Selby District Local Development Framework

Core Strategy
Development Plan Document

Further Options Report

Selby District Council – November 2008

Selby District Local Development Framework
Core Strategy
Consultation on Further Options

Contents

The following Background Papers referred to in this report are available on the Council's website

No.1 Analysis of Journey to Work in Selby District
No.3 Producing and Assessing Housing Distribution Options
No.5 Assessing the Relative Sustainability of Smaller Rural Settlements in Selby

Introduction

1.1 The Council is preparing a series of development plan documents required under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which will form part of the new 'Local Development Framework' (LDF). The Council's current programme for plan production is set out in its Local Development Scheme (February 2007). When adopted, the plans will replace the Selby District Local Plan, most of the policies of which are saved under the transitional legislation.

1.2 The Core Strategy is one of the first documents to be produced within the LDF and will provide a context with which subsequent Development Plan Documents (DPDs) must conform.

1.3 The Core Strategy will provide:

- A spatial vision for Selby District and strategic objectives to achieve that vision.
- A development strategy to provide:
  - the context for designating areas where specific policies will apply, either encouraging development to meet economic and/or social objectives or constraining development in the interests of environmental protection and
  - designation of strategic sites for housing and economic development to accommodate major growth in Selby and a district-wide framework for the subsequent allocation of sites for housing, employment and other specific uses.
  - policies setting out the context for more detailed policies and guidance to be included in other LDF documents.

1.4 Site specific policies and allocations for housing, employment and other land uses will be set out in other Local Development Documents, such as the Selby Area Action Plan and an Allocations DPD (see the Local Development Scheme, which is currently being reviewed, for the timetabling of these documents).

The Preparation Process

Previous Issues and Options Stage

1.5 In May 2006 the Council published a consultation document, which discussed and requested views on the main planning issues which might be addressed in the Core Strategy. The report was circulated to all stakeholders and advertised in the local press and on the Council's web-site. 71 individuals and organisations responded .

1.6 Views were requested on what were considered to be important issues for the Core Strategy, across a wide spectrum of planning related topics. These included: the future role of the District within the sub-region, bearing in mind the current high levels of out - commuting; use of greenfield and previously developed land; affordable housing provision, climate change issues and the spatial strategy for accommodating additional growth.

Interim Housing Policies Consultation

1.7 Although not strictly part of the Core Strategy process, the Council in December 2007, considered the possibility of introducing interim housing policies, to operate in the short term prior to the Core Strategy being adopted. The Council was concerned at the high levels of housing development being brought forward under existing Selby District Local Plan policies, which, if they had continued, would have prejudiced the overall aims of the Regional Spatial Strategy, both in terms of scale and distribution of housing development and restricted the ability to influence housing development through the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework documents. A second concern, which the policies also tried to address was the desirability of increasing affordable housing provision across the District as a whole.

1.8 An extensive consultation was undertaken during February 2008 which elicited a wide ranging response from 122 individuals and organisations. There was extensive support for the policies from the majority of individuals and parish councils but generally a negative reaction from those respondents with a direct association with the development industry. There was also a negative response from Government Office, who questioned the need for and status of the proposed policies.

1.9 In the event, after considering the responses, the Council decided not to proceed with the Interim Policies. While the subsequent downturn in the housing market is reducing housebuilding activity, issues on distribution and affordable housing provision remain to be addressed in the Core Strategy. The responses made to the Interim Housing Policies have provided most useful comments which have been taken into account in producing the further options for housing policies presented in this report.

Purpose of this Consultation

1.10 After the Issues and Options stage in 2006, this current consultation represents the next stage of the Core Strategy preparation process.

1.11 In view of the time that has elapsed since the Issues and Options consultation, together with the relatively general nature of those issues and options, the Council considers it is appropriate to consult on further policy intentions and options containing more detail.

1.12 These options and indicative policies set out the Council's approach to the Core Strategy which has been distilled from examination of the evidence base, the regional context and the results of the previous consultations on Issues and Options and also the consultation earlier this year on possible Interim Housing Policies.

Future Stages

1.13 Following consideration of the results of this consultation, the Council will prepare a Submission Draft of the Core Strategy, which will be published for comment prior to formal submission. The submitted Core Strategy will then be the subject of an Examination in Public conducted by an independent inspector in order to assess its soundness. The inspector's binding recommendations will then be incorporated into the Strategy prior to adoption by the Council.

Current Regional Context for the Core Strategy

1.14 The strategic planning context for the Core Strategy is provided by national planning policies and guidance and the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), entitled The Yorkshire and Humber Plan, which was published in its final form by the Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber in May 2008.

1.15 The Regional Assembly for Yorkshire and the Humber is undertaking an immediate partial review of the Plan to be completed by 2011 to ensure that longer term housing growth is planned and accommodated in the most sustainable way. This will include consideration of New Growth points and Ecotowns.

1.16 The possibility of accommodating an Ecotown within the Leeds City Region is the subject of a separate consultation exercise by the Government, although Selby District Council and other Leeds City Region authorities are opposed to the proposal. At this point in time it is not possible to anticipate the outcome of the Government's deliberations and therefore this strategy is based on the future housing requirement established in the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy, without an Ecotown. It is important that a context for continuing development within the District is established as soon as possible and the Council considers it would be beneficial to continue to prepare the Core Strategy as a basis for planning within the District in the short to medium term, whilst being aware of the potential for possible changes in the longer term.

Policy Areas

1.17 The Core Strategy is grouped into the following three policy areas:

Spatial Strategy - Housing and Economy

Environmental Quality and Natural Resources

Sustainable Communities

1.18 Policy intentions and possible options within these areas are discussed below. A series of questions are included to provide a framework to assist respondents.

The Consultation

2.1 The six weeks consultation period will begin on 6 November 2008 and responses should be submitted to the Council, at the address below, by 18 December 2008.

2.2 Please use the response form provided to make your comments. A number of questions have been posed in order to highlight issues on which we are seeking comments.

2.3 This consultation document, background papers and copies of the response form are available on the Council's web site and reponses can be sent by post and electronically.

2.4 Response forms should be sent by post to:

Principal Planner (LDF Team)
Development Policy
Selby District Council
Civic Centre
Portholme Road
SELBY
YO8 4SB

****

Housing

Scale of New Housing

3.1 The requirement for future house building in the Region is set out in The Yorkshire and Humber Plan (Regional Spatial Strategy), which also establishes the number of dwellings required for individual Local Authority areas.

3.2 The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) establishes the following minimum requirement for house building within Selby District :-

April 2004 – March 2008 390 dwellings per year.

April 2008 – March 2026 440 dwellings per year.

This gives a requirement of at least 9,480 dwellings in the period up to 2026.

3.3 House building rates in the District between 2004 and 2008 have averaged 640 dwellings per year, which has the effect of reducing the requirement to 384 dwellings per year from 2008 onwards. In addition existing unimplemented housing permissions (termed commitments) amount to 2,637 dwellings (as at 31st March 2008). In total, therefore, allowing for a 10% proportion of the commitments not being implemented, it is proposed to provide additional land for a minimum of approximately 4,550 new dwellings (253 dwellings a year) between 2008 and 2026.

Distribution of New Housing

Context

3.4 The context for determining the distribution of new housing within the District is established in national and regional planning guidance. The Regional Spatial Strategy directs that the focus for growth within the District should be Selby, as the Principal Town.

3.5 Outside Selby, the RSS indicates that Local Service Centres should be defined to provide a focus for more limited locally orientated development, and generally seeks to prevent dispersal of development to other settlements and the open countryside. It indicates that Local Development Frameworks, should identify local development needs that are essential to support village communities as well as the appropriate limited types of development that would be acceptable in the open countryside, in line with Planning Policy Statement 7.

3.6 Planning Policy Statement 7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (2004) is a national policy statement which makes reference to allowing some development in villages of a lower order than Local Service Centres where they have important roles in the

provision of local employment, services and facilities.

Issues and Options Consultation

3.7 The Council first consulted on this topic in May 2006 through the Issues and Options report, when four options were put forward:

1) Growth concentrated in Selby town and adjoining Parishes
2) Growth in Selby plus additional growth, over and above local needs, in Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster.
3) Growth above local needs in Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster, and larger Villages
4) A very dispersed growth strategy, potentially including some development in a majority of villages.

3.8 While all the options attracted a degree of support, it became apparent that only one option was likely to be fully compliant with the Regional Spatial Strategy. In this respect, the Regional Assembly were strongly of the view that Options 3 and 4 would conflict with emerging RSS and that Option 2 could be only be supported if housing growth outside Selby was limited to meeting local needs and supporting the vitality of settlements. Option 1 was considered to most closely reflect emerging guidance.

3.9 Additional work undertaken by the Council on local sustainability from a Journey to Work aspect fully supports this approach (See Background Paper No.1 Analysis of Journey to Work in Selby District.) The Council has therefore decided to base the Core Strategy on Option 1, which focuses new market housing in Selby (and adjoining parishes) and limits development in the remainder of the District. Within this general strategy, however, there is still scope for considering the precise distribution to be sought, particularly in terms of the balance of growth between Selby and the remainder of the District and the distribution of local needs orientated growth amongst the village settlements. The settlement hierarchy discussed below provides a framework for this discussion.

Settlement Hierarchy

a) Principal Town

3.10 The Regional Spatial Strategy defines Selby as a Principal Town which should provide the main focus for housing, employment, shopping, leisure, education, health and cultural activities and facilities within the District.

b) Local Service Centres

3.11 The Regional Spatial Strategy indicates that Core Strategies should identify Local Service Centres which provide services and facilities for people living in the surrounding local area, and which should be protected and enhanced as attractive and vibrant communities. The Regional Spatial Strategy advocates that Local Service Centres are locations where local services should be retained and improved, economic diversification encouraged and where local housing needs for both market and affordable housing should be met.

3.12 In Selby District, Tadcaster and Sherburn in Elmet stand out as larger settlements which serve a Local Service Centre function. (This view is confirmed by the Regional Settlement Study)

3.13 Sherburn in Elmet is located close to the A1(M) and has access to two railway stations. It has expanded significantly since the 1980s, and provides a range of employment opportunities, including manufacturing and logistics. Work is being undertaken to further improve the central area as part of a Renaissance programme.

3.14 Tadcaster is famous for brewing and is situated on the River Wharfe off the A64 between York and Leeds. In recent years housing and economic growth have not kept pace with other parts of the District and Tadcaster functions as a dormitory town for surrounding employment centres outside the District. This is undermining its service centre role, particularly in view of the very limited opportunities for new housing in surrounding villages.

c) Other Settlements

3.15 The Council is of the view, that in addition to the identified Local Service Centres, there is a case for allowing limited development in some of the larger more sustainable villages for the following reasons.

- PPS7 encourages some development in villages with good services in order to help sustain them.
- There was a degree of public support for some development in villages at the Issues and Options stage.
- Outside Selby, Tadcaster and Sherburn in Elmet have limited catchments which do not serve the local needs of all the rural areas. In these remaining areas, the need to support larger villages which supply local services is important.

3.16 To assist in creating policies for the lower order settlements, the

[1] Regional Settlement Study – Regional Assembly (2004)

Council is proposing two categories of villages – Primary and Secondary in order to be able to differentiate settlements in policy terms.

3.17 The Council has undertaken an analysis of the relative sustainability of villages, as a result of which 20 villages have been selected as Primary Villages. These are considered to be the more sustainable of the villages, providing an existing network of basic local services. It is intended that these villages will provide the focus for further development in the District's rural settlements in order to support and where possible improve the service network they provide. The potential for further development will vary considerably between villages and selection as a Primary Village does not automatically imply any significant further growth. It has to be borne in mind that the overall level of development to be allocated to villages is likely to be relatively low.

3.18 Views are being sought in this consultation on the approach adopted in defining Primary Villages, the number of villages selected to provide a good service network, as well as on the specific villages included.

Primary Villages

3.19 In defining Primary Villages a comprehensive assessment has been made of the relative sustainability of settlements larger than 600 inhabitants. (See Background Paper No.5 – Assessing the Relative Sustainability of Smaller Rural Settlements in Selby District). The assessment considers the existence of four key services: primary school, general store, post office and doctor's surgery. It also takes into account public transport accessibility to service centres, proximity to job opportunities; and settlement size, which is used as an indicator of the market potential for sustaining and improving services.

3.20 During February 2008, the Council undertook consultation on a number of Interim Housing Policies which it was considering introducing with early effect. As part of that consultation a list of 17 potential Primary Villages (termed Service Villages at that time) was published for comment. There was no widespread strong feeling about the identified villages although there were a number of individual comments regarding both the list and methodology.

3.21 In response to the comments received, Background Paper No. 5 has been reviewed incorporating minor changes to the methodology. As a result, Cliffe has been removed from the list of Primary villages and Brotherton, Church Fenton, Fairburn and Ulleskelf have been included.

3.22 The complete list of proposed Primary Villages is as follows:

Barlby	Fairburn
Brayton	Hambleton
Brotherton	Hemingbrough
Byram	Kellington
Camblesforth	Monk Fryston
Carlton	Riccall
Cawood	South Milford
Church Fenton	Thorpe Willoughby
Eggborough	Ulleskelf
Escrick	Wistow

Secondary Villages

3.23 The secondary villages comprise the remaining 42 village settlements which were defined with Development Limits in the Selby District Local Plan namely:- Appleton Roebuck, Barkston Ash, Barlow, Beal, Biggin, Bilbrough, Birkin, Bolton Percy, Burn, Burton Salmon, Chapel Haddlesey, Church Fenton Airbase, Cliffe, Colton, Cridling Stubbs, Drax, Gateforth, Great Heck, Healaugh, Hensall, Hillam, Hirst Courtney, Kelfield, Kellingley Colliery, Kirk Smeaton, Little Smeaton, Lumby, Newland, Newton Kyme, North Duffield, Osgodby, Ryther, Saxton, Skipwith, South Duffield, Stillingfleet, Stutton, Thorganby, Towton, West Haddlesey, Whitley, Womersley.

3.24 In accordance with the Regional Spatial Strategy aim of preventing the dispersal of development to smaller settlements, it is the Council's intention not to make any more housing allocations within the Secondary Villages, other than those specifically to provide 100% affordable housing, to meet an identified local need.

Question 1

Do you agree with the Council's criteria for defining Primary Villages and, if so, do you agree with those 20 villages selected? If not please explain why

Where Will the New Housing Development Go?

3.25 Within the broad strategic approach of concentrating growth in Selby - three possible theoretical approaches to distributing housing across the settlement hierarchy post-2008 have been considered.

A Reflecting identified Affordable Housing Need

B Maximising the Use of Previously Developed Land

C Maximising the Amount of New Development in Selby

Background Paper 3 - Producing and Assessing Housing Distribution Options explains the evidence used to make the comparisons and sets out the numerical outcomes of each approach.

3.26 Approach A, which reflects affordable housing need , would result in a higher proportion of housing in the rural areas at the expense of the Selby area. However, it would be contrary to RSS guidelines and sustainability objectives. It is not necessarily appropriate to make full provision for affordable housing in the smaller, less sustainable settlements, since occupiers may have a high dependency upon public transport and local services and therefore need better serviced settlements.

3.27 Approach B is closer to the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) objectives than Approach A, but availability of previously developed land is influenced by the fact that residential garden curtilages are included in that definition. Garden land is widespread across the District and is not restricted to the more sustainable locations. In practice, therefore, it may be difficult to achieve this distribution through new allocations on previously developed land, as recent completions and commitments are largely the result of windfall developments, either on smaller sites or larger commercial sites, the availability of which is difficult to anticipate and plan for. However, it is indicative of the distribution which is likely to occur through continuing to allow windfall development on previously developed land other than in Secondary Villages.

3.28 Approach C is included in order to illustrate the maximum amount of housing such an approach would imply for Selby town over the Regional Spatial Strategy period between 2004 and 2026. It would limit development outside Selby to existing commitments and reduce the scope for providing for local needs close to where they arise. It would not make use of previously developed land outside Selby and would also create undue pressure on infrastructure and greenfield land around the fringes of Selby.

3.29 Background Paper No. 3 - Producing and Assessing Housing Distribution Options, illustrates the number of dwellings provided

through the alternative approaches, for each of the settlement categories.

Preferred Distribution

3.30 After considering the above options, a preferred option has been developed (Table 1). It provides a distribution which balances the objectives of the other three approaches, as well as taking into account other considerations which could influence the practical implementation of the distributions, such as land ownership constraints.

3.31 The preferred option provides a balance between the varying objectives by:

- Achieving just over 50% of development over the Regional Spatial Strategy plan period - 2004 –26, within the Selby area (including adjacent villages).
- Ensuring that, as far as practical, the proportions of new development (2004 – 2026) allocated to Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster are compatible with the equivalent proportions in the Affordable Housing led approach, although in Tadcaster the target reflects potential land ownership constraints.
- Continuing to allow a limited degree of development in the larger more sustainable villages, particularly those with good, existing basic services.
- Making good use of previously developed land.

Proposed Distribution of Housing 2004 – 2026 **Table 1**

	Selby Area Action Plan**	Sherburn in Elmet	Tadcaster	Primary Villages (Excluding Barlby, Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby)**	Secondary Villages (excluding Osgodby) **	Total
Completions and Commitments*	2641	319	198	977	798	4933
Dwellings from future allocations	2774	227	273	1273	0	4547
TOTAL	5415	546	471	2250	798	9480
%	57	6	5	24	8	100%

* *The contribution from commitments has been discounted by 10% to allow for some non-implementation*

** *Selby together with the parishes of Barlby and Osgodby, Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby fall within the Selby Area Action Plan boundary.*

Question 2
Bearing in mind the commentary on the role of the various settlements and the overriding objective of concentrating growth in Selby

a) Do you agree with the overall distribution of housing as indicated in the proposed distribution Table 1 ?

b) In particular, should there be more or less housing in Tadcaster ?

c) In particular, should there be more or less housing in Sherburn in Elmet ?

In each case please explain why.

Strategic Housing Sites

3.32 It can be seen from the above figures that the scale of growth to be accommodated in Selby creates a considerable challenge for the town and surrounding area, whilst at the same time creating opportunities to make the area more self-sufficient. However, investigations to date indicate that there are insufficient opportunities to accommodate the scale of growth required on previously developed land or other infill sites and it is necessary to plan for the release of significant amounts of greenfield land in the form of sustainable urban extensions.

Government guidance (Planning Policy Statement 12 – Local Spatial Planning) indicates that Core Strategies should make clear spatial choices about where developments should go in broad terms. It suggests that strategic development sites should be identified within Core Strategies, but strategies should not include less significant non-strategic sites, consideration of which may hold up progress.

3.33 The Council has previously identified an area known as Olympia Park to the east of Selby as having potential for mixed housing and economic development. The Concept Plan, which was the subject of public consultation in November/December 2005, envisages approximately 700 new homes on land currently forming part of the BOCM Pauls' animal feedstuffs factory, which comprises a mixture of previously developed and greenfield land. However, at least one other strategic site is likely to be required. With this in mind, five other potential locations for strategic growth have been identified around the periphery of Selby, which will be investigated further in more detail to fully assess their planning merits and impacts on existing infrastructure and service provision. In the meantime the Council is anxious to obtain an early spectrum of views on these potential strategic sites through this consultation.

3.34 It is envisaged that, in addition to the strategic sites, the shortfall in new homes will be accommodated on previously developed land and other infill sites in Selby, plus greenfield sites in Barlby, Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby villages by allocating specific sites in the Selby Area Action Plan at a later date.

3.35 The six strategic sites are described below and illustrated on the accompanying map. At this stage they are only indicative areas with no firm boundaries.

3.36 ***Site A Cross Hills Lane***

Area 42 hectares --- Approximate Capacity 1000 + units

Land north of Leeds Road, west of Peppermint Close (including Crosshills Farm and East Farm)

This site includes an existing Selby District Local Plan (Phase 2) housing allocation (SEL/2).

Access - The main access would be from Leeds Road, west of the veterinary surgery, and/or via Meadway and would involve bridging Selby Dam.

Flooding - Part of the site is in a low risk flood zone (Flood Zone 1), and part, including land adjacent to Selby Dam is high risk (Flood Zone 3a). The limit of the site to the north is dependent on determining the precise extent of the Functional Flood Plain and secondary defences may be required along this boundary.

Advantages

- The site could be extended to include the area to the south of Leeds Road, (north of the railway).
- Potential to create a linear park along Selby Dam, providing new green infrastructure within Selby and cycleway/pedestrian access to the town centre.
- Potential highway benefits in providing an alternative route to Scott Road for journeys from north Selby to west Selby. (and vice versa).

Disadvantages

- No natural limit to development.
- Infrastructure costs including new bridge across Selby Dam and possibly secondary flood defences.

3.37 ***Site B Land West of Wistow Road***

Area 25 hectares --- Approximate capacity 500 units

Land between Flaxley Road and Wistow Road (including Hempbridge and Cockret Dyke).

Access - From Wistow Road and Flaxley Road

Flooding - Most of the site has a low risk of flooding (Flood Zone 1). However Functional Flood Plain associated with Cockret Dyke, which bisects the site, sterilises approximately 6 hectare. The limit of the site to the north is dependent on determining the precise extent of the Functional Flood Plain and secondary flood defences may be required along this boundary.

Advantages

- Relatively compact site.
- Opportunities to create green infrastructure around the northern edge of the town.

Disadvantages

- Highway capacity on Flaxley Road and Wistow Road and around town centre.
- No natural limit to development.
- Part sterilised by Functional Floodplain.
- Cost of secondary flood defences.

3.38 ***Site C Bondgate/Monk Lane***

Area 47 hectares --- Approximate Capacity 1000 + units

Land between Bondgate, Monk Lane and The Holmes extending towards Wistow Lordship Flood Barrier.

Access – From Bondgate (Wistow Road)

Flooding – The site is within a high risk flood zone (Flood Zone 3a) and is vulnerable to flooding owing to its close proximity to the River Ouse, and the Wistow Lordship Barrier Bank and associated Functional Flood Plain.

Advantages

- Well related to existing pattern of development.
- Opportunities to create green infrastructure around the northern edge of the town.

Disadvantages –

- Highway capacity on Bondgate (Wistow Road) and around town centre.
- No natural limit to development.

3.39 ***Site D Olympia Park (Olympia Mills)***

Area 38 hectares --- Approximate Capacity 700 + units

Land contained by the River Ouse to the east of Barlby Bridge and west of the Potter Group freight transhipment warehouses and associated rail infrastructure. The area contains a mixture of industrial uses associated with BOCM Pauls animal feedstuffs, allotments and playing fields and forms part of the 'Olympia Park' mixed development concept.

Access - From Barlby Road, providing good access to the by-pass and the town centre.

Flooding - The site is within a high risk flood zone (Flood Zone 3a). It benefits from improved flood defences, but is vulnerable because of its proximity to the River Ouse.

Advantages

- Well related to existing built form.
- Potential to improve the river frontage and create new green infrastructure.
- Only strategic site to utilise substantial amount of previously developed land.

Disadvantages

- Infrastructure costs including new railway bridge.

3.40 ***Site E Baffam Lane***

Area 26 hectares --- Approximate Capacity 500+ units

Land between A19 (Doncaster Road) and Selby Canal, which is bisected by Baffam Lane.

Access - From A19 and Brayton Lane

Flooding - Mostly low probability of flooding (Flood Zone 1) with some medium risk (Flood Zone 2)

Advantages

- Could create opportunities to open up the Canal for leisure and amenity/landscaping purposes as part of Selby's green infrastructure network.
- Recognisable physical limits to development.
- Low flood risk.

Disadvantages

- Forms part of the Strategic Countryside Gap between Selby and Brayton, which is currently protected from development by Policy SG1 in the Selby District Local Plan.
- Western part of site falls within Brayton Conservation Area and development would impact on views of St Wilfrid's (Grade 1 Listed) Church.
- Eastern part of site would impact on the environs of Selby Canal.

3.41 ***Site F Foxhill Lane/Brackenhill Lane***

Area 31 hectares --- Approximate Capacity 750 units

Land between Brackenhill Lane, Foxhill Lane and the Selby – Leeds railway line.

Access - The principal access would be from the A19 via an upgraded Foxhill Lane. Other accesses subject to capacity.

Flooding - Low risk of flooding (Flood Zone 1)

Advantages

- Recognisable physical limits to development.
- Low flood risk.

Disadvantages

- Forms part of the Strategic Countryside Gap between Selby and Brayton, which is currently protected from development by Policy SG1 in the Selby District Local Plan.
- Development would impact on views of St Wilfrid's (Grade 1 Listed) Church.
- Access capacity issues, particularly on possible secondary access routes such as Sandhill Lane (level crossing) and Green Lane, Selby.

Question 3

Please tell us whether you agree or disagree with the following options for strategic housing development on the edge of Selby (please number in preference order 1 = highest, 6 = lowest).

Site A - Cross Hills Lane

Site B - West of Wistow Road

Site C - Bondgate/Monk lane

Site D - Olympia Mills

Site E - Baffam Lane

Site F - Foxhill Lane/Brackenhill Lane

Managing Housing Supply

3.42 New housing proposals come forward in two ways:

i) through development on development plan allocations produced and adopted by the Council either through the Local Plan process or Local development Framework.

through planning permission being granted on unallocated sites. These are often small sites of less than 10 houses or larger sites on previously developed land whose availability could not have been anticipated at the time the plan was prepared. These are termed 'windfall' developments.

3.43 The scale of allocations in development plans has to be sufficient to cover the housing requirement without making allowance for windfall development. However, any windfall development which does come forward has the effect of postponing the need to bring forward new allocations. Within this Core Strategy, the Council will therefore include policies to govern the type and location of windfall development, to monitor the development coming forward and to set out how the release of new allocations will be phased to ensure a continued 5 year supply of available housing sites. Allocations will be identified through other development plan documents and released through the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Windfall Policy

3.44 The Council's current policy on windfall development is to limit it to development which falls within the Development Limits of settlements and is on sites which fall within the definition of previously developed

land. The current policy permits such development in all settlements which have Development Limits. However, because garden curtilages are classed as previously developed land this has led to significant development in even the smallest villages.

3.45 One of the aims of the Regional Spatial Strategy is to prevent the dispersal of development to smaller settlements and open countryside and therefore the Council is considering restricting windfall development in Secondary Villages, other than that which comprises 100% affordable housing which meets an identified local need. Policies for controlling development in the open countryside, outside Development Limits are already restrictive and are likely to be continued without significant modification.

Question 4

Do you agree that market housing should only be allowed in the Principal Town (Selby), Local Service Centres (Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster) and the 20 Primary Villages? If not please explain why.

Affordable Housing

3.46 The Government is committed to providing high quality housing for people who are unable to access or afford market housing. Its policy relies heavily on providing affordable housing in association with market housing, through developer contributions. Planning Policy Statement 3 – Housing (2006) requires local authorities to set an overall target for the amount of affordable housing to be provided and set out the approach for seeking developer contributions to facilitate the provision.

The Need for Affordable Housing in Selby District

3.47 The Council commissioned a Housing Needs Study in 2004 which considered the affordable housing need over the five-year period to 2009. Its conclusions were that affordable housing need arising from local requirements in the District amounted to some 294 dwellings per year, or some 1,470 dwellings over the period 2004 to 2009. (Part of this figure is based on removing the pre-2004 backlog by 2009.)

3.48 From April 2004 to March 2007, some 487 affordable dwellings have been constructed or are committed through planning permissions which is well below the requirement.

[2] Housing Needs Study – Selby District Council 2005

3.49 The circumstances surrounding affordable housing need can change over time and the Council is commissioning a Strategic Housing Market Assessment which will roll forward the 2004 Study to provide a longer-term perspective. However, house prices in the District have been rising faster than the regional and national averages and the indications are that the severity of the problem has increased since 2004/5, notwithstanding the recent downturn in house prices. However, the current reduced demand for housing is directly related to increased difficulties of obtaining finance rather than an oversupply of dwellings and therefore the problems of affordability for local residents remain as acute as ever. It is considered that the affordable housing requirement is unlikely to diminish in the medium term.

3.50 The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) also recognises the need to increase the provision of affordable housing. While Local Development Frameworks should set specific targets for the amount of affordable housing to be provided, the RSS estimates that over 40% of new housing may need to be affordable in high need areas such as North Yorkshire.

Previous Consultations on Affordable Housing

3.51 At the Issues and Options stage there was a general consensus from respondents that the affordable housing requirement identified in the Housing Need Study should be met, although a number of respondents recognised that it was unlikely to be achievable within the five years to 2009. There was also support for reducing thresholds for requiring affordable housing and also for the 'exception sites' policy.

3.52 Further more detailed consideration on this issue was undertaken within the consultation on potential Interim Housing Policies in February 2008. In the light of the high need for affordable housing within the District, proposals were put forward in the Interim Policies which proposed increasing the number of affordable units to be provided in conjunction with market housing.

3.53 The main points of the proposed policy were:

- A 50/50 market/affordable split;
- A threshold of 2 dwellings in all areas outside Selby;
- A threshold of 10 dwellings in Selby and
- Single dwelling units to be affordable units

3.54 The responses received indicated agreement with lowering thresholds to 10 dwellings in Selby but there was less agreement on the threshold of two dwellings in Tadcaster and Sherburn in Elmet. The main objections to the proposed policies centred on their viability.

3.55 Consultation also took place on a proposed policy for 100%

affordable housing schemes. While there was widespread support for allowing affordable housing in locations where market housing would not normally be permitted, many respondents considered that this should be dependent on first establishing whether a local need existed or not.

Proposed Affordable Housing Policy

3.56 The Council remains convinced of the need to maximise affordable housing provision, particularly outside Selby, where the Regional Spatial Strategy places most emphasis on providing for local needs rather than a general demand led dispersal of market housing to less sustainable settlements. However, in the light of the responses to the proposed Interim Housing Policies earlier this year (which in the event, were not proceeded with), the Council accepts that there is a case that a slightly more relaxed policy would be more viable and implementable.

3.57 The Council is therefore proposing slightly higher thresholds than in the proposed Interim Housing Policies outside Selby and, particularly in Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster. However, as the main emphasis in these settlements is on meeting local needs, all developments, however small, should be expected to make a contribution to affordable housing.

3.58 The main points of the proposed policy would therefore be:

- A 60/40 market/affordable split
- A threshold of 10 dwellings in Selby:
- A threshold of 5 dwellings in Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster;
- A threshold of 3 dwellings elsewhere;
- Outside Selby, a financial contribution to be sought on all developments below the threshold, to contribute to affordable housing provision in the District.

3.59 For 100% affordable housing schemes it is proposed that all developments in locations where market housing would not be appropriate should be subject to meeting an identified local need.

Question 5

Do you agree with the different thresholds proposed for affordable housing? If not please explain why.

Question 6

In order to help meet the need for affordable housing, do you agree with the use of commuted sums for housing schemes below the proposed thresholds? If not please explain why.

****

Economy

4.1 Selby District plays an important role in the local and regional labour market, traditionally accommodating employment in the manufacturing, brewing and agricultural sectors. However evidence indicates that the District, as a result of a high level of out-commuting to Leeds and York, has become a dormitory location for these cities, supplying them with skilled labour, at the expense of the local economy and sustainable development objectives.

4.2 Reducing out-commuting through the restructuring of the local economy, towards a modern service and knowledge based economy, is a key challenge. Developing and revitalising the economy of the District has emerged as a major priority if a more self-contained, sustainable way of life for District residents is to be created. The Core Strategy will facilitate increased economic development, particularly focussed on Selby, in line with Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) guidance.

Employment Land

4.3 The RSS requires local authorities to ensure the availability of sufficient land and premises in sustainable locations to meet the needs of the modern economy. In areas like Selby this means catering for additional office, retail and leisure uses, as well as supporting the ongoing restructuring and modernisation of the manufacturing sector.

4.4 In order to foster regeneration and strengthen and diversify the local economy the RSS promotes significant economic development at Selby, in line with the town's status as a principal service centre. The creation of new job opportunities is intended to support indigenous (local business) growth, following the decline of coal mining, as well as to capitalise on the town's close links with both York and Leeds. This approach is supported by research commissioned by the Council as part of a recent Employment Land Study (GVA Grimley 2007), which concluded that the town is well placed to benefit from overspill of highly skilled, knowledge and technology based forms of employment from other parts of the Leeds City Region.

4.5 The Employment Land Study (ELS) provides a more detailed and up to date assessment of employment land requirements and job growth potential than that presented in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), although the estimate of employment land requirements in the period up to 2016 remains relatively small (21hectares). Because both the RSS and the ELS econometric models are based on forecast demand in relation to national and regional trends, neither adequately reflects the potential role of the indigenous economy nor the inherent

problems associated with increasing commuting levels, if housing growth is not matched by job growth. The RSS does acknowledge, however, that "It is possible that there will be variance from the indicative figures, especially for sectors and in locations where the Plan's Core Approach and Sub Area policies are proposing a particularly significant change, for example, economic growth in Selby."

4.6 With the importance of increasing local employment opportunities in mind, the Council is mindful to adopt a more aspirational approach to economic growth, which will:-

- Ensure that economic growth comes before residential growth;
- Allow Selby to fulfil its sub-regional role within the Leeds City Region;
- Provide a range and choice of employment opportunities across the District including sites for indigenous (local business) employment;
- Provide flexibility to take advantage of future opportunities that arise (The need for flexibility formed the basis of a number of comments at the Issues and Options stage);
- Meet the transformation change agenda of the Renaissance programme.
- Safeguard longer term opportunities for employment development.

4.7 The Employment Land Study assessment emphasises the need to focus high value Business, Professional and Financial Services/B1 office development in and around Selby town centre and the urban periphery. Tadcaster is also seen as a suitable location for knowledge based employment activity, complementary to Selby, with further support being offered to Selby's primary growth role by renewal and intensification of existing uses at Sherburn in Elmet . In the longer term the accommodation of specific research and development uses along the A19 corridor may be appropriate if there is a proven need. Outside Selby and the Local Service Centres, a continuing need for local employment opportunities in rural communities has been identified.

4.8 The need for additional employment land is further justified by the fact that significant levels of short term constraints have been identified across most of the remaining Selby District Local Plan allocations (although they remain viable in the longer term) and the fact that parts of the District, particularly Selby, remain vulnerable to major losses of traditional employment.

4.9 In addition to relatively small scale additional employment land opportunities which will be identified in the Selby Area Action Plan and the Allocations DPDs (Development Planning Documents), two potentially larger sites have been identified – one, or both, of which could be identified as longer term strategic sites.

4.10 The two sites are described below and illustrated on the accompanying plan. At this stage they are only indicative areas with no firm boundaries.

4.11 ***Site G: Olympia Park (Land adjacent to Selby By-pass)***
Site Area 54 hectares

Land adjacent to the Potter Group warehouses and associated rail infrastructure, forming the eastern part of the area covered by the Concept Plan for the 'Olympia Park' mixed development scheme. Comprises mostly agricultural land but including redundant buildings associated with BOCM Pauls animal feedstuffs on the Barlby Road frontage.

Access - Directly from the Selby By-pass

Flooding - The site is within an area of high flood risk (Flood Zone 3a). It benefits from improved flood defences but is vulnerable because of its proximity to the River Ouse. The eastern part of the site is below 3m OD and flooded in 2000. Culverts beneath the by-pass allow water to escape.

Advantages

- Good access to A19.
- Potential to use rail network.
- Well located in relation to Selby workforce and not intrusive into the countryside – rounds off existing development.

Disadvantages

- High infrastructure costs
- Poor ground conditions on part of the site.

4.12 ***Site H: Burn Airfield***
Site Area 195 hectares

Land formerly used as Burn Airfield. Part used by gliding club. The site was put forward as a potential site for the European Spallation Source (ESS) project – a high technology science based research installation. However, in the final analysis it was not chosen. The site has the benefit of a planning permission for a single occupier research establishment.

Access - From the A19. Development of a strategic site would justify developer contributions towards a Burn By-pass, which would provide direct access.

Flooding -Part of the site has a low risk of flooding (Flood Zone 1). The remainder is within an area of high risk (Flood Zone 3) and its development capacity is dependent on determining the extent of the Functional Floodplain.

Advantages

- Good access to A19 (subject to Burn by-pass construction)
- Better general ground conditions

Disadvantages

- Less well located in relation to Selby
- Burn Bypass infrastructure cost
- More intrusive in the countryside

Question 7

If a strategic employment site is provided, which of the following do you consider is the most appropriate location?

Site G - Olympia Park (land adjoining Selby Bypass)

Site H - Burn Airfield

Have you any other suggestions?

Employment Policies

4.13 It is intended that the Core Strategy will contain policies which outline the Council's approach to supporting economic development. In order to assist the development of policies, views are being sought on a number of statements relating to the approach to existing industrial sites and premises, to providing for new commercial activity and the relationship between new housing and new employment.

Question 8

Please tell us whether you agree or disagree with the following statements:

A – 'Land allocated for employment purposes but which is undeveloped should be considered for mixed use or possibly other uses if there is no realistic prospect of employment development coming forward.'

B – 'Existing employment premises should be protected from redevelopment where there is evidence of market need.'

C - 'For new business development, the focus should be on securing small/medium sized business space and general industrial premises in suitable locations.'

D – 'New housing development should be balanced with an appropriate level of new business development.'

****

****

Environment / Natural Resources / Climate Change

5.1 It is intended that the environment policies are consistent with the principles established in regional policy and national guidance including Planning Policy Statements on Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (PPS 7), Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (PPS 9), Planning and the Historic Environment (PPG15) and Greenbelts (PPG2).

5.2 The Council is committed to working with a wide range of bodies including Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency in order to achieve an environment that is enhanced and protected. For example, a strong partnership approach has been established through the preparation and implementation of the Selby Biodiversity Action Plan which was adopted in August 2004. The Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework documents will make a further contribution to achieving its objectives.

5.3 The Council is proposing a continuation of existing policies which aim to protect and enhance the District's environmental assets and promote high quality design in new development. In addition the Core Strategy will introduce, for the first time in the District's formal planning documents, policies relating to climate change issues.

5.4 It is envisaged the policies will cover energy conservation, renewable energy and flood risk management. In terms of energy conservation the policy will aim to manage the design and location of development to: reduce the need to travel, especially by private car; improve the energy efficiency and minimise resource consumption of developments; and promote use of sustainable design and construction techniques.

5.5 Other Core Strategy policies will support renewable energy projects within the District subject to their local impact being proportionate to their importance as energy generators, and support micro-generation proposals wherever possible, again subject to there not being an unacceptable impact on the locality. The Council is proposing a Core Strategy policy to ensure that a proportion of the energy needs of major residential/industrial/commercial/leisure proposals is derived from on-site renewables or through other genuine decentralised, renewable and low carbon sources. The Council considers 10% to be an appropriate percentage in these cases but views are being sought through this consultation.

****

****

Question 9

Do you agree that approximately 10% of the energy requirements of major development schemes should be produced from on-site renewables or from other decentralised renewable or low carbon supplies? If not, should the percentage be higher or lower?

Sustainable Communities

6.1 One of the Council's main aims is to encourage the development of sustainable communities. Creating sustainable communities means encouraging self-sufficiency, as far as practical by;

- encouraging the best possible level of services and/or access to them; market towns particularly should have thriving centres.
- providing access to employment as locally as possible;
- creating an environment in which a healthy lifestyle can be led e.g good access to open space and the countryside and green infrastructure.
- achieving an appropriate level and mix of housing accommodation, which, as far as practicable, meets the needs of residents, from new entrants into the housing market through to the needs of the elderly;
- encouraging social inclusion.

6.2 It is important to note that the pursuit of maximum local sustainability may sometimes conflict with a more strategic view of the role of different types of settlements and the relative sustainability of the overall settlement pattern. A balance has to be struck between the desirability of local sustainability and the difficulties/practicalities of achieving that for all types of settlement. The Regional Spatial Strategy emphasises, for example, the greater sustainability of larger settlements and strongly encourages focussing new development in them.

6.3 It is intended that the Core Strategy will be mindful of achieving the appropriate balance between the differing functions of settlements. However, within that context, general policies will be introduced to supplement housing, employment and environmental policies and provide encouragement to achieving optimum sustainability at the local level. It is intended that the Core Strategy will contain policies to protect and strengthen the role of town centres and local services; to encourage the development of appropriate infrastructure to accompany new development; and to ensure that the housing and accommodation needs of all sections of the local community are met.

****

Infrastructure Provision

6.4 The Core Strategy policies on infrastructure provision will further develop policies currently established in the Selby District Local Plan. The Government has introduced an initiative on 'green infrastructure' and new legislation on funding infrastructure – the Community Infrastructure Levy.

6.5 'Green Infrastructure' is an increasingly used term applying to the establishment of networks of linked open spaces and green corridors running through urban, suburban, urban fringe and rural areas. The concept gives strategic direction to what has often been in the past a more piecemeal approach to the provision and conservation of green assets.

6.6 The Regional Spatial Strategy places considerable emphasis on green infrastructure and includes reference to it in the Core Approach (Policy YH8). Improving the green infrastructure of the District forms an integral part of the Council's priorities for creating a healthy and green environment, and future Local Development Framework plans will be expected to embrace the concept and identify opportunities for enhancement. Priority will be given to maximising opportunities for green infrastructure as part of the development of the strategic sites in Selby and other major development proposals.

6.7 The Council is interested in your views on where 'green infrastructure' could be enhanced or developed further in your locality.

The Community Infrastructure Levy

6.8 The Community Infrastructure Levy is being introduced by Government to ensure that funding is obtained as part of the development process to provide for the increasing infrastructure needs of local communities, as they accommodate further growth. The legislation makes it incumbent on local authorities to indicate in their Core Strategies how they will operate the Levy within their District and their priorities for using the funding obtained. In order to assist in formulating the Council's approach to the Levy, it wishes to obtain views on the priorities for infrastructure expenditure in the District.

****

****

Question 10

The Government is introducing a Community Infrastructure Levy on new development. Please indicate your priorities for using the funding received from the Levy.

- Broadband
- Community facilities
- Cycling and walking infrastructure
- Education
- Green infrastructure
- Health
- Public Realm
- Rail and bus infrastructure
- Recreation Open Space
- Recycling
- Road infrastructure
- Other (please specify)

Question 11

Do you have any views on opportunities to enhance or create green infrastructure?

Housing Mix

6.9 A good mix of housing accommodation appropriate to the needs of the settlement can make an important contribution to achieving a more sustainable community. As far as practicable, the aim should be to meet the local needs of residents, from new entrants into the housing market through to the needs of the elderly. In general, the larger the settlement the easier it should be to achieve a comprehensive mix.

6.10 It is intended that Core Strategy policies will encourage the provision of an appropriate mix of dwellings. The Council is undertaking a comprehensive Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) in order to provide an improved evidence base from which to implement the policy and views are sought through this consultation on the need for particular types of housing within your locality and the District.

****

Question 12

Do you consider that

a) More housing should be in the form of small dwellings (flats and terraced housing), or

b) More housing should be in the form of 3-4 bedroom family houses?

Gypsies/Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

6.11 In catering for the needs of all sections of the community, the Council will also take into account the needs of particular groups such as gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople. An assessment has been made for North Yorkshire authorities. which indicates that there are currently between 151 and 172 gypsy and traveller households living in Selby District, most of whom live in conventional housing, while authorised sites (Common Lane, Burn and Racecourse Lane, Carlton) provide a combined total of 24 pitches.

6.12 Based on the number of existing concealed households, projected demand and the number of households expressing a preference to move from authorised / non authorised sites into housing, the assessment identifies a need for 55 additional pitches in the North Yorkshire sub region in the period up to 2015, of which 20 are required in Selby District.

6.13 The Council intends to include a policy in the Core Strategy advocating the provision of these pitches together with some general guidance on how and where the need should be met. Any appropriate allocation of new provision will be identified through an Allocations DPD. It is anticipated that at least two additional sites will need to be provided since Government Guidance advocates the provision of sites of between 6 – 12 pitches and this also reflects the clearer preference for smaller sites expressed by those interviewed during the assessment.

3 Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment– North Yorkshire Sub-Region (May 2008)

Question 13

In making appropriate provision for gypsies and travellers, do you agree or disagree with the following options?

Option A – New sites should be spread across the District.

Option B – new sites should be located in or close to the towns and Primary Villages.

Option C – Expanding the existing sites.

Question 14

Do you agree or disagree with the following options?

Option A – Sites should be sought that accommodate between eight and twelve pitches.

Option B – Individual pitches should be encouraged to allow flexibility and choice for gypsies and travellers distributed across the District.

Option C – A combination of A and B; one site of between 8 and 12 pitches plus individual pitches.

Travelling Showpeople

6.14 Although not recognised as a distinct ethnic group, travelling showpeople travel extensively and therefore live, almost exclusively in wagons. During the winter months these are parked up in what was traditionally known as 'winter quarters'. These yards are now often occupied all year round by some family members.

6.15 The North Yorkshire assessment found the number of responses from travelling showpeople living in the sub-region was too small to able to provide a reliable assessment of accommodation required. However, from those that did respond, there was an indication that new yards/living quarters may be needed in the York and Selby District areas.

Question 15

The indications are that only limited provision is required within Selby District for travelling showpeople. If provision is required, should an area of search be?

Option A – In or close to the towns of Selby, Tadcaster or Sherburn in Elmet.

Option B – In close proximity to the strategic road network (such as the M62, A1 and A64).

Produced by Selby District Council as part of
The Local Development Framework

LOCAL
DEVELOPMENT
FRAMEWORK

SELBY
DISTRICT COUNCIL
Moving forward with purpose

For further information please contact:
LDF Team
Development Policy
Civic Centre
Portholme Road
Selby YO8 4SB

Email ldf@selby.gov.uk
Website: www.selby.gov.uk
Tel: 01757 292063
Fax: 01757 292090