield sites before greenfield. Or more appropriate to be in allocations dpd?
DCS/451	Natural England	CP15	Partly	Support the policy and agrees with the findings of the SA which recognises the policy support of wildlife enhancements, contributing to habitat restoration and creation, together with producing a net gain in biodiversity through development. Glad to see GI included, and linked to both natural environment and provision of ROS. Note the Landscape Character Assessment (1999) and suggest it is mentioned in text or policy. To ensure robustness, recommend LCA be updated, particularly in relation to areas most subject to development pressures. This will provide comprehensive landscape evidence, underpinning planning and management decisions and therefore should be included in the Core Strategy 3rd para to add	Comments noted. Further consideration of the points raised required.
DCS/471	D & J Poulter Buildings Contractors / Wrigley	CP15	Yes	Discussion of policy content - supported.	Support to be noted.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

	Property Development / Mr Geoff Lunn / Daniel Gath Homes / Penny England				
CP16 - Design Quality					
DCS/455	Natural England	Para 7.64	Yes	Pleased to note VDSs are mentioned as it is an initiative which Natural England promotes.	Noted.
DCS/34	North Yorkshire Police	Para 7.68	Partly	Welcome reference to community safety and secured by design in core strategy. It may be appropriate to add a paragraph which makes a link to design and access statements being required to demonstrate how crime measures have been considered in planning proposals.	Consideration to be given to adding text here or more likely to be left for more detailed consideration as part of future development management policies.
DCS/24	The Woodland Trust	CP16	Partly	Support policy but would like to see access to green infrastructure include access to woodland and to see this measured by the Council adopting the Woodland Trust's Access to Woodland Standard.	The term 'green infrastructure' encompasses woodland. Consideration must be given to whether the suggested Standard is appropriate to use as part of the Council's monitoring mechanisms.
DCS/31	Roderic Parker	CP16	Partly	Should be all dwellings not those above a threshold. The 'sustainable construction principles' statement is weak and planning powers should insist on locally sourced building materials wherever possible.	Further investigations may determine if it would be reasonable to apply the policy to all developments. The inclusion of locally sourced materials wherever possible may be appropriate (alongside reusing/recycling materials for example).

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/107	Chapel Haddlesey Parish Council	CP16	Partly	3-storey development should not be allowed where there is development in rural areas and villages.	It would be a blunt tool which forbids 3-storey homes in all villages as each area has its own characteristics which determines what styles are appropriate (some villages have historic, locally distinctive buildings of more than 2 -storeys). Adopting Village Design Statements will be helpful in this regard.
DCS/152	Sherburn in Elmet Parish Council	CP16	Partly	We need to retain a rural and agricultural aspect for the village and therefore when planning permissions are given this should be considered. It should be ensured that future developments do positively contribute to the area's identity and that the Village Design Statement is taken into consideration when planning permission is sought.	Noted, this policy should meet these objectives.
DCS/289	English Heritage	CP16	Yes	Support policy which should help safeguard the distinctive character of the District's settlements.	Noted.
DCS/353	The Grimston Park Estate	CP16	Partly	It is appropriate to have a policy of this nature which seeks to promote high quality design and to ensure that new development is appropriate to its context. Elements of this policy appear to duplicate (or be duplicated by) policy CP12.	There is some over-lapping of certain issues. Further consideration needs to be given to whether this can be rationalised for the Submission document.
DCS/372	Mr & Mrs M Waddington	CP16	Yes	The generality of this policy is supported.	Noted
DCS/391	Sport England	CP16	Partly	Sport England has produced a recent report on creating 'active design' which may also be worth evidencing. There are no details about how the policy will be delivered, but this may be through lower tier policies yet to be produced. Is there to be a threshold? Need further studies for this to be sound.	The report will be referred to. This policy is a strategic one, and Development Management policies will deal with detailed implementation.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/454	Natural England	CP16	Yes	Support the policy as it will meet NE's own objectives that development should be 'good enough to approve', accessible to all, locally distinctive and makes a positive contribution to the character of the area.	Noted.
DCS/472	D & J Poulter Buildings Contractors / Wrigley Property Development / Mr Geoff Lunn / Daniel Gath Homes / Penny England	CP16	Yes	This policy is supported.	Noted.
DCS/513	Selby PDI Reference Group	CP16	Partly	<p>The group were disappointed that there was no firm commitment to Lifetime Homes by making a definite statement that 100% must meet the standard. They felt very strongly that the cost of adaptations would be reduced and that this would justify any increased cost in building, although the increase has been shown to be only circa £500 anyway.</p> <p>The ad hoc as and when new developments are built would not work as how do you know who is going to live there anyway and developers are not too good at following standards. It should be a term of contract for all new developments.</p> <p>Lifetime Homes and or Buildings for Life must be compulsory. The lack of inclusive facilities in open spaces and recreation areas for elderly and disabled people was a big issue; these must also be provided in new developments and should be improved in existing areas.</p> <p>Play areas for children should be inclusive and not just leave disabled children as spectators. This again could be placed on developers as part of the contract and S106 community</p>	<p>Further consideration is required. ROS accessibility comments to be taken into account.</p> <p>Offer of future assistance from the PSI Reference Group appreciated</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

			<p>development.</p> <p>Secure by design, although rejected in the Strategy, should be included where appropriate, again, statistics of disabled people would help with these areas, and even just simple things like lighting, key fobs for garages, doors etc would be better than nothing. Safety was a big issue for vulnerable people and often overlooked.</p> <p>All new facilities in these new developments MUST be fully inclusive and where private companies move in, they must be building to a higher than minimum standard and be subject to inspection by Access Officers and any new developments and plans for them should INVOLVE consultation from the START with disabled people in those communities. The PSI group would be more than willing to establish this arrangement and are working towards such a link with Selby Council.</p> <p>The use of Part M of Building Control should be used in conjunction with other standards that cover upper floors, sports halls, recreation, play areas etc.</p> <p>The Access Consultant also pointed out that proper Design and Access statements would need to consider all of the above and should be viewed as living documents that develop with the project to ensure everything is fully inclusive.</p> <p>Lifetime Homes to meet changing needs over times but developers are only “to be encouraged”</p> <p>Selby DC considered specifying % of lifetime homes but said no evidence to justify it</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

Section 8 - Implementation					
ID No.	Name/ Company/ Organisation	Paragraph/ Policy	Agree/ Disagree	Issues Raised	Decision
DCS/144	Highways Agency	Whole Section	Omissions	Recognises the importance in the Core Strategy of reducing out commuting to Leeds and suggests this needs to be reflected in the indicators. Important to identify that if the principles of self sustaining are not proving successful, travel to work patterns would require different infrastructure provision over the plan period. Request inclusion of an indicator relating to net number of people out-commuting and number of people living and working within the district. Implementation chapter also needs to outline what contingencies are in place should existing commuting patterns continue.	Need to research putting these indicators in place and contingencies.
DCS/190	Environment Agency	Whole Section	Partly	Fig 8 - CP1 - Target for '100% development outside Functional Floodplain' needs to be qualified as the definition is presumably based on that within the Selby SFRA Level 1, rather than the Env Agency designation, as we do not routinely map the functional floodplain. Needs to be made explicit, and that the Council will be responsible for capturing this information. Fig 8 - CP12 - Indicators include 'flood storage capacity' - meaning is unclear - usually refers to providing flood compensation for sites which encroach on floodplains. However, PPS25 steers development away from floodplains. Therefore this indicator may not be relevant in most instances. Recommend national standard indicator of permission being granted contrary to an outstanding Environment Agency objection, as will object to proposals increasing flood risk elsewhere and the indicator would capture flood storage capacity concern. Would advocate an indicator which measures the % of developments incorporating sustainable drainage measures - accompanied with a 100% target.	Further consideration required.
DCS/290	English Heritage	Whole Section	Omissions	Suggest amending to include a schedule of how the various elements of the Vision and Strategic Objectives will be delivered through the policies of the Core Strategy and future documents. Presently unclear precisely which mechanisms the	Consider the feasibility of including such an indicator.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				Council intend to implement the Strategic Objectives.	
DCS/291	English Heritage	CP15 - Fig 8	Partly	It is not clear what indicator is proposed to monitor the effectiveness of the Plan's Policies upon the historic environment. Preferable to have an indicator(s) based on the number of assets and the percentage identified as being at risk. Info on number of assets could come from the annual E Heritage 'Heritage Counts', and on the number of assets at risk from the 'Heritage at Risk Register'.	Currently monitor the number of heritage assets in the AMR but not Buildings at Risk. Should more detailed monitoring such as this be related to grants – or not worth it if we don't actually have the evidence of a starting point for assessments of heritage assets and conservation areas?
DCS/324	The Grimston Park Estate	Figure 8	Omissions	Dealing with individual challenges, appear to be no subsequent PI's contained in Fig 8 assessing any reduction in car mileage or commuting patterns (para 2.11).	Consider the feasibility of including such an indicator.
DCS/456	Natural England	Figure 8 Section 8 Policy CP15 Indicators	Partly	In figure 8 Core Strategy Performance Indicators, we generally agree with the indicators set out for Policy CP15 but consider that there should be an indicator relating to the protection and enhancement of landscape character and quality, the following indicator is suggested: "Percentage of Landscape Character Areas where marked changes or significant changes inconsistent with character have occurred." This indicator would assist in showing how far applications are following the guidance contained in landscape character assessments. This would rely on regular reviews of landscape character integrity. A number of further landscape indicators have been developed and explored in a useful report published by Brentwood Council (see http://www.brentwood.gov.uk/pdf/pdf_1183.pdf)	Research the frequency of reviews that monitoring would necessitate. Further consideration required. Comments to be noted.
DCS/308	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	Monitoring Table	Partly	The table at the end of the document will provide a good basis for a clear delivery plan. It should be clear for at least the first 5 years of the plan what infrastructure is required, who is going to fund and provide it and how it is to relate to the rate of development, with key partners signed up for such	Additional work required to put this in place. Need to cross reference with Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>infrastructure provision. Critical dependencies need to be identified and it may be appropriate to break down infrastructure requirements into essential and desirable categories. You need to make sure that you take the implications of uncertainty into account in your strategy. Where an element of the plan is critical but delivery is uncertain, the plan should identify alternative options. The degree of uncertainty may be reduced with time and this is a matter that should be expressly considered in the monitoring section.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

Evidence Base – Background Papers – Omissions – General					
ID No.	Name/ Company/ Organisation	Omissions/ Background Papers/ Evidence Base/ General Comments	Agree/ Disagree	Issues Raised	Decision
Whole Document – General Comments					
DCS/11	South Milford Parish Council	General Comments on Whole Document	Yes	Would like to offer general support for many of over-arching principles and welcome choice of Option 1 as the preferred spatial strategy.	Noted.
DCS/18	Leeds City Council	General Comments on Whole Document	General Comments	Have no comments to make but please keep informed of progress of other AAPs and DPDs.	Noted.
DCS/33	Civil Aviation Authority	General Comments on Whole Document	General Comments	<p>The CAA would not wish to comment on local development plans but where officially safeguarded aerodromes lie within the local authority area, we recommend that the Council considers the needs of such aerodromes within the development plan and consult with the operators/licensees directly.</p> <p>The CAA also provides some background material for development/aviation related issues (other civil aerodromes, telecom installations, wind turbines, high structures and venting/flaring).</p>	Noted.
DCS/35	CABE	General Comments on Whole	General Comments	Due to limited resources we are unable to comment on this document. Provides some general comments: e.g. a good spatial plan is essential to achieving high quality places and good design. 3 key messages: tell the story, set the agenda	Note that SDC attended a CABE workshop recently where informal comments have been made on the Selby Draft Core Strategy;

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

		Document		and say it clearly. Also refers to CABE guidance for further help.	which mainly relate to a reformatting of the document to provide a spatial approach and the need for more photographs and diagrams.
DCS/46	Highways Agency	General Comments on Whole Document	General Comments	<p>The Highways Agency's key concern is to protect the primary role of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and to ensure its safe and efficient operation. The Highways Agency would therefore have concerns over any development proposals or plans which could have a material impact on this. The Highways Agency provides the following statement and request it is included in the transport evidence base for the plan.</p> <p><i>SRN Description and Operational Conditions</i> - :M62 from east of Ferrybridge to Great Heck, including Junction 34 with the A19; A1(M) at Bramham Crossroads; and A64(T) from Bramham Crossroads to Bilbrough.</p> <p>The M62 and A1(M) are three lane dual carriageway motorways with grade separated junctions. The A64(T) is an all-purpose two lane dual carriageway with grade separated junctions.</p> <p><i>Operational conditions</i>:- At present no sections of the SRN within Selby district have regular weekday traffic congestion problems. However, the A64(T) acts as a commuter route between York and the towns and villages beyond and the West Yorkshire urban centres. Thus there is a predominant traffic flow in the westbound direction in the morning peak and eastbound in the evening peak.</p> <p>In addition the A64(T) is subjected to a considerable amount of leisure traffic as it is a route from the urban conurbations of south and west Yorkshire to the Yorkshire coastal towns and North York Moors National Park. This can result in a considerable variation in traffic demand levels, particularly at weekends and on bank holidays.</p> <p>Traffic congestion can occur on the A64(T) and its junctions within the vicinity of York as a result of the more-popular race meetings at York Racecourse.</p>	Noted.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p><i>Proposed Network Enhancements:</i> - The HA has no proposals for capacity enhancements to the M62 or A64(T) within the District. However, the A1 to the north of Bramham Crossroads is currently being upgraded from all-purpose trunk road to motorway. As part of this, a parallel all-purpose service road has been constructed between Bramham Crossroads and Wetherby to the north.</p>	
DCS/47	Mobile Operators Association	General Comments on Whole Document	General Comments	<p>Have no specific comments in respect of specific issues and options for the Core Strategy as it is a strategic document. There should however be a telecommunications policy in the emerging LDF as they play a vital role in both the economic and social fabric of communities. PPG8 provides clear guidance as to the main issues.</p> <p>The submission provides detailed comments on the type of criteria based, stand alone policy which should be in one of the main LDDs</p>	Noted for consideration in future Development Management DPD.
DCS/52	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	General Comments on Whole Document	General Comments	<p>The Government Office is generally pleased with the way the Core Strategy is progressing and we would not want our comments to delay publication.</p> <p>We are pleased to see that there are only 17 policies in total. However, the document is still quite long and detailed, which is appropriate at the current stage where you are still justifying options. At submission a briefer document would give a clear message about the ways in which the area will change.</p> <p>Our comments should be read in conjunction with the general soundness points covered in the recently published Planning Inspectorate (PINS) <i>Learning from Experience</i> document. They should also be read alongside the Inspector's note of points arising from the frontloading visit of 25 August 2009, which we fully support.</p> <p>PINS also strongly urges LPAs to conduct a self assessment throughout the plan making process and a toolkit is provided on the PAS website. Experience has shown that those using the toolkit are more likely to produce a sound DPD.</p> <p>At publication there should be a table within the document listing the current saved policies and stating which are</p>	Noted/For Action.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				replaced and which are deleted.	
DCS/59	Sport England	General Comments on Whole Document	General Comments	Provide comments and information intended to be constructive and of assistance during the preparation of the Submission document in the form of two “self-assessment” checklists to help ensure a robust evidence base is in place and that all issues relating to sport and active recreation have been strategically considered. The general comments cover Sport England aspirations for sport and active recreation and General comments on the approach and evidence base of the Core Strategy. (Elsewhere, specific comments are provided for individual parts of the Core Strategy).	For noting/further consideration.
DCS/63	Environment Agency	General Comments on Whole Document	General Comments	Overall, we feel that the document addresses most of the pertinent environmental issues which will impact, or be impacted upon by Selby’s development in the future. However, there are areas where we believe that insufficient weight is afforded to environmental concerns, resulting in guidance which could be more helpful to both the local environment and the development community. We wish to see clearer guidance in relation to flood risk, safeguarding of water resources and promotion of Green Infrastructure.	For noting. Points are considered in relation to detailed comments on specific sections of the Core Strategy.
DCS/72	The Theatres Trust	General Comments on Whole Document	General Comments	The Theatres Trust is The National Advisory Public Body for Theatres. The Town & Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995, Article 10, Para (v) requires the Trust to be consulted on planning applications which include ‘ <i>development involving any land on which there is a theatre.</i> ’ It was established by The Theatres Trust Act 1976 ‘ <i>to promote the better protection of theatres.</i> ’ This applies to all buildings that were either built as theatres or are used for theatre presentations, in current use, in other uses, or disused. Due to the specific nature of the Trust’s remit we are concerned with the protection and promotion of theatres and therefore anticipate policies relating to cultural facilities.	For noting/consideration in future DPD’s.
DCS/78	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	General Comments on Whole Document	General Comments	As a general observation, we note that the Core Strategy as drafted is a very lengthy document and we would suggest that the Council endeavours to streamline this document.	The next ‘submission’ version will be a more succinct document in line with best practice advice.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/94	Bayford Developments	General Comments on Whole Document	General Comments	Propose a change to Green Belt, amended Development Limits at Monk Fryston to the east in the light of its designation as a primary village. This is in compliance with the aims and objectives of the Core Strategy. Also suggest a housing allocation at Monk Fryston Petrol Station.	This is another for the future Allocations DPD.
DCS/97	Bartle & Son	General Comments on Whole Document	General Comments	Generally support the Core Strategy. The thrust of the policy is generally correct but issue is raised in respect of a few points (<i>see elsewhere</i>).	Noted.
DCS/135	Mr Barry Hague	General Comments on Whole Document	General Comments	Yes we need a plan but surely it could have been put before the public in a language that most of us could understand without the need for a degree in "Glossary of Terms" or acronyms. This is the major problem with the document, or is this deliberate policy so that the general public do not understand?	Noted. Core Strategy has been profound in line with best practice and the Councils SC1. While Plain English is used as far as possible the document inevitably uses technical language. Future publishing material and summary leaflets/website should ensure that the concerns raised are addressed.
DCS/227	Land 4 New Build Limited	General Comments on Whole Document	General Comments	For the Core Strategy to be found sound it should be able to demonstrate significant flexibility as there is clear evidence that the strategy may be required to accommodate a fluctuating level of housing delivery within the Plan Period.	Relates to DCS/226 (Policy CP2).
DCS/274	UK Coal	General Comments on Whole Document	General Comments	Harworth Estates is a significant land owner in the Selby district and is committed to investing in their land holdings to bring them forward for development. This presents a major opportunity for Harworth Estates to work with Selby District Council and other key stakeholders to assist in meeting the district's aspirations for regeneration and employment growth. More specifically, Harworth Estates' land holdings within the Selby district represent significant economic, environmental and social assets, the employment reuse of which would also offer significant regeneration and sustainability benefits. In particular, the former mine sites put forward offer the potential to contribute to the district's economy in terms of: - Maximising opportunities for low carbon/renewable energy generation;	Not appropriate to promote the events of individual companies/businesses in the Core Strategy.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promoting the more sustainable movement of materials by rail; - Creating jobs to reduce out commuting of residents and enhance rural employment opportunities; - Providing opportunities for employment development on land which is not constrained by flood risk; and - Providing affordable and flexible employment space to meet local needs. <p>Accordingly, it is considered that this should be acknowledged in both the Core Strategy and forthcoming Allocations DPD.</p>	
DCS/422	Mr John Taunton	General Comments on Whole Document	General Comments	The consultation period was both very short and not well publicised especially when dealing with Parish Councils that can meet on a monthly or even less regularly basis.	Parish Councils and other stakeholders were contacted direct. Consideration could be given to either extending the consultation period (to 8 weeks) or agreeing extended deadlines for organisations who are experiencing difficulties in responding.
DCS/494	North Yorkshire County Council	General Comments on Whole Document	Yes	The County Council has no strategic planning policy objections to the proposals.	Noted.
DCS/495	North Yorkshire and York PCT	General Comments on Whole Document	General Comments	It is an informative and clear guide to the background policy and strategic direction over the next 15 years and will assist the PCT in developing its own local plans for Selby District.	Noted.
DCS/502	Local Government Yorkshire and Humber	General Comments on Whole Document	Yes	<p>Acting on behalf of Local Authorities Leaders Board comments highlight issues relating to the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). The Coalition Government is committed to abolishing RSS and comments are intended to help the District Council form a view on which parts of the Core Strategy are fit for purpose and which need further work in order to prepare a robust and sound DPD.</p> <p>Welcome and support approach. Support the positioning of the RSS within the wider context of the Core Strategy. Confirm</p>	Noted.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				that there are no major areas of discrepancy between the Core Strategy and the achievement of the outcomes of the RSS.	
DCS/512	Selby PSI Reference Group	General Comments on whole document	General Comments	It would be an idea for the council to obtain a database of people needing alternative formats and they would automatically get the documents in preferred formats.	Issue to be raised with the Community Engagement Officer.
Omissions					
DCS/102	Ye Fraternite of Olde Selebians	Any omissions to Consultation Draft Core Strategy	Omissions	Whilst the old BOCM factory was shown (Citizenlink supplement), nothing was mentioned of the old Rostron, Shipyard, Sturges and Yorkshire Chemicals.	A photograph was used for illustrative purposes. It is not realistic to mention all potential development sites across the District.
DCS/109	Mr Barry Hague	Any omissions to Consultation Draft Core Strategy	Omissions	Disappointed that services to support the major expansion of Selby District are only given a passing mention (e.g. schools, doctors, dentist 'new' hospital).	Services and infrastructure will be considered in more detail in an accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
DCS/111	Ye Fraternite of Olde Selebians	Any omissions to Consultation Draft Core Strategy	General Comments	Generally there was guarded approval for proposals for Selby.	Noted.
DCS/307	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	Any omissions to Consultation Draft Core Strategy	Omissions	The Inspector at his Frontloading visit suggested that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) should be in place by the draft plan stage, at least in a simplified form, to demonstrate that the Core Strategy provisions can be delivered. It should be in place at publication so that you can show that the strategy is likely to be deliverable at least for the first 5 years or so and that there are not major showstoppers for strategic developments. The table at the end of the document will provide a good basis for a clear delivery plan.	Work has commenced on an IDP in line with current best practice. See also DCS/308 Section 8 Monitoring table.
DCS/411	Samuel Smith Old	Any omissions to	Omissions	There should be a detailed and appraised housing trajectory for the District. The failure to provide an adequate housing	The Council produces an annual trajectory, which is published in

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

	Brewery	Consultation Draft Core Strategy		trajectory (for a DPD which determines future locations of housing land), to support its policies, seriously undermines the credibility of the evidence base.	the AMR and forms part of the evidence base. It would be appropriate to ensure that the latest information and trajectory is available at Publication and Summary Stage.
DCS/459	D & J Poulter Buildings Contractors / Wrigley Property Development / Mr Geoff Lunn / Daniel Gath Homes / Penny England	Any omissions to Consultation Draft Core Strategy	Omissions	Need for a Green Belt review.	See main report and similar comments submitted in response to the Spatial Development Strategy (Section 4).
DCS/476	Bayford Developments	Any omissions to Consultation Draft Core Strategy	Omissions	Need for a Green Belt review.	See main report and similar comments submitted in response to the Spatial Development Strategy (Section 4).
DCS/518	Selby PSI Reference Group	Any omissions to Consultation Draft Core Strategy	Omissions	Town Centre policy in C.S. does not refer to inclusivity and accessibility for all and should	Suggest including wording to reflect this comment,
DCS/519	Selby PSI Reference Group	Any Omissions to Consultation Draft Core Strategy	Omissions	Supported/special needs accommodation not referred to in Selby Core Strategy	Supported/special needs accommodation not referred to in Selby Core Strategy.
The Sustainability Appraisal					
DCS/166	Redrow Homes	The Sustainability	Partly	The SA fails to have sufficient regard to the spatial development strategy set out in the Core Strategy in terms of	Further consideration required in consultation with Watermans

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

	(Yorkshire) Ltd	Appraisal		specific reference to housing numbers and employment land allocations. This strategy is considered sufficiently definitive to enable impacts, particularly in respect of flood risk and SA16, to be assessed at this stage, having regard to the evidence base. This should be addressed and corrected at this stage in order to properly assess the Core Strategy proposals rather than deferring detailed consideration until DPD and SPD stages.	Consultants.
DCS/292	English Heritage	The Sustainability Appraisal	General & Omission	<p>We had some major concerns about the Scoping Report and, in particular, the lack of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives for the historic environment. As a result, we did not consider that that the Scoping Report set out an appropriate framework against which to assess the likely impact of the Policies and proposals of this DPD upon the historic environment. We are pleased to note that the changes which we suggested to overcome these deficiencies have been incorporated into this latest iteration of the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Also have the following comments:</p> <p>Paragraph 3.3.3 – In terms of the issues facing the historic assets of the District, it should be noted that a large number of them are at risk in the 2009 Heritage at Risk Register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Registered Battlefield at Towton (the bloodiest engagement ever fought on British soil) has been identified as being at high risk. It has consistently been targeted by metal detectorists and has been subject to deep ploughing. - 22 of the District's 45 Scheduled Monuments have been identified as being at Risk. 14 of these monuments are moated sites. - Of the five Buildings at Risk on the Register, three are at Huddleston Hall and have been on the Register since its inception in 1999. 	Noted and reference to the 'at risk' status of many assets to be included.
DCS/293	English Heritage	The Sustainability Appraisal	Partly	<p>Table 3, Table 5 and Table 24:</p> <p>In terms of the historic environment, whilst we would broadly concur with the assessment of the compatibility of the Core Strategy's Objectives with those of the Sustainability Appraisal, we consider that a number need further</p>	Further consideration required in consultation with Watermans.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				reconsideration:- DPD Objective 3 (concentrating development in the most sustainable locations), Objective 5 (provision of housing) and Objective 9 (economy) could have an impact upon the historic assets of the District. However, the impact will depend upon how these Objectives are implemented and the likely effect is, at this stage, uncertain. Consequently, it would be more appropriate to record the relationship of these DPD Objectives to SA Objective 12 as “uncertain”.	
DCS/294	English Heritage	The Sustainability Appraisal	General Comments	Appendix B will need to take account of the recently published PPS5.	Noted/For Action.
DCS/295	English Heritage	The Sustainability Appraisal	General Comments	English Heritage strongly advises that the conservation staff of the Council together with those at the County Heritage Unit and are closely involved throughout the preparation of the SA of the plan. They are best placed to advise on; local historic environment issues and priorities, including access to data held in the HER (formerly SMR); how the policy or proposal can be tailored to minimise potential adverse impacts on the historic environment; the nature and design of any required mitigation measures; and opportunities for securing wider benefits for the future conservation and management of historic assets.	Noted/NYCC are consulted at all stages.
DCS/384	Sport England	The Sustainability Appraisal	General Comments	Sport England would offer the following advise in production of SAs: Have appropriate documents such as the Regional Plan for Sport and a local Sport and Recreation/Leisure/Culture Strategy been used to inform the development of sustainability objectives? Is sport and recreation included within or referred to by at least one of the sustainability objectives? Is there cross-referencing between objectives such that the wider contribution of sport and recreation, in respect of economic and social well-being, is recognised? Are appropriate indicators attached to that objective relating to the delivery of sport and recreation, such as: open	Further consideration required in consultation with Watermans Consultants.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>space/facilities assessment; participation in sport and active recreation; and assessment of accessibility and quality of provision?</p> <p>Is there an evidence base, notably a PPG17-compliant assessment of open space and facility provision, available to appraise the contribution of sport and recreation to securing sustainability objectives?</p>	
DCS/441	Natural England	The Sustainability Appraisal	Yes	<p>Urban Extensions:</p> <p>The Strategy includes the proposal for sustainable urban extensions to the north-west and east of the town and we are concerned with the environmental impact of these. However we agree with the Sustainability Appraisal which says that the actual impact on biodiversity and other environmental assets is as yet uncertain until the actual locations are determined. We would be happy to advise further on how ecological, green infrastructure and landscape evidence can be used to inform these large housing developments</p>	Noted
Evidence Base - SHLAA					
DCS/115	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	Evidence Base - SHLAA	Disagree	<p>Concerned about the robustness of the SHLAA and its assessment of site delivery - including strategic sites. Appears to be an over reliance on larger sites to meet housing targets with an unrealistic assessment of likely delivery. Effectively appear to be promoting an 'eggs in one basket' approach that may lead to a failure in the Councils ability to deliver the required new homes.</p>	<p>Strategic sites do not contribute to the 0-7 year potential supply and form a small proportion of the 8-17 year potential supply. The working Group have advised and agreed to the delivery plan that has been used in assessing each site. The SHLAA is also being reviewed and the working group will advise on any changes necessary to the methodology used.</p>
DCS/419	Samuel Smith Old Brewery	Evidence Base - SHLAA	Partly	<p>1. Question the application of housing densities within site assessments and therefore overall yields calculated for the sites outside of Selby. Stage 6 of methodology shows 45 dph applied to Selby Urban Area and 35 dph in all other areas and all sites within Strategic Site boundaries. Consider blanket 35dph approach inappropriate as it does not necessarily</p>	<p>1. 30dph was initially proposed as the density to be applied to all other areas – using the starting point of the density included within the adopted Selby District Local Plan. This was increased to</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>represent the best use of land in these areas. Considering the SHLAA practice guidance advice, it is not clear what approach has been taken in devising the housing potential figures in the SHLAA. Evidence needed to support the density assumption - which must be released to allow proper consideration of the methodology underpinning the assessment. Consider that the SHLAA should apply a higher density to sites that are in sustainable locations.</p> <p>2. The methodology also states that sites with potential for 500 plus dwellings are subject to a 30% reduction to take account of the normal amount of non-housing elements that need to be incorporated. Again, consider that supporting credible evidence on assumptions made is not included in the methodology - making the SHLAA unsound.</p> <p>3. Due to historical impact of windfalls believe that an allowance for windfalls should be made after the first 10 years of supply identified. Do not support stage 10 para 16.0 of the methodology, and wish to see further evidence of the council's conclusions if the current stance is to be pursued.</p>	<p>35dph on the advice of the working group, a figure still considered to be reasonable, not artificially inflated to indicate a higher level of potential delivery. 45dph for Selby Urban area was a figure that resulted from the overall density of sites built in the area over previous year, which was then reduced to a more realistic level, given the level of flatted developments that had recently been built, and are highly unlikely to be repeated in the near future. Again the working group supported this figure. The issue of densities will require future review in light of changes to PPS3.</p> <p>1&2. Given the changing housing market, assumptions have to be made, and as it is recommended to review the SHLAA on a yearly basis, recent evidence will be used to either support the methodology or allow for amendments to be made, with the support of the working group, which is made up of key stakeholders and professionals within the planning and development field.</p> <p>2. Evidence of the density rate achieved on large sites in the District was used to produce the methodology relating to very large site development.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

					3. The need to include a windfall allowance after 10 years will be reviewed with the SHLAA, however, currently the healthy results of the SHLAA do not indicate a need to include an allowance.
DCS/475	Bayford Developments	Evidence Base - SHLAA	No	Having viewed the sites in the SHLAA it is apparent they are unlikely to meet the RSS housing targets. The SHLAA includes space for 6339 properties within Primary Villages to meet the Core Strategy target of 1495, however a simple assessment indicates that 3379 are within flood zone 3. Without considering all material planning considerations on SHLAA sites the majority are likely to be unviable or have significant barriers to development.	The SHLAA is a technical record of evidence related to the potential deliverability of sites. Regional guidance is to only exclude potential from land of flood Zone 3b level. The flood zone of other sites is recorded, but not used as a 'show stopping' constraint as the sequential test is intended to balance flood risk against other policy objectives. More detailed site assessments will be made at the Allocations DPD stage.
Evidence Base - SFRA					
DCS/114	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	Evidence Base - SFRA	Disagree	<p>Very concerned as this work is 'ongoing' (incomplete) and that Scott Wilson were only instructed at the level 2 stage to consider Strategic Site options A, D and G. Scott Wilson have confirmed that the document is a 'living draft' rather than a fully completed document.</p> <p>Having regard to the Council's Sequential Test, this document does not align with the tests set out in PPS 25. For example, the Council concludes in respect of site options E and F (which are part Flood Zone 1 & part Flood Zone 2), that these sites cannot accommodate <i>all</i> of the development requirements for Selby and as such, they represent insufficient opportunities and should be discounted (Selby DC: Sequential Test page 12).</p> <p>We note that PPS 25 and its sequential test aim to locate</p>	<p>1. The document is described as a 'living draft' because it will require future review to reflect updated flood risk data and other changes in circumstance.</p> <p>2. The sites are excluded from further consideration because they are considered to not be 'reasonably available' in the sense that they conflict with established policy to prevent settlement coalescence (see supplementary report to agenda item 3 – strategic development sites) As medium - low flood risk</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

			<p>development in those areas least at prone to flooding. It does not suggest that sites should be discounted on an 'all or nothing basis' in respect of their ability to accommodate growth. We contend this approach and suggest that the Council has incorrectly applied the Sequential Test. The correct conclusion in this background paper should have been be to identify sites E and F (which are part Flood Zone 1 & only part Flood Zone 2), as the most sequentially preferable behind site B (Flood Zone 1), and entirely appropriate for residential development.</p> <p>The Council should then continue to apply the sequential test to consider other sites which primarily fall into Flood Zones 2 and 3. We notes that Sites A,C, D and G all include large parts of Flood Zone 2 and 3 and therefore logically offer a lower priority for development.</p> <p>We note that PPS 25 suggests that development should be directed towards areas of the lowest probability of flooding. In Selby's case this means Sites B, E and F. The Council has attached limited weight to this guidance.</p> <p>We consider that the Council has not clearly set out what the wider sustainable development reasons actually are (contrary to PPG25 guidance) to warrant a focus on developing Flood Zone 3 sites.</p> <p>Unfortunately the Council's flood risk consultants, Scott Wilson, have not been instructed by the Council to consider the sequential test sites on pure PPS 25 grounds. They have instead only been asked to consider the sites the <i>Council</i> considers to be sequentially preferable and to justify these on the exceptions test basis, rather than to undertake a level 2 assessment and flood risk impact on all of the strategic growth opportunities. In the context of Selby which is well known for its flooding issues, this appears to be somewhat misleading and a 'cart before the horse' approach.</p> <p>Overall, our client is concerned that the Council has taken an unjustified stance in respect of protection of the strategic gap at all costs, despite this land outperforming other sites on the important issue of minimising flood risk.</p>	<p>sites they would otherwise pass the sequential test, but as they cannot physically accommodate all the development required consideration of higher flood risk sites is justified in any case.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

Evidence Base - SHMA					
DCS/492	Samuel Smith Old Brewery	Evidence Base - SHMA	Partly	Support Core Output 7 of the report, also evidenced within the Housing Distribution Options paper, which shows the annual affordable housing requirements for the District. Within this section of the report, Table 4.12, Tadcaster is identified as needing to provide 3.9% of the District's requirement.	Support noted
Evidence Base - General					
DCS/383	Sport England	Evidence Base - General	General Comments	The centrepiece of a sound evidence base should be a PPG17-compliant demand and supply-led assessment of open space and recreation facilities that takes into account existing and future demand and supply. Sport England provides an extensive set of checklists to act as a "self-assessment" guide to ensure the PPG17 Assessment has been undertaken in such a way that it provides robust evidence to underpin the Core Strategy policies. Specific comments on the Selby Core Strategy are not provided.	Helpful advice noted. Information to be taken into account in production of future PPG17 compliant documents.
DCS/420	Samuel Smith Old Brewery	Evidence Base - General	General Comments	Employment Land Study - note the limited release of the appendices information that supports this study and request that Appendix 2 and 7 are released to allow a full assessment of its contents.	Appendix 2 (Strategic Policy Review) is available on the Council's website. Appendices 5 (Economic Analysis) and 7 (Local Business Survey) are both confidential due to commercial sensitivity.
Background Paper No. 1 – Travel To Work Patterns					
DCS/25	Roderic Parker	Background Paper 1 - Travel to Work Patterns	Partly	Analysis with respect to Leeds is simplistic as it doesn't differentiate between areas. Policy should allow for more cycling to enhance the attractiveness of Tadcaster as a place to live even if employment supporting this is outside the District (e.g. Thorpe Arch).	The limitations of the study are appreciated although it does provide a broad guide as to the influence of employment opportunities in Leeds as whole. Policy CP12 encourages the promotion of walking, cycling and use of public transport.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

Background Paper No. 2 – Affordable Housing					
DCS/412	Samuel Smith Old Brewery	Background Paper 2 - Affordable Housing	Partly	<p>Tadcaster is identified as an area with lowest identified need at 3.9% of the total District requirement. We support this identified need in accordance with the requirements of YH6 of RSS as Tadcaster as Local Service Centre should meet only locally generated need for affordable housing.</p> <p>The proposed wording of Para 7.8 is not sufficiently clear in this regard and request further clarity regarding role of RSS and that LSC provide for only their own need.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Amend Paragraph 7.8 to make it more explicit that the lower thresholds in Local Service Centres reflects the emphasis on focussing on local needs in these settlements.</p>
Background Paper No. 3 – Housing Distribution Options					
DCS/413	Samuel Smith Old Brewery	Background Paper 3 - Housing Distribution Options	Partly	<p>In analysing the 3 potential approaches, agree that Selby should be focus for growth in accordance with YH5 of RSS.</p> <p>Disagree with proportion of 7% share for Tadcaster as SHMA and Background Paper 2 states need is only 3.9%. RSS says that Local Service Centres should only provide for their own needs. The 7% allows for meeting need that exists elsewhere.</p> <p>Para 3.5 outlines PPS3 does not encourage allowing for windfalls and this is not a true reflection of Government policy and requires clarification. Given the historic high rates of windfalls in the District, allowance should be made for windfalls in developing a preferred housing distribution after the first 10 years of land supply.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Consider it appropriate that Tadcaster should cater for need from some or all of the surrounding area.</p> <p>The overriding guidance in the PPS is nevertheless that future housing growth should be planned as far as possible. Windfall contribution is also likely to decrease following changes to the definition of pdl regarding gardenland.</p>
Background Paper No. 4 – Previously Developed Land Target					

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/414	Samuel Smith Old Brewery	Background Paper 4 - Previously Developed Land Target	Partly	Support 50% target for PDL for new development between 2004 and 2017.	Noted However the revised classification of garden land in national guidance may justify a lower estimate. (See main report on Policy CP1.)
Background Paper No. 5 – Sustainability Assessment of Rural Settlements					
DCS/7	Mr David Brewer	Background Paper 5 - Sustainability Assessment of Rural Settlements	No	<p>Disagrees with the Background Paper on the following grounds;</p> <p>1. Size: Classification ignores the fact that the majority of people in the District live in rural areas and they have as much right as any other resident to an "improved quality of life" as promised in the Council's own Mission Statement. to deny nearly 50% of the population the means to improve their quality of life by statute is not only inequitable it is probably against the Council's own Constitution and is almost certainly against European Human rights legislation.</p> <p>2. Basic Local Services: The table ignores Appleton Roebuck's much appreciated Post Office service. Appleton Roebuck should be in Overall Classification 2 and not 3.</p> <p>3. Public Transport: The assessment approach discriminates against rural settlements. Most villages above 600 population have some form of service allowing commuting to Principal or Local Service Centre. Council should be considering ways of encouraging more frequent services. Most people are able to gear their journeys to work around the services available and other services through the day are irrelevant to those people already at work.</p> <p>4. Access to Local Employment Opportunities: Unrealistic to restrict commuting distances within 5 miles or less is unrealistic. 10 miles would be more realistic. If Escrick is included as within 5 miles of major job opportunities in York, so should Appleton Roebuck. Employment at Bilbrough Top is ignored, which also requires explanation. Considers that Draft Core Strategy will stop all building work in villages which will</p>	<p>1. The purpose of the size indicator is explained in Para. 2.2 (of the Background Paper). It is primarily an indicator of potential and is only one of four key indicators used.</p> <p>2. The omission of reference to the part-time Post Office is acknowledged. Following representations from the Parish Council, Appleton Roebuck is being recommended as a Designated Service Village.</p> <p>3. Again accessibility to Service Centres is only one indicator used. It is considered entirely appropriate to include some indicator of public transport accessibility in an assessment of sustainability.</p> <p>4. The aim with this indicator was to measure proximity to LOCAL employment opportunities which could be accessed easily by sustainable means e.g. cycling and bus. Longer journeys by bus become less attractive. It is accepted that in the case of the</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				reduce access to local employment.	employment criteria that Escrick and Appleton Roebuck have been judged to fall either side of a relatively arbitrary cut-off On the criteria used Appleton Roebuck emerges as a marginal case for inclusion as a Designated Service Villages and in view of the robust representations made on behalf of the Parish Council it is proposed that Appleton Roebuck should be included in the Designated Service Village category. (See main report Policy CP1).
DCS/148	Mr Philip Charles Johnson	Background Paper 5 - Sustainability Assessment of Rural Settlements	No	Considers the methodology of assessing overall sustainability is incorrect, some villages classed as Primary even though they have poor or inadequate services and poor access roads. Some have access to good services close by and are classed as Secondary. The methodology doesn't make sense and is wrong.	Four indicators have been used to assess basic sustainability. Sustainability is a relative concept with a number of facets. The methodology attempts to take a broad view without placing undue emphasis on any one factor.
DCS/213	Jennifer Hubbard	Background Paper 5 - Sustainability Assessment of Rural Settlements	No	This evidence is highly suspect as, indeed, is acknowledged in the document itself. The East Riding sustainability matrix on which the Paper is based is no longer used by that Council as a material planning consideration and appeal Inspectors attach little weight to it. It – and Background Paper 5 – have two fundamental flaws: First, the list of sustainability “indicators” is too short and, second, the indicators are given equal weight in the overall assessment which is rarely appropriate and indicative of actual circumstances. Simply, a simple tick box assessment is unsubtle and fails to identify the different characteristics of the settlement patterns in different parts of the District. For example, where there are significant gaps in the distribution of larger settlements (for example in the north west	1. The Background Paper places no specific reliance on the East Riding Study. The Study places the sustainability of rural settlements in a wider context and illustrates the relative nature of the term which depends upon the context within which it is used. The background paper can only provide a starting point by providing an initial degree of objectivity onto which more subjective considerations can be added in the more marginal

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

			<p>part of the District) no consideration is given to meeting the needs of the smaller settlements by the identification of one (or more) settlement as a focus for services and growth to serve the group. It is not surprising that such settlements, individually, attract low scores on the sustainability index as facilities are frequently distributed across the group rather than concentrated in one settlement.</p> <p>I support the representations of Appleton Roebuck Parish Council for that village to be redesignated as a Service Village to assist in maintaining the sustainability of the group of settlements in the north west part of the District.</p> <p>Size, in itself, should not be a determinant of sustainability. Barlby, Osgodby and Brayton are designated as Service Villages mainly due to size and the consequential range of facilities which serve those populations but it is not clear what service function they perform for the surrounding areas. This, surely, is a pre-requisite of designation under CP1A(a). Given the limited growth envisaged in the CS, it would be preferable to limit new development in these settlements to that which maintains the existing level of services and to redistribute any “surplus” to Selby and Sherburn and to those settlements which perform a genuine service function for surrounding settlements and surrounding rural areas.</p> <p>The list of local services used to classify settlements at Table 2 of Background Paper 5 should be widened/increased to include – at least - garage/petrol filling stations, playing fields/parks/recreation grounds, public houses/restaurants and churches/chapels. Whilst accepting the importance of a local Doctors’ surgery, residents in any settlement are likely to visit one, most if not all of these suggested additional facilities more frequently than the Doctors’ surgery.</p> <p>Escrick enjoys a wide range of services and facilities. The settlement lies on a bus route with a 15 minute service between York and Selby in what the Council has described as a sustainable commuting corridor with a string of employment sites along the route. Escrick clearly performs a service function for the surrounding settlements of Deighton, Stillingfleet and Skipwith. The village should be included in Category 1 under Table 4 of Background Paper 5</p>	<p>cases.</p> <p>2. Appleton Roebuck is a case in point where the arguments put forward on behalf of the Parish Council have been accepted (see report Policy CP1).</p> <p>3. It is entirely agreed that size itself should not be the sole determinant of sustainability. It is however a useful indicator of the potential within the village to provide a potential for sustaining community activities and local services. Size is only one the factors taken into account. The Paper also indicates that differing weightings could be applied to the factors depending on the use to which the analysis was being put.</p> <p>The issue of the role of the villages closest to Selby is one for the Strategy and not the Background Paper.</p> <p>4. It is not considered it would be helpful to widen the list of services/facilities in differing villages. It would tend to make comparison more difficult with greater discussion on the relative value of the services. Whatever the criteria there will always be similar considerations of marginal cases and a need to consider more subjective circumstances. This short list were selected from the former Countryside Agency’s document Parish Accessibility Audit as the most important</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

				<p>(Classification of settlements by accessibility).</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above comments, on the basis of the indicators considered in Background Paper No.5, Escrick is incorrectly ranked in the summary of relative sustainability of settlements at Table 7. Based on the four indicators considered (size, local services, accessibility to service centres and accessibility to employment, Escrick's overall ranking should be 2, confirming it as a "more sustainable" settlement in that three of the indicators fall in the highest two categories (para 4.1). Based, therefore, on the Council's own assessment and irrespective of other considerations Escrick should be designated as a service village.</p>	<p>services which are traditionally village based.</p> <p>5. Accept Escrick has been misclassified in Table 7. However, even with its present Ranking in group 3 it has already been considered as a Designated Service Village. However Designated Service Villages have been selected on the potential to accept a degree of growth which generally will be in the form of extension. Escrick was rejected on the basis that there were no such appropriate and easily deliverable opportunities within or around the village. (See Background Paper No6.)</p>
DCS/230	Appleton Roebuck & Acaster Selby Parish Council	Background Paper 5 - Sustainability Assessment of Rural Settlements	General Comments	<p>The Sustainability Assessment is based on a now somewhat elderly but similar Assessment prepared by the East Riding of Yorkshire Council and it has some serious shortcomings and lacks the sophistication to be used as a basis for planning policy.</p> <p>Settlement classification by size and basic local services needs to be considered not just on a settlement by settlement basis but in relation to the level of services in groups of villages which identify with one another. Classification by accessibility seems to the Parish Council, in relation to Appleton Roebuck, to be flawed. In relation to classification by access to local employment opportunities, the Parish Council considers that "access" should be assessed by reference to a combination of distance and transport modes, not just distance: also (as is acknowledged in the document) local employment opportunities including agricultural opportunities, are difficult to quantify.</p> <p>Any errors or rankings based on incomplete information in the five separate classifications covered in the Background Paper</p>	<p>See Response to DCS/213 above.</p> <p>Appleton Roebuck is recommended for reclassification as a Designated Service Village. (See main Report on Policy CP1)</p>

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

			<p>are compounded in the summary of relative sustainability ranking at Table 7. Specifically, the Parish Council does not accept that Appleton Roebuck's overall ranking (No. 4 – least sustainable settlement) is a true representation of its importance as a Service Centre in the relatively sparsely populated north west sector of the District.</p> <p>Put simply, Appleton Roebuck may not be sustainable in comparison with – say – Brayton or Barby but that begs the question – how are the small settlements in the north west sector of the District to be properly serviced in the future.</p> <p>In Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no land currently available for development within the Development Limits of Appleton Roebuck. • The Parish Council does not want to see any local facilities lost, which would be a consequence of the redevelopment of brownfield sites within the village. • Appleton Roebuck has an extremely low turnover of population but there needs to be continued modest growth if the village is to remain a sustainable community. • There needs to be continued modest growth within the catchment area of the school to ensure its future. Appleton Roebuck rather than any of the other villages in the group is the most sustainable location for such growth. • The Parish Plan, approved in January 2005 after lengthy consultation in the village, promotes development which is necessary to maintain activity in the village at least at its present level. The Plan recognises that more affordable housing is required and that any new market housing should be predominantly small units rather than large houses. <p>The Parish Council does not consider that the long term needs of Appleton Roebuck, the Parish and the surrounding settlements can properly be met throughout the life of the Local Development Framework other than by upgrading the settlement to the status of a Service Village.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/415	Samuel Smith Old Brewery	Background Paper 5 - Sustainability Assessment of Rural Settlements	Partly	Agree Appleton Roebuck and Stutton are among the least sustainable rural settlements as identified in Table 17; and are therefore not suitable to accept any new development, should the Core Strategy require that development be distributed more widely.	Noted although a Appleton Roebuck is now recommended for reclassification as a Designated Service Village (See response to DCS/230 above and main report re Policy CP1)
Background Paper No. 6 – Designated Service Villages					
DCS/416	Samuel Smith Old Brewery	Background Paper 6 - Designated Service Villages	Partly	<p>Agree Appleton Roebuck and Stutton should be Secondary Villages and not suitable for planned growth.</p> <p>Support Appendix 2 which identifies Bolton Percy, Colton, Stillingfleet and Towton as Secondary Villages but this analysis should be included in the Paper with more detailed consideration of landscape and visual assessment, road networks, biodiversity and agricultural land value.</p> <p>The Stutton analysis refers to a promoted SHLAA site and this is not sufficiently dismissive of the site's potential and should make clear that its development would be contrary to the locational development strategy of the RSS.</p>	<p>1. Noted although a Appleton Roebuck is now recommended for reclassification as a Designated Service Village (See response to DCS/230 above and main report re Policy CP1)</p> <p>2. Resource availability constrained work of this nature on villages which were clearly unsuitable as Designated Service Villages</p> <p>3. Further work is necessary to clarify this point.</p>
Background Paper No. 7 – Strategic Development Sites					
DCS/32	Mr Stuart Black	Background Paper 7 - Strategic Development Sites	No	<p>Cross Hills Lane Strategic Housing Site is entirely unsuitable because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Flooding (at high risk, was flooded in 2000 to great extent). 2. Access and its cost (length of road and special measures needed). <p>Environmental impact (adverse affect on species and amenity value of green space).</p>	See main report for issues raised in response to Policy CP2.

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

DCS/37	Mr John Wetherell	Background Paper 7 - Strategic Development Sites	Partly	<p>Cross Hills Lane Strategic Housing Site consists of farmland; but also allotments and school playing fields which should not be included as it will lead to a loss of recreation space. If spare, NYCC should use the playing fields as public open space for the local community as there is little in that area.</p> <p>The farmland near the Dam is prone to flooding.</p> <p>The road link to Leeds Road will not happen due to finances.</p>	See main report for issues raised in response to Policy CP2.
DCS/112	Barratt and David Wilson Homes	Background Paper 7 - Strategic Development Sites	No	<p>We note that the Council has not undertaken any detailed evidence based work in respect of the landscape and visual impact of urban extensions, or, the impact of development and urban extension options on the Strategic Gap.</p> <p>Our client is concerned that this represents a fundamental omission in the Council's evidence base. Instead, the Council has a very short proforma at Appendix 5 of the Strategic Sites background paper (no. 7) which is the only work to justify major Strategic Sites in Selby.</p> <p>It is widely accepted that in assessing development comprising urban extensions, that a comprehensive assessment of Landscape and Visual Impact should be undertaken. Landscape assessment should also take into account Landscape Character Areas identified at the regional, county and local levels. From these assessments, conclusions can be drawn as to the overall sensitivity of the landscape and visual environment to the type of development envisaged. The sensitivity of the landscape to change is reflected in the degree to which the landscape is able to accommodate change without adverse effects on its character.</p> <p>The Council has not undertaken such a robust assessment.</p>	<p>A comparative assessment of landscape impacts has been undertaken as part of the evaluation of strategic development site options, and the results are summarised in Background Paper No 7. The assessments were undertaken by officers in accordance with guidance and best practice produced by the former Countryside Agency. This is considered to provide a proportionate solution to the need for landscape evidence which is relevant to local circumstances as advocated by PINS and GOYH. As referred to in the main report (see addendum to item 3 – strategic development sites)</p>
DCS/417	Samuel Smith Old Brewery	Background Paper 7 - Strategic Development Sites	Yes	<p>Agree that the majority of development should be focussed around Selby in accordance with the requirements of RSS.</p>	Support noted

Selby District Core Strategy - Council Decisions on Responses to the Consultation Draft Core Strategy

		nt Sites			
Background Paper No. 8 – Climate Change					
DCS/418	Samuel Smith Old Brewery	Background Paper 8 - Climate Change	Yes	<p>Reducing the need to travel by car, renewable energy and improving energy efficiency are strategies broadly supported within the LDF evidence base.</p> <p>Also support the developing Climate Change agenda with regard to future planning applications and look forward to reviewing future DPDs and SPDs proposed to tackle more detailed requirements.</p>	Support noted