

PLAN Selby: Initial Consultation - Summary of Representations

The following documents were consulted on in December/January 2015 –

- Sustainability Appraisal
- Habitats Regulations Assessment
- Duty to Cooperate Statement
- The Engagement Plan
- Infrastructure Delivery Plan
- PLAN Selby Initial Consultation document

The PLAN Selby Initial Consultation Document asked over 60 questions covering the supporting technical documents and topics such as housing, the economy, settlement growth etc.

Questions were broad and open, leading to a wide ranging response in over 2000 different representations.

This document contains two tables:

Table 1: Overall Summaries of Key Issues with Officer Responses

Table 2: Summaries of all Representations

Table 1 Overall Summary of Key Issues with Officer Responses

Chapter 1 Introduction	
i)	<p>Strategic Environmental Assessment/Sustainability Appraisal/Habitats Regulation Assessment (SEA/SA/HRA)</p> <p>Detailed comments relate to a range of issues including the baseline data, the SA process and suggested amendments to the Framework objectives.</p> <p><i>Response: Selby District Council (SDC) is in the process of analysing these comments in consultation with its SEA/SA/HRA consultants, Waterman and will take them into account prior to further SEA/SA/HRA work on PLAN Selby.</i></p>
ii)	<p>Duty to Cooperate (DTC)</p> <p>Support for the approach to the DTC with all adjoining local authorities and a wide range of DTC bodies providing comments. None raised any DTC issues at this stage but highlighted the on-going nature of the process and the need to take account of cross boundary issues. Some noted specific issues such as highways and housing needs as well as particular proposals in other emerging local plans.</p> <p><i>Response: SDC will continue to work closely with stakeholders and neighbouring authorities to fulfil its Duty to Cooperate. SDC officers will be meeting with neighbouring authorities and stakeholders during the focussed engagement (Summer 2015).</i></p>
iii)	<p>Draft Engagement Plan</p> <p>Concern about accessibility to the complex consultation documentation, short consultation period, IT issues and the need to avoid holiday periods.</p> <p><i>Response: SDC will seek to improve people's ability to access material during consultation periods, provide sufficient time for representations to be made and avoid the Christmas period.</i></p> <p>The need to ensure on-going active engagement with all stakeholders in line with legal requirements in order to provide a sound plan.</p> <p><i>Response: Through the focussed engagement (Summer 2015) and other engagement with stakeholders this year and next, SDC will be undertaking active engagement throughout the period up to the submission of PLAN Selby to the Secretary of State for examination.</i></p>
Chapter 2	
iv)	<p>Aims and Objectives</p> <p>General Support for aims and objectives as they align with the Core Strategy but suggested amended emphasis and suggested additional objectives for example regarding flood risk and employment/economy.</p> <p><i>Response: SDC is in the process of analysing these comments and will take them into account to inform plan preparation.</i></p>

Chapter 3 Key Issues	
v)	<p>The topics should include social and community issues as well as historic and cultural assets.</p> <p><i>Response: Social and community issues form an important part of the plan making process and will feature in the testing of the plan through its Sustainability Appraisal and through the consideration of housing and employment needs as well as through the Council's work on Sport and Local Green Space. PLAN Selby will also be the subject of an Equalities Impact Assessment.</i></p>
vi)	<p>Topic 1 Providing Homes</p> <p>A large proportion of comments received related to the details of this topic (25%) including the need to update the base date, support from developers for an over-allocation and a range of sites to ensure delivery.</p> <p>A level of objection was received to a simple percentage growth in the villages without consideration of capacity and infrastructure needs.</p> <p>There was a split between the need to provide traveller sites or not at all and a split between having a number of smaller sites or extensions to existing traveller sites. There was a clear response that the 1 mile threshold was not necessary.</p> <p><i>Response: The Draft Selby District Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) will be published for comment as part of the summer 2015 focussed engagement and this will include discussions with neighbouring planning authorities. SDC is awaiting the final publication of this document in order to respond to a number of issues regarding 'providing homes' Workshops with those Parish Councils of the District's 'growth' villages (Designated Service Villages) are to take place during early July to discuss issues arising from the Initial Consultation and additional options for the distribution of growth.</i></p> <p><i>Work has commenced on the need to accommodate gypsies and travellers housing needs in PLAN Selby and focussed engagement on this specific issues will take place on this matter later in the year.</i></p>
vii)	<p>Topic 2 - Promoting Prosperity</p> <p>The majority of the responses suggest that Existing Established Employment Areas should be re-assessed in terms of existing uses in line with the NPPF. Overall a flexible approach to employment allocation to both Existing Established Employment Areas and new allocations was suggested by responses. Agents and local residents suggest the employment allocations should be market-led.</p> <p>In terms of allocations in DSVs, 50% of respondents suggest that small allocations should be linked to rural diversification uses while the remaining 50% suggest allocations should support small business and start-ups. Overall there is support for small scale allocations in the DSVs to support the rural economy.</p>

	<p><i>Response: A Draft Selby District Employment Land Review is to be published by SDC in June and this will make recommendations on existing established employment areas. It will also provide up to date evidence on the need for employment land. Representations about the distribution and allocation of employment land will be taken into account during further work on the plan preparation.</i></p>
viii)	<p>Topic 3 – Green Belt</p> <p>There is wide spread support for protecting the Green Belt but also recognition of a need to alter boundaries to accommodate development if shown to be necessary. There is support for brownfield development before green field development.</p> <p><i>Response: A draft report on the Green Belts within Selby District is to be published for focussed engagement this summer. This will result in further comments from stakeholders on the potential for changes to Green Belt boundaries. All relevant comments on Green Belt issues will then be taken into account before this report is finalised and decisions made about the Green Belt. Support for brownfield development before greenfield development is welcomed and this endorses the approach in the Core Strategy.</i></p>
ix)	<p>Topic 3 – Safeguarded Land</p> <p>The majority of respondents recognised the need to identify Safeguarded Land to meet development needs beyond the plan period and to ensure that Green Belt boundaries do not need reviewing in the next plan period in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>Some comments referred to specific locations where Green Belt boundaries should be altered or protected.</p> <p>Suggestions for determining the amount of safeguarded land or what to take into account included: consider capacity of existing safeguarded land, enough for 15 years or next 25-30 years, at least 10% or 20% of development needs and use objective evidence for need/availability/delivery</p> <p><i>Response: A draft report which recommends the approach PLAN Selby should adopt to Safeguarded Land is to be published for comment during this summer's focussed engagement. The comments from the Initial Consultation and from the engagement will be taken into account before the finalisation of this report and decisions made on safeguarded land.</i></p>
x)	<p>Topic 3 – Development Limits</p> <p>There was a split between: wanting tight boundaries to stop development beyond existing village limits to protect character and promote regeneration; and those considering that looser limits are needed as the existing ones blocked new development and are over-restrictive.</p> <p><i>Response: A draft report which recommends the approach PLAN Selby should adopt to the definition of Development Limits is to be published as part of this summer's focussed engagement. This will encourage further debate on this issue and all comments received will be taken into account prior to the finalisation of the report and decisions made in PLAN Selby.</i></p>

<p>xi)</p>	<p>Topic 3 – Strategic Countryside Gaps</p> <p>General support for keeping existing boundaries as they are. Some specific suggestions for new ones to be established. Some support for revised boundaries to allow some development.</p> <p><i>Response: A draft report which recommends the approach PLAN Selby should adopt to Strategic Countryside Gaps is to be published for comment during this summer’s focussed engagement. The comments from the Initial Consultation and from the forthcoming engagement will be taken into account before the finalisation of this report and decisions made in PLAN Selby.</i></p>
<p>xii)</p>	<p>Topic 4 - Infrastructure Needs</p> <p>Many comments raised issues about the need to ensure that new development is accompanied by associated infrastructure as there are existing capacity problems especially junctions/highways/parking/traffic calming, schools, drainage/sewerage/flooding and public transport as well as broadband/4G coverage. Local infrastructure needs were identified in specific settlements. A wide range of bodies also provided comments and support for updating the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p><i>Response: In preparing PLAN Selby SDC and during the focussed engagement, SDC will be meeting with those bodies who support infrastructure delivery to discuss the representations made about infrastructure and will be updating its Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</i></p>
<p>xiii)</p>	<p>Topic 5 – Climate Change and Renewable Energy</p> <p>Elicited a large number of responses (17% of representations). Virtually no support for District renewable energy targets or a requirement for on-site renewable energy or specific requirements for sustainable design (e.g. BREEAM). The majority of respondents on this topic objected to identifying suitable areas for Renewable Energy although a few supported this approach. There was wide spread support for the use of separation thresholds and the need for further policy or guidance on cumulative impacts and other design issues such as noise from turbines.</p> <p><i>Response: SDC is analysing the representations made on this issue and will, in the light of these comments and the latest Government policy and guidance and case law, be making decisions about the need for, and scope of, any policy framework required in PLAN Selby in addition to that already contained in the Core Strategy.</i></p>
<p>xiv)</p>	<p>Topic 6 – Protecting and Enhancing the Environment</p> <p>Wide variety of comments supporting the protection of environmental assets including policies on local green spaces, green infrastructure, recreation open space, nature conservation and the need to coordinate with proposals across our borders with adjoining authorities.</p> <p><i>Response: SDC has recently commissioned studies to be undertaken by consultants on the District’s green infrastructure and landscape. This work will, following focussed engagement, map out important green spaces and green infrastructure to inform PLAN Selby. It will also discuss with</i></p>

	<p><i>neighbouring authorities cross boundary issues and seek to ‘join up’ the planning for green infrastructure and landscape protection. SDC has also recently commissioned consultants to provide the Council with a playing pitch and built sports facilities strategy which will allow PLAN Selby to include policies on the protection of recreation open space used for sports purposes. Furthermore SDC will be updating its information on sites of importance for nature conservation to inform protection policies for nature conservation in PLAN Selby.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 4 Development Management Policies</p>	
xv)	<p>General support for not creating policies for the sake of them and only concentrate on those that are needed. Wide variety of topics raised. Support for design policies in villages, protecting heritage assets, local transport needs and walking/cycle routes. Mixed response on need for general design policies versus treating each case on its own merits. Views split between protecting former mine sites and utilising them for rural development.</p> <p><i>Response: SDC is analysing these responses and will be taking them into account during the on-going process of scoping and drafting development management policies for inclusion in PLAN Selby.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 5 Settlements</p>	
xvi)	<p>High volume of comments relating to settlements and their future (11% of representations).</p> <p><i>Response: These comments have been taken into account by SDC in its preparation of the content of the focussed engagement this summer. Workshops with communities and other stakeholders on the future growth, regeneration and conservation of the District’s market towns and Designated Service Villages will be taking place during late June and early July to allow the Council to consider further the most important issues and options in connection with the future planning of these settlements.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 6 - Evidence Base Requirements</p>	
xvii)	<p>Respondents consider that generally there is a need to ensure that the results of the comprehensive list of studies must be available to enable informed consultation responses.</p> <p>Comments included that: the highways assessment should meet national guidance; there is a need for an up to date playing pitch strategy; the Green Belt/Development Limits/Strategic Countryside Gaps review is needed as soon as possible; and concern that SINC data is not up-to-date.</p> <p>Suggested need for review of affordable housing and viability. Also need for land availability/demand information.</p> <p><i>Response: Responses to the above earlier issues have already referred to various pieces of evidence that are being gathered and updated. Many of these are to be made available on the Council’s website on 29 June 2015, including the draft findings of the Green Belt, Strategic Countryside Gap and Development Limits Studies. SDC need to consider the outputs from the emerging Strategic Housing Market Assessment before it considers further work on affordable housing. SDC is in discussion with North</i></p>

	<p><i>Yorkshire County Council and the Highways Agency in terms of the requirements for traffic assessments in connection with PLAN Selby. Land availability information is provided in the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which is on the Council's website.</i></p>
--	---

Table 2: Summary of Comments by Topic and/or Question

In order to capture all comments received summaries have been provided below on:

- each of the technical documents
- the topic areas in the PLAN Selby document
- the remaining chapter/sections which relate to Development Management Policies, Settlements, Evidence Base requirements and
- General comments.

Each section in the table below highlights all the key issues raised by the representations. Some relate to specific questions and others relate to the topic area more generally. Some are more detailed than others depending on the topic as appropriate.

CHAPTER 1 Introduction
Supporting Technical Documents Summary of Representations
Q1 - Comments on Sustainability Appraisal (SA)
The detailed analysis of all the submitted representations is currently being considered by Waterman, the Council’s SEA/SA consultants. The comments relate to a range of issues including the baseline data, the SA process and suggested amendments to the Framework objectives.
Q2 - Comments on Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)
The detailed analysis of all the submitted representations is currently being considered by Waterman, the Council’s HRA consultants. The comments relate to a wide range of nature conservation issues and the HRA process.
Q3 - Comments on Duty To Cooperate Statement (DTC)
A number of DTC bodies responded such as the Highways Agency who support cross boundary partnership working on transport issues and English Heritage who have not identified any strategic matters at this stage affecting the historic environment. Others included Natural England and Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, who support reference to the Lower Derwent Valley Plan and continued working together to identify impacts and mitigation. Would like to see more detail of cross boundary working on green infrastructure and ecological networks.
All our adjoining Local Authorities have provided comments on the Initial Consultation. A number of these have provided specific comments on the DTC - for example Leeds CC who provides an update on their allocations plan preparation programme for the site allocations. Noted is the Headley Hall proposal on the boundary of SDC close to Tadcaster.
Other comments on the Duty to Cooperate Statements were received from individuals and organisations which referred to the DTC process and commented on specific issues such as: it’s not clear how SDC will work with Leeds CC regarding Headley Hall and its

impact on Tadcaster. SDC must maintain discussions with neighbouring authorities regarding housing delivery, infrastructure and green belt boundaries.

Other issues related to:

- **DEVELOPMENT NEEDS** - York should meet its own needs and we should not be building houses in SDC for Leeds and York. Action by Leeds on flood prevention should not impact in SDC. At Escrick - on border with York - SDC and CYC must cooperate to ensure village grows only at a size that is appropriate and sustainable. Do not want to see more incinerators on land adjacent to SDC. SDC must engage with NYCC regarding educational needs relative to proposed growth and capacity of settlements. Must have regard for neighbouring authorities plans. Given current stage of York, Leeds and Doncaster, SDC has opportunity to consider whether it can assist any of their unmet needs or if they can meet any of SDC's unmet needs.
- **STRATEGIC DUTY AND PROCESS** - Although strategic issues dealt with in CS the DTC was not tested. And it remains unclear whether or not the Council would have fulfilled the legal requirements of the duty within the CS. The dialogue must consist of more than consultation and meetings. It is efficacy in the engagement process and the outcomes which will determine if the DTC has been met. DTC must be undertaken to fully comply with all relevant legal requirements and it is important to appreciate that this is an on-going process and the effects of any changes made to the emerging plan need to be fully appraised and considered.
- **MISCELLANEOUS** - Concerned that LCR and York Sub area will impose policies on SDC to detriment of residents as happened with national policy at CS. Suggestions provided of wide range of bodies to be involved in cooperative working.

For Infrastructure Development Plan – see Topic 4 - Q25

Q4 - Comments on Engagement Plan

Most of the responses on this question related to the format of the document and the arrangements for the consultation exercises. There was broad consensus on the following points:

- The Plan and associated papers were too long and complex meaning it was inaccessible to a lot of Selby residents.
- The consultation period was too short and taking place over the Christmas and New Year period created problems in being able to respond. Future consultation should avoid summer holidays and Christmas.
- There were IT issues in submitting forms.
- The leaflet was delivered after the consultation period began.
- People wanted local events with presentations and a chance to discuss issues.
- The consultation should be broken down into smaller parts over a longer period.
- The above issues results in developers having an advantage over residents and communities.

Specific comments about the Engagement Plan itself included:

- Engagement must be conducted to comply with relevant regulations and legal

<p>requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It fails to commit SDC to engage collaboratively with stakeholders – it says ‘may’. • It is unclear why the EP highlights ‘major land owners’ when there is no such differentiation in the NPPF, and this focus on specific groups at the expense of other stakeholders fails to ensure the plan is developed with the understanding of all stakeholders.
<p>CHAPTER 2 Aims & Objectives (Q5)</p>
<p>There is general support for the suggested Vision, Aims and Objectives as they align with the Core Strategy. Some people objected to the intention of and/or specific wording of some of the objectives and suggested amendments. A number of suggestions have been put forward to strengthen objectives, provide a different emphasis or for new ones to be added. The range of issues included for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objectives need to be ‘smart’ • Pre-judging that a review of Green Belt is needed • Include new objectives on flood risk, economy and jobs, reducing out-commuting, enhancing the environment, promoting the arts/cultural needs and relating to provision of infrastructure.
<p>CHAPTER 2 Key Issues (Q6)</p>
<p>There have been 57 responses in relation to the key issues. Most responses are of support or provide general comments on the proposed topic areas. Some respondents commented on the order of policies and proposed a change to the order set out in the document.</p> <p>A number of respondents note that the Topics do not address social issues as a stand-alone issue. PLAN Selby should be more than just providing homes (i.e. social inclusion, cohesion, quality of life etc.). The topics need to address the provision of social and community facilities, and deal with any conflicts arising from such facilities causing harm to the environment and residents amenity/quality of life and creating safe and healthy environments.</p> <p>Comments propose the list needs to address social and community issues, and in particular the capacity of existing settlements to accommodate growth of schools. Emphasis should be placed on protecting the environment and improving infrastructure.</p> <p>Historic and cultural assets should be an individual topic and Green Belt should be a stand-alone topic area.</p> <p>The more standard approach of focusing on each individual topic area is a more clear way of structuring the document to make it easier for the reader to navigate.</p>
<p>Topic 1 Providing Homes</p>
<p>Amount of Housing Allocations Needed</p>
<p>Q7 a) a) Do you agree with the proposed approach to the base date?</p>

The base date should be updated to reflect 2015 figures - the consultation version is dated 2014. In assessing the base date there should be a review of the deliverability of permissions which will be carried forward. Overall there is support of the base date, however some argue for the base date to be the same as the Core Strategy (2011).

b) Do you agree with the broad principles of the calculation method?

By reducing the allocation requirement by the 2015 permissions base date, this will have the effect that villages which have received housing growth since 2011 (Start of the Core Strategy plan period) could receive a high level of growth if further PLAN Selby sites are allocated in a short period - without supporting infrastructure.

A high number of representations were in relation to the 10% discount for non-delivery of permissions as set out in the Core Strategy. They argue that the reduction of 10% over allocates housing in the District. In most cases on large sites the whole site is built out and therefore could lead to higher levels of growth.

Points were raised in terms of the deliverability issues in Selby Town in terms of flood risk; if sites cannot be delivered to accommodate Selby's growth then the requirement should be either distributed across the Principal Towns or DSVs.

Q8 a) Should PLAN Selby over-allocate to allow for any non-delivery on the allocations? By what method and by how much?

Support from house builders and agents that the housing requirement is a minimum target and that there should be over allocation to ensure choice and flexibility of sites to ensure housing delivery. A 20% buffer of sites was put forward by agents/house builders linked the NPPF requirement as part of the 5 year housing land supply calculation.

A number of representations suggested that this would lead to over development across the District and that 10% non-delivery was already considered as part of the allocation calculation method. Objection to over allocation as this leads to Green Belt release.

Q8 b) How should PLAN Selby seek to allocate sites in such a way as to secure delivery over the whole plan period?

All responses put forward that a range of sites should be one of the proposals to ensure delivery. An important point raised was that in order to maintain delivery of the 450 per annum target, 15 outlets building 30 units per annum would be required and that delivery rates should form part of the allocation method in securing delivery.

Others suggested penalties for non-implemented planning permissions locally. When considering major sites delivery and phasing in line with infrastructure should be considered. There is a danger in allocating a number of large sites as this will mean the plan will not deliver the required level of housing over the plan period.

Q8 c) Is there opportunity to have contingency sites in case others are not delivered elsewhere in the District? How might the contingency sites release be managed to maintain a 5 year housing land supply?

<p>Contingency sites seen as failure to deliver the plan, this could be done more effectively through a local plan review or a plan monitor approach.</p>
<p>Q9 a) Is a simple percentage growth across all Designated Service Villages a fair and appropriate starting point for deciding the split between the DSVs?</p>
<p>A level of objection was raised to simple % growth without the consideration of growth capacity and infrastructure as part of the distribution. Further considerations in terms of settlement sustainability and constraints must be applied in the determining local growth in each area. Support for an evidenced based approach to allocation.</p>
<p>Q9 b) Bearing in mind issues such as land availability, flood risk and other technical constraints (e.g. highways capacity and access) are there particular criteria that should be taken into account in assessing the final <i>minimum target</i> for Designated Service Villages?</p>
<p>School capacity, highway network, flood risk, doctors' capacity, and historical housing expansion of DSVs. Some DSVs have experienced above 50% of growth since the 1990s while other DSVs which have not seen high levels of growth could take more.</p>
<p>Q10 The Core Strategy sets the 'rules' for choosing sites; but do you have any views on the relative importance or weight to be attached to the criteria for site selection?</p>
<p>Green field land protected to maintain the rural character of settlements, PDL developed first.</p>
<p>Q11 In Tadcaster, three phases are proposed. Phase 1 and the contingency phase 2 are to be in Tadcaster and will follow the site selection methodology referred to in the previous section. However, how should PLAN Selby determine where the contingency Phase 3 sites should be located?</p>
<p>Concern that if Phase 3 sites are allocated to local DSVs they will not be able to sustain the level of growth proposed and it will not address the issues in Tadcaster. Suggestion that Phase 3 should go in the next largest centre - Sherburn. Some level of objection by Tadcaster residents to the concept of Phase 3 sites as if this non delivery is reached it will mean a failed plan for the Town. Tadcaster Town Council also suggests that Phase 3 should be as close to Tadcaster as possible, this to include a Green Belt release.</p>
<p>Topic 1 Providing Homes - Travelling Community</p>
<p>Q12 Do you know of any sites which may have potential for Gypsy and Traveller use?</p>
<p>Q13 a) Do you agree with the criteria used in the approach? b) Are there other factors that should be considered to further refine the</p>

criteria for broad locations for growth?
Q14 a) Should the Council develop a more detailed policy that sets out specifically the criteria when determining planning applications?
b) Should the Council develop a more detailed policy that sets out specifically the criteria when determining planning applications? If so what should be in it?
There was a range of detailed responses to these questions and the following summarises the collective responses to all the Questions 12-14
<p>There was a mixture of responses with some clear splits, many people thought the council needed a proactive approach and trying to find sites was the right approach. Others thought there should be no provision out right and that the sites suggested in the map book would all be approved and numbered too many, with others criticising the TNA evidence and why travellers need permanent pitches.</p> <p>Others were split over sites needing good access to trunk roads as some thought it was imperative and others not necessary. The majority thought each site should be addressed on its own merit based on individual suitability, location and access to services. There are strong feelings no Green Belt land should be used for sites and the same rules should apply to all allocation sites regardless of use.</p> <p>There was also a split on having a number of small sites or extensions to existing ones or one or two new large sites.</p> <p>There was a clear response from residents, parish councils and from Gypsy and Travellers that the 1 mile of the major settlements policy was not necessary and was not needed. There was also criticism of the council's approach to only considering sites that have own support as this is not a national policy or approach.</p> <p>There were also responses on anti-social behaviour and lack of support for sites locally.</p>
Topic 2 Promoting Prosperity
Q15 a) What approach should be taken on the existing Established Employment Areas as defined the Selby District Local Plan 2005?
Reponses highlighted the need for the existing employment areas to be reviewed in term of the NPPF requirements to assess whether existing uses should be maintained for PLAN Selby or alternative uses considered.
Q15 b) Is there a need for a detailed policy to apply to the Established Employment Areas?
General objection for detailed policies to restrict employment uses and a flexible approach to development on these sites should be promoted and development market led.
Q16 In the Selby District Local Plan, all Employment Allocations were considered suitable for all types of employment use (B1, B2 and B8). However in light of the different roles of each of the towns, should PLAN Selby consider a different approach, for example being more specific about the types of employment uses on

<p>particular sites?</p>
<p>The majority of responses suggest a flexible approach to employment generation, in line with NPPF to ensure job creation with less restrictive policies being promoted. Some responses indicated that particular sectors or uses should be promoted on different sites across the District, based on PLAN Selby evidence.</p>
<p>Q17 What should the approach to employment land be in rural areas, including Designated Service Villages?</p>
<p>Many responses suggest that employment allocations within DSV's should be restrictive to agricultural diversification. There was also support for the reuse of disused agricultural buildings for rural diversification. Other responses suggested a positive policy aimed to provide allocations to support small scale start up space or for self-employment. In open countryside and within the Greenbelt, applications for employment and tourism should be considered on their own merits.</p>
<p>Q18 Do we need any Development Management (DM) policies particular to the rural areas to expand on the requirement set out in the Core Strategy?</p>
<p>A policy on speed limits in rural areas, with additional growth there will be increased traffic in all villages - even smaller villages – what restrictions will be put in place?</p> <p>Some level of objection for site specific policies, promotion of general DM policies which maintain rural character of the District.</p> <p>Fewer policies are needed not more and flexible approach to economic development in rural areas is sought. Some objection to DM policies in rural areas, each application should be considered on its own merits.</p> <p>A prescriptive approach to employment in the rural areas would not be appropriate it would be helpful to have a positive policy context which encourages enterprise and facilitates job growth.</p> <p>The required development policies in addition to those in the Core Strategy include the need to define areas in which the landscape, cultural and heritage assets are particularly valuable and should be protected, in addition areas where the, for example, renewable energy is not appropriate.</p> <p>General support from parish councils for DM policies to support rural areas.</p>
<p>Q19 Within the rural area do we need any special policies or designations for any of the particular rural sites in the District to support the rural economy? For example Drax and Eggborough power stations, The former mine sites, Former airfields.</p>
<p>NYCC set out that a clear policy status is required on the power stations, former mine sites and former airfields. NYCC would like to work closely on policy development particularly where there are implications for highways and minerals and waste consents.</p> <p>Support (60%) for special policy areas for these sites which have the potential for economic development. However there is a high level of objection in that the sites should be restored to their former uses rather than create more development in the countryside.</p>

Burn airfield is not mentioned in the list, further clarification on the development of the site and how it related to PLAN Selby is sought.

Some objection to policies that may constrain the redevelopment of the site as market conditions may change over the plan period.

Support for former mine sites could be suitable for engineering associated with agriculture.

Kellingley Mine could become a residential village as there is already loose residential around the mine site.

Support for specific policies on Drax/Eggborough to deal with future opportunities, although not overly prescriptive to be flexible in line with national/international policy.

Support for defining areas – opportunities to define areas for promoting development and flexible uses of land should be seized. Support for the designation of special policy areas in PLAN Selby.

The majority of former mine sites, airfield and power stations are typically justified in locations where development is normally restricted on the basis of national needs and/or requirements. In order to ensure that these special circumstances are properly reflected in the sites' future use, they have conditions which require restoration of the site upon completion. Such sites have also been removed from the definition of PDL in the NPPF. No justification for further development; the original requirement to restore sites should be considered in the future.

Objection to restrictive uses on these sites In line with the NPPF a more flexible approach should be considered which does not preclude residential development.

City of York – A special policy for ensuring safe, suitable and attractive access for all Former Airfields is suggested.

Support special policy areas for former mine sites, could potentially cover missed uses such as employment and low carbon energy.

Q20 Do you have any particular views at this stage on these issues or how each of the 3 town centres should be developed? Or specific issues for shops and services in other settlements.

Tadcaster does not need the retail area expanding while the units above existing shops should be brought forward as residential or business uses.

More should be done to encourage smaller retailers such as the Tesco at Brayton as the focus seems to be on housing not retail.

The Council needs to prepare a comprehensive regeneration scheme for Tadcaster and this needs to be done with full cooperation of local stakeholders.

Secondary villages should have school places looked at before any housing growth.

Keep retail in the centres not outskirts.

The change in the retail sector means that there is a need for easier changes of use to encourage vibrant centres and a plan to alter where retail use is no longer the principal land use. Greater flexibility is required in helping the retail sector.

The conservation area needs to be considered in any proposals.

This is outside of the scope of Plan Selby and should be a marketing/PR exercise, Selby can't compete with York/Leeds and that needs to be recognised and stop trying to compete. Sherburn is clearly the powerhouse of the Selby region and needs a clear plan to build on its success.

The Council needs to do more to fill empty retail units which blight Tadcaster.

The Council should use its own buildings for retail.

Business rates need to be reduced to stop the spread of charity shops.

Shop frontages should have stricter guidelines on being in keeping with the heritage of towns.

Car use should be made unattractive while tourism should be promoted through better and more attractive signs.

The Council should consider a master planning approach to the 3 three main settlements.

Selby Town needs to have traffic improvements made before any other improvements can be implemented, especially the narrow road at Church Hill.

The rents need reducing and a reduction in charity shops and estate agents is needed

Q21 a) Are there any such areas that should be safeguarded, allocated or designated to restrict or promote development?

Q21 b) What is the justification for such an approach?

Should be no Special Policy Areas as they do not work.

This will be monitored by the SFRA and is not something that requires further work.

No mention of HS2 in the PLAN, a 500m buffer should be included around the proposed plans.

More development will increase the amount of traffic in villages and the impacts of HGV and more industrial uses should be assessed.

No land should be used that would limit the expansion of the A64.

More development will increase the amount of traffic on the A19 Corridor and the Brayton to M62 Roundabout. A comprehensive traffic study is required.

Special Policy Areas should be considered with particular attention given to Church Fenton Air Base.

Protecting the rural environment and the public amenity.

Secondary settlements need to have their capacity assessed in order to control any future development.

BARLBY/004 should be allocated as residential.

Policies T5 and T5a seem to have been written in order to protect Burn Airfield, however SDC purchased the site for £1.7m as this was proposed as the only way to protect the site. It is not clear why tax payer money has been spent if these policies do the same thing.

Special Policy Area is required for Tadcaster to promote open space, Heritage Assets

and regeneration schemes.

There may be the need to restrict land in the Lower Derwent Valley due to seasonal flooding.

There is limited reference to HS2/HS3 during the plan period which will plug into the existing network between Ulleskelf and Church Fenton. These should be identified within the plan.

The former Selby mine sites need to be allocated as Special Policy Areas.

Infrastructure needs.

Such elements of transport infrastructure fall under national government policy and should come to fruition during the plan period.

The School at Saxton must not be allowed to expand as this will not be in keeping with the scale or character of the village. Any expansion of the school will contradict the CS and the NPPF.

Topic 3 Defining Areas for Promoting Development and Protecting Key Assets

Green Belt

There were no specific questions asked in the Initial Consultation document about Green Belt in the light of the forthcoming further work on a Green Belt Review. However a number of comments were received on Green Belt Issues and specific sites.

General Comments

Green Belt sites can only be removed under exceptional circumstances therefore no Green Belt sites should be included in PLAN Selby.

Only residents and Parish Councils should be allowed to authorise Green Belt removal.

Brownfield first - it is not necessary to build on green sites given the amount of Brownfield.

Agricultural land should be protected to enable food production.

The Core Strategy makes it clear that a Green Belt review is required, only land that meets the requirements of Green Belt should therefore continue to be allocated.

NYCC (waste authority) stated that certain waste management sites [none given] should be removed from the Green Belt in light of stricter national policy restricting development.

Green Belt alterations should only be in relation to principle towns and DSVs, with no Green Belt amendments in secondary villages.

Green Belt should be protected at all cost.

DSVs in Green Belt should be altered to take their share.

Site Specific

Site East of Selby Road Whitley should be removed from the Green Belt. The site is enclosed on all sides and does not fulfil the role of preventing urban sprawl or protecting openness.

Church Fenton 002/003/004 should be removed from the Green Belt as it does not meet the criteria set out in the NPPF, while land beyond the site is a more logical boundary protecting the openness.

FRBN has historically been used for storage - the removal of this site would not conflict with the NPPF. This site forms a coherent part of the development and re-drawing the boundary would strengthen the Green Belt in this area.

SHER020 should be removed from Green Belt as the site is currently in industrial use and by re-drawing the boundary it would strengthen the role of Green Belt in the area.

The Green Belt around Kellingley Colliery should be looked at in detail as there seems to be an error on Weeland Road which has the colliery included when it has clearly not been Green Belt since the original site opened.

The 4 map book sites in Whitley are within Green Belt, there should be no loosening of the Green Belt as this would detract from the rural village feel.

There are no exceptional circumstances in Byram-Cum-Sutton Parish therefore there is no reason for Green Belt removal.

It is essential to change the Green Belt boundaries around MFRYSTON008.

Green Belt review is supported; however existing safe guarded land should be released first such as that at Hodgsons Lane.

Development Limits

Q22 Should Development Limits be drawn tightly to maintain the settlement pattern, or loosely around the settlements to enable sympathetic development?

The question attracted quite straight forward either 'tight' or 'loose' Development Limits, with slightly more wanting tight limits in order to block any development beyond what they considered was the existing village/DSV. Those wanting tight limits expressed that they didn't want a change to the current limits, expansion into the Green Belt or a loss of character by having new developments. Some considered that tight limits increase and encourage much needed regeneration.

Those wanting loose limits thought it blocked development, put unnecessary strain on the planning system, contributed towards the lack of 5 year supply and was against the NPPF. Many agents/developers have cited the limits are an old fashioned system that needs abolishing as it is based on out dated policy

Strategic Countryside Gaps

General comments

SCGs should only be built on if there are no other options available. This would need to be demonstrated. All SCGs should remain as they are.

No new SCGs should be drawn as they are a restrictive policy.

SCGs need reviewing. Keep SCSG off safe guarded land.

Q23 a) Where should the boundaries of the new Strategic Countryside Gap

between Selby and Thorpe Willoughby be drawn?

Keep the boundary between Selby and Thorpe Willoughby as it is.

The SCSG for Selby and Thorpe Willoughby/ Thorpe wood should follow the Yorkshire Water aqueduct. The Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby boundary should be the level crossing Leeds Road.

The SCG between Selby and Thorpe Willoughby should be drawn from the Western side of Selby to the bridal path to the East of Thorpe Willoughby.

Thorpe Willoughby is able to expand in a Westerly direction with scope into the SCG.

Q23 b) Are the boundaries of the other existing Strategic Countryside Gaps still appropriate?

The existing boundaries have scope to release some land.

The gap between Selby and Barlby can be reduced keeping the overall aim but to a more appropriate scale. Selby and Barlby SCG needs reviewing with the gap reducing to 150m.

Selby Brayton gap is out of date and is stopping development.

All current should be retained and the following added:

- Sherburn to S Milford
- M Fryston to Gateforth
- Gateforth to W Haddlesey
- Gateforth to Hambleton
- Gateforth to T Willoughby

Between Church Fenton and the airbase SCG should remain.

Safeguarded Land

Q24 How should PLAN Selby determine how much Safeguarded Land should be designated for potential future use?

Some respondents did not know what 'safeguarded land' is as it was not defined or explained in the document.

The majority of other respondents recognised the need to identify safeguarded land to meet development needs beyond the plan period and to ensure that Green Belt boundaries do not need reviewing in the next plan period in accordance with the NPPF.

Some comments referred to specific locations where Green Belt boundaries should be altered or protected. For example Hillam, Sherburn in Elmet, Burton Salmon and Tadcaster. In Tadcaster a representor considered that there is no need to identify safeguarded land around Tadcaster as the Core Strategy already allows an over allocation of housing sites and any development above this level to be met outside the town.

Suggestions for the amount of safeguarded land or what to take into account included:

- Consider capacity of existing safeguarded land
- Sufficient to ensure no need to review again in next plan period
- Enough for next 25-30 years

- Equivalent to 15 years
- Use objective evidence for need availability/delivery
- A buffer to allow for non-delivery of housing allocations
- At least 10% of development needs
- At least 20% of existing housing allocations

Topic 4 Infrastructure Needs (Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP))

General Comments

The Environment Agency suggest that Flood Defences be added to the list at Para 3.114 as the need for flood defences is identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

NHS Property suggests that the definition of Community Infrastructure includes a reference to Primary Care and Community Services.

Many comments raised issues about the need to ensure that new development is accompanied by associated infrastructure as there were existing capacity problems especially junctions/highways/parking, schools, drainage/sewerage and public transport.

Specific issues and local needs were identified by Parish and Town Councils and local residents in the following settlements: Sherburn in Elmet, South Milford, North Duffield, Brayton, Cliffe, Whitley, Tadcaster, Saxton, Selby, Hambleton, Eggborough, Byram cum Sutton and Brotherton.

Q25 Are there any infrastructure requirements that have not been identified, including small scale and local needs?

A wide variety of bodies provided detailed comments on the content of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) including NYCC, Highways Agency, Natural England, NHS Property, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, North Yorkshire Police and City of York Council. Comments included the continued support by agencies in developing the plan, the need for the IDP to be updated in the light of further work, supporting the reference to specific issues such as highways capacity and provision of Green Infrastructure as well as resourcing issues in relation to policing.

A large number of Parish and Town Councils provided detailed views on local issues and identified specific requirements for additional infrastructure to cope with proposed new development. Common concerns included drainage and flooding problems, the need for high speed broadband and 4G coverage in rural areas, improvements to healthcare, increased capacity in education, better public transport, and improvements to roads / junctions especially the A19, and A64 around Tadcaster (in addition to traffic calming and other facilities in the town). Comments from Sherburn in Elmet reiterated the need for infrastructure to keep pace with the high level of development taking place and planned there.

Other specific proposals included the need for the proposed spine road as part of the Cross Hills Lane housing site in Selby (within the existing local plan) to be included in the IDP and funded proportionally by all developers in the area as it would provide wider relief benefits to town.

Topic 5 Climate Change and Renewable Energy

NB for brevity; 'Climate Change' is referred to as CC and 'Renewable and Low Carbon Energy' is referred to as RLCE in this report

General Comments

Energy generation is driving force in Selby's economy and should be given commensurate coverage in PLAN Selby. It only gets 5 pages.

PLAN Selby must be capable of adapting to changes.

There is expected to be a significant change in the relative priority given to CC matters by government due to current pause in global warming.

Topic should be broken down into:

1. Energy Generation.
2. Energy Consumption.
3. Adaptation and CC mitigation.

A further sub-division should be: macro, mid-scale, small scale and micro generation relating to output rather than capacity as output generates revenues.

A policy should be introduced which maximises renewable and low carbon energy whilst minimising the adverse impacts on the District.

Should support more efficient and reliable sources such as biomass and anaerobic digestion which are more suited to the District and have lower impact rather than wind and solar power which are the opposite

RE definition does not accord with national policy.

Table 7 is confusing as it mixes a number of topics which should be separated.

The AECOM report has been used at a number of wind farm appeals and has been discredited. It contains inaccuracies and cannot be relied on. The target capacity is very large and does not exclude any areas due to landscape impact - this is not acceptable either socially or morally. Government policy has shifted and a number of appeals have been refused on landscape grounds. The AECOM report does not provide any information on which Selby should base its plan

Q26 Is it necessary for PLAN Selby to consider:

a) Providing a revised target for the plan period to 2027 for installed renewable energy?

'Against' revised targets:

Targets should be abolished or left as they are. RSS no longer applies and in any case it's been exceeded already. Carries little weight in appeals.

Simple targets linked to generating capacity are ill-conceived - it should be about generation not capacity. The targets were based on wind energy but now there's been diversification into other technologies. - E.g. biomass at Drax. Decisions on biomass fall outside Selby with DECC. Drax biomass is already well over the target set. Targets based on assumptions about technology serve no purpose.

The goals of SDC should be to maximise its contribution to actual energy generation

<p>rather than maximising nameplate generating capacity. The measure of success should be contribution to UK total power and carbon reduction while limiting landscape and environmental impact.</p>
<p>No - it should be removed from SP17 and replaced with a policy which maximises renewable energy/ low carbon energy in such a way that it minimises the adverse impact on Selby District.</p>
<p>The target at SP17 should not be revised because it is irrelevant. It needs removing and replacing with a policy to minimise adverse impact on the region/district. As a region we could generate another 1000mw from biomass - if compared to generation from turbines it is greatly preferable (100 turbines at 400ft+ would only generate 250mw).</p>
<p>Concern is the cumulative effect on the environment by the proliferation of applications for renewable energy projects. 40 applications for farm turbines in the area. The cumulative effect on our landscape together with 3 anaerobic digesters which circle my village of Beal, is unacceptable. Why do we persist with these numerous small projects when the local power stations are capable of a much bigger effect on output of electricity by converting to bio-mass?</p>
<p>Why do we want a multiplicity of wind farms? They produce relative little energy compared to other renewable/low energy sources, such as biomass. Therefore, the target should not be revised.</p>
<p>Heck Parish Council sees no benefits from the proposal to take minimum targets from the defunct RSS allocations and notes that the AECOM report relates mainly to wind turbines without taking into account other forms of renewable energy. The original targets were based on generating capacity rather than delivery and so, therefore, are of no real value.</p>
<p>A target should be set that takes into account what has already been achieved. That target should be supported by a policy that maximises renewable energy including low carbon but minimises the adverse impact on the locality.</p>
<p>No target should be included - the targets in the RSS were dropped by the Government. Provision of renewable energy within PLAN Selby should ensure that such energy is derived from developments that will provide high levels of sustainable, low carbon emissions and continuity of supply whilst having limited impact on the countryside environment and residents of the District. The AECOM Study referred to is dated and likely to be biased with no consideration given to renewables such as the biomass unit at Drax Power Station.</p>
<p>Targets are irrelevant so there is no need for a revision and this should be removed from the plan</p>
<p>Not in favour of targets. Instead focus on low carbon energy with minimum impact on the district. Encourage biomass at power stations. Support anaerobic digestion in agricultural areas to benefit economy rather than WF and solar which take land but don't provide jobs.</p>
<p>Achievement of local targets is influenced by factors not under local control. Need to consider some types of RE are more useful than others. Any local target should be undemanding proving few local constraints.</p>
<p>No targets because already been greatly exceeded and yet PPs still being granted. RE has become broader in scope and targets are no longer relevant. Instead RE projects should have minimal adverse impact on the area and be effective in their production of</p>

energy.
No target for SDC. Already abolished by government. We have 2 large power stations which are making a large contribution to RE and have met previous targets many times over and we are still expected to accept WFs. A target system wouldn't work given the generating capacity differences between powers stations and other forms of RE.
CS already dealt with climate change and renewable energy and no need for PLAN Selby to have policies on this matter
<i>'For' revised targets:</i>
It would be appropriate to have revised target as CS 32MW was not a ceiling and need to have positive policies in line with NPPF. Need to review AECOM 2011 study and have up-to-date evidence and consider key actions such as identifying allocations or Special Policy Areas for renewable energy initiatives.
Support target as will contribute to UK (“) targets. Policies are not a ceiling and should be framed positively – developers are not required to demonstrate need.
Support target and focus on low carbon that has minimum impact on District Encourage biomass at Drax and Eggborough and anaerobic digesters as are reliable, have low impact, compatible with agricultural land and provide local jobs.
Any target must be based and revised on best evidence and not set in stone.
b) Reviewing the 10% onsite requirement?
No need to review as CS recently adopted so it is up-to- date.
The 10% policy should be reviewed and removed in favour of more positive policies because: there is no benefit to SD in exceeding national standards esp. if it is not clear if these targets can be achieved; any standards which drive up costs of homes will deter developers - they should be encouraged to fit solar panels and heat pumps but not mandatory; greater opportunity on existing rather than new build; and the market is driven by subsidies dependent on government
This relates to micro-generation and given that its major impact would be on building standards it would be better dealt with under house building policy.
Plan Selby should not include additional targets for housing development that differ from National Guidelines. This would place a financial burden on some developments but not on others. The 10% guideline should be removed.
Remove targets and do not exceed national standards - instead encourage solar panels on existing g roofs and alternative energy supplies such as biomass, heat pumps etc. Many buildings in the District, esp. industrial could add solar roof panels and install heat pumps without detrimental effect on surroundings and businesses and residents should be encouraged to do so at large scale
10% unachievable. Increases burden of costs to homes which will mean fewer homes being built at higher prices.
10% is arbitrary and economically inefficient and has little environmental benefits.
10% is arbitrary, unnecessary and counter-productive. Replace instead with requirement

to ensure potential renewable energy is secured where viable on individual development sites.
Yes on the basis that policies do not exceed National Standards. The 10% target should be replaced by one that encourages photovoltaic, solar, heat pumps and biomass, but not in a way that it is dependent on a level of subsidy. Para 95 of the NPPF is sufficient
Yes if 10% becomes the norm.
c) Including specific requirements for sustainable building design such as Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM, subject to local viability testing?
<i>'Against' sustainable building requirements</i>
NO - Selby should follow and adhere to national standards. There is no benefit to Selby of imposing different standards to those that apply in the rest of the UK. Selby would incur additional costs and if they were higher standards they would deter developers from coming to the district
No. Selby should adhere to National Standards and not be subject to Viability Testing as it will prevent development.
Why require standards which are higher than applied nationally? This would have an impact and may result in reluctance by 'developers' to undertake building in the area
Plan Selby should not include targets that differ from National Guidelines
The matter is dealt with at national level and no need to repeat or increase the requirement.
<i>'For' sustainable building requirements</i>
Yes, Selby should be a leader in demanding 'greener' design.
Could be valuable as there is a tendency for developer to choose cheapest option rather than ones which have the greatest impact in reducing carbon emissions and supporting bi-0diversity
d) Identifying suitable areas for renewable and low-carbon schemes by technology? e.g. wind, solar, hydro?
<i>'Against' identifying suitable areas:</i>
Any site allocation exercise would almost certainly create a hostile district wide social environment. However the biggest objection to a site allocations exercise is that it would achieve virtually nothing because of the way in which the wind industry selects sites and put them forward for development. Identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon schemes is neither necessary nor desirable.
NPPF says desirable but not that it should be done. In other words any area that is allocated is almost certain to see proposals that then must be approved, and if the criteria are not absolutely unique to those sites then it will be more difficult to argue against other proposals. In Selby District where the landscape is reasonably consistent having sites allocated would be an expensive and pointless exercise
If there is no designation the local authority can refuse planning for wind farms and large

<p>solar farms. The applicant may well appeal the decision but as we saw at Wistow Lordship the appeal is then decided on its merits and gives local residents an opportunity to make their case. Where other developments have already been approved it is then possible to argue on the basis of cumulative impact, which again would be more difficult if the area had been identified as suitable.</p>
<p>There are no areas suitable for wind farms in the flat Selby District landscape. Identifying and designating sites according to a set of criteria would make refusals difficult and exclude the voice of local communities. Plan Selby should not give any preferred site designation but should, instead, rely on NPPF guidelines.</p>
<p>Selby should not allocate specific areas for wind/and solar farms as to do so would not limit them to those areas because developers would still be able to propose them on any other site. Suitable areas would be meaningless.</p>
<p>SDC should resist the temptation of installing wind turbines within the district</p>
<p>There are no suitable areas for wind farms in the flat Selby District. If sites are identified according to a set of criteria, then it would become difficult to resist their development in other sites which have not been so identified but share the same criteria. If there are no designations it would be easier for a Planning Authority to refuse applications when necessary. To identify sites would effectively exclude local voices should an application be submitted because at this stage communities would not know what they were objecting to until an application was made. Plan Selby should resist any attempt to provide any preferred site designation and rely on NPPF guidelines</p>
<p>Worst suggestion so far. It would encourage a flood of applications which could not be resisted and would not stop applications in other areas. No legal requirement to identify suitable areas.</p>
<p>Would encourage wind farms which we don't support. Instead should be encouraging biomass and anaerobic digestion.</p>
<p>There are so many factors to take into account for many technologies in site selection that it is not practical to pre-determine. Each should be considered on its own merits.</p>
<p>Bad idea because would blight these areas especially if it were for wind farms and wouldn't stop developers applying outside the areas.</p>
<p></p>
<p>'For' identifying suitable areas:</p>
<p>Yes must consider identifying suitable areas because without clear guidance/policy, landowners are submitting inappropriate applications within areas of Green Belt and designated areas of landscape character.</p>
<p>Identifying areas would provide certainty in line with NPPF.</p>
<p>Areas considered viable for renewable energy should be defined as broad areas.</p>
<p>Could identify River Wharfe in Tadcaster as a source of hydro-power and investigate on tidal River Ouse and River Aire.</p>
<p>Not for wind farms and fracking but yes for solar and hydro as well as biomass, anaerobic digestion and waste incineration.</p>
<p>Identify areas alongside a presumption against development outside those areas unless</p>

they can be shown to be acceptable.
Yes but not in Green Belt. Also need to consider which areas are not suitable e.g. Skipwith Common, Lower Derwent Valley.
e) Identifying separation thresholds? What might they be?
<i>'For' separation distances</i>
The short answer is yes – separation distances are very important.
Minimum separation distances provide a simple set of rules which determine how close turbines can be to homes. The wording of minimum separation distance policies have to be positive. Case law can be referenced to find a form of words which is acceptable within the NPPF framework.
Setting minimum distances is the best way to protect Selby District residents from the worst effects of wind turbines. Many argue for a minimum of 2km but this is unreasonable because it would exclude all turbines, including smaller turbines from most of the District. A minimum distance which is linked to the size of turbine is a better approach and would protect communities as turbines get bigger. 2km is reasonable for the larger turbines (say 145metres but it must be greater for 200metres turbines). The number of turbines should also be taken into consideration. It must not be permissible to have more than one turbine at the minimum distance. Minimum distances should be set for distances from homes, roads, pathways, public areas and areas used for recreational activity
The minimum distance should depend on the size of the turbines e.g. approx. 2km for large turbines. If turbines get bigger this distance should be increased. The cumulative effect of a number of turbines should also be taken into consideration.
2km for the large turbines (145m) is reasonable but if turbines get bigger then the distance should be bigger. There should anyway be a minimum distance from homes, roads and pathways etc. It is difficult as these things are changing and developing but I think it is important that a long term view is taken for the Selby region so that the character of the area is not changed forever
Serious concerns about the health effects of wind turbines situated too close to housing. Imagine the quality of life subjected to the flicker and shadowing from many turbines. More consideration should be given to the siting of wind farms and their proximity to residential housing if you are to meet your mission statement.
The height of any turbine should determine separation. For example, a distance of 10x the height would appear to be reasonable for a single turbine with this distance being increased where there are two or more turbines.
Turbines are already becoming higher and if this is to be the case then a 2KM separation is nowhere sufficient. In my opinion 2 Km should be used for the smallest of turbines & then proportionately larger for the higher turbines if these abortions are to be forced upon us. The proliferation of these monstrosities means that it is ever more important to regard separation distances more closely
Separation – the height of a turbine should determine its separation. A distance of 10x the turbine height would be reasonable for a single turbine whilst the distance should be increased proportionally where there are two or more turbines.

<p>Minimum distances should be set related to the size of the turbine e.g. 10x height as in Bavaria. This should be the distance to residential properties.</p>
<p>It is totally unacceptable that Selby District Council has not set minimum separation distances for wind turbines. Particularly concerned about Thorpe Willoughby as the planning application for the nearby turbines involves particularly large turbines that are too close to an increasing number of homes. [<i>The representor provides references to a variety of research relating to 'wind farm syndrome'</i>]. Recommend setting minimum distances linked to the size of the turbine and the number of turbines – 2km is reasonable for larger turbines 145m. It must not be permissible to have more than one turbine at the minimum distance.</p>
<p>This is the most effective way of protecting residents from adverse effects. There is a legal precedent to implement such a policy but needs to be carefully worded. Distance from homes and other features to be taken into account, the more wind turbines the bigger the distance.</p>
<p>Should be minimum distances due to hazards of blade failure, ice and toppling. Should be 10-15 times turbine height from homes, roads, footpaths or recreation land.</p>
<p>Totally against wind farms in this area which are a blot on the landscape we want to preserve for future generations.</p>
<p>Any policy should give careful consideration to proximity to homes, green belts etc. With wind turbines special regard to noise and distance to homes is a key factor, as well as visual impact – as they increase in size and numbers. SDC should set minimum distances from homes, public areas to protect its residents.</p>
<p>Separation distances could be valuable to prevent cumulative impacts. But impacts on wildlife must be backed by detailed mapping and data.</p>
<p>Existing planning laws did not envisage such huge structures. Should depend on height of wind turbines and size of wind farms / numbers. Needs to be flexible as issues will change over life of plan.</p>
<p><i>'Against' separation distances</i></p>
<p>The EIA process is the most appropriate basis for assessment for large scale renewable energy schemes and determined on a case-by-case basis. Creation of arbitrary thresholds would need to take account of site circumstances and proposals. Refers to Wiltshire example – the distance itself does not necessarily determine whether the impact of a proposal is unacceptable.</p>
<p>There should be no arbitrary identification of thresholds. Any such parameters should be based on evidence and best practice.</p>
<p>No basis in national policy to support establishment of such thresholds but could have regard to NY&Y Sensitivity Framework (2012) technical toolkit for development of policy and development management proposals.</p>
<p>Contrary to national policy. Not appropriate to identify arbitrary separation thresholds as each development should be considered on its own merits in light of site specific circumstances.</p>
<p>f) Incorporating more detailed development management policies for climate</p>

<p>change and renewable/low-carbon energy requirements? If so what do they need to cover? For example taking into account cumulative impacts of schemes?</p>
<p>Renewable and low carbon energy technologies are evolving rapidly and there is no point developing policies which are irrelevant by the time that they are introduced. Policies should focus on issues which are expected to apply generally.</p>
<p>Policies should focus on matters which will relate to large numbers of planning applications and be relevant to more than one type of application</p>
<p>Four broad topics should be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • environmental impact • amplitude modulation noise condition policies • cumulative impact assessments • detailed landscape character assessment
<p>Environmental impact - light pollution, air pollution, landscape and visual impact, traffic, and fencing/enclosure form large scale solar.</p>
<p>Amplitude modulation noise condition - raises issues relating to the Den Brook wind farm in Devon compared to the Renewable UK Ltd proposed conditions - in relation to peak noise levels and frequency of pulses; noting long running dispute between RE industry and local communities on how to measure.</p>
<p>Cumulative impact assessments - should be considered across all energy generation technologies and energy related infrastructure using same factors as above (environment impact)</p>
<p>Landscape character assessment (LSCA) and visual impact - lots of time at appeals spent on this. Now accepted that impact can be on flat landscape as well as hilly landscape. LSCA should be comprehensive and detailed down to local level. Selby's needs reviewing and revising where necessary. Developers play on Selby being in humberhead levels and having low sensitivity to WF</p>
<p>Reasonable separation distances must be in place.</p>
<p>Rapidly changing technology may well result in detailed policies becoming irrelevant and out of date very quickly. Policies on the cumulative impact of light and air pollution, including pollution from incinerators, should be considered along with NHS policies on improving health and life expectancy</p>
<p>SDC should resist any incinerator type proposal on existing industrial land and also not sacrifice land close to settled communities that have a small voice.</p>
<p>A proactive approach should be taken to renewable energy with clear guidelines as to what is acceptable in terms of cumulative impact both for wind and solar energy. The light reflection and effects on wildlife should be taken into account along with domination of the environment for residents.</p>
<p>Could include solar farms (loss of agricultural land and open space) and wind turbines (cumulative impact - noise/visual)</p>
<p>Should have policies to manage RE developments such as cumulative impact and visual impact, air quality and traffic.</p>
<p>Whilst not advocating quotas for individual types of generation, some weighting needs to be given to the environmental and security of supply benefits of particular types of</p>

generation - solar, wind, biomass.
Consideration should be given to cumulative visual impact of WFs and SFs as well as the loss of good quality farmland with large arrays of solar panels.
The ID Boards would wish to see more detailed policy in regard to climate change issues with this being linked to the issue of uncontrolled creeping development, permitted development rights and householder applications. The situation is presently anomalous in that in a low lying and flat area with a propensity for flooding planning policy can address a range of relevant issues in the interests of true sustainability but this is constantly undermined through unregulated and uncontrollable development.
New policies should address cumulative impact (especially in sensitive areas), loss of tranquillity and free movement of wildlife and: Solar – visual impact, loss of agricultural land, enclosure of open space Wind turbines – cumulative visual impact, noise Incinerators / anaerobic digestions – air quality, traffic, noise
New policy required to positively address RE schemes which offer Community Shared Ownership as per DECC taskforce paper.
Any new policies must be positively worded in line with NPPF and PPG and strongly promote renewable energy and low carbon schemes.
Any new policies must add value and deal with genuine issues. Must be costs effective in dealing with issues that affect5 numerous planning applications.
This is beyond the scope, responsibility and resources of any District Council. Nothing is Selby specific. Must keep costs down and not enter into schemes which add to administrative burden within the District for no financial reward.
g) What topics should instead be left to a subsequent SPD (supplementary planning documents) or guidance?
Plan Selby should avoid producing a raft of detailed policies. It should place more reliance on National Guidelines and focus on implementing the plan’s vision rather than aiding development for development’s sake
SDC should look at what other local authorities do. Topics suggested include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum separation distances for turbines • Amplitude modulation / noise conditions for wind farms - although the need for such policies; will be influenced by on-going court cases and Government review • Fencing and enclosure issues to do with solar farms • Incinerators • Anaerobic digesters • Also input to minerals and waste authority policies needed
While not an SPD the most urgent requirement is to do a detailed landscape character assessment. Need a landscape assessment to allow consideration of planning applications which impact on the character of the area.
The nature of the landscape must be taken into account. Largely flat, it renders large structures as inescapable unlike more hilly environments, which can obscure the

<p>structures from different positions. There should be pride in the District's landscape and it should not be allowed to be flawed due to power stations and the flatness. It currently maintains a unique balance of rural and industrial characteristics which is appropriate to its history.</p>
<p>Landscape policies must be in place to ensure the rural District has an outstanding environment and is attractive to existing residents and businesses and for further growth.</p>
<p>SPD should not be used to set out policy matters but add further detail to Local Plan policies. SPD should not add unnecessary financial burdens.</p>
<p>Any delay in putting together policies on CC and RE could result in a proliferation of unsuitable wind farms and solar farms and Selby District would lose its character.</p>
<p>Power generation technology will change and the local plan must be able to accommodate developments in the future which offer better environment and power supply without being constrained by decisions taken unnecessarily early.</p>
<p>h) How should each of the site allocations (to be identified in later stages) deal specifically with climate change and renewable energy issues?</p>
<p>Difficult to answer without further information. Needs further consultation on site allocations.</p>
<p>Plan Selby should avoid producing a raft of detailed policies. It should place more reliance on National Guidelines and focus on implementing the plan's vision rather than aiding development for development's sake</p>
<p>Avoid a plethora of detailed policies due to rapidly changing technologies plus changes in national policies with move away from local standards to Building Regulations.</p>
<p>Identify appropriate and inappropriate technologies for larger allocations.</p>
<p>The question should be asked when the subjects to be covered by site allocations are known. However the following are examples of things that should be included in baseline considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flooding – which is attributed to climate change but is more about drainage; • CHP- ensure that sources of heat from CHP plants is considered in conjunction with potential use of the heat; • Encourage industrial developments to deploy solar panels on roofs; which will have little impact on amenity / landscape character and save farm land. • Encourage biomass heating of industrial premises; • Encourage use of heat pumps – preference should be given to ground source and potential for shared use of the underground heat exchangers.; • Consider the impact and opportunity provided by carbon capture and ensure that sources of carbon other than Drax can use the facility. Site allocation for industrial use should have this as a prime consideration.
<p>The Council should consider allocating sites just for RLCE uses or wash over suitable areas or allocate sites for 'mixed uses' or as a 'special policy area' encompassing a range of using including RLCE uses</p>
<p>Topic 6 Protecting and Enhancing the Environment</p>

General Comments

Green Assets

With an increasing population the requirement should increase and there should be a designated requirement to any developers.

Green Infrastructure (GI)/Recreation Open Space (ROS) – General

Investment in flood defences; ensure all developments include GI - to increase green space and reduce impact on drainage systems; include protected species, Local and UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) habitats and species and soil and agricultural land; in addition to Public Rights of Way and cycle/bridleways, consideration of long distance trails including the Trans-Pennine Trail - more detail on how these assets will be protected and enhanced through development management process; agricultural land should be preserved - once lost cannot be restored; include river corridors which are an important part of the ecological network - policies should consider buffer area along waterways to restrict development and allow species free movement along networks.

GI/ROS - Specific suggestions

Group in North Duffield looking for allotments - future development should take this into consideration.

Village green in Saxton not identified as Local Amenity Space.

Reinstatement of Stillingfleet and Wistow mines to countryside should take place as soon as possible.

Why not build a new town at Burn Airfield?

Table 6 provided an indicative range of environmental issues to be addressed in PLAN Selby

Q27 a) Is this comprehensive? Are there other environmental assets that should be afforded some protection or have a policy basis?

Number of general concerns raised:

List of assets include small percentage of the green spaces that people enjoy;

District wildlife population threatened by developments - wildlife lives in areas it wants, not where designations are and appropriate action is needed to protect them;

Imperative that policies are understood within SDC and District - need to engage with communities to ensure policies do not appear to be imposed on reluctant residents;

Designations should only be undertaken where there is robust and up to date evidence - policies for development of such sites will be supported where proposals facilitate the protection or enhancement of the site or appropriate alternative site;

Environmental protection should be more extensive than the list in Table 8.

Asset list suggestions/omissions

One response agreed with the list of issues identified.

Other issues raised:

- Leeds City Region Green Infrastructure map/strategy not easily available;

- Reference to Yorkshire Wildlife Trust Living Landscape mapping as an important resource;
- Concerns that Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation data is not up to date and robust following withdrawal of NYCC support could lead to challenge;
- Lower Derwent Valley Plan is at early stage of development and further protection, or retention of existing policies, may be required;
- Consideration of pollution and effects upon wildlife from planning and unregulated activities;
- Suggest open water courses are included - District has an abundance of such features which form critical drainage infrastructure - over time there has been a preference to pipe in watercourses which has resulted in a loss of flood storage and inhibiting biodiversity - watercourses need protecting in terms of access to ensure functionality of watercourse;
- Local green Spaces omitted as provided for in NPPF para 76 and 77.

Suggestions/considerations for designation:

Number of suggestions relating to areas which should be considered/included as part of GI studies/policies: canal, river and towpaths; woods and wildlife habitats (Sherburn); lake and surrounding land at New Lane and propose (Burton Salmon); wildlife corridors for animals which use regular routes.

A number of responses received stating no additional environmental assets/issues required.

b) Are the existing policies in the Core Strategy sufficient to protect these environmental assets or are further detailed policies necessary?

Existing Policies:

- Approach to be consistent with that being pursued by adjoining authorities;
- Current policies not sufficient to protect District's assets despite regulation from EA and NYCC - Blue Lagoon and Womersley Tip have been polluted by leachate from Womersley spoil disposal site run by UK Coal;
- Review policies to ensure compliance with and do not replicate other guidance - policies should be simple and to the point;
- Concerns with policy ENV29 (Local Amenity Space) - wish to see the provision of play areas strengthened;
- Further details required due to new guidance and policies and case law - case to revisit issues is set out in Core Strategy - adopted undertaking in the Core Strategy to complete work as part of PLAN Selby - Core Strategy adopted as sound on the premise that these tasks would be undertaken;

Policy Suggestions:

- Up to date information required to ensure they are fully protected;
- Broader and more bespoke policy base relevant to watercourses would be beneficial;
- Detailed policy on Local Green Spaces required and audit of suitable sites undertaken;

Collaborative working:

Regarding Wakefield Site Specific Policies Local plan and emerging Leisure, Recreation and Open Space Local Plan which allocate wildlife and leisure corridors at the River Aire, Knottingley & Goole Canal and Wentbridge and Brockadale which abut the Wakefield/Selby border and wherever possible these should be reflected in PLAN Selby and shown on the policies maps. Will help to support and recognise sub regional GI. Also emphasise the potential for Knottingley & Goole Canal to support more freight movements and request that this is recognised in PLAN Selby where relevant.

CHAPTER 4 Development Management Policies

Q28 Do the existing Selby District Local Plan policies for heritage assets remain relevant?

3 responses agree (yes only answers) that the SDLP policies remain relevant and another would not wish to see heritage aspects of Tadcaster spoiled through removing policies.

General comments:

Heritage assets should not be restricted to listed buildings and conservation areas but also other buildings of historic nature (including landscapes) - should be broader than this to include other buildings of historic nature

Encourage re-use of old buildings such as old warehouses and farm buildings - should be converted in preference of demolition;

S.66 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act (and related cases) require the protection of the setting of listed building - failure of PLAN Selby to protect the setting of listed buildings would be incompatible with legislation/policy required to protect listed buildings from encroachment and harm from other developments including the assets setting - criteria should be established on setting as only grounds of property are deemed to constitute the setting (example of Gateforth Hall estate which consists of a number of listed buildings, other buildings and farms which originally belonged to the estate) - should be considered as a collective and whole of original estate should be considered;

Policy SP18 is high level and PLAN Selby needs to include specific guidance on considerations that will be taken into account in determining applications affecting heritage assets - areas that need to be covered are those which the NPPF is largely silent, those areas where development management policies are necessary to address local circumstances of the plan area, and those areas where the NPPF is very generalised;

Policies should be simple and to the point;

Policies remain relevant but must be updated in the light of new case law and also need to be updated with the creation of a list of Locally Important Heritage Assets and the development of specific policies and protections;

Specific suggestions:

- Abbot's Staithe, Micklegate needs special attention;
- Suggest assets to be considered are Birkin Church, Gateforth Hall, Hillam Hall and views towards Gateforth Wood;
- Should have a comprehensive list of heritage assets which identify those that are protected - states Womersley conservation area and listed buildings (St Martin's

<p>Church);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Mary's Church, Birkin is grade 1 listed and would be at serious risk from Wood Lane Wind Farm and increased HGV movements - this heritage must be protected and preserved;
<p>Q29 Is there a case for PLAN Selby to consider developing a Local List for heritage assets?</p>
<p>Most responders generally agreed there is a case for developing a local list for heritage assets; one responder had no comment; no reason not to have a list - provides a basis for which buildings and heritage assets should be afforded protection. A local list would be consistent with the Localism Act and NPPF and would help resist inappropriate development.</p> <p>Selby's heritage assets represent a fraction of the heritage resource in the District (*list of assets provided) - how applications are considered which affect these assets would also need to form part of the policy framework.</p> <p>Should include list of locally important heritage assets and the development of specific policies and protections that will ensure these are enhanced and preserved in an appropriate manner - not restricted to built development but also include open spaces and natural features that contribute to the character and setting of an area.</p> <p>However, others commented that not certain what a local list would achieve over what is possible under present system and queried what assets would qualify? As it would appear it is too detailed approach for PLAN Selby - may be better to be considered in supplemental documents.</p> <p>National Heritage is the custodians of the database of listed buildings so cannot see why SDC should hold a separate list if that is available for reference.</p>
<p><i>Specific suggestions:</i></p> <p>There are many heritage assets in the District which have no protection - Sherburn has no conservation area and few listed buildings but there are features that are important for aesthetic, cultural and community reasons (the Id School, Kirkgate).</p> <p>Communities should be consulted on which assets they consider worthy of protection; suggest inclusion of Birkin Church, Gateforth Hall, Hillam Hall and views to Gateforth Wood;</p> <p>Should have a comprehensive list of heritage assets which identify those that are protected - states Womersley conservation area and listed buildings (St Martin's Church).</p>
<p><i>Table 9 Provided a list of key topic areas to consider the need for further development management policies</i></p>
<p>Q30 a) Looking at Table 9 above, which topics should PLAN Selby concentrate on?</p>
<p>b) Which topics do not require any further detailed Development Management policy because the NPPF or Core Strategy policies are sufficient?</p>
<p>c) Are there any other topics that PLAN Selby should address?</p>
<p>General consensus was not to create policies for the sake of them and that PLAN Selby</p>

needs to concentrate on what the Core Strategy does not provide while ensuring that PLAN Selby does not undermine the Core Strategy.

National housing standards should ensure delivery of housing and PLAN Selby should not restrict development.

Development in the countryside needs to be protected whilst supporting the rural economy.

There is a greater need for design in villages, designing out crime doesn't go far enough in the Core Strategy.

Mine sites should be taken as brown field sites in the countryside.

Suggest policies needed on transport travel plans, support for sustainable travel and better parking.

Some suggested further work on nature provision.

Q31 Should PLAN Selby include policies for setting specific house types and sizes, tenures and specialist housing such as care homes and Self builds?

There was a mixed response to this question. Some support for development but noted that infrastructure is too slow to catch up, There was also some support for self-build and for some housing need such as care homes. Others stated that the Strategic Housing Market Assessment can decide on housing need however not a policy for it as it will restrict the market. Some respondents considered that more homes are required for the elderly so they can remain in their own village but that large houses in villages are not always required. Other views expressed included - local targets should not be set and each application should be dealt with on its own merits.

Q32 a) Should PLAN Selby include further policies for any of the following?

- **travel plans**
- **parking standards**
- **active traffic management**
- **integrated demand management**
- **capacity improvements**
- **electric vehicle charging points**
- **cycle routes**
- **car parking**

Q32b) Are there other local transport schemes/issues that PLAN Selby should develop policies for?

There was a wide range of comments on this topic including:

- There is a lack of public transport in villages.
- Should use canal and train instead of road.

- Need to consider implication of electrification of Selby rail line and HS2.
- There is no need to provide guidance for travel plans when these are done through NYCC. Sustainable travel appraisal is already covered by Policy SP7 of the Core Strategy
- Improvement of car parking is needed in train stations.
- New by-passes are required for villages which are affected by Sherburn industrial estate.
- Rural footpaths and cycle routes require improvements.
- Supplementary Planning Documents should be used for this instead of policy; otherwise a policy would restrict development.
- Improved parking in Tadcaster would increase the regeneration.
- Policies to make the environment more attractive to non-car users would contribute to SA objective 10.

Q33 a) Should PLAN Selby have more detailed general policies on design by being more specific about the minimum design standards it will seek to achieve, including policy on development density, environmental and quality design benchmarks (such as BREEAM, Lifetime Homes, Secure By Design etc.)?

b) Should PLAN Selby establish design requirements in the new allocated sites that consider the layout, orientation and aesthetic of development proposals?

The range of topics referred to in responses included:

- Density - design should be in keeping with the neighbouring land
- Good design and amenity are linked, national standards will cover this.
- Policies for allocations should be incorporated
- A general policy for housing development is unlikely to be used by development management on a day to day basis.
- New housing should be of good design on a site by site basis and need to allow for creation and innovation.
- The Strategic Housing Market Assessment should cover what housing is required.
- It would be better to use Development Briefs rather than policies on specific allocation to allow for flexibility.

Q34 a) Are the Core Strategy policies sufficient, are the remaining SDLP policies still relevant and evidence based?

b) Should PLAN Selby have a more restrictive policy against the loss of rural community facilities? What could the tests be?

c) How can PLAN Selby promote tourist accommodation, recreation open space, community and sports facilities etc.?

Some comments are linked to climate change and cover the same issues raised at Q26 above.

Other comments covered:

- Do not consider Core Strategy Policy SP9 on affordable housing is acceptable as it will have a significant impact on the delivery of homes.
- Communities should be given the option to buy key assets.

- Housing development will restrict tourism as tourists are less likely to stay in areas close to wind turbines.
- Need to review policies against the NPPF and not repeat national guidance, or restraint development.
- The focus should be made on local needs and not tourism as a basis for the rural economy.
- Promote tourism through other means such as 'Visit England,
- More evidence base is required for new policy
- Support in principle protection of existing facilities but all should be sustainability appraised with the main focus on existing settlements and protect the countryside from over-development

Q35 What policies should PLAN Selby include to manage development in the countryside?

For example is there a need for more detailed policies for: replacement dwellings, farm diversification, conversions, re use of buildings, local amenity, appropriate scale, form and character of area / role and function / design codes, Isolated homes – special circumstances?

Some detailed comments were received regarding countryside policies and incorporated views on the following areas:

- Policies should reflect the needs for countryside between towns and villages
- Encourage reuse of converting disused farm buildings but on sustainability grounds not all farm buildings are suitable for conversion as there is a conflict whether to develop in rural areas. Some reps support some don't.
- Don't support infrastructure that is out of place in rural location.
- Solar farms with fencing are not going to create an outstanding environment.
- Refer back to the Selby Vision.
- Reduce the impact on the open countryside and improve visual amenity.
- PLAN Selby needs to return to rural distinction. PLAN Selby does not acknowledge what NYCC who are doing such as developing minerals and waste plan.
- Flexibility in the Core Strategy should be retained.
- Replacement farm buildings with dwellings must be sympathetic.
- NPPF allows local plans to address countryside matters.
- Former mine sites would benefit from a special policy area; mine sites should be allowed to fall back to agricultural use, unless there is an alternative use which would benefit the district.

Q36 How should the Council view large previously-developed sites in the countryside?

Better to develop large derelict or unused sites than allow them to become a local eyesore.

If the [mine] site has a condition to revert back to agricultural use then it must do so instead of leaving them derelict. However if an alternative use can be found it is better to use the previously developed sites rather than the green field sites.

Ensure surveys of wildlife are carried out on mine sites before considering them for development.

PDL sites need special consideration before bringing them forward, they are small in number, and should be treated on an individual basis, do not think it is possible to formulate a policy on this basis, the previous use of the sites may dictate the future use. and allow development if better overall.

Burn PC seek clarification on the Council's intentions for the former Burn Airfield which it purchased.

Development on PDL in the countryside should be supported provided there is proof for sustainable development.

Each site should be considered on their own merits Any proposal for sites that are not to restoration should provide clear outline of sustainable benefits of the proposed sequential approaches to site identification and allocation.

Table 10 provided a list of all the saved Selby District Local Plan (SDLP) policies

Q37 a) Which SDLP Policies are suitable for continued use in PLAN Selby?
b) Which are completely out of date, or no longer necessary?
c) Could any be updated or amended for use in the PLAN Selby? How can they be brought up to date?

Many detailed comments were received concerning all the saved SDLP policies. In summary the types of comments received related to:

- SDLP policies should be updated or deleted, in line with NPPF, NPPG and should not constrain development
- Safeguarded land is now needed to address housing need
- By-pass land still required for Monk Fryston
- RT2 is out of date needs to be in accordance with the NPPF in para 73, and update the developers contribution SPD
- Reference should be made to the new permitted development rights and house holder polices
- Review parks and gardens and locally important assets - are they still relevant in SDLP policies?
- Ensure policies are consistent with the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- Consultation too short to allow response.

CHAPTER 5 SETTLEMENTS

Selby

Q38 a) How should Selby grow and develop – what could a vision say?
b) What else is needed in Selby that could be allocated a site?

Policy SP2 of the Core Strategy already sets this out with a focus on previously

developed land and the NPPF already applies a sequential test towards areas of lowest Flood Risk.
Policy SP5 already sets out further guidance on the residential requirements.
There is no land in Flood Risk 1 so it is obvious development should be steered towards Flood Risk 2 sites.
Selby should grow in a sustainable manner balancing the environment and the growth needs. As there is no FloodZone1 development should be directed to FloodZone2 and only if this is exhausted directed to FloodZone3.
Development should avoid strategic gaps and sensitive landscape areas.
More small sites which are preferable to large ones like Olympia Park.
The land to the NW of Selby Town is the most suitable as its FloodZone2 and wont impact on the strategic gaps.
Selby has many potential tourist sites that could attract much needed visitors but they are currently under used.
Railway Bridge at A1041 Bawtry Road is going to be electrified and should be replaced with a new smaller bridge before the old one is removed.
English Heritage - Selby should not grow SW as this would harm the Brayton Conservation area, and St Wilfred's Church.
Secondary Villages are not being proposed for allocations, however Burn Airfield will be owned by SDC after March 2015. If SDC propose any development on this site is will demonstrate the PLAN Selby process is unsound and had not met the required community engagement.
Sherburn In Elmet
Q39 a) How should Sherburn in Elmet grow and develop – what could a vision say?
b) What else is needed in Sherburn in Elmet that could be allocated a site?
No more needed
The Parish Council is of the view no further housing or employment land needs to be allocated prior to 2027, there is also no need to discount Sherburn figures by 10%. Sherburn now needs to address the current infrastructure shortfall and over provision of employment land
The CS highlights that the existing transport infrastructure should be made best use of. The train connection is only for passenger trains and has not been expanded in line with other growth. The road network will continue to be the main transport system unless other methods are utilised such as rail. The Rail network also does not support the import and export of goods and materials
Any development needs to prove it will not have an adverse impact on the drainage or climate change
Land should be removed from the Green Belt for Sherburn to grow
Review village centre and consider expansion to north to include shopping/supermarkets and include a bypass.

<p>Review and promote Southerly expansion of the industrial estate to make use of the existing rail siding for intermodal rail connection.</p>
<p>Leisure facilities are needed.</p>
<p>The CS highlights that the existing transport infrastructure should be made best use of. The train connection is only for passenger trains and has not been expanded in line with other growth. The road network will continue to be the main transport system unless other methods are utilised such as rail. The Rail network also does not support the import and export of goods and materials</p>
<p>Indoor and outdoor leisure facilities are required, road links need improving A1 at Lumby, the train links need improving, train parking facilities need improving, a household waste re-cycling centre needs providing and the cemetery is full</p>
<p>The Parish Council considers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The village is in need of new indoor and outdoor leisure facilities including the replacement of the high school pool, SDC is working with the school on an all-weather pitch but more needs to be done. • The access to the A1 at Lumby needs improving while the 2 train stations need improved parking and services to Leeds and York. • There is also a need for a household recycling centre to serve the SW of the district. • The cemetery at All Saints Church will be at capacity in 2 years a site is urgently needed
<p>The Sherburn le Willows SSSI which is a Yorkshire Wildlife Trust reserve has very high quality grassland. Buffering and protection should be installed to stop new development/residents damaging the site</p>
<p>Secondary Villages are not being proposed for allocations, however Burn Airfield will be owned by SDC after March 2015. If SDC propose any development on this site it will demonstrate the PLAN Selby process is unsound and had not met the required community engagement.</p>
<p>Tadcaster</p>
<p>Q40 a) How should Tadcaster grow and develop – what could a vision say?</p>
<p>b) What else is needed in Tadcaster that could be allocated a site?</p>
<p>Agricultural land should not be built on when there is so much brown field land in Tadcaster centre. The centre of the town must be developed in keeping with its tradition; building on the outskirts will encourage people to commute out to York and Leeds rather than Tadcaster.</p>
<p>Need to review the Leeds City Council Headley Hall site which must be resisted at all costs.</p>
<p>This section is premature as SDC has not made decisions on distribution; until the council releases a Green Belt and Development Limits review no meaningful answer can be given.</p>

Tadcaster can only grow and develop if there is land available if landowners choose not to develop that is their choice.
Any development needs to prove it will not have an adverse impact on the drainage or climate change
Employment allocation wherever possible.
Tadcaster should grow in terms of business and residential as the growth would help bring in new facilities.
Tadcaster is in need of more housing and regeneration of the town centre. CPO's may need to be used to bring land forward and there needs to be an investigation into why land with PP in not being developed.
Before any green fields are built on the empty houses in Selby should be renovated. Then after this brown field sites should be the priority especially on the high street, with any development on agricultural land the very last resort.
The CS examination confirmed that previously allocated sites in Tadcaster are not available for development. However the Grimston Park Estate has a number of sites (24 hectares) to the South of Tadcaster that need to be considered for development and removed from the GB.
<p>The following are concerns in Tadcaster:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empty shops in the town centre • Empty offices like the old work house • Empty buildings owned by the breweries • Lack of footfall in town centre • The high number of PP that are not built • Lack of industrial land • A64/A162 interchange and A64 Tadcaster junction need improving. • Under use of River Wharfe for recreation • The narrowness of the one bridge over the Wharfe in the town
The regeneration of Tadcaster Town centre is supported, however visually nothing seems to be done about derelict properties, parking isn't sufficient, roadside parking restriction discourage trade and the brewery seems to take all the parking spaces for staff.
Objection to the housing target figures and general approach to Tadcaster. A master plan has been submitted.
Protection of the Wharfe river corridor could enable connectivity for wildlife and also help with flooding and the eco system.
A local land owner would like to propose a Town Riverside Park on its residual land and it would also be willing to provide the Council with employment land in Tadcaster.
Secondary Villages are not being proposed for allocations, however Burn Airfield will be owned by SDC after March 2015. If SDC propose any development on this site is will demonstrate the PLAN Selby process is unsound and had not met the required community engagement.
Appleton Roebuck

<p>Q41 a) How should Appleton Roebuck grow and develop?</p> <p>b) What else is needed in Appleton Roebuck that could be allocated a site?</p>
<p>Appleton Roebuck is an attractive village where people want to live, however they tend to work in York or Leeds and commute by car due to the lack of public transport. The Village should continue to grow in an organic manner and not cram in more developments. There is a demand for larger houses which could be built on previously developed land outside the village development limits.</p>
<p>The drainage in AR is insufficient and any new development will make matters worse. This includes further down the system at Bolton Percy who will be affected by more development in AR as well as the Tadcaster process plant.</p>
<p>Within the confines of the already overstretched sewage and surface drainage facilities. The 60 houses built in the last 10 years have overloaded the sewage and surface runoff problems.</p>
<p>All facilities and services need upgrading before any development is built. Limited growth for limited needs. Within the confines of the already overstretched services.</p>
<p>Any development needs to prove it will not have an adverse impact on the drainage or climate change.</p>
<p>Eastern extension of Appleton Roebuck is not feasible due to the requirement to protect the scheduled monument at Brocket Hall. Southern Extensions are not possible due to the Historic Park and Garden at Nun Appleton Hall.</p>
<p>The development should be to the north of AR as this avoids and FR areas, with good access to the A64 development could bring in commuters to York and Tadcaster. The extra people would be a benefit to Tadcaster's facilities and economy.</p>
<p>It is good to see Appleton Roebuck are producing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
<p>Secondary Villages are not being proposed for allocations, however Burn Airfield will be owned by SDC after March 2015. If SDC propose any development on this site it will demonstrate the PLAN Selby process is unsound and had not met the required community engagement.</p>
<p>Barlby and Osgodby</p>
<p>Q42 a) How should Barlby & Osgodby grow and develop?</p> <p>b) What else is needed in Barlby & Osgodby that could be allocated a site?</p>
<p>Limited growth for local needs.</p>
<p>Any development needs to prove it will not have an adverse impact on the drainage or climate change.</p>
<p>The current planning application for 179 dwellings being considered by SDC on York Road should be approved.</p>
<p>The Selby Toll bridge is a traffic bottleneck and needs upgrading.</p>
<p>There is a need for more frequent buses.</p>
<p>Secondary Villages are not being proposed for allocations, however Burn Airfield will be</p>

<p>owned by SDC after March 2015. If SDC propose any development on this site is will demonstrate the PLAN Selby process is unsound and had not met the required community engagement.</p>
<p>Brayton</p>
<p>Q43 a) How should Brayton grow and develop?</p>
<p>b) What else is needed in Brayton that could be allocated a site?</p>
<p>Due to the close proximity to Selby, Barlby & Osgodby and Brayton should complement the growth of Selby. Brayton is also more suitable and sustainable then other DSV's due to its proximity to Selby and the services provided there. CS Policy SP2 also highlights this, while this was also a point raised by the inspector at the examination. The church commission is keen to develop and release land in Brayton.</p>
<p>Brayton should be considered a highly sustainable location due to its proximity to Selby, facilities and transport links. The Barff Lane site [submitted with rep] can create jobs and employment in a highly sustainable location.</p>
<p>Brayton is highly sustainable and should be treated as a separate settlement the same as Selby and Tadcaster not as a DSV.</p>
<p>There is scope for growth at Brayton and this growth should reflect it being the biggest of the DSV's not an equal approach.</p>
<p>Limited growth for local needs.</p>
<p>Capacity of the village should be extended West and avoid strategic gaps.</p>
<p>The strategic gap review should be used to build on the gap between Brayton and Selby which is 1.5 miles. This is an excellent site with existing infrastructure.</p>
<p>Due to the strategic gap between Selby and Brayton the only reasonable area for development is to the West of Brayton with a review of the local landscape designation between Brayton and Brayton Barff to accommodate new housing.</p>
<p>The current Strategic countryside gap should be maintained, any development should only be in the South near the bypass or infill. South of Westbourne and Baffam Gardens are in a flood risk area and are not suitable</p>
<p>Brayton needs to keep its rural character and protection of Brayton Barff as a local landscape of environmental importance should be considered.</p>
<p>The increase in Brayton's population especially older people is causing strain on the medical facilities in the area. New medical facilities need to be planned.</p>
<p>Secondary Villages are not being proposed for allocations, however Burn Airfield will be owned by SDC after March 2015. If SDC propose any development on this site is will demonstrate the PLAN Selby process is unsound and had not met the required community engagement.</p>
<p>Brotherton and Byram</p>
<p>Q44 a) How should Brotherton & Byram grow and develop?</p>
<p>b) What else is needed in Brotherton & Byram that could be allocated a site?</p>

Limited growth for local needs.
SDC have identified a housing need in DSV's so additional housing land should be allocated to accommodate the need.
Brotherton and Byram are constrained by Green Belt and flood risk but would benefit from small scale development.
There are now no shops and the last pub has been closed, there needs to be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • regeneration of the centre • the Coach Road playing fields need to be protected • the Whale Jaw playing fields need changing facilities • a pelican crossing outside the school • a skate park.
Secondary Villages are not being proposed for allocations, however Burn Airfield will be owned by SDC after March 2015. If SDC propose any development on this site is will demonstrate the PLAN Selby process is unsound and had not met the required community engagement.
Carlton
Q45 a) How should Carlton grow and develop?
b) What else is needed in Carlton that could be allocated a site?
Limited growth for local needs.
Carlton is heavily constrained by FloodZone3 to the south, west and south-east.. This leaves the north beyond the now approved CAR 1 which has been deemed by SDC to have low landscape sensitivity score and is highly suitable for development.
English Heritage note that a large area to the East of the village falls within the locally-designated Historic Park and Garden around Carlton Tower. Any allocations would have to prove no significant harm was caused to the designation.
Secondary Villages are not being proposed for allocations, however Burn Airfield will be owned by SDC after March 2015. If SDC propose any development on this site is will demonstrate the PLAN Selby process is unsound and had not met the required community engagement.
Cawood
Q46 a) How should Cawood grow and develop?
b) What else is needed in Cawood that could be allocated a site?
Limited growth for local needs.
There is no mention of the flooding that development will cause on neighbouring villages Due to Flood Risk constraints any further housing seems unlikely.
Review Para 5.64 Cawood, 5.65 Church Fenton and 5.90 Ulleskelf as it needs noting development in these areas will increase flooding in Ryther.

Comprehensive development should be around the station and include more parking facilities.
English Heritage comments that the conservation area covers the North of the village so expansion should be limited to SW. Any development must meet the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990.
Secondary Villages are not being proposed for allocations, however Burn Airfield will be owned by SDC after March 2015. If SDC propose any development on this site is will demonstrate the PLAN Selby process is unsound and had not met the required community engagement.
Church Fenton
Q47 a) How should Church Fenton grow and develop?
b) What else is needed in Church Fenton that could be allocated a site?
Limited growth for local needs.
Church Fenton is not suitable for further significant development The current services can't support growth: the train service is already limited and will be reduced further under the HS2 plans; the road network can't cope with more traffic; and the Green Belt should be protected. There should be no further development.
Para 5.90 should mention how flooding will increase if these developments are built.
There is no mention of the flooding that development will cause on neighbouring villages.
The sewage/drainage system can't cope in heavy rain, the plans also haven't included HS2 and its implications.
No further land should be removed from the Green Belt.
The train station provides good services but the parking needs to be improved, while a direct service to Castleford should be reinstated.
Any development must meet the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and take into account the G1 listed Church of the Virgin Mary views and openness.
Secondary Villages are not being proposed for allocations, however Burn Airfield will be owned by SDC after March 2015. If SDC propose any development on this site is will demonstrate the PLAN Selby process is unsound and had not met the required community engagement.
<i>Church Fenton Air Base</i>
Para 5.66 of PLAN Selby states the nearby RAF base is in use by the MOD, it isn't and is now under private ownership. SDC also need to be careful when referring to the site as airbase, airfield and aerodrome are not all the same and the CS does define Development Limits of 'Church Fenton Airbase'. Therefore CFA/1 and the Development Limits for Church Fenton Airbase need to be reviewed along with the now disposed of Aerodrome, it is considered this site should be designated as a Special Policy Area (SPA). As PLAN Selby is not allocating outside of the DSVs, SPA's are needed to allow this site to develop.
Why is Church Fenton airbase being considered as a secondary village with its own

Development Limits? The airbase is largely in Ulleskelf but will mainly affect Church Fenton Village; any new housing should be split between the two equally.
Church Fenton should develop on the Airfield as this would represent linear development and stop random development.
Eggborough and Whitley
Q48 a) How should Eggborough & Whitley grow and develop?
b) What else is needed in Eggborough & Whitley that could be allocated a site?
Limited growth for local needs.
Eggborough and Whitley are already at capacity, the school/doctors/dentists are full there is no need for these houses - the data is out of date.
There is not enough infrastructure for more growth, the school is at capacity, the local pub has been turned into a house, and Kellingley Colliery is closing down.
From 2000-2014 the village has expanded 81% from 233-422 with no improvement in facilities or infrastructure. No more large scale development is needed.
There should be no release of land from the Green Belt in Whitley as this would detract from the rural feel of the village. The village has already doubled in the last 20 years and is now at capacity, there has to be no more development. Traffic is also a major problem in the village.
There are currently plans to build residential on Learning Lane, however the school is already at capacity and this site would surely be better placed to expand the school.
It would also make more sense to direct development around the pub in order to keep it at the centre of the village.
Eggborough and Whitley should have a higher % of growth as they are sustainable with good levels of services, including a train station and good bus links. Land should be released from the GB to supply this housing.
By allocating land further facilities can be provided such as retail sites, recreational and community uses and be provided by the developers.
No change to Green Belt and build on brownfield first. Will any development bring well paid jobs? Why is all of the housing for people from outside of the village and where will the job opportunities come from for these extra people?
The drainage and telephone network need upgrading.
The main Road through Whitley, the school is full and crime is high due to the location of the M62
More ROS and allotments are needed but local land owners won't sell at agricultural prices as they are waiting to sell to developers at a mark-up for residential.
Another school is required.
More improvements are needed to the pavements on the A19, a light controlled pedestrian crossing, traffic calming, ROS, allotments and high speed broadband.
There is no clear explanation why Whitley is linked to Eggborough; they are 2 distinct

<p>separate villages. Whitley is not a service village and has no shops or facilities. Whitley has Green Belt constraints, any substantial development would encroach into the countryside, lack of public transport and the sewage system is inadequate. The information in the SDC Local plan 2015 is also incorrect on P144, the petrol station closed in 2006, there is not a frequent bus service as it is hourly, therefore no development should take place outside of the dev limits except possibly on the old vegetable processing site.</p>
<p>Eggborough should be reinstated as a DSV and Whitley as a secondary service village. SDC has never explained why this happened and has not published the relevant information. The view that the school provides the link between the two was only expressed by one individual and is not evidence for the joint designation.</p>
<p>The people of the village are also the real victims either the continual traveller sites that are allowed in the Green Belt.</p>
<p>There is a disused air field between Great Heck and Pollington which is being turned into a major industrial centre with little regard for road infrastructure. It falls in E Riding and SDC. The lack of cross boundary working is causing problems which would not exist if it were one authority. The site is next to the M62 and the proposed 8km detour is not environmental or sustainable. Road infrastructure for this site needs upgrading.</p>
<p>Secondary Villages are not being proposed for allocations, however Burn Airfield will be owned by SDC after March 2015. If SDC propose any development on this site it will demonstrate the PLAN Selby process is unsound and had not met the required community engagement.</p>
<p></p>
<p>Escrick</p>
<p>Q49 a) How should Escrick grow and develop?</p>
<p>b) What else is needed in Escrick that could be allocated a site?</p>
<p>The village has a great character and community spirit, however any development must keep the character and village centre. 5% increase in housing would be sustainable. This could be achieved through infill in the existing village boundary.</p>
<p>There should be no large scale development around the village or on Green Belt while the A19 is already close to capacity, the school would also struggle to cope with the extra children.</p>
<p>The York Green Belt around Escrick was only ever supposed to be temporary and serves no purpose. Subject to the Green Belt review the development should be on the east side of the village. The land on the East has no Green Belt designation and only a small part is in FloodZone2.</p>
<p>Para 5.71 is incorrect as the Environment Agency and SDC flood maps show that parts of the village are in Flood Risk Zones. Other environmental restrictions designations must also be considered.</p>
<p>Limited growth for local needs.</p>
<p>A % growth of 8/9% is the correct approach while a joined up approach between SDC and York is needed to avoid over allocation. The site York have identified would cause minimal damages to the village.</p>

Any development should be organic and follow the existing village layout. The village is a commuter hub and the new traffic must be considered along the A19.
The current facilities including school, and playing fields, public open space, village playground, allotments, village hall, community hub, doctors Parsonage Hotel, and queen Margret's must be protected through appropriate policies. Not aware of any new needs.
English Heritage state that the conservation area covers 2/3 of the village therefore only expansion to the East seems likely.
Secondary Villages are not being proposed for allocations, however Burn Airfield will be owned by SDC after March 2015. If SDC propose any development on this site it will demonstrate the PLAN Selby process is unsound and had not met the required community engagement.
Hambleton
Q50 a) How should Hambleton grow and develop?
b) What else is needed in Hambleton that could be allocated a site?
Hambleton should grow as a large sustainable village to complement Selby. Its proximity to Selby's facilities makes it highly sustainable for significant growth.
Limited growth for local need
Para 5.73 Q50 is an inadequate write up compared to the other villages, it has missed out that there are 2 churches, a primary school, central village hall, supermarket, car garage, fully equipped play area for children up to 12, adult playing fields and a football pitch.
5.73 p113 doesn't mention the age limit for Garth play area is 12 years old while the playing field mentioned doesn't note how unsafe the access road is.
Priority should be given to brown field sites first, with growth to the village adding not subtracting from the character.
Remove bypass protected route as it won't happen.
Hambleton 001-008 are all agricultural and will impact on the village, Hambleton 007 is not agricultural anymore.
Broadband connection boxes need installing as the cable is there but there are not enough boxes to connect up.
Also required are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more doctors • road improvements • footpath to the playing field • car park for village hall • more classrooms at the school • indoor sports facilities/youth club • a GP Surgery

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> more traffic calming measures as there is a severe speeding problem in Hambleton
<p>Secondary Villages are not being proposed for allocations, however Burn Airfield will be owned by SDC after March 2015. If SDC propose any development on this site is will demonstrate the PLAN Selby process is unsound and had not met the required community engagement.</p>
<p>Hemingbrough</p>
<p>Q51 a) How should Hemingbrough grow and develop?</p>
<p>b) What else is needed in Hemingbrough that could be allocated a site?</p>
<p>This question should be answered by the elected Parish Council who must survey all the residents they are supposed to represent rather than a few people answering this consultation.</p>
<p>Limited growth for local need</p>
<p>Hemingbrough is suitable for further residential development and is correct to be designated as a DSV.</p>
<p>The settlement is not in a Flood Risk area and has good services and transport links making it a sustainable location with suitable sites. Therefore it is reasonable to expect higher than the suggested % allocation.</p>
<p>Hemingbrough is suitable for further residential development and is correct to be designated as a DSV.</p>
<p>Hemingbrough should be allocated further residential development.</p>
<p>No development should take place north of the A63 and no A road should go through the village, new development should be to the East of the village</p>
<p>There is a need for more frequent buses.</p>
<p>A second shop is needed and could again be in the east of the village. The school will need extending as well as a new village hall, sports/fitness facilities and a large function room.</p>
<p>The conservation area covers the West of the village so expansion seems limited. Any development must meet the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990.</p>
<p>Secondary Villages are not being proposed for allocations, however Burn Airfield will be owned by SDC after March 2015. If SDC propose any development on this site is will demonstrate the PLAN Selby process is unsound and had not met the required community engagement.</p>
<p>Kellington</p>
<p>Q52 a) How should Kellington grow and develop?</p>
<p>b) What else is needed in Kellington that could be allocated a site?</p>
<p>Limited growth for local need.</p>

No housing on Flood Risk, between village gaps and no incinerators in this area
The strategic gap between Kellington and Eggborough should be maintained to protect the identity of the villages.
Any development in Kellingley licensed underground coaling area needs to take this into account as there is potential sterilisation processes.
English Heritage state that Eastern Kellington lies 0.5 miles from the Scheduled Monument at Roall Hall, any allocation would have to prove that development would not harm the significance of the monument.
Secondary Villages are not being proposed for allocations, however Burn Airfield will be owned by SDC after March 2015. If SDC propose any development on this site is will demonstrate the PLAN Selby process is unsound and had not met the required community engagement.
Monk Fryston and Hillam
Q53 a) How should Monk Fryston & Hillam grow and develop?
b) What else is needed in Monk Fryston & Hillam that could be allocated a site?
Limited growth for local need
Further development should be resisted; any that is granted should follow the conservation area policies, while the traffic and road safety issues need to be addressed.
Monk Fryston is one of the most sustainable DSVs with good facilities and excellent motorway links, therefore Monk Fryston should take more development than other similar sized DSVs.
The village contains a good mix of housing and this must be retained with large scale development resisted.
The existing Safeguarded land should be released for residential development.
Any development must be in scale with the village, protect the historic character and no Green Belt or conservation areas changed.
Austfield Lane could provide employment land for small businesses.
The area marked for the bypass should be allocated for housing as the bypass is not going to be built.
It is also worth noting that in the 2011 SAPD preferred options the council proposed this bypass land as a mixed use site therefore the principle of development has already been established while the council identified constraint free apart from the Green Belt allocation
Space should be allocated for a railway station, small-scale office/commercial/retail, paths, cycleway and bridleways should be reviewed to form a cohesive network. Selby should try promoting tourism more.
Should develop a number of smaller sites not large ones, sites which join the built up area and are bordered already should be developed first not in the open countryside. Any development should be a natural extension to the village envelope.
The school facilities are not available for public use, this must be changed or new

facilities provided.
The following facilities should be provided, MUGA, bowling green and a skate park.
English Heritage state that due to the extent of the conservation area any growth to the north of the village seems greatly limited. Any development would have to comply with the Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act 1990
Secondary Villages are not being proposed for allocations, however Burn Airfield will be owned by SDC after March 2015. If SDC propose any development on this site is will demonstrate the PLAN Selby process is unsound and had not met the required community engagement.
North Duffield
Q54 a) How should North Duffield grow and develop?
b) What else is needed in North Duffield that could be allocated a site?
Limited growth for local need
North Duffield needs incremental growth opportunities beyond the current restrictive dev limits if it is to prosper and enhance its current services and facilities.
North Duffield should grow very little or ideally not at all, it has already taken a lot of expansion in the last 20 years and does not have the infrastructure to cope with more expansion. The bus services are not adequate, the roads can't be upgraded and there is no brown field land left to develop. The primary school is at capacity and there is no secondary school which will mean increased traffic.
The village does need to grow but this should be within the current curtilage and not defined by a set %.
Accommodation for old people should be a priority as they are also less like to put demand on services and will walk to the shops.
Development should follow the current triangular shape of the village as this will help the village maintain its rural character.
The village does not need any commercial sites, Whitmore Business Park is sufficient.
Solar farms are not appropriate in the Village while 80,000 solar panels are not in keeping with the SDC vision of a rural district with an outstanding environment.
Solar panels on roofs of homes and businesses are the way forward not building on agricultural land, a footpath connecting Skipwith Parish and North Duffield is essential.
The lower Derwent Valley is an international wildlife site; it is designated as an area of restraint under the existing SDC local plan.
More amenity/sports pitches are needed to promote healthier living.
Secondary Villages are not being proposed for allocations, however Burn Airfield will be owned by SDC after March 2015. If SDC propose any development on this site is will demonstrate the PLAN Selby process is unsound and had not met the required community engagement.

Riccall
Q55 a) How should Riccall grow and develop?
b) What else is needed in Riccall that could be allocated a site?
Limited growth for local need
Land to the North of Riccall (York Road) should be allocated for residential.
Riccall already has 7 allocated sites with some already in the early stages of planning; this does not seem fair as this is potentially 339 dwellings that will be built.
Riccall has also had 20 new estates built since 1960 while neighbouring villages have had 4 due to the Green Belt allocation. The Green Belt needs to be re-assessed.
Access to the A19 needs to be considered with a new roundabout for both the northern and southern junctions.
The local school has potential for growth, however there are issues with parking and Coppergate road needs improvement.
The doctor's surgery is not able to cope with the current demand and its facilities are not suitable for a modern surgery.
English Heritage states that there is a scheduled moated site (Listed Manor House) at the NW of the village; any allocations should not harm the significance of the site.
Secondary Villages are not being proposed for allocations, however Burn Airfield will be owned by SDC after March 2015. If SDC propose any development on this site it will demonstrate the PLAN Selby process is unsound and had not met the required community engagement.
South Milford
Q56 a) How should South Milford grow and develop?
b) What else is needed in South Milford that could be allocated a site?
PC supports the review of Development Limits and Green Belt in an organic and sustainable fashion. This should be on the SE boundary of the village as there are strong defensible boundaries which will stop urban sprawl, the infrastructure will also be easier to upgrade here.
Para 5.86 is not correct there is no rail link to York.
Limited growth for local need
SDC have identified a housing need in DSVs so additional housing land should be allocated to accommodate the need.
Development in S Milford has already been excessive with the gap between the old village and the bypass filled - no more volume house building is suitable.
Local identity needs to be assessed and new boundaries drawn based on people's assessment on living in Sherburn or S Milford.
S Milford has recently taken a lot of development which has put a lot of strain on the local infrastructure especially the primary school. The village needs time to adjust before any

more development.
No further development which increases flooding should be allowed, the gap between Monk Fryston and South Milford must be retained.
The Parish Council expect as a minimum for CIL or other development tax to contribute towards the following: The village hall, Grove House, Church Hall, The school, train parking, open and recreational space, expansion of sports facilities and changing rooms, refurbishment of footpaths.
There is a scheduled monument (Steeton Hall) located 300m west of the village, any allocation must take any possible harm into account.
Thorpe Willoughby
Q57 a) How should Thorpe Willoughby grow and develop?
b) What else is needed in Thorpe Willoughby that could be allocated a site?
Limited growth for local need
There is scope for development in Thorpe Willoughby and this development should reflect it being one of the largest DSVs. The DSVs target should not be equally divided up between the DSVs.
Development should be to the west up to the bypass / following existing boundaries and the road network. Development to the east is not suitable and does not have existing defensible boundaries.
Housing should be limited to what already has planning permission or what is in the current system. The area has already exceeded the projected growth rate.
The NYCC 'Old Folks home' site should be used for housing.
There are good social and environmental facilities no more are required.
Thorpe Willoughby requires more doctors and dentists to cope with the population increase; the village also needs butchers, bakers and a take away.
Any new development should provide a shop like the 3 shops provided by the Orchard Wood estate in the 1960's.
There is a scheduled monument 220m from the north of the village, any development would have to demonstrate there was no harm to the significance of the monument.
Hambleton should grow as a large sustainable village to complement Selby. Its proximity to Selby's facilities maker it highly sustainable for significant growth.
SDC should also allocate in secondary villages as the CS identifies the need for 170 up to the plan period.
Ulleskelf
Q58 a) How should Ulleskelf grow and develop?
b) What else is needed in Ulleskelf that could be allocated a site?
There is no mention of the flooding that development will cause on neighbouring villages.

Limited growth for local needs
Ulleskelf Parish Council will support small appropriate development.
Ryther Cum Ossendyke PC suggests a review of Para 5.64 Cawood, 5.65 Church Fenton and 5.90 Ulleskelf as it needs noting development in these areas will increase flooding in Ryther.
Ulleskelf suffers flooding from the river Wharfe, therefore any development should not make the flooding worse.
The foul water drainage in this area shares the system with Bolton Percy and Appleton Roebuck and any development in any of these places will needs system upgrade.
A local landowner supports residential development which according the SHLAA could stand at 260 dwellings in the village, while the narrative suggests the rail service is limited it could be enhanced and protected by developing the sites and providing new passengers.
Ulleskelf's railway is underused with very few trains.
The train station should be investigated for improvements and connections to HS2/3, such improvements could include a car park and a connection between the East and West of the village.
Chapter 6 Evidence Base Requirements
Q59 Do you have any comments on the evidence that the Council considers necessary?
<i>Highways</i> Not clear whether Highways Assessment will comprise a 'Transport Assessment' of the Local Plan as required by national policy and guidance - PPG advises LPAs to undertake an assessment of transport implications of developing Local Plan so that a robust evidence base may be developed in support of the plan - evidence base should reflect the opportunities provided by sustainable modes of transport such as rail and canal otherwise the opportunity to support a more sustainable pattern of development could be lost.
<i>Open Space/Sports/Recreation</i> NPPF states LPAs should set out policies to deliver for health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities - assessments should identify needs/deficits/surpluses of open spaces, sports and recreational facilities and determine what open space, sports and recreational provision there is - Sport England will challenge the soundness which is not justified by an up to date playing pitch strategy and an up to date built sports facilities strategy.
<i>Green Belt/Strategic Countryside Gap/Developments Limits</i> Review should be undertaken as soon as possible given its influence on the progress of PLAN Selby and effect on allocations.
<i>SINCs</i> Concerns SINC data is not up to date and a programme of surveying and monitoring

<p>should be put in place - survey data from 1998 or before is not adequate.</p>
<p><i>General</i></p> <p>3 responders agree list is comprehensive and one offering advisory role through evidence base working groups.; consultation has not gathered enough evidence as it has not achieved its aims of being a true reflection of the views of the people of the District; large number of studies will not be available until after second round of consultation - consultation should be delayed until all documentation is available to enable informed responses.</p>
<p>Q60 Is there any other evidence that the Council should consider gathering?</p>
<p><i>General</i></p> <p>1 responder states no; 3 responses are reflected in Q59; maintenance of an up to date evidence base to deliver sustainable development.</p>
<p><i>Affordable Housing</i></p> <p>To ensure allocations are deliverable affordable housing targets should be considered for each site against the infrastructure requirements they need to consider, potential CIL payments and any other financial implications - affordable housing policy is not flexible and starting point of 40% is too high and sets incorrect aspirations from the outset - other LPAs seeking lower targets than Core Strategy (Harrogate) - sound evidence base required in respect of viability; excessive target which fails to deliver in areas where the greatest need is (Olympia Park and Rigid Paper); comprehensive review of Affordable Housing requirements - in last few years needs surveys do not exceed 20% - should only be providing in DSV's for local need and not encourage migration from elsewhere - resources should be concentrated in Selby - Sherburn has an over-provision but due to low level of dwellings provided in Tadcaster there is likely to be demand.</p>
<p><i>Land availability</i></p> <p>Do not see a shortage of land for housing/employment due to large amounts of land in SHLAA (2008 & 2011), 2013 'Call' and ELR - appears problem is not lack of supply but lack of demand - even though many sites will be unsuitable the evidence base shows there is enough land without buying Burn Airfield.</p>
<p>Chapter 7 Conclusions and Next Steps</p>
<p><i>No comments</i></p>
<p>Appendix 2 Plan process</p>
<p>Strongly support the retention of SDLP Residential Site CAM/1 - Land adjacent to A645/A1041</p>
<p>General Comments</p>
<p><i>Documentation/Consultation</i></p> <p>Number of comments raised regarding timing of consultation over holiday period and lack</p>

of time to provide in-depth comments - suggest future consultations should not take place over holiday periods

Comment from PCs regarding lateness of presentations to PCs

Lack of public meetings in villages; distributed leaflet received after start of consultation and referred to CEF meetings which had already taken place and were 'invite only'; lack of available information at Town Hall exhibition;

Suggestion that developers, experienced at consultations, will dominate the process and local communities are not aware of the importance of the document; document is far too complicated to understand, not user friendly and likely that residents would not respond; suggestion that document could be broken down into digestible sections with staged consultations;

Online form could not be saved or completed electronically;

Consultation provides mixed messages as to the extent to which the new Plan will replace Core Strategy policies and where the document is in conflict with the 2012 regs - public are given view that the Core Strategy is adopted under pre-2012 regs and is an over-arching set of policies which PLAN Selby must comply (2012 regs indicate that the new Plan can contain policies which supersede the policies in the adopted Core Strategy) - new consultation should be undertaken to confirm that PLAN Selby will involve alterations to some Core Strategy policies and consultees can comment on all aspects of the Core Strategy as well as the issues in PLAN Selby

Highways Agency wish to be consulted on specific site allocations as they are progressed through PLAN Selby.

Approach/Queries/Suggestions

With regards to development on PDL - attempts to build on greenfield land in Eggborough and latest Harron Homes development provides only 14% affordable housing;

No mention of road safety engineering and casualty reduction in the Plan including how this compliments neighbouring authorities Local plans or NYCC Plan, traffic authority for Selby;

Suggest more cycle routes/paths through town - link road between Meadway and Cross Hills would improve footpath infrastructure and reduce traffic for North Ward

Query regarding how PLAN Selby intends to deal with existing Parish Plans and VDSs

Comment regarding wrongly assessed long term aims will tragically affect communities.

Duty to Cooperate

Support general approach - particularly support commitment to cross boundary working in relation to Lower Derwent Valley

Future reviews of Green Infrastructure corridors, Ecological Networks and Locally Important Landscape Areas should involve East Riding of Yorkshire Council.

Overall

General comments provided with regards to Cawood's history and facilities; comment received regarding legality of Core Strategy and Olympia Park Strategic Development Site and property rights at Recreation Road.

Not related to PLAN Selby
(Core Strategy) - (1/2)- Comments regarding indictment against judge for dismissing challenge to Core Strategy Adoption - <i>see full rep for details.</i> (1/4)- Comments regarding US Gannett Publications Inc backing Core Strategy/Olympia Park development/adoption - <i>see full rep for details.</i>
(Core Strategy) - Objection to the number of proposed houses to be built across the whole plan period - <i>see rep for full comments.</i>
(Cycle Path) - Comments regarding riverside footpath upgrade to bridle/cycle path and owner liability considerations - <i>see full rep for details.</i>
(SADPD) - Number of comments regarding the previous SADPD relating to planning permission and boundaries. Additional comments reiterating comments made in 1/2 regarding Core Strategy/Olympia Park - <i>see full rep for details.</i>
(Tadcaster/Affordable Housing) - Affordable housing contributions are too high. Sites of under 9 now have severe financial penalties meaning windfall sites will not be developed to the same numbers as in the past. Suggest integrated transport policy is required to encourage surrounding population to visit the town.
Highways Agency) (CIL) - May be necessary to explore if Strategic Road Network (SRN) Schemes can be included in CIL if Highways Study finds that the operation of the SRN is at risk as a result of collective development in Selby. Would like to be consulted on the development proposals for CIL in Selby.
(DSV Status) - Disagree with Appleton Roebuck DSV status. Unlike nearest equivalent size DSV, Ulleskelf, it has no railway station, no shop and limited bus service to provide viable commuting alternative. Unclear why Fairburn was removed as a DSV when it appears to be similar to Appleton Roebuck.
(DSV Status) - Not sure Hillam and Monk Fryston should be treated as one DSV. Hillam is much smaller than other DSVs. If listed separately Hillam would, like Fairburn, not have been classed as a DSV. Hillam has no shop, church, school or access to main public bus routes.
Church Fenton PC) (HS2) - Disappointed with lack of comment on HS2 proposal - will need to be addressed in next phase of consultation.
Brotherton PC) (Neighbourhood Plans) - Consideration by planning officers of Village Plans which will be replaced by Neighbourhood Plans eventually.
Plus number of people commented on sites in the call for sites map book which was not part of the initial consultation. however these will be revisited later in the process