

SDC/14

Selby District Core Strategy
Examination in Public

Selby District Council and Cunnane Town
Planning on behalf of Samuel Smiths Old
Brewery (Tadcaster)

Statement of Common Ground

Interim Housing Policy Consultation
Responses Clarification

29 September 2011

1. In the Hearing Session on the morning of 20 September, relating to Matter 1 (Procedural Matters and Legal Compliance), Cunnane Town Planning (on behalf of Samuel Smiths Old Brewery (SSOB)), highlighted that they considered that Paragraph 1.19 of the Selby District Core Strategy (SDCS) (CD1) did not provide a full and accurate reflection of the results of the consultation on the Council's proposed Interim Housing Policy (IHP, 2010), to which the text referred.
2. This paragraph is proposed to be removed from the SDSCS and incorporated into the Councils Consultation Statement, (along with paras 1.6 – 1.22), through published First Set of Minor Amendments, May 2011 (CD2). Cunnane Town Planning consider that the EIP should be appraised of fuller information than that currently included in the Core Strategy.
3. This Statement of Common Ground has been produced jointly by the Council and Cunnane Town Planning and provides more detailed information for the EIP on the results of the IHP Consultation
4. All the original representations are published on the Council's website via the Interim Housing Policy webpage..
5. A complete schedule of summary responses to the IHP and officer comments on them is included in Appendix 1 of a Policy and Resources Committee report (14 December 2010, Agenda Item 10). However the Report was not considered by the meeting (Minute 421) but withdrawn. The report is still available on the Council's website (Agendas and Minutes page) to view.
6. The following is a summary of the information contained in the P&R report.
 - In total 44 responses were received.
 - 19 are generally supportive
 - 8 are generally negative although only 4 of these objected to the policy as a whole in principle.
 - The remaining 17 expressed no discernible view, either for against. Of these 9 made no comments at all directly related to the policy.
 - Eleven of the fifteen respondents directly or indirectly associated with the development industry support the policy.
 - Of the 4 objectors, 2 oppose the Interim Policy in principle, another considers the development management controls should be less rigorous, and one has a number of detailed comments on the wording of the policy.
 - Of the 'other organisations/public bodies', 4 expressed general support, 2 made related comments and 8 (including GOYH) made no comments directly related to the policy.
 - Responses from the general public are split equally (2 each) between support and objects, with 6 making neutral comment on the policy and 1

not directly related comment.

- Parish Council's are split equally (2 each) between support and object. Of those objecting 1 was against the policy on prematurity grounds and the other on a point of detail with regard to the list of Designated Service Villages.
- Although the policy is generally well supported, concerns have been raised by 4 respondents over the need for and the value and legitimacy of an Interim Policy which can only be of an informal nature.
- One issue in particular, which attracted 5 comments, was the need to for greater clarity with regard to the term 'conversion of farmsteads'. As a result it is suggested that the policy is significantly expanded to clarify the approach that will be taken on this topic.
- A number of relatively minor issues have been raised by one or two respondents, many of which, if adopted, would lead to improvements in the policy.

