



Report Reference Number: PR/21/4

To: Policy Review Committee
Date: 20 July 2021
Ward(s) Affected: All
Author: Caroline Skelly, Planning Policy Manager
Lead Executive Councillor Richard Musgrave, Lead Executive Member for Place Shaping
Lead Officer: Dave Caulfield, Director of Economic Regeneration and Place

Title: Feedback on the Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 To present Policy Review Committee with an update on the responses to the Preferred Options consultation.

2. Background

2.1 Consultation on the Preferred Options Local Plan took place between 29 January and 12 March 2021. The consultation was adapted to take account Covid-19 restrictions.

2.2 Two public meetings were held on 11 and 16 February 2021. The purpose of these sessions was 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.

2.3 In addition to the public meetings, virtual meetings were also undertaken for Parish Councils which took place on the following dates:

- 2 February
- 3 February
- 4 February
- 9 February
- 10 February

- 2.4 The consultation was advertised in the Selby Times, on the Council's website and through the Council's social media streams. Leaflets were also distributed providing details of the Local Plan and where to find further information on the Preferred Options consultation.
- 2.5 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.
- 2.6 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).
- 2.7 Over 1200 responses were received from individuals in response to the Preferred Options consultation, which comprised 4719 comments.

3. Consultation responses: New settlements, strategic and large development sites

- 3.1 A brief summary of the issues raised on the potential new settlement sites; the proposed urban extension to Eggborough; the larger preferred residential sites (over 200 dwellings), and the two proposed employment allocations are provided below.

Land to the south of Escrick Road, Stillingfleet (STIL-D)

- 3.2 In total 365 responses were received to the potential new settlement south of Escrick, which is now referred to as Heronby. The vast majority of the comments received 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

Former Burn Airfield, Burn (BURN-G)

- 3.3 A total 96 responses were received to the potential new settlement at Burn, 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.

3.4 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.

Land at Church Fenton Airbase, Church Fenton (CFAB-A)

3.5 In total 78 responses were received to the potential new settlement at Church Fenton 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 (Heronby). 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.

3.6 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.

Land west of Kellington Lane, Eggborough (EGGB-Y)

3.7 A total of 102 responses were received to the proposed village extension to Eggborough, 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

Low Street, Sherburn in Elmet (SHER-H)

- 3.8 In total, 22 responses were received to site 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.

Cross Hills Lane, Selby (SELB-BZ)

- 3.9 A total of 59 responses were received to site 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.

Rigid Paper, Selby (SELB-AG)

- 3.10 A total of 21 responses were received to site SELB-AG, the majority of which supported the redevelopment of this brownfield site. However, viability issues were raised relating to flooding and contamination.

Industrial Chemicals, Selby (SELB-B)

- 3.11 Ten responses were received to site SELB-B, the majority of which supported the redevelopment of this brownfield site. However, viability issues were raised regarding contamination of the site.

Land at Mill Lane, Tadcaster (TADC-I)

- 3.12 A total of 20 responses were received to site TADC-I, the majority of which were in support of the redevelopment of this site. Notwithstanding this, some concerns were raised regarding flooding and the impact on car parking in the town.

Olympia Park, Selby (SELB-CA)

- 3.13 A total of 22 responses were received to site SELB-CA, most of which were in support of the site and favoured the redevelopment of brownfield sites such as this over greenfield. A number of respondents also suggested the site be reconsidered for mixed use development, including an element of residential.

Gascoigne Wood, Sherburn in Elmet (SHER-AA)

- 3.14 There were 14 responses to SHER-AA, which represented a mix of supports and objections. There was some concern that the development of the site would place further strain on the road network around Sherburn; that it currently has an unsuitable site access; that the site requires substantial investment and is therefore unlikely to come forward until the later years of

the plan period; and that its location away from the main settlement means that its redevelopment doesn't necessarily accord with the proposed spatial strategy.

4. Consultation responses: Policy Approach

4.1 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

4.2 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 three 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

4.3 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

4.4 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

4.5 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

4.6 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

5. Consultation responses: The approach to Tadcaster

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

Tadcaster Town Council

5.2 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

5.3 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.

6. Additional Sites Consultation Document

- 6.1 As part of the consultation a further 44 sites have been submitted for consideration. All of these sites have been assessed in accordance with the Site Assessment Methodology. In order to ensure that all sites have been subject to the same level of scrutiny consultation on a Local Plan Additional Sites document will take place between 2nd August and 13th September 2021, as approved by Executive on 8th July.

7. Background Documents

None.

8. Appendices

None.