



Report Reference Number: E/21/6

To: Executive
Date: 8th July 2021
Status: Key Decision
Ward(s) Affected: All Wards
Author: Caroline Skelly, Planning Policy Manager
Lead Executive Member: Cllr Richard Musgrave, Lead Executive Member for Place Shaping
Lead Officer: Dave Caulfield, Director of Economic Regeneration and Place

Title: Local Plan Additional Sites Consultation Document

Summary:

On 17 September 2019 Council gave approval for work to commence on the preparation of a new comprehensive Local Plan for the District. A Local Development Scheme was also brought into effect following Council approval.

In accordance with the Local Development Scheme consultation took place on the Local Plan Preferred Options between January 31st and 12th March 2021. The consultation also provided the last opportunity to suggest new sites for consideration. Over 1231 individual responses were received on the consultation and a further 44 sites were submitted.

Approval is now sought for consultation to take place on the Local Plan Additional Sites Document which will be undertaken under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended). This will ensure that all sites submitted for consideration have been subject to the same level of public scrutiny.

Recommendations:

That Executive

- i. Approve the Local Plan Additional Sites consultation document at Appendix 1 of this report for consultation in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) regulations 2012 (as amended)
- ii. Delegate to Officers the arrangements for the consultation to take place for six weeks between 2nd August and 13th September 2021.
- iii. Delegate to the Director of Economic Regeneration and Place, in consultation with the Lead Councillor for Place Shaping, any minor amendments required

to the documentation for typographical, grammatical and factual or Plain English purposes to the documents prior to publishing for consultation.

Reasons for recommendation

Executive are asked to approve the Local Plan Additional Sites document for public consultation in order to further progress the adoption of the Selby Local Plan.

1. Introduction and background

- 1.1 The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 set out the requirements in relation to the preparation of Local Plans. Although no longer a formal requirement of the Regulations the consultation on the Council's Preferred Options allowed for proper engagement with local communities and stakeholders on the emerging spatial strategy, potential allocations and policy approach for the Local Plan.
- 1.2 As further sites were submitted through the Local Plan Preferred Options consultation exercise it is considered appropriate to consult on the merits of these sites to ensure that all proposals have been subject to the same level of public scrutiny.
- 1.3 This report provides a summary of the Local Plan Additional Sites Consultation and outlines the proposed consultation arrangements. The report also provides a high level of summary of the responses received to the Preferred Options Local Plan for information.

2. Feedback on Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation

- 2.1 Consultation on the Preferred Options Local Plan took place between 29th January and 12th March 2021. The consultation was adapted to take account Covid-19 restrictions.
- 2.2 Two public meetings were held to provide information about the Local Plan including the proposed preferred sites. These sessions also provided members of the public with a chance to ask questions. The questions and answers have been published on the Council's website and can be viewed [here](#). Approximately 50-60 members of the public attended each session. In addition to the public meetings, five virtual meetings were also undertaken for Parish Councils.
- 2.3 Whilst copies of the consultation document and supporting material were not made available at deposit points due to Covid-19 restrictions, all the information was provided online. Furthermore, hard copies of the documents were provided to any members of the public that requested them. A dedicated Local Plan phonenumber was set up with an Officer available within office hours to answer any queries.
- 2.4 Consultation on the plan was widely advertised through social media and press releases which led to a total of 17,040 views on web pages during the

consultation period. In the first week of the consultation there were 4,578 views which made it the Council's most visited website page by a significant amount. The Local Plan animation was viewed 994 times via twitter, with 7908 impressions (how many times it has been seen).

- 2.5 A total of 1231 individual responses were received in response to the Preferred Options consultation and a high-level summary of comments is outlined below.

New settlements, strategic and large development sites

- 2.6 We received 365 responses to the potential new settlement at Stillingfleet (STIL-D), the vast majority of which were objections. The main issues raised were as follows:

- The development of a large greenfield site (particularly when the other 2 new settlement proposals are located on brownfield land) and the loss of agricultural land
- The already-congested A19 and the impact that this proposal would have on the road network
- The loss of ancient woodland habitats

- 2.7 A total of 96 responses were received to the potential new settlement at Former Burn Airfield (BURN-G), comprising a mix of support and objections. It should be noted that a significant proportion of supports were submitted by those objecting to STIL-D. Comments in support can be summarised as follows:

- The site is previously developed
- Burn is located close to Selby which has existing infrastructure, including bus and rail connections

- 2.8 The objections to the site raised the following issues:

- The site is located within an area of high flood risk
- The airfield provides important local recreational opportunities
- The A19 is narrow and is often closed in the winter due to flooding

- 2.9 A total of 78 responses were received to the potential new settlement at Church Fenton Airbase (CFAB-A) and comprised a mix of comments of support and objection. It should be noted that a significant proportion of supports were received from those objecting to site STIL-D. The comments of support are summarised below:

- The site is brownfield
- There are employment opportunities located close by
- The site is well-located close to the A1 and with rail links to both York and Leeds

- The site is located close to existing shops and services in Sherburn in Elmet

2.10 Objectors to the proposal raised the following concerns:

- The area is at risk of flooding
- The village of Church Fenton doesn't have the necessary infrastructure to support such a proposal and it will create much greater volumes of traffic through the village
- The surrounding country lanes are not suitable to support such a proposal

2.11 A total of 102 responses were received to the proposed village extension to Eggborough (EGGB-Y), the vast majority of which were objections. Concerns were raised regarding the following issues:

- Concerns over doubling the size of Eggborough
- The fact that the site experiences surface flooding
- The site is greenfield and currently in agricultural use
- The wildlife implications of its development
- Infrastructure implications, particularly on existing sewerage and drainage systems
- Traffic implications, including on J34a of the M62

2.12 A total of 22 responses were received to Low Street in Sherburn in Elmet (SHER-H), comprising a mix of supports and objections. There was a general concern over the level of housing development experienced in recent years in Sherburn in Elmet and a lack of corresponding investment in infrastructure. However, some respondents agreed that the site was the most sensible location for further housing and that it was well-placed for employment opportunities and road/rail connections.

2.13 We received 59 responses in relation to Cross Hills Lane, Selby (SELB-BZ), the majority of which were objections. Concerns were raised regarding the development of greenfield land, habitat loss, flooding, the impact on traffic and local roads and the overall viability / deliverability of the site.

2.14 With regard to the preferred policy approach, the greatest proportion of comments were received on the spatial approach; development limits; climate change; housing distribution; and the approach to windfalls.

Question 12: Spatial Approach

2.15 A greater number of respondents disagreed with the spatial strategy than agreed. Comments are summarised as follows:

- The plan provides for more than the legal minimum housing required which is not appropriate and will destroy the countryside

- The housing figure is low and unambitious given the district's location in the Leeds City Region and close to large urban areas
- Historic housing delivery rates indicate that the housing target should be higher
- A higher housing figure is required to encourage economic growth and re-balance commuting patterns
- A 20% buffer to the housing figure should be applied instead of 5%, to ensure that the plan is future-proofed
- Housing should be concentrated near employment centres, i.e. Selby, Barlby and Tadcaster
- New development should be located close to railway stations
- Allocations should be concentrated in Selby, Tadcaster and Sherburn in Elmet
- There needs to be a focus on the development of brownfield sites rather than greenfield sites
- No further development should be directed to Sherburn – the level of infrastructure and services has not kept pace
- The failure of the District's 3 towns to deliver sufficient housing indicates an over-reliance on these settlements, particularly Selby and Tadcaster. A re-think of the spatial strategy is required.
- Further sites should be allocated to encourage the growth of Tier 1 and Tier 2 villages
- Support the suggestion that development will be supported in smaller villages to ensure their long term viability
- A large element of the growth should be met in existing settlements rather than in a new town
- The fundamental aim of the spatial strategy should be to direct development to areas of low flood risk
- The location of the potential new settlements are not suitable – they are remote from existing community infrastructure. These settlements need to meet the Council's own tests – being close to existing centres, jobs and transport links
- A new settlement is not the most sustainable option and development should be directed towards existing settlements
- Concern that new settlements are not large enough to be viable
- Further employment land should be allocated to promote economic growth, particularly in respect of increasing the variety of employment sites in respect of both scale and location
- The preferred spatial strategy for employment land does not optimise the excellent motorway connections that exist within the District
- Employment allocations do not reflect regional growth aspirations

Question 14: Development Limits

2.16 A greater number of respondents supported the preferred approach to development limits than not. Comments are summarised below:

- Several respondents supported the principle of development limits for Tier 1 and Tier 2 villages

- Development limits should not be drawn too tightly around settlements
- The boundary of development limits should be clear and defensible, indicated by roads / physical boundaries rather than private rear gardens
- All settlements should have the development limits removed and a criteria- based approach. There is no sense in allowing small developments adjoining smaller villages, but not in settlements higher up in the settlement hierarchy
- The use of development limits is outdated and not required by the NPPF
- A flexible approach should be taken to development limits in Selby and Tadcaster given the historic under-delivery of housing
- A number of comments objected to the removal of development limits for smaller villages

Question 21: Climate Change

2.17 The preferred approach to climate change was supported in principle by the majority of respondents, subject to the following comments:

- The objective for a carbon neutral economy is not embedded in the vision for the district
- The plan should be trying to minimise car journeys. Contradictions exist – by building new development in rural locations, car journeys are increased
- Several of the policy requirements have viability implications for some sites
- Whilst the provision of vehicle charging points in new developments were generally supported it was suggested that the plan should acknowledge that there are specific costs associated with meeting this requirement
- Whilst Future Homes Standards were supported it was highlighted that there are difficulties and risks associated in the delivery of homes given the immaturity of supply chains in the production and installation of heat pumps
- Home insulation measures appear to be missing – heat loss is a big contributor to climate change in the district
- There should not be an outright presumption against all renewable energy in sensitive landscapes
- The preferred approach should be supplemented by further information on existing and emerging technologies and infrastructure which are likely to come forward during the plan period

Question 43: Housing Distribution

2.18 A range of comments were provided on the preferred distribution of housing allocations which have been summarised below:

- The Council should proceed with a higher housing target to meet the ambitious economic growth proposals
- The plan should allocate more housing sites as a buffer – the 5% buffer is not large enough
- The historic rate of completions indicates that the housing target should be more ambitious
- There is concern from a number of respondents regarding the over-reliance on the new settlement. Significant work is still required to confirm whether any of these sites are viable and the assumed build out rates are overly ambitious
- The spatial distribution of housing should prioritise the development of brownfield land
- Advocate an approach which proposes the delivery of housing across a greater number of smaller sites, which will involve fewer infrastructure constraints
- Disagree with the exclusion of smaller villages from housing allocations
- The distribution of development in Tier 1 and Tier 2 villages seems inconsistent with the aims of the settlement hierarchy – there are too many villages with no allocations or very small allocations
- Housing delivery is largely predicated on the timely delivery of four major sites (SELB-B, SELB-BZ, EGGB-Y, and the new settlement) which account for some 62% of all allocated housing sites in the plan. Each of these sites has known constraints (e.g., existing industrial uses, flood risk, etc.) and/or major infrastructure requirements
- Continuing to rely on the supply of housing in Selby is not an effective spatial distribution approach
- The Preferred Options document seeks to reallocate sites in Tadcaster which have failed to deliver and have notable issues relating to ownership; these issues have been ignored in the specific site assessments of the preferred options
- Tadcaster, as a Local Service Centre and second on the settlement hierarchy should be allocated significant housing numbers to reflect the highly sustainable location and strategic location
- Development in all villages should exclude large scale developments, or multiple smaller ones, which significantly increase their size.

Question 44: Windfall Developments

2.19 The policy received a mix of responses, with those that broadly supported the approach subject to some amends and those that objected to the proposed approach. A summary of comments is provided below:

- Windfall development has been stifled, so the policy is welcomed
- There is no justification given for the arbitrary limit of 5 dwellings
- Small scale development should not be at the expense of rural exception sites
- Tier 1 and Tier 2 villages should have the ability to allow small developments adjacent to development limits – opportunities for small scale development in smaller villages is likely to provide greater

flexibility and opportunities than will be achieved in higher order settlements

- Concern over removing the development limits in smaller villages and allowing a criteria based approach provides a weaker set of subjective criteria
- The inclusion of the words 'within a continuous frontage' are unnecessary
- Further guidance is required to explain what is meant by the main built up area
- There should be more flexibility to consider proposals outside development limits
- Development limits should remain and the provision of development adjacent to existing built form should not be allowed
- Natural England would welcome specific reference to the need to avoid windfall development in proximity to sensitive designated sites

The approach to Tadcaster

2.20 Responses received from Tadcaster Parish Council and Samuel Smith Old Brewery (Tadcaster) Ltd are summarised below.

Tadcaster Town Council

2.21 Overall, Tadcaster Town Council support the plan as a step in the right direction to develop Tadcaster into a sustainable town with increased footfall and thriving businesses. The following specific issues / site-specific policies were commented on:

- There is a concern that there is no proposed economic development in Tadcaster
- The refurbishment of empty properties must be completed before other changes are made to the town
- TADC-H (Central Area car park): not opposed to its development, although replacement car parking essential, 43 houses feels too many, greenspace close to war memorial could be included in the plans as a new public park
- TADC-N (Robin Hoods Yard): welcome development into parking area, how many spaces are anticipated and would welcome legal safeguard to ensure their retention as car parking in perpetuity
- TADC-I (Mill Lane): support particularly the emphasis on creating design in keeping with town's heritage. Traffic implications on Mill Lane
- TADC-AD (Fircroft and former Barnados): support – the refurbishment of the existing buildings is positive. Would like to see Fircroft refurbished as a hotel for Tadcaster
- TADC-L (Wighill Lane): support proposal but consider it might be too high-density
- TADC-AE (Butchers Field): Support but query density and consideration needs to be given to the impact on surrounding housing

- TADC-J (Station Road): Support, but consider that the site would be suitable for employment or for mixed residential / employment
- TADC-M (London Road): Support sports provision, but consider part of the site could be allocated for employment

Samuel Smith Old Brewery (Tadcaster) Ltd

2.22 Overall, SSOB are in general support of the Local Plan and the approach taken to Tadcaster. A summary of comments is provided below:

- Support for the vision for Tadcaster although it should be explicit that the retention of the open character of the riverside setting is critical to the development of the town
- Regarding the town centre objective – it is not agreed that Tadcaster town centre should be diversified. The Retail Study does not advise diversification and notes that the mix of uses is broadly consistent with the national average
- General support for the spatial approach including the heritage led redevelopment of the town. Concerns regarding the new settlement and the development of such a large area greenfield land – it must be demonstrated that this is the most sustainable approach and all other options have been considered
- Broad support of the approach to the Green Belt
- AROE-I (Maltkin Lane): objects to the allocation of this site for residential purposes
- Concern over the proposed approach to windfalls – lots of small incremental growth to villages can be as harmful as one large development
- Support for the preferred approach to the delivery of homes within Tadcaster, and the support and reinforcement of the settlements role as a local centre aimed at providing for the local needs of residents and its limited rural hinterland.

3. Local Plan Additional Sites Consultation Document

- 3.1 The additional sites have been assessed in the same way as those contained within the Local Plan Preferred Options consultation that is against the criteria set out in the Site Selection Methodology. It should be noted that any comments on the Site Selection Methodology itself will be considered and will inform the assessment of sites at the Publication consultation stage.
- 3.2 A consultation document has been drafted which follows a similar format as Part 4 of the Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation Document – Council's Preferred Allocations and this is attached at Appendix 1. A table of the draft preferred additional sites is set out on the following page.

Draft Preferred Additional Sites

Local Plan Reference	Settlement	Site Location	Size (Hectares)	Proposed Use	Dwellings
AROE-N	Appleton Roebuck	Therncroft, Malt Kiln Lane	0.35	Residential	11
OSGB-N	Barlby & Osgodby	Land south of Hull Road	2.34	Education (SEND School)	-
EGGB-AA	Eggborough	Land at Eggborough Power Station	70.81	Employment	-
NDUF-O	North Duffield	Land north of Gothic Farm, Back Lane	3.96	Residential	101
SELB-CR	Selby	Former Ousegate Maltings	0.41	Residential	14
SELB-CT	Selby	Land south of Coupland Mews	0.17	Residential	6
THRP-X	Thorpe Willoughby	Land south of Leeds Road / north of Field Lane	4.36	Residential	111

4. Consultation on Supporting Evidence

3.1 The Preferred Options Local Plan has been informed by a number of key pieces of evidence. This includes a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal Report and Habitats Regulations Report, which will be updated to consider the additional sites and will be consulted on alongside the Local Plan Additional Sites Consultation Document.

3.2 In addition, consultation will also take place during the summer on the following evidence:-

- Indoor and Outdoor Sports Facilities Study;
- Development Limits Methodology – a paper setting out options for how development limits will be drawn around settlements;
- Green Space Audit – a comprehensive record of all existing greenspace in Selby District to inform the policy framework for the protection and enhancement of existing greenspace, including recreational and sporting facilities and for the creation of new spaces and facilities.

- Stage 1 Green Belt Review – a report which considers whether any exceptional circumstances exist at the strategic level to justify the release of land from the Green Belt for development purposes.

4. Proposed Consultation Arrangements

- 4.1 The consultation is proposed to take place over a six-week period between 2nd August and 13th September 2021.
- 4.2 Consultation arrangements will include;
- Virtual consultation sessions with Parish Councils and the public,
 - Social media campaign,
 - Specific consultation website page with pop up maps,
 - Press releases.

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 The next step in the programme will be the preparation of a Publication Version of the Local Plan. In accordance with the current Local Development Scheme, consultation on the Publication Local Plan is due to take place in January/February 2022, with submission to the Secretary of State for examination anticipated in June 2022.

6. Alternative Options Considered

- 6.1 The consultation is required to fulfil Regulation 18 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 which state that the Local Planning Authority must notify relevant organisation or individuals about the intention to prepare a Plan and to invite comments on what it should contain. Although consultation on the additional sites is not a formal requirement of the Regulations it is still considered good practice to engage with local people on all potential sites prior the formal Publication stage.

7. Implications

7.1 Legal Implications

Consultation on this stage of the Local Plan fulfils the statutory requirements as set out in Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended).

7.2 Financial Implications

The consultation is covered by the Local Plan budget.

7.3 Policy and Risk Implications

Not consulting at this stage in plan will result in failure to comply with the statutory regulations for plan making.

7.4 Corporate Plan Implications

The preparation of a new Local Plan will help the Council to deliver its Corporate Plan objectives to make Selby a great place to do business and to enjoy life. More specifically it will contribute to the objective to have a local plan in place which will deliver more houses in the District, business opportunities, promote health and well-being and protect and enhance the local environment.

7.5 Resource Implications

The consultation is covered by the Local Plan budget.

7.6 Other Implications

None

7.7 Equalities Impact Assessment

An impact screening assessment has been undertaken and this concludes that proposals are in place to ensure that as many people as possible are made aware of and are engaged with the consultation.

8. Conclusion

8.1 Consultation on the Local Plan Additional Sites Document attached at Appendix 1 is a formal stage in the preparation of the plan and will ensure that the Council complies with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

9. Background Documents

- Updated Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
- Indoor and Outdoor Sports Facilities Study
- Development Limits Methodology
- Stage 1 Green Belt Review
- Green Space Audit
- Local Plan Additional Sites Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment

10. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Local Plan Additional Sites Consultation Document

Contact Officer:

Caroline Skelly
Planning Policy Manager
cskelly@selby.gov.uk
01757 292137

