

Selby District Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal: Appendix E

**Detailed Appraisal of the Spatial Strategy Options (Regulation 19
stage)**

July 2022

1 CONTENTS

Background	3
Methods.....	3
Summary of findings	4
Population and Communities	6
Climate change mitigation	11
Economy and Employment	17
Transport.....	25
Historic environment	31
Health.....	38
Air quality.....	43
Biodiversity	51
Land and Soils	60
Climate Change adaptation	65
Housing	72
Landscape	78
Water	84

Prepared by:

AECOM Ltd

Impact assessment and sustainability Team

© 2022 AECOM Limited. All Rights Reserved.

Background

Following on from the appraisal of spatial options at preferred options stage, the Council deemed it necessary to tweak the options and update the appraisals accordingly (to respond to the reduced housing target being planned for at this stage). In addition to updating the options appraisal for options A, B, C, D and E, two new options have been tested in response to consultation suggestions. These are named option I and Option J

Options F, G and H were not taken forward for further assessment given that they related to a higher scale of growth of 589 dwellings per annum.

The options are briefly summarised below. There are many similarities, so the key features of each option are noted:

A: Greater focus on Selby Town

B: Higher amounts of growth directed to Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements instead of Selby Town

C: Highest amounts of growth are directed to the Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements, with much less growth at Selby and Eggborough as a result.

D: Similar to Option A, but less growth overall, and dispersal to Tier 1 and 2 settlements rather than Selby.

E: Green Belt release is involved at Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster, meaning that growth in Selby is lower than Option A.

I: Avoidance of flood zones in Selby Town means that a more dispersed approach is taken with a greater amount of growth in Tier 1 and 2 settlements.

J: Not including the Heronby new settlement means that this additional growth is directed to Selby and the Tier 1 and 2 settlements.








Methods

The appraisal has been undertaken by assessing each option against a framework of sustainability objectives.

These objectives were established at the Scoping Stage of the SA process.

The aim is to identify what the effects would be as a result of development and how this compares to what might otherwise be expected to happen (the projected baseline).

To determine effects, account is taken of a range of factors including the magnitude of change, the sensitivity of receptors, the likelihood of effects occurring, the length and permanence of effects, and cumulative effects. This gives a picture of how significant effects are likely to be, ranging from neutral, minor, moderate and major. The table below sets out the scale that has been used to record effects.

Major positive	
Moderate positive	
Minor Positive	
Neutral	
Minor negative	
Moderate Negative	
Major negative	

When determining what the overall effects of each option are, account has been taken of the different effects that could occur in different settlements and locations across the district. A detailed picture has been built up for each sustainability topic as to how different patterns of growth would affect the District. In some cases, the overall effects might be the same, but how these arise might be quite different.

To support the assessments, we have referred to objective information and facts gathered in support of the Scoping Stages. However, as with all assessments, a degree of professional opinion is involved, and this should be recognised.

Comments made in relation to the spatial options appraisal at preferred options stage have also been considered and factored into this updated options appraisal (as considered appropriate). This explains the difference in outcomes for some of the sustainability topics (from preferred options to publication stage), despite the options remaining relatively similar.

For example: a clearer account has been provided in relation to groundwater source protection zones (Water), and congestion issues (Transport).

Summary of findings

The table below presents a visual summary of the options appraisal findings. This is followed by a summary of the effects by each SA topic, and then a comparison of each option.

For clarity, the Council's proposed approach (Option A) at this stage is highlighted below in purple.

	A	B	C	D	E	I	J
Air quality	?		?				
Biodiversity							
Land and Soil							
Climate change adaptation						?	
Climate change mitigation	?						
Economy and employment					?		?
Health							
Historic Environment							
Housing							
Landscape	?	?		?		?	
Population and Communities							?
Transport		?		?			?
Water	?	?		?		?	

There are similarities between the appraisal findings for each of the options. For example, all of the options are predicted to have major positive effects with regards to housing as they would all meet identified needs in one way or another. All options are also predicted to have major negative effects with regards to land and soil, as the scale of growth requires the loss of agricultural land regardless of approach. There are some subtle differences between the options for these SA objectives, but these do not warrant a different overall score.

The options also perform similarly with regards to climate change adaptation and mitigation, with minor negative effects being identified for all options. The main differences relate to Option A, which ought to be marginal better in terms of reducing additional transport related emissions, and Option I, which avoids a greater amount of areas at risk of flooding.

The effects on landscape are also predicted to be major negative for all options, but this is more certain for options C, E and J which involve higher levels of growth in tier 1 and 2 settlements and / or Green Belt. There is some uncertainty for the other options as to whether effects would be moderate or major. The options perform the same with regards

to the water SA objective, with options C, E and J being most likely to give rise to negative effects.

The main differences between the options relate to the air quality, biodiversity, economy, health, historic environment, transport and population. Option Aa is most positive with regards to social factors, with major positive effects recorded in relation to health and economy and employment. Options E and J could also potentially have major positive effects for employment, but for health these are only moderate effects. Options C, E and J also have the potential for greater negative effects on biodiversity compared to options A, B, D and I.

Option A however, is potentially one of the more negative options regarding air quality, as it focuses higher growth closer to an existing AQMA. This also has implications in terms of congestion, but this is offset by the fact that accessibility would be good for a higher proportion of new homes.

Broadly speaking, the options perform quite similar, and where there are differences, this relates to different SA topics. Therefore, it is difficult to say that one option is clearly better than all the others.

However, it is possible to identify that options C, E and J perform generally more negatively against the environmental topics (particularly biodiversity, historic environment and water) compared to the alternative options.

Options B, D and I perform marginally better than option A with regards to environmental factors (given that Option A is less favourable in terms of air quality), but they do not generate the same significance of effects overall in terms of socio-economic benefits.

Population and Communities

The SEA objective for population and communities¹ is to; to *support access to existing and planned community infrastructure, including green infrastructure*. Measures that promote accessibility to leisure, health and community facilities and promote active lifestyles can serve to achieve this objective. Similarly, the provision and enhancement of community access to green infrastructure and improving perceptions of safety can help remove barriers to community activities and reduce social isolation.

¹ AECOM report Selby Local Plant Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Jan.2020; <https://selby-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/event/35204>

Selby Town

Selby town is well equipped to support leisure and recreation needs of existing and new residents. Further growth on strategic developments could help to complement such facilities, and potentially benefit communities that suffer inequalities. The location of sites could also bring potential to enhance access to green infrastructure if this is designed into the development from the outset. Several sites proposed here are brownfield sites where reuse of industrial space can improve public realm and community spaces.

The scale of growth proposed in the town could contribute towards new active travel infrastructure such as walkways and a cycling network. For this reason, options that focus new growth in Selby Town are likely to score more positively compared to options that disperse growth throughout the District. Therefore, proposing higher growth in Selby Town, namely; Option A, (1750 dwellings), is predicted to have favourable effects on population and communities in this respect. The substantial scale of development proposed is likely to enhance existing community facilities and provide new ones. The larger sites such as, at Cross Hills Lane, provide scope for including multifunctional, interconnected green space. Therefore, Option A is predicted to have **moderate positive effects** on population and communities.

Options B, C, D and E involve a lower level of growth of 550 units within Selby Town. These allocations are also predicted to have favourable effects due to proposed development being close to existing community facilities and social infrastructure. However, these are likely to have a lesser positive effect due to the smaller scale of development proposed which is less likely to contribute towards new infrastructure investment. Therefore, options B, C, D and E are predicted to have **minor positive effects** on population and communities.

Option I would involve a lower level of growth in Selby Town at 200 units. The potential for positive effects therefore becomes uncertain and would still only be likely to be minor.

Option J would involve 1000 dwellings. This could still contribute towards new facilities, but not to the same extent as Option A. There is therefore a degree of uncertainty as to whether **moderate positive effects** would be achieved (or whether they would minor positive effects).

Tadcaster

Tadcaster has the second largest centre after Selby Town. Development in Tadcaster is likely to benefit from existing community and leisure facilities. The proposed refurbishment of vacant or derelict properties and sites is likely to improve the public realm and create safer, healthier spaces. The proposed Community Sports Hub development at the London Road site is also likely to produce favourable effects, as is a focus on heritage-led development.

All options involve at least 400 new homes. Therefore, **minor positive effects** on population and communities are predicted.

All options allocate 400 dwellings on a range of brownfield and greenfield sites in and around the town, outside of the green belt. Alternatively, Option E allocates an additional 200

dwellings in the green belt (on top of the 400 dwellings identified for the other options). The effects of this additional growth are discussed below under 'green belt release'.

Sherburn in Elmet

Sherburn in Elmet is one of the main three settlements in the District with the third largest centre with a good range of community facilities. Sherburn in Elmet is also set to benefit from the Selby District Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs) which should encourage more residents to adopt healthier active lifestyles in Sherburn in Elmet. Six of the options (A, B, C, D, I and J) involve the same level of growth in this location; 300 dwellings. These developments are likely to benefit from the existing community facilities and infrastructure and potentially lead to improvements. Therefore, **minor positive effects** are envisaged for these options.

Options E allocates an additional 500 dwellings at an area to the south of Sherburn in Elmet, the effects of this are discussed under the green belt release section below.

Settlement Expansion

All options except Option C, allocate 950 dwellings at land west of Kellington Lane, Eggborough, in the form of a settlement expansion. The scale of the scheme provides good opportunities to create sustainable settlements that are well served by local facilities, green infrastructure and recreation. However, the full benefits may not be realised within the plan period. Therefore, these options are predicted to have uncertain **moderate positive effects** on population and community.

Option C allocates a smaller growth of 400 units utilising a smaller portion of the same site. This level of growth offers less opportunity to provide new investment in community recreational infrastructure but may help improve the vitality of existing community infrastructure. Therefore, this option is predicted to have **minor positive effects** on population and community.

Green Belt Release

Only Option E, involves green belt release. Therefore, for the other options **neutral effects** are predicted with respect to transport.

Option E proposes greenbelt release in Sherburn in Elmet (500 units) and Tadcaster (200 units); these are chosen in the first instance given their role in the settlement hierarchy. Both locations benefit from the existing community facilities and recreational infrastructure but are somewhat peripheral to the towns. A new Community Sports Hub development is proposed in Tadcaster, therefore growth here is likely to benefit from this additional provision. The Sherburn in Elmet development would take the total growth proposed here to 800 new homes which should provide added vitality to existing community facilities and potentially

provide additional investment in community infrastructure. Therefore, Option E is likely to have **moderate positive effects** on population and community.

New Settlement: Heronby

The scale of growth proposed for the new settlement is likely to provide investment in new community infrastructure and green space. New settlements are likely to provide greater scope for incorporating active travel infrastructure such as walkways and cycle routes. Therefore Options A, B, C, D, E and I, which propose one new settlement are predicted to have **moderate positive effects** on population and communities. There is uncertainty whether the full range of benefits would be secured in the plan period though given the lead times associated with strategic growth and associated infrastructure. Securing infrastructure prior to development phases would help to remove such uncertainties in the plan period.

Tier 1 and 2 Villages

These settlements have lower levels of services and some are relatively remote. Additional growth here can potentially support the vitality of existing community facilities and sustain these rural communities. Options proposing larger growth can support new community facilities and open space.

Option A proposes the lowest growth; 1510 new homes across Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages in total. The moderate levels can help sustain these rural communities but unlikely to provide new facilities. Therefore, this option is predicted to have **minor positive effects** on population and communities.

All remaining options allocate higher levels of growth to Tier 1 and Tier 2 villages with options C and J proposing the highest growth. These options are likely to support existing community facilities and potentially engender new facilities and open space. Therefore, options B, C, D, E, I and J are predicted to have **moderately positive effects** on population and communities. The effects are likely to be most prominent for options C and J, but are not considered likely to bring about major effects given the dispersed nature of growth across many settlements.

Smaller Villages

Only windfall development is proposed for smaller villages and therefore all options are predicted to have the same **neutral effects** on population and communities due to the small scale of development that’s likely to result.

	Summary effects matrix: Population and Community						
Options	A	B	C	D	E	I	J
Selby						?	?
Tadcaster							

<i>Sherburn in Elmet</i>							
<i>Expansion</i>	?	?		?	?	?	?
<i>New Settlement</i>	?	?	?	?	?		?
<i>Green Belt</i>							
<i>Tier 1 and 2 Villages</i>							
Overall							?

Summary: Needs-led growth

As the principal town in the District, Selby is well equipped to support leisure and recreation needs of existing and new residents. Further growth on strategic developments could help to complement such facilities, and potentially benefit communities that suffer inequalities. The location of sites could also bring potential to enhance access to green infrastructure if this is designed into the development from the outset. For this reason, Option A (followed by Option J) is predicted to be most positive in relation to these factors when compared to options that disperse growth wider.

The dispersed approaches are unlikely to support new facilities but could support the vitality of existing ones. This can be very important in smaller settlements. Therefore, positive effects are likely to accrue for rural communities in this respect, especially for Options C and J, which might also support some new community facilities and open space where levels of development are higher.

New settlements and expansion of settlements are involved for all options (with the exception of Option J), and this brings good opportunities to create sustainable settlements that are well served by local facilities, retail and recreation. This too could benefit surrounding settlements.

Overall, Option A is predicted to have **moderate positive effects**, as it directs a large amount of growth into areas that are well equipped to support growth and community development. There would also be moderate positive effects associated with settlement expansion and new settlements.

Option E is also predicted to have **moderate positive effects**. Whilst a dispersed approach is taken, which means the services available to many new developments will be more limited, this approach would be likely to support the vitality of tier 1 and 2 villages and maintain a sense of community. The increase in greenbelt development would also support good access to services in the affected settlements of Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster.

Options B, C, D and I are predicted to have **minor positive effects**. Whilst they still involve growth in Selby Town, it is less pronounced, and the effects are somewhat more diluted compared to Option A in this respect.

Option J is predicted to have **moderate positive effects**, but there is a greater element of uncertainty compared to option A in relation to the benefits that would be felt in Selby town.

Climate change mitigation

The primary challenge when considering settlement level effects on climate change mitigation are greenhouse gas emissions (GHG). The main sources for emissions are those associated with transport and vehicular travel generally, the built environment, industry and commerce. Developments located close to main employment opportunities, community facilities and services are likely to score more favourably as they tend to encourage more sustainable forms of transport (public and active) and help reduce need to travel further afield.

New developments also have the potential to incorporate renewable or low carbon energy generation opportunities with larger schemes likely to offer greater scope for such opportunities. In this context, those options that involve strategic developments (such as new settlements and settlement expansion) ought to be more beneficial. Other aspects of climate change mitigation are related to the physical infrastructure of the built environment; more energy efficient buildings using more sustainable materials can also contribute to mitigation. However, these issues are primarily related to development design.

Selby Town

There are several development sites at Selby Town; those which were proposed at preferred options stage included; a large greenfield site at Cross Hills Lane, the former Rigid Paper site, the Industrial Chemical site, land west of Bondgate, and the Olympia Park employment site. These sites lie within a 500m to a 1000m radius from the town centre. Road transport is a significant contributor to GHG in the district and the rural nature of the much of the district means that car ownership is particularly high. It is considered that all of the options have the potential to lead to increases in GHG emissions from transport given that they all propose significant growth likely to lead to an increase in car-based travel. Selby town is the main centre for shopping, housing, employment, leisure, education, health, and local government. Therefore, locating larger developments here is likely to reduce the need to travel further afield to access employment and services. The developments are also likely to encourage more sustainable forms of transport as Selby town is the main transport hub within the

District. Furthermore, Selby railway station links the town to major cities such as York, Leeds, Hull and London.

Options A, proposes 1750 new dwellings within Selby Town. Growth would need to involve several of the residential sites mentioned above (and / or alternative sites). The scale of development is likely to generate more road traffic and therefore lead to an increase in GHG emissions. However, the location of proposed development, close to the employment opportunities, retail and services, is likely to reduce the need to travel and offset the increase in GHG. In addition, development here will benefit from existing (and potentially improved) public transport infrastructure and services. Therefore, Option A is predicted to have **neutral effects** on climate change mitigation.

Options B, C, D and E involve a lower level of growth of 550 units within Selby Town. Again, these will lead to an increase in GHG emissions due to increased vehicular traffic. However, the proposed developments are relatively well located, being close to employment and services in Selby Town. Therefore, options B, C, D and E are also predicted to have **neutral effects** on climate change mitigation.

Option I would involve a lower level of growth in Selby Town at 200 units, and thus **neutral effects** are predicted.

Option J would involve 1000 dwellings, which would increase potential for emissions compared to all options but Option A. At this scale of growth the potential for infrastructure improvements would be lower than for Option A, but nevertheless, **neutral effects** are predicted in terms of carbon emissions.

Tadcaster

Tadcaster is the second largest centre in the District with the second largest retail, community facilities and services offering after Selby Town. The breweries provide additional employment opportunities in the town. With the exception of option E, all options involve the same level of growth in this location (400 homes). The developments proposed will lead to increased GHG due to increased road traffic. However, the location of the proposed developments, close to employment and services will help reduce the need to travel and also facilitate better public transport services. Option E adds a further 200 units in the green belt, the effects of which, are discussed below in the green belt release section. Overall, all options are predicted to have **neutral effects** on climate change mitigation.

Sherburn in Elmet

Sherburn in Elmet is one of the main three settlements in the District. It has a good range of facilities and services. The town benefits from employment opportunities; such as, the Sherburn in Elmet Enterprise Park, the strategic employment sites of Gascoigne Wood Interchange and Sherburn 2. Sherburn in Elmet is well connected to surrounding major cities

such as York, Leeds and Selby and Hull via the railway and the highways network; such as A1(M), the A63 and A162.

Six of the options (A, B, C, D, I and J) involve the same level of growth in this location; at preferred options stage, it was assumed 300 dwellings would be located at Land adjacent to Prospect Farm, Low Street. **Neutral effects** on climate change are predicted as the location of developments close to employment and services within Sherburn in Elmet will likely reduce the frequency and distance of car journeys resulting from the proposed growth here. This will serve to offset the increase in GHG emissions associated with increased vehicular traffic.

Options E allocates an additional 500 dwellings at an area to the south of Sherburn in Elmet. The effects of this additional allocation are discussed under the Green Belt release section below.

Settlement Expansion

Options A, B, D, E, I and J allocate 945 dwellings at land west of Kellington Lane, Eggborough, in the form of a settlement expansion. The scale of the expansion offers scope for renewable energy or low carbon energy schemes. For example; large active solar systems combined with community heating schemes can support renewable energy and increased energy efficiency. The substantial scale of development can also facilitate more sustainable public transport services and the location benefits from access to railway services via Whitley Bridge Railway Station. The expansion will likely include new community infrastructure such as schools and health and retail services which will likely encourage active travel such as walking and cycling (Though the full extent of benefits may not arise in the Plan period). Furthermore, the site is closely located to the strategic employment locations at the former Kellingley Colliery and the former Eggborough power Station. However, the scale of development proposed will inevitably result in increased vehicular traffic and therefore lead to increased GHG (though not necessarily in per capita terms). All options are therefore predicted to have **neutral effects** on climate change mitigation as the increased GHG from traffic is likely to be offset by the potential for renewable and low carbon energy schemes and the location; close to employment and services, will promote more sustainable transport modes. Option C involves a lower amount of growth, and therefore total greenhouse gases would be lesser. Conversely though, the potential for infrastructure upgrades is not as high, so **neutral effects** are also predicted.

Green Belt Release

Only Option E, involves green belt release. Therefore, for the other options **neutral effects** are predicted with regards to economy and employment.

Option E proposes greenbelt release in Sherburn in Elmet (500 units) and Tadcaster (200 units). Potential Green Belt sites in Sherburn in Elmet are relatively close to a range of facilities, services and employment opportunities at Sherburn in Elmet, including Sherburn in Elmet

Enterprise Park, Gascoigne Wood Interchange and Sherburn 2. They are also well served by the railway and highways network. The Tadcaster green belt release will lead to a total allocation of 600 units, again this is slightly higher than growth proposed in Selby Town under this option. The scale of growth proposed is predicted to produce an increase in GHG due to the increased vehicular traffic, this will be offset to some extent by availability of employment and services nearby. Therefore, option E is predicted to have **minor negative effects** on climate change.

New Settlements

Options A, B, C, D, E and I all propose a growth of 945 units in the plan period (3000 total) based on a new settlement at Heronby.

The settlement will include some employment land provision. The scale of the expansion offers scope for renewable energy or low carbon energy schemes. For example; large active solar systems combined with community heating schemes can support renewable energy and increased energy efficiency. Therefore, these options are predicted to have **neutral effects** on climate change mitigation as the increase in GHG due to the additional growth can potentially be offset by renewable and low carbon energy schemes within the new settlement. The new settlement is not close to existing public transport infrastructure, and so could possibly lead to increased car travel, especially as it would have good links to the A19. This could generate some minor negative effects, unless substantial new public transport is secured, which is an uncertainty.

Tier 1 and 2 Villages

Given the lower levels of services and employment and relative remoteness of these locations; substantial growth in a dispersed manner is likely to lead to increases in GHG emissions associated with vehicular travel. Option A proposes the lowest growth; 1510 new homes in total across Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages. Therefore, this is predicted to have **neutral effects** on climate change mitigation due to the relatively modest scale of growth proposed.

All remaining options allocate higher levels of growth to Tier 1 and Tier 2 villages which would likely produce a more pronounced increase in car journeys as residents would need to travel further afield e.g. to major service centres such as Selby in order to access services and employment opportunities. The potential to improve infrastructure through development is considered to be limited compared to a concentrated approach to growth. Therefore, these options are predicted to have **minor negative effects** on climate change mitigation. Options

Smaller Villages

Only windfall development is proposed for smaller villages and therefore all options are predicted to have the same **neutral effects** on climate change mitigation due to the small scale of development that's likely to result.

Summary effects matrix: Climate Change Mitigation							
Options	A	B	C	D	E	I	J
Selby							
Tadcaster							
Sherburn in Elmet							
Expansion							
New Settlement	?	?	?	?	?	?	
Green Belt							
Villages							
Overall	?						

Summary

It is considered that development proposed under any of the options has the potential to incorporate renewable or low carbon energy. However, generally larger-scale developments offer a greater opportunity to incorporate renewable or low carbon energy. For example, in larger schemes, large active solar systems can be combined with community heating schemes to support renewable energy and increased energy efficiency. In this context, those options that involve strategic developments (such as new settlements and settlement expansion) ought to be more beneficial. That said, if these schemes are required to support other improvements to infrastructure, then the potential for low carbon development could become more problematic. At this stage, it is recommended that any approach that is followed should seek to explore the potential for on-site measures to reduce carbon emissions and generate low carbon energy.

In terms of emissions from transport there is little to add to the discussion presented under the air quality and transportation SA themes. Road transport is a significant contributor to greenhouse gas emissions in the district, with the rural nature of the much of the district, as well as issues relating to public transport provision, meaning that car ownership is particularly high. It is considered that all of the options have the potential to lead to increases in greenhouse gas emissions from transport given that they all propose significant growth likely to lead to an increase in car-based travel. It is also recognised that growth focussed towards the three key settlements (Selby, Tadcaster and Sherburn in Elmet) would likely capitalise upon existing sustainable transport infrastructure present at these locations. This is potentially positive for Option A, but Options B, C, D, E, I and J which focus a higher level of growth towards lower tier settlements (Tier 1 and Tier 2 villages) is likely to increase private

car journeys as residents would need to travel further afield e.g. to service centres such as Selby in order to access services and employment opportunities.

As a result, all options are predicted to have **minor negative effects**. These effects would be most likely for options C and J (as there would be a refocusing of growth to broadly less accessible locations), and less likely for Option A, which focuses more growth towards Selby Town, away from the tier 1 and 2 settlements, and could have opportunities at new settlements.

Economy and Employment

The Selby District Economic Development Framework (EDF) for 2017-2022 (updated 2019) focused on the delivery of 5 predominantly brownfield sites for employment growth; Olympia Park; Gascoigne Wood Interchange; former Kellingley Colliery; Church Fenton Airfield and Sherburn in Elmet². The former Kellingley Colliery, Sherburn 2 and Church Fenton Creative and Digital Hub have planning permissions. The 2019 review of the EDF noted that more needed to be done to improve the District's places and town centres and identified the following as strategic land-use priorities:

- M62 Strategic Development Zone/Energy Corridor - identify future sites and infrastructure needs to develop the low carbon economy
- Deliver Strategic sites – Olympia Park, Selby; Gascoigne Wood Interchange; former Kellingley Colliery; Church Fenton; Sherburn in Elmet²
- Regenerate and enhance town centres and Selby Station – including Transforming Cities Fund proposals, Heritage Action Zone and Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans
- Support the growth of Small Medium Enterprises and large employees in the District Selby Town.

The sustainability appraisal framework in the Selby Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report sets out the criteria against which the Local Plan (and alternatives) is to be appraised². This states that employment sites located within close proximity to existing strategic areas can benefit from established services and sites with good access to strategic transport routes and hubs ought to be marked as particular opportunities. Furthermore, loss of employment land is presumed to be negative unless there is evidence that the site is poor quality / not attractive for modern business.

Selby Town

There are a range of site options within Selby Town. In particular, there are 5 important development sites; a large greenfield site at Cross Hills Lane, the former Rigid Paper site, the Industrial Chemical site, land west of Bondgate, and the Olympia Park employment site.

The 80.4ha Cross Hills Lane Selby (SELB-BZ) is the largest site for residential development in Selby town. Although mainly residential, the site will also include open space, leisure and education provision. The site is close to the strategic employment area at Olympia Park; being around 2 miles away via the A19. It is also very close (around 1 mile) to employment opportunities, services and retail within Selby's Town centre.

² AECOM report Selby Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Jan.2020; <https://selby-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/event/35204>

The site is around 1.3 miles from Selby train station. It is well served by highways such as the A19, A63, A1 and M62.

The Sherburn in Elmet 2 and Gascoigne Wood Interchange, strategic employment sites, are around 7 miles away (12 minutes' drive). The Kellingley employment site is 11 miles away (23 minutes' drive) and the Church Fenton employment site is around 8 miles (15 minutes' drive). Development of this site would not lead to loss of employment land. Overall this site is predicted to have favourable effects as it provides homes in areas close to the main employment and services centre in Selby Town centre and proximity to strategic employment sites particularly the Olympia Park employment development.

The former Rigid Paper site (SELB-AG), Denison Road, Selby is a 7.5ha site allocated for mixed use (primarily residential). It is very close to Selby Town Centre, within a short distance of many services and employment opportunities. It is also close (1.2 miles) to the strategic employment site at Olympia Park development. The Sherburn in Elmet 2 and Gascoigne Wood Interchange employment sites are just over 7 miles (14-19 minutes' drive). The Kellingley employment site 11 miles (20 minutes' drive) and the Church Fenton employment site is just over 9 miles away (18 minutes' drive). Therefore, development here would be predicted to have positive effects on employment as it does not lead to loss of employment land and it is located close to the strategic employment and service centres in and around Selby Town. Similarly, the Industrial Chemicals and Land West of Bondgate are located close to Selby Town centre and to the Olympia Park employment area and therefore also predicted to have moderately positive effects on economy and employment.

The site at Olympia Park is a 33.6ha site allocated to provide 14ha of employment development (B1, B2 and B8). The site is located to the north east of Selby town on the edge of the built-up area yet close to Selby Town Centre and provides an opportunity to regenerate former industrial land and premises. The site is predicted to have favourable effects as it will create 14ha of new employment land and is located close to the main employment and service area within Selby Town. It is also close to main residential areas within the town.

Option A proposes the highest level of growth at 1750 dwellings. This option would likely involve residential growth at the sites discussed above plus the employment site at Olympia Park. The development of land in these locations is predicted to have moderately positive effects due to their proximity to main employment opportunities within Selby town and the strategic employment sites in the District. The Olympia Park employment development is predicted to have a significantly positive effect on economy and employment as it will provide substantial new employment land (14ha) providing new opportunities in a location that's well connected to the rest of Selby and the District. Therefore, this option is predicted to have **major positive effects** on economy and employment taking the residential and employment elements into account.

Options C and D involve a lower level of growth of 550 units within Selby Town. with growth presumed to be focused around the Industrial Chemicals and Rigid Paper sites. Both of these sites are well connected to employment and service centres within Selby Town and the rest of the District and they will not result in the loss of employment land. They also include the employment allocation of Olympia Park which will provide 14ha of employment land. Therefore, these options are also predicted to produce **moderate positive effects** on economy and employment overall.

Options B and E also propose a growth of 550 units within Selby Town. These are assumed to utilise the Cross Hills Lane site for housing and Olympia Park for employment. Again, these sites are well connected to employment and service centres within Selby Town and the rest of the District and the Olympia Park site will provide an additional 14ha of employment land. Therefore, these options are also predicted to produce **moderate positive effects** on economy and employment

Option I would involve a lower level of growth in Selby Town at 200 units. However, a lower level of housing growth means that the potential for positive effects arising in relation to residential development is somewhat lower. Hence, there is a greater degree of uncertainty as to whether **moderate positive effects** would arise.

Option J would involve 1000 dwellings, which would likely bring about benefits in relation to both housing and employment growth. Compared to the options that involve 550 dwellings, it is more likely that the benefits relating to residential growth would be of a greater magnitude, and hence the potential for **major positive effects exist**.

Tadcaster

Tadcaster is the second largest centre in the District with the second largest retail and services offering after Selby Town with a range of community facilities. The brewing industry plays an important role in the local economy. The strategic employment sites of Sherburn 2 and the Gascoigne Wood Interchange are within 8 miles; a 15-minute journey. The main retail, employment within Selby Town centre and the Olympia Park employment development is 16 miles away; around half an hour's drive. There are no new employment sites proposed in the town in the draft Preferred options Local Plan.

With the exception of Option E, all remaining options involve the same level of growth in this location (400 homes), and thus the effects are the same. The sites proposed; a mix of brownfield and greenfield plots, will not lead to loss of employment land.

Option E allocates an additional 200 dwellings in the Green Belt. Again, this is unlikely to lead to loss of employment land. Overall, all options are predicted to have **moderate positive**

effects on economy and employment as the allocations proposed do not lead to loss of employment land and well connected to nearby strategic employment sites such as Sherburn 2 and the Gascoigne Wood Interchange.

Sherburn in Elmet

Sherburn in Elmet is one of the main three settlements in the District. It is located 10 miles west of Selby and 6 miles south of Tadcaster. This large settlement has a good range of facilities, services and employment opportunities. There is the Sherburn in Elmet Enterprise Park, a large industrial estate, on the eastern side of town. The strategic employment sites of Gascoigne Wood Interchange and Sherburn in Elmet 2 are just to the south east and east of town.

Sherburn in Elmet benefits from two railway stations; Sherburn in Elmet in Elmet station and South Milford. It is well connected to surrounding major cities such as York Leeds and Selby and Hull via the railway and the highways network; such as A1(M), the A63 A162.

Six of the options (A, B, C, D, I and J) involve the same level of growth in this location; which at preferred options stage was assumed to involve 300 dwellings located at Land adjacent to Prospect Farm, Low Street (this site continues to form part of the strategy at this point in time). **Moderate positive effects** are predicted as Sherburn in Elmet is one of the three main settlements in the District and is well located for access to services and strategic employment areas. Option E allocates an additional 500 dwellings on Green Belt land surrounding Sherburn in Elmet. This brings added economic growth opportunities to Sherburn in Elmet by placing homes in a location accessible to employment opportunities. Therefore, for Option E, **major positive effects** are predicted on economy and employment.

Settlement Expansion

All options except Option C, allocate 945 dwellings at land west of Kellington Lane, Eggborough, in the form of a settlement expansion. The site has railway access to Leeds and is closely located to the strategic employment locations at the former Kellingley Colliery and the former Eggborough power Station. This site is therefore predicted to have **moderate positive effects** on economy and employment as it is closely located to two large strategic employment sites and is well connected to surrounding major cities via railway and the M62. Furthermore, the site will not lead to loss of employment land and will involve some on-site facilities and services.

Option C allocates lower growth of 400 units utilising a smaller portion of the same site. This option is predicted to have **minor positive effects** as it proposes a smaller scale of development and would be less likely to achieve economies of scale and infrastructure enhancements.

Green Belt Release

Only Option E involves green belt release. Therefore, for the other options **neutral effects** are predicted with regards to economy and employment.

Option E proposes greenbelt release in Sherburn in Elmet (500 units) and Tadcaster (200 units). The Sherburn in Elmet site is close to a range of facilities, services and employment opportunities at Sherburn in Elmet, including Sherburn in Elmet Enterprise Park, Gascoigne Wood Interchange and Sherburn in Elmet 2. It is also well served by the railway and highways network. Growth at Tadcaster is similarly well placed to benefit from the strategic employment sites of Sherburn 2 and the Gascoigne Wood Interchange; as these are 8-10 miles away; a 15-20 minute journey. Therefore, option E is predicted to have **moderate positive effects** on economy and employment as the sites allocated to development are in the second and third largest settlements in the District and close to strategic employment sites.

New Settlements

Options A, B, C, D, E and I all propose a growth of 945 units in the plan period (3000 in total) based on a new settlement at Heronby.

The Heronby site is relatively remote from the main strategic employment sites and the main centres of services and employment in the District. It is also relatively distant from the main strategic employment sites. Nonetheless a new settlement here will also provide additional employment land, therefore development at this site is predicted to have **moderate positive effects** on economy and employment (which applies to options A,B,C,D, E and I). **Neutral effects** are predicted for Option J, which does not involve the new settlement.

Tier 1 and 2 Villages

Option A proposes 1510 new homes in total across Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages. Development sites in villages such as Brayton and Barlby are likely to contribute more positively to economy and employment due to their proximity to major towns such as Selby and strategic employment sites such as the Olympia Park employment development. Similarly, sites in Eggborough and Whitley are closely located to strategic employment sites such as Kellington Lane, Eggborough Power Station and the proposed M62 Energy Corridor. However, for the most part the villages have lower levels of service and employment provision and the majority are relatively distant from major employment and service centres. Whilst the growth proposed in Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages is likely to support growth in these rural communities it is not expected to produce the same scale of benefits expected from the larger settlements. Therefore, all options are predicted to have **minor positive effects** on economy and employment. Some of the options involve a greater amount of growth in the Tier 1 and 2 villages than the others, and despite the effects being dispersed, cumulatively these options (Option C and Option J) are predicted to have **potentially moderate positive effects**.

Smaller Villages

Only windfall development is proposed for smaller villages and therefore all options are predicted to have the same **neutral effects** on economy and employment due to the small scale of development that's likely to result.

Summary effects matrix: Economy and Employment							
Options	A	B	C	D	E	I	J
Selby	Dark Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green with ?	Dark Green with ?
Tadcaster	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green
Sherburn in Elmet	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Light Green	Light Green
Expansion	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green
New Settlement(s)	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Blue
Green Belt	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Blue
Villages	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green with ?	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green with ?
Overall	Dark Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green with ?	Light Green	Light Green with ?

Summary

All of the options involve employment growth in key locations, which is likely to lead to positive effects in terms of the provision of employment land that is accessible to existing communities. In terms of further housing growth, the options perform similarly in some respects, given that all involve growth across the district in important locations. However, there are some differences, which influence the overall scores for each option.

Option A places a large amount of growth in Selby, which is a key location for existing and future employment growth. This ensures a good match between housing and jobs, and also brings investment, and jobs (in construction) to areas that are most deprived (though it is not a certainty these communities would benefit). Though the spread of development to the tier

1 and 2 settlements is fairly small, it should support their ongoing viability, but without having a notable effect on the rural economy. Overall, a **major positive effect** is predicted.

Options B, C, D and E disperse growth more widely and so the benefits associated with Selby are less pronounced. Positive effects are still likely to arise though due to the involvement of settlement expansion in Eggborough, and a new settlement (which would involve an element of employment land).

For option B and D (to a lesser extent), the effects for the smaller settlements would be more positive, and much else remains the same compared to Option A. However, the benefits in the smaller settlements are not considered to be as significant as those under Option A which focuses on Selby. Therefore, **moderate positive effects** are predicted overall for both options.

Option C is likely to be most supportive of growth in rural economies and the vitality of the tier 1 and 2 settlements. However, it does not have the same benefits at Eggborough that all other options do. Therefore, **moderate positive effects** are predicted.

Option E involves additional growth at Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster, whilst only slightly reducing growth in the rural areas compared to Option D.

As the second and third largest settlements in the district, this brings economic growth opportunities to these locations and also places homes in locations that are accessible to employment opportunities. Therefore, overall potentially **major positive effects** are predicted when considered alongside the benefits associated with Eggborough, a new settlement and modest growth in a range of other settlements.

Option I is predicted to have **moderate positive effects** overall. Benefits would arise in most of the locations across the district, but these would be unlikely to be major in any one location, and would be less prominent in Selby Town.

Option J does not involve a new settlement, and thus the economic benefits of a large mixed use development are not realised. However, the growth would be distributed to Selby, bringing more positive effects in this location. There would also be a greater amount of development in the Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements, which should help to support the rural communities. Overall, potential **major positive effects** are predicted reflecting these factors.

TRANSPORT

The SEA objective for transport³ is to; *support the provision of transport infrastructure to meet local population change whilst helping to reduce congestion and travel times and support sustainable modes of transport.* Development proposals that help provide transport infrastructure to meet growth whilst helping reduce congestion and travel times are likely to score positively. Similarly, proposals that maximise opportunities to connect new development to new and existing services and facilities through sustainable modes of travel are also viewed as beneficial.

Selby Town

The development involved under the various options utilise combinations of residential sites and the employment site at Olympia Park. With Selby being the main hub of employment and services in the District; all locations proposed are close to employment, retail and services. They benefit from Selby's existing transport service and infrastructure, including; Selby train station and bus services. The area has good access to the highways network including; the A19, A63, A1 and M62. The proposed additional growth could help to improve transport services and infrastructure within the town. Similarly, the proposed developments are likely to include active modes of travel such as connected cycle ways and footpaths which would help reduce reliance on private vehicles by linking developments to nearby employment areas and services.

Option A proposes the highest level of growth within Selby Town. Growth is distributed across residential sites that have relatively good access to services. The scale of development is likely to engender more viable public transport services such as bus routes and connected cycle routes. It should also benefit from the existing rail and road services within the Town as well as provide new sustainable travel options such as walkways and cycle ways. Therefore, **moderate positive effects** are predicted in this respect. Conversely, with regards to traffic and congestion, an increase in development in the town is likely to contribute towards more car trips (despite there being opportunities for walking, cycling and sustainable modes of transport). At the scale of growth involved, **moderate negative effects** are predicted. Therefore, overall, both positive and negative effects are recorded against different aspects of the SA objective.

Options B, C, D and E involve a lower level of growth of 550 units within Selby Town. These allocations are predicted to have more limited favourable effects due to proposed development being close to employment and services in Selby Town and proximity to existing transport infrastructure. However, they are unlikely to produce new infrastructure due to the lower scale of development proposed. Therefore, options B, C, D and E are predicted to have

³ AECOM report Selby Local Plant Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Jan.2020; <https://selby-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/event/35204>

minor positive effects in this respect. In terms of congestion though, it is predicted that only minor negative effects would arise.

Option I would involve a lower level of growth in Selby Town at 200 units. It is unlikely that this would create the critical mass to support new transport infrastructure, but likewise, the potential for congestion would be reduced. Therefore, on balance, **neutral effects** are predicted overall.

Option J would involve 1000 dwellings, which should mean that the potential for positive effects in terms of accessibility and infrastructure is higher than for options B, C, D, E and I. There would be less certainty that the effects would be of moderate significance though when compared to Option A (which involves higher growth still). Likewise, the potential for moderate negative effects would be lower.

Tadcaster

Tadcaster has the second largest retail and services offering after Selby Town, with a range of community facilities which also serves the wider rural communities.

The brewing industry provides additional employment opportunities here. The town benefits from good access to the highway network such as the A162, A64 and the A1 (M) is around 6km from the town centre. National Cycle Route Networks also connect Tadcaster to both York and Leeds. However, there is currently no train station in Tadcaster with nearest trains station being in Ulleskelf around 7 km away. Development in Tadcaster is likely to benefit from existing transport facilities and services. It is also likely to enhance existing transport services, e.g. by making bus routes more commercially viable. With the exception of Option E, all options involve 400 new homes. Therefore, these all options are predicted to have **minor positive effects** in terms of locating development in accessible locations. The additional growth is likely to lead to some increase in car travel (despite there being relatively good access to local facilities). However, it is considered that effects on congestion and traffic would be potential **minor negative effects**.

Option E allocates an additional 200 dwellings on Green Belt land. The effects of this additional growth are discussed below under green belt release section.

Sherburn in Elmet

Sherburn in Elmet is one of the main three settlements in the District with the third largest centre. This settlement has a good range of facilities, services and employment opportunities. There is the Sherburn in Elmet Enterprise Park, a large industrial estate, on the eastern side of town. The strategic employment sites of Gascoigne Wood Interchange and Sherburn in Elmet 2 are just to the south east and east of town. Sherburn in Elmet benefits from two railway stations; Sherburn in Elmet station and South Milford. It is well connected to

surrounding major cities such as York, Leeds and Selby and Hull via the railway and the highways network; such as the A1(M), the A63 and the A162.

Six of the options (A, B, C, D, I and J) involve the same level of growth in this location; presumed to be 300 dwellings located at Land adjacent to Prospect Farm, Low Street. Development is likely to benefit from the existing transport infrastructure here and potentially help enhance existing sustainable public transport services. Therefore, **minor positive effects** are envisaged for these options. Option E involves an additional 500 dwellings at an area to the south of Sherburn in Elmet, the effects of this are discussed under the green belt release section below.

The increase in housing in the settlement is likely to increase car trips to an extent, which is a potential **minor negative effect** for each option.

Settlement Expansion

All options except Option C, involve 945 dwellings at land west of Kellington Lane, Eggborough, in the form of a settlement expansion. The site has railway access to Leeds and is closely located to the strategic employment locations at the former Kellingley Colliery and the former Eggborough power Station. The location is well connected to surrounding major cities via the M62. The scale of development proposed in the form of an urban extension would help provide new transport infrastructure and services. These are **moderate positive effects**.

However, the large scale of growth in a focused area could lead to increased traffic and congestion locally, which are potential **moderate negative effects**.

Option C allocates a smaller growth of 400 units utilising a smaller portion of the same site. This level of growth is less likely to support new transport infrastructure and services, but there would still be existing infrastructure in place to support sustainable travel, which are **minor positive effects**. However, the scale of growth would be such that any increase in trips would only be likely to have **minor negative effects** with regards to traffic and congestion.

Green Belt Release

Only Option E involves green belt release. Therefore, for the other options (A, B, C, D, I and J) **neutral effects** are predicted with respect to transport.

Option E proposes greenbelt release in Sherburn in Elmet (500 units) and Tadcaster (200 units). The Sherburn in Elmet site is close to a range of facilities, services and employment opportunities at Sherburn in Elmet, including Sherburn in Elmet Enterprise Park, Gascoigne Wood Interchange and Sherburn 2. It is also well served by the railway and highways network. This additional allocation would take the total growth proposed in Sherburn in Elmet to 800 units. At this level of growth, the developments can help enhance existing transport services and potentially provide new transport infrastructure and services.

The additional growth in Tadcaster ought to be able to benefit from the employment opportunities and services in Tadcaster. The inclusion of Green Belt land would take the total growth proposed in Tadcaster to 600 units. Therefore, option E is predicted to have **minor positive effects** on transport as additional growth is likely to be close to employment and services in the 2 main centres in Selby District. These additional developments when considered with the main Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster allocations would produce substantial scale of growth which will benefit from the existing transport infrastructure and services and potentially provide additional infrastructure.

New Settlement

Options A, B, C, D, E and I all propose a growth of 945 units in the plan period (3000 in total) based on one new settlement at Heronby. The Heronby site is relatively remote from the main strategic employment sites in the District or in neighbouring areas. However, a new settlement on this scale could help improve transport links in these parts of the district as well as ensuring that local facilities are provided to help reduce the need to travel. The new settlement would also be relatively close to York. In this respect, **minor positive effects** are predicted in relation to accessibility and travel. Conversely, development of this scale would increase the amount of car trips, particularly along the A19, which could affect traffic heading towards York and Selby Town (passing through / alongside some smaller tier villages). In terms of congestion and traffic, this is a potential **minor negative effect**.

Tier 1 and 2 Villages

Given the lower levels of services and employment and relative remoteness of these locations; the existing transport infrastructure and service are less likely to accommodate the additional pressures of substantial growth. Distributing growth across the villages may produce piecemeal improvements in transport services (and / or could help support the viability of existing services) but the growth is unlikely to produce the economies of scale required to produce substantial new transport infrastructure that larger scale developments can engender. Growth in such locations is also more likely to encourage car trips and longer travel distances.

Option A proposes the lowest growth; around 1500 new homes across Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages in total. The moderate levels of growth can potentially lead to minor improvements in local transport services but unlikely to offer scope for new infrastructure and services and therefore are predicted to have **neutral effects** on transport.

All remaining options allocate higher levels of growth to Tier 1 and Tier 2 villages with options C and J proposing the highest growth. Broadly speaking, the existing transport infrastructure within these villages is less likely to support such substantial levels of growth; the additional traffic generated is also likely to involve increases in car travel. Therefore, options C and F are predicted to have **moderate negative effects** on transport in Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages. The

remaining options are predicted to have **minor negative effects** on transport as they could strain existing transport services and infrastructure whilst lacking the scale required to facilitate new infrastructure (whilst also encouraging longer and more frequent car travel). In terms of congestion and traffic, the dispersed nature of growth is unlikely to lead to significant effects in any one location, but increased car trips across the district could put general pressure on road networks.

Smaller Villages

Only windfall development is proposed for smaller villages and therefore all options are predicted to have the same **neutral effects** on transport due to the small scale of development that's likely to result.

	Summary effects matrix: Transport														
Options	A		B		C		D		E		I		J		
Selby	Green	Orange	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Blue	Green	Orange	Green	Orange
Tadcaster	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green
Sherburn in Elmet	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green
Expansion	Green	Orange	Green	Orange	Green	Yellow	Green	Orange	Green	Orange	Green	Orange	Green	Orange	Green
New Settlement	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Blue
Green Belt	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Yellow	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue
Villages	Blue	Blue	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Orange
Overall	Green	Orange	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Orange	Green

Summary

Overall, Option A is predicted to have mixed effects. The majority of growth would be in accessible locations, and strategic growth at Eggborough and a new settlement could help to

improve transport links in these parts of the district. Whilst some development in less accessible locations is still involved; this does not outweigh the positive effects that ought to arise in other locations. Therefore, in terms of accessibility and reducing the need to travel, **moderate positive effects** are predicted overall. In terms of traffic and congestion, it is possible that moderate negative effects will arise in Selby, and to a lesser extent at other settlements across the district, which overall amount to potential **moderate negative effects**.

Options B and D perform similarly, with the main point of difference being increased growth in the Tier 1 and 2 settlements for Option B. Overall, this does not change the effects from a district wide perspective though. There are a mix of **minor positive effects** and **minor negative effects** for the settlements across the district, which translate to a similar picture overall for both options.

Option C involves further growth in the Tier 1 and 2 settlements and less development at Eggborough. This means that overall, a greater proportion of development would be in less accessible locations, and could potentially give rise to **moderate negative effects** in this respect overall. **Minor positive effects** are still identified, reflecting the fact that a range of settlements would still involve development in broadly accessible locations.

Option E involves a similar spread of development to Options B and D, but directs greater levels of growth to Tadcaster and Sherburn in Elmet rather than the tier 1 and 2 settlements. This is slightly more favourable in terms of placing development in the higher tier settlements that are accessible. However, in overall terms, the effects are considered to be similar from a district-wide perspective (i.e. **minor positive effects** and **minor negative effects**).

Option I avoids negative effects in terms of congestion in Selby Town, but does not bring about the same benefits in terms of placing a large proportion of new development in the most accessible locations. The effects are therefore **minor positive** and **minor negative** overall.

Option J is predicted to have potential **moderate positive effects** as it directs sizeable growth to Selby Town and could also see improvements associated with the Eggborough expansion. However, the potential for moderate negative effects exists in several locations including Selby and Eggborough (congestion related) and in the tier 1 and 2 villages (accessibility related). Therefore, overall this option is predicted to have **moderate negative effects** alongside the positives.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

The SEA objective for the historic environment⁴ is to; protect, conserve and enhance heritage assets, including their setting, significance and contribution to the wider historic landscape and townscape character and cultural heritage of the District.

In this context the effects of development should be considered in terms of their contribution to the maintenance and enhancement of historic character and cultural heritage through design, layout and setting of new development. Developments that are likely to promote access to heritage assets for visitors and residents are also likely to score favourably if done so in a sensitive way.

Selby Town

Selby Town Conservation Area (CA) forms the core of the historic market town with Selby Abbey (Grade I listed) being the focus of the townscape, dominating as it does, views into and across the area. The townscape is intercepted and influenced by the River Ouse with its historic quays and crossings. Some industrial buildings associated with the river survive such as the early twentieth century Westmill flour mill, which is a prominent feature of the skyline. There are two further conservation areas adjacent to the Selby Town CA; Leeds Road and Millgate CAs. The Millgate CA is an early nineteenth century historic suburb and Leeds Rd CA extending out along an arterial route into Selby. The Leeds Road CA lies immediately west of the Selby Town CA on the A1238 to Leeds forming a key suburban extension to the town dating to the mid-twentieth century⁵. These three CA's include over a hundred and twenty listed (mainly Grade II) buildings. There is one Scheduled monument in the form of the Abbey Staithe site (also on the heritage at risk register). The listed buildings date back to the 15th and 16th Centuries. A fourth Conservation Area is allocated at Armoury Road and Brook Street. However, in the Conservation Area Appraisal, it is recommended that this area is de-designated due to the substantial erosion of character that has already taken place in this area.

The development sites involved under the various options utilise combinations of four residential sites and the employment site at Olympia Park. The largest site at Cross Hills Lane abuts the Leeds Road CA at the south eastern boundary of the site (figure 1). This can potentially affect part of the CA between Armoury Rd and White Lodge. However, there is around a 100m buffer between the edge of site and the listed buildings in this part of the CA (Selby College, St Marys Church and a listed barn). The substantial size of this site should provide scope for mitigation measures such as planting and screening if required. The north

⁴ AECOM report Selby Local Plant Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Jan.2020; <https://selby-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/event/35204>

⁵ SDC report Leeds Road Conservation Area Appraisal (Nov. 2020); <https://www.selby.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Documents/Leeds%20Road%20Conservation%20Area%20Appraisal%20v5.pdf>

eastern part of the site overlooks several grade II listed buildings, Hempbridge Farmhouse and two Barns, at Flaxley Road.

The buildings are currently in a rural setting facing expansive, flat, agricultural fields, placing a large-scale development just across the road from these heritage assets can potentially have unfavourable effects on their setting. However, the size of site offers scope for the inclusion of buffers and sensitive landscaping to lessen negative effects.

The former Rigid Paper site on Denison Rd is adjacent to the Grade II listed buildings of the Selby Canal Lock House and Bridge house, at the north western corner of the site. Redeveloping this brownfield site can potentially have positive effects provided the development is sensitively designed so as to protect and enhance the assets and their setting. This can potentially help make the heritage assets more accessible to residents and visitors.

None of the remaining sites involved overlap heritage assets or CAs. However, due to the high number of heritage assets within Selby Town it is likely there will be some residual unfavourable effects on the historic environment depending on the scale of growth (for example, secondary effects such as increased traffic). Similarly, the land west of Bondgate Site faces a Grade II listed building; Mount Pleasant, an early-mid C19, Brown brick building. Again, development here could have potentially unfavourable effects on the heritage asset, although the existing mature trees on site will help mitigate impacts on the setting of this heritage asset.

Option A involves the highest levels of growth in Selby Town; 1750 new dwellings. Although the substantial scale of growth proposed can potentially have negative impacts on the numerous heritage assets here, there is scope for mitigation, particularly on larger sites. Some positive effects are also anticipated from redeveloping brownfield sites such as the Rigid Paper site which can help protect and enhance heritage assets of Selby Canal Lock House and Bridge house. Overall Option A is therefore predicted to have **minor negative effects** due to the scale of growth proposed in this particularly sensitive, heritage rich area.

Options B, C, D and E involve a lower level of growth of 550 units within Selby Town. These are again likely to have unfavourable effects on the historic environment due to the area's rich historical and architectural heritage. Although the development is reduced in scale, the smaller sites are likely to provide less scope for mitigation. Therefore, options B, C, D and E are also predicted to have **minor negative effects** on the historic environment.

Option I involves a lower level of growth still, and as such, it will be less likely that negative effects arise with regards to the overall scale of growth. Conversely, the potential for improvements is also likely to be limited (depending on the choice of sites). **Neutral effects** are predicted overall.

Option J involves 1000 dwellings, which is likely to bring about similar effects to those identified for Option A (i.e. **minor negative effects**).

Tadcaster

Tadcaster enjoys rich historical and architectural heritage assets. Heritage assets include the 12th century St Mary's Church, the 13th Tadcaster motte and bailey castle (an ancient monument) and the 15th century Ark. There are several historical buildings associated with the Breweries industry dating back to the 18th century. The majority of the centre of town (between Wetherby Road and the river Wharfe) is a conservation area (CA). The CA contains around 40 Grade II listed buildings and 3 Grade II*.

The sites assumed for development in the strategic options include the Chapel Street Car Park, a site in the centre of the conservation area allocated for a high-density development of up to 43 dwellings.

This brownfield site is surrounded by over a dozen listed buildings. The largest site proposed (up to 248 units) is at Mill Lane adjacent the river Wharfe and partially overlapping the conservation area.

With the exception of Option E, all options involve 400 new homes in total. Due to the sensitivity of the area and the numerous heritage assets it is likely that development could have some adverse effects on the historic environment. Conversely, redeveloping brownfield sites can potentially help enhance the setting of these assets. Overall, the smaller plot sizes and relatively dense development mean there is less scope for mitigation therefore all options can potentially lead to negative effects on the historic environment. It will be important to minimise the scale, massing and height of buildings to ensure that new development does not have negative effects. An important consideration is the heritage-led approach that is proposed for Tadcaster for the options. This makes it less likely that negative effects will arise and creates the opportunity for positive effects.

Option E allocates an additional 200 dwellings in the green belt. The effects of this additional allocation are discussed below under green belt release.

Sherburn in Elmet

Sherburn in Elmet has fewer heritage assets compared with Selby Town and Tadcaster. There are five listed buildings along Moore Lane and Church Hill, including the Grade I listed Church of All Saints. These are relatively distant (over 800 m) from the proposed development sites involved for each of the options.

Six of the options (A, B, C, D, I, and J) involve the same level of growth in this location; 300 dwellings located at Land adjacent to Prospect Farm, Low Street. Development here is predicted to have **neutral effects** on the historic environment as it would not be in the vicinity of heritage assets or likely to affect setting.

Option E involves an additional 500 dwellings at an area to the south of Sherburn in Elmet, the effects of this are discussed under the green belt release section below.

Settlement Expansion

All options except C, involve 945 dwellings at land west of Kellington Lane, Eggborough, in the form of a settlement expansion. There are no designated heritage assets or conservation areas here.

Option C allocates a smaller growth of 400 units utilising a smaller portion of the same site. All options are predicted have **neutral effects** on the historic environment as the locations proposed are not in the vicinity of heritage assets and are not likely to affect setting.

Green Belt Release

Only Options E involves green belt release. Therefore, for the other options (A, B, C, D, I and J) **neutral effects** are predicted with respect to heritage.

Option E proposes greenbelt release in Sherburn in Elmet (500 units) and Tadcaster (200 units).

The Sherburn in Elmet growth is predicted to have neutral effects as there are no heritage assets nearby.

Whilst more distant from the sensitive central areas of Tadcaster, Green Belt development could potentially have negative impacts on the setting of historic landscapes and on long range views (depending upon the exact sites). It is also predicted to involve neutral effects as the site proposed is distant from the central conservation area in Tadcaster. Therefore, Option E is predicted to have **minor negative effects** on the historic environment.

New Settlements

Options A, B, C, D, E and I all propose a growth of 945 units in plan period (3000 total) based on one new settlement at Heronby.

The Heronby site is adjacent to the Escrick conservation area at its eastern boundary. The latter contains several listed heritage assets including a historic park. The western boundary of the proposed development site is around a 1000m away from the Stillingfleet Conservation Area which includes several listed assets including the Grade I listed; Church of St Helen.

Development could affect the character of settlements and listed buildings in the wider vicinity, but mitigation ought to be possible to reduce the significance of effects. Overall, minor negative effects are predicted for each option involving the new settlement, with neutral effects for Option J.

Tier 1 and 2 Villages

The majority of these locations contain heritage assets set in small scale village settings and therefore particularly sensitive to development. For example, Brayton conservation area which contains three listed buildings including a Grade 1 listed Church.

Thorpe Willoughby also has several heritage assets; four listed buildings and Scheduled Monument (Thorpe Hall). Similarly, Riccall has a rich historic environment with a conservation area covering most of the centre of the village and a Scheduled Monument.

Tier-2 villages also enjoy rich historic environments; Appleton Roebuck’s conservation area contains eight listed buildings and a Scheduled Monument. Hemingbrough also has a conservation area and a dozen listed buildings. Carlton has a dozen listed buildings and a historic park.

Option A proposes the lowest growth; 1510 new homes across Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages combined. Some of the potential site options are close to or adjacent to heritage assets and therefore can potentially have some unfavourable effects, particularly in view of the smaller context of the urban area, where scope for mitigation could be more limited.

Therefore, this options is predicted to have **minor negative effects** on the historic environment.

Options B, D, E and I propose higher levels of growth and therefore predicted to have **moderate negative effects**.

Options C and J allocate the highest levels of growth. At this level of growth options there could be **major negative effects** on the historic environment as the scale of development could possibly overwhelm the existing historic and architectural heritage within these villages.

Smaller Villages

Only windfall development is proposed for smaller villages and therefore all options are predicted to have the same **neutral effects** on the historic environment due to the small scale of development that’s likely to result.

	Summary effects matrix: Historic Environment						
Options	A	B	C	D	E	I	J
Selby	Minor	Moderate	Major	Moderate	Moderate	Minor	Minor
Tadcaster	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
Sherburn in Elmet	Major	Major	Major	Major	Major	Major	Major
Expansion	Major	Major	Major	Major	Major	Major	Major
New Settlement(s)	Minor	Minor	Minor	Minor	Minor	Minor	Minor

<i>Green Belt</i>							
<i>Villages</i>							
Overall							

Overall, it is difficult to rank the options in terms of preference against the historic environment SA theme. All options are predicted to have potential negative effects through directing development to areas in that are sensitive in terms of the historic environment; albeit in different areas of the district. It is considered that as the level of growth increases so does the potential for significant effects. However ultimately, effects will be dependent on the design/ layout of development as well as the implementation of mitigation measures.

The main differences are discussed below:

Summary

Option A focuses the most growth in Selby. This is a sensitive settlement, but most of the site options are on the urban periphery. Whilst negative effects are still possible, they are more likely to be minor in nature. The regeneration of brownfield sites could also lead to some improvements in townscape.

For Tadcaster there are likely to be major positive effects because the proposed approach (Option A) and all other options provide for a heritage-led approach to housing development which should deliver improvements to heritage assets (including many listed buildings and the conservation area) and provide a catalyst for wider regeneration of the historic town such as bringing back into use vacant and derelict properties and sites which currently have a negative impact on the town.

The level of growth at the smaller settlements is also lower under this approach, helping to avoid negative effects there. The other elements of this approach are large scale developments at Eggborough (which ought to be possible without generating significant effects), and at Heronby. Whilst development could affect the character of settlements or listed buildings in the wider vicinity, mitigation ought to be possible and effects minor for Heronby. Overall, **minor negative effects** are predicted for Option A.

Whilst the effects in Selby Town might be less significant for Options B, C, D, I and E, it is perhaps more difficult to avoid the negative effects arising in locations where settlements are small scale and any change might be difficult to accommodate without affecting their character. For this reason, Option C and J record **moderate negative effects** overall as a large amount of growth is directed to the tier 1 and 2 settlements.

Options B and D spread growth to the tier 1 and 2 settlements to a lesser extent, whilst also avoiding large amounts of growth at Selby and Tadcaster. As such, **minor negative effects** are predicted overall.

Option E directs greater levels of growth to Tadcaster and Sherburn in Elmet and involves higher growth overall than A-D. Tadcaster is sensitive to change, whilst the large scale of growth involved at Sherburn in Elmet would be likely to affect the historic setting of several listed buildings, and potentially the nearby Scheduled Ancient Monument. As a result, **moderate negative effects** are predicted overall.

HEALTH

The SEA objective for health⁶ is to; *improve the physical and mental health and wellbeing of Selby residents and reduce health inequalities across the District*. Although deprivation in the District is relatively low, parts of Selby fall into the highest 20% and 10% deprived locations in England. Focusing housing and investment in these locations is therefore likely to have particularly beneficial effects on health. Other beneficial initiatives include; improving access to high quality health facilities, multifunctional green space, sports and recreation facilities.

Selby Town

Generally, the town has low levels of deprivation with small pockets of deprivation in the 10% to 20% most deprived areas in England. The provision of a mix of affordable housing targeted at the more deprived areas is likely to be beneficial. Furthermore, there is an increasingly ageing population in the District therefore the provision of a mix of smaller dwellings and homes adapted for older residents is likely to produce positive outcomes. As the main service centre in the District, the town enjoys comparatively good provision of health facilities including New Selby War Memorial Hospital, numerous pharmacies, GP and dental surgeries.

Therefore, focusing growth in Selby Town is likely to have favourable effects on health as it offers greater scope for the provision of affordable housing and concentrated growth in an area with good existing health infrastructure. It also serves to facilitate investment in new health and community facilities.

Option A proposes 1750 new dwellings within Selby Town. Growth is assumed to be distributed across four residential sites. The substantial scale of the proposed development is likely to help provide a mix of housing types and tenures including affordable housing. The growth proposed is also likely to facilitate investment in existing and new health and recreational community infrastructure. The larger sites such as, at Cross Hills Lane, provide scope for including multifunctional, interconnected green space and active travel infrastructure such as walkways and cycle routes. Therefore, these options are predicted to have **major positive effects** on health.

Options B, C, D and E involve a lower level of growth of 550 units within Selby Town. The sites involved are also predicted to have favourable effects due to proposed development being close to health care provisions and community infrastructure. However, these are likely to have a smaller positive effect due to the lower scale of development proposed which is less likely to produce new infrastructure investment. Therefore, options B, C, D and E are predicted to have **moderate positive effects** on health.

Option I only involves a small amount of additional growth, and therefore **minor positive effects** are predicted.

⁶ AECOM report Selby Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Jan.2020; <https://selby-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/event/35204>

Option J involves 1000 dwellings, which is likely to have benefits beyond those discussed for options B, C, D and E. Therefore, whilst **major positive effects** could arise, this is not with the same certainty as for Option A.

Tadcaster

Tadcaster has the second largest retail and services offering after Selby Town. Therefore, development in Tadcaster is likely to benefit from existing health facilities and services and potentially engender improvements to local healthcare provision. The proposed Community Sports Hub development at the London Road site is also likely to produce favourable effects on health. All options involve at least 400 new homes. Therefore, **moderate positive effects** on health are predicted.

Option E allocates an additional 200 dwellings in the Green Belt. The effects of this additional allocation are discussed below under green belt release.

Sherburn in Elmet

Sherburn in Elmet is one of the main three settlements in the District with third largest centre. This large settlement has a good range of facilities. Six of the options (A, B, C, D, I and J) involve the same level of growth in this location; 300 dwellings most likely to be located on Land adjacent to Prospect Farm, Low Street. Developments are likely to benefit from the healthcare facilities and community infrastructure and potentially lead to improvements in these provisions through additional investment. Therefore, **minor positive effects** are envisaged for these options. Options E allocates an additional 500 dwellings at an area to the south of Sherburn in Elmet, the effects of this are discussed under the green belt release section below.

Settlement Expansion

All options except Option C, involve 945 dwellings at land west of Kellington Lane, Eggborough, in the form of a settlement expansion. The scale of development proposed is likely to include new education infrastructure and multifunctional green space. Eggborough has three GP surgeries serving 12,000 residents. The scale of investment proposed may facilitate expansion of existing services. Therefore, these options are predicted have **moderate positive effects** on health. Some of the full benefits associated with the site may only arise in the longer term once the full settlement is built out with associated infrastructure. Therefore, there is a degree of uncertainty involved as to the timing of effects arising fully within the plan period.

Option C allocates a smaller growth of 400 units utilising a smaller portion of the same site. This level of growth is also likely to support investment in services but unlikely to engender new ones. Therefore, this option is predicted to have **minor positive effects** on health and would be unlikely to lead to benefits in the longer term.

Green Belt Release

Only Option E involves green belt release. Therefore, for the other options (A, B, C, D, and J) **neutral effects** are predicted with respect to transport.

Option E proposes greenbelt release in Sherburn in Elmet (500 units) and Tadcaster (200 units). Both locations potentially benefit from the existing healthcare and social infrastructure at these locations therefore **minor positive effects** are predicted on health.

New Settlement

The scale of growth proposed for the new settlement is likely to eventually provide new social and healthcare infrastructure and services. The scale of site proposed also makes the provision of open and multifunctional green spaces possible. New settlements are likely to provide greater scope for incorporating active travel infrastructure such as walkways and cycle ways, but this is unlikely to benefit existing communities, as the Heronby site is relatively distant in this respect. Therefore Options A, B, C, D, E and I, which propose the new settlement are predicted to have **moderate positive effects** on health.

Tier 1 and 2 Villages

Given the lower levels of services and relative remoteness of some of these locations; existing health and social infrastructure and services are unlikely to be able to serve the additional pressures of growth proposed. Distributing growth across the villages may produce piecemeal improvements in some services but the growth is unlikely to produce the economies of scale required to produce substantial new investment in infrastructure that larger scale developments can engender. In some locations this has the potential to strain existing healthcare provisions.

Option A proposes the lowest growth across Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages. The modest levels of growth may help support existing local health and social services and potentially generate improvements though it is unlikely to engender new services. Therefore, these options are predicted to have **minor positive effects** on health.

All remaining options allocate higher levels of growth to Tier 1 and Tier 2 villages. In particular, options C and J which involve the highest scales of growth could be difficult to support through existing health infrastructure within these villages. In these instances, development is less likely to support such substantial levels of growth; the additional growth could therefore strain local health infrastructure. Pressures on existing green space and amenity are also likely to produce unfavourable effects on health. Therefore, these options are predicted to have **moderate negative effects** on health overall. Options B, D, E and I involve lower levels of growth compared to Options C and J, and therefore only **minor negative effects** are predicted.

Smaller Villages

Only windfall development is proposed for smaller villages and therefore all options are predicted to have the same **neutral effects** on health due to the small scale of development that's likely to result.

	Summary effects matrix: Health
--	--

<i>Options</i>	A	B	C	D	E	I	J
<i>Selby</i>							?
<i>Tadcaster</i>							
<i>Sherburn in Elmet</i>							
<i>Expansion</i>							
<i>New Settlement</i>							
<i>Green Belt</i>							
<i>Villages</i>							
Overall							

Summary: Needs-led growth

Each of the options involves the same level of growth overall, and in this respect, the need for health care across the district is the same. However, some locations for growth are currently better serviced by health care and / or improvements could be achieved through investment. In terms of inequalities, the majority of the District experience low levels of multiple deprivation, with parts of Selby Town falling into the highest 20% and 10% deprived locations in England. A focus on housing in these areas ought to provide benefits in terms of inward investment, improvements to local schools and GP provision and new open space / recreational facilities.

In locations that are well serviced it may also be easier to support walking and cycling, which is good for health.

In this respect, Option A performs most positively, as it involves the most targeted growth at Selby Town. Each of the options also involves growth at Eggborough (to varying extents). The scale of growth involved for options A, B, D, E, I and J ought to help support a new primary school and contributions to healthcare at Eggborough urban extension. This is positive for these options.

For Option C, the scale of growth at Eggborough urban extension might not be sufficient to create economies of scale, and so effects would be less positive, or potentially negative if the pressure on local facilities is overwhelming.

Growth at the tier 1 and 2 villages could lead to mixed effects. On one hand it brings affordable housing and could lead to some improved facilities locally at higher levels of growth. However, the general picture will be one where new development is placed in areas that have poorer access to healthcare and other public services.

In terms of access to green space and recreational opportunities, the majority of development involved under any option would involve land that is currently not in use by the public. Development could therefore perhaps lead to some improvements in access to useable greenspace, particularly on larger strategic developments and new settlements. Where development is piecemeal, and small-scale, it is less likely that strategic improvements would be achieved, but there could be impacts on the amenity value of land that local residents oppose.

Each option involves a new settlement apart from Option J. At the scale involved, the range of facilities could be supported, as well as access to new open space. However, it is unlikely that new healthcare, secondary education would be viable in the Plan period (unless front-loaded).

Overall, Option A is predicted to have **major positive effects**. On one hand it directs growth to areas where investment is most needed to rectify health and deprivation issues. It also ensures that the majority of development has good access to services and offers potential to improve green infrastructure through Selby Town, Eggborough and at Heronby new settlement. Some negative effects are likely to occur as some communities may experience amenity concerns and some development would be in less accessible locations. However, these are not likely to outweigh the overall benefits.

Option C directs much of the growth to tier 1 and 2 settlements, which is positive in terms of inward investment and affordable housing. The scale involved at each settlement would not likely support new facilities. In some instances, growth might be possible to accommodate but in others it would put pressure on existing services. There would also be a wider range of amenity issues experienced across the district by multiple communities. In terms of greenspace, the potential for enhancements at smaller settlements would be higher for this option, and access to the countryside would be good. On the flip side, there would be fewer strategic large-scale developments under this approach. This would mean opportunities for comprehensive new communities would be missed. Therefore, overall, a **minor positive effect** is predicted.

Options B, D, E and I involve considerable dispersal too, and so the effects are similar to Option C. However, the degree of dispersal is lower as both also involve the Eggborough extension. Overall, these are predicted to give rise to **moderate positive effects**.

Option J has similarities to Option A in that it brings potential major positive effects in Selby Town, whilst also having benefits in Tadcaster, Sherburn in Elmet and an expansion of Eggborough. However, the benefits associated with a new settlement at Heronby would be lacking, and the effects in villages would be negative rather than positive. Therefore, overall, only **moderate positive effects** are predicted.

AIR QUALITY

Selby Town is the largest town in the District with a population of approximately 17,299 and is surrounded by a number of satellite villages. It is the main shopping centre and hub for housing, employment and other local facilities, including leisure, education, health, and local government. Selby Council undertook an assessment of nitrogen dioxide concentrations along New Street in March 2015 and subsequently designated an air quality management Area (AQMA) along New Street, in Selby Town Centre, as an AQMA in early 2016.

The Council's Air Quality Annual Status Report 2020⁷ states that monitoring results for 2019 have shown a reduction in Nitrogen dioxide at 77% of the monitoring locations compared with 2018. However, within the AQMA; 73% of monitoring locations showed a reduction in NO₂ concentration (by 4.9%). However, the remaining 27% of locations showed an increase in NO₂ concentration (by 3.8% on average). Furthermore, the levels of NO₂ recorded at some locations exceeded national health standards.

No monitoring of ultra-fine particulate (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) levels is currently undertaken within the District. However, based on data from neighbouring York, the report infers that the objectives for PM₁₀ are currently being met in Selby.

The report also concludes that the current levels of PM_{2.5} within the District are below the EU set annual average concentrations limit of 25µg/m³; again this is based on data from neighbouring York where the concentrations of PM_{2.5} were found to be well below the EU limit (concentrations measured at 3 York sites were 11.1µg/m³, 9.8µg/m³ and 7.6µg/m³).

Air quality impacts are likely to arise during the initial phases of development such as; groundworks, construction/ demolition works. Once new homes are completed, and new residents move in; there will be an associated increase in vehicular traffic both in the vicinity of new developments and throughout the local roads network. This could potentially lead to congestion and build-up of vehicular pollutants such as nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, and particulates. Such impacts are particularly significant in areas where air quality is known to be relatively poor e.g. within or adjacent to the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Furthermore, new development should not be located within poor quality areas or an AQMA if this would expose residents to air pollution.

The majority of the strategic options involve development at similar sites within Selby Town. In the main these sites are in urban or intraurban locations and include Brownfield, or previously developed land (PDL), such as; the former Rigid Paper site, the Industrial Chemicals site and the Olympia Park site. The latter is allocated as an employment site.

⁷ Selby District Council 2020 Air Quality Annual Status Report (June 2020)

Several different levels of growth are tested across the options. Option A involves the highest levels of growth at 1750. The sites involved are;

Cross Hills Lane Selby (SELB-BZ); at 80.4ha this is the largest site for development within Selby Town. The Eastern most point of the site is around 700m (as the crow flies) from the AQMA on New Street and around 1.2 miles by via the road network. The site has the capacity to provide up to 1270 dwellings; this is to comprise mixed development including residential, open space, leisure and education. The scale of development will inevitably lead to increased vehicular traffic and this is likely to impact air quality due to the associated emissions such as nitrogen dioxide and particulates. On the other hand, the size of the site creates opportunities for viable public transport services and active travel infrastructure, such as cycle routes and walkways.

The former Rigid Paper site (SELB-AG), Denison Road, Selby is a 7.5ha site located nearest to the AQMA; at distance of around 507m as the crow flies (figure 2) and around 1.2 miles by road (shortest route). The site is allocated for up to 330 dwellings. The volume of additional traffic created by the new development is likely to be substantial due to the number of proposed dwellings. The additional number of road trips generated would increase traffic in the area and would require effective mitigation measures in order to avoid exacerbating air quality at the New Street AQMA and surrounding areas. On the other hand, the site's proximity to Selby Town Centre and its services, employment and retail offer can potentially help reduce the need to travel by private vehicles to these services, particularly if effective active travel infrastructure is secured (e.g. foot paths and cycle routes) linking the development to the town centre. Furthermore, the size of the site is likely to provide opportunities for sustainable travel infrastructure such as cycle ways and green walkways linking it to the town centre.

The Industrial Chemicals, Canal View site (SELB-B) is a 14.3ha site that could accommodate up to 450 dwellings. This site is 635m (as the crow flies) from the AQMA and 0.6 miles by the by road (via shortest route). The site is bound by the railway on the west and the Canal on the East with Canal View linking it to Bawtry Rd. at the upper most boundary of the site. This site again is close to retail, services and employment centres both within Selby Town Centre and the Three Lakes retail park. This will potentially reduce the number of car journeys required by local residents to access such services.

However, the scale of development proposed will lead to an increase in the number of vehicles on local roads and therefore potentially lead to increased air pollution due to increased vehicular emissions.

The land west of Bondgate (SELB-D) site is a 0.27ha site allocated for up to 9 dwellings. The site is 1,024m (as the crow flies) and 0.7 miles by road from the AQMA. This site is likely to have neutral effects on air quality due to the smaller scale of development proposed and being over 1km away from the AQMA.

The site at Olympia Park is a 60.4ha site allocated to provide 14ha of employment development. The site is around 886m from the AQMA (as the crow flies) and 1.4 miles through shortest road route. The development will comprise class B1, B2 and B8. The site already contains some warehousing and storage operations, the additional development (use class-B8) may lead to an increase in HGV traffic through the local road network. However, SDC's Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) includes several measures that should mitigate for this impact. These include enforcing weight limits on vehicles passing through New Street.

All the sites are all over 500m from the AQMA; the threshold set in the Site Appraisal Framework⁸. However, the combined impacts of development on the sites allocated are likely to have an additive adverse effect on air quality. The scale of proposed growth (1750 units for option A) will lead to an increase in the number of car journeys within Selby Town and the associated emissions will adversely affect air quality, particularly at traffic pinch points. However, all the sites are within short distances from the major service, employment and retail centres which can facilitate less reliance on private vehicles and encourage active modes of travel such as walking and cycling. Furthermore, the scale of development is likely to create opportunities for viable, public transport and active travel (walking and cycle routes) provision. Therefore Option A is predicted to have a **moderately negative effect** on air quality at least in the short to medium term.

Options C and D involve lower levels of growth, within Selby Town, allocating 550 dwellings in total. These options also involve the former Rigid Paper site, the Industrial Chemicals Ltd site, the land west of Bondgate site and the Olympia Park employment site. Options C and D do not utilise the Cross Hills Lane site. The combined impacts of developing these sites would result in increased car journeys with an associated increase in vehicular emissions. On the other hand, placing development in the vicinity of main the main centres of employment, retail, services and social infrastructure (e.g. schools and health facilities) would reduce distance travelled by residents to access such services. It would also encourage the use of public transport and active travel modes such as walking and cycling.

Therefore, Options C and D are predicted to result in a **minor negative effect** on air quality due to the smaller scale of growth proposed.

Options B and E also involve 550 dwellings each. These options utilise the Cross Hills Lane site and Olympia Park site (employment). The Cross Hill Lane site is the largest within Selby Town. It is around 700m (as the crow flies) from the AQMA on New Street and around 1.2 miles by road. As discussed above, this site is to comprise mixed development including residential, open space, leisure and education. Whilst the increased vehicular traffic is likely to impact air quality due to the associated emissions; the provision of services such as education, employment and retail within this site which is likely to reduce the need to undertake car

⁸ AECOM report; Selby Local Plant Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Jan. 2020; <https://selby-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/event/35204>

journeys. The site creates opportunities for viable public transport services and active travel infrastructure, such as cycle routes and walkways. The proposed new distributor road connecting the A63 Leeds Rd., to Cross Hills Lane and Flaxley Rd, is also likely to reduce the development's traffic impacts on the AQMA. However, the combined effects of development here with the employment development at Olympia park are predicted to have **minor negative effects** on air quality, due to the additive effects of the large-scale development at Cross Hill Lane and the commercial/ Industrial development (likely to include warehousing thus HGV traffic generating).

Option involves the lowest amount of growth in selby, and is likely to have **neutral effects** with regards to air quality.

Option J involves substantial growth, but to a lesser magnitude compared to option A, therefore, whilst **moderate negative effects** could arise, there is less certainty.

Tadcaster

Tadcaster is the second largest centre with a population of around 7,854. It has the second largest retail and services offering, after Selby town, with a range of community facilities which also serves the wider rural communities. The brewing industry plays an important role in the local economy. Tadcaster is set in undulating countryside surrounded by the Green Belt. There are no AQMAs within Tadcaster and the town itself lies approximately 11 miles (as the crow flies) from the New Street AQMA in Selby Town.

With the exception of Option E, all remaining options involve the same level of growth in this location of 400 homes split across 6 sites. In addition to these sites, Option E includes a further 200 units in the Green Belt. The sites involved for development are as follows;

- The Mill Lane site (TADC-I) is a 3 ha, mixed brown field / green field, site with a planning application for 248 dwellings. The site lies to the east of the river Wharfe and would form a logical extension to adjacent residential areas. It is close to local services (supermarket, retail, bus station and medical centre) with the main employment, services and leisure facilities located close by at Tadcaster's town centre, just across the river to the west.
- The land at Station Road (TADC-J) is 3.4ha site allocated for up 104 dwellings. This site is close to the main employment, services and retail areas in Tadcaster and well served by public transport.
- The Chapel Street/Central Area Car Park (TADC-H) is a 0.7ha site for up to 43 dwellings. The site is in Tadcaster town centre, the majority of which is a council owned car park. The site, being in the town centre, is within the main retail, employment and service area in Tadcaster, it's also within short distance (320 meters) of the main bus station. There is no

longer an operating railway station in Tadcaster; the nearest railway station is in Ulleskelf, a ten-minute bus journey away.

- The land off Hill Crest Court (TAD-AE) site is 1ha site for up to 30 dwellings. This is a greenfield site within the town's development limits, adjacent to residential areas. Again, being on the outskirts of the town centre, this site is very close to main services, retail and public transport services within Tadcaster.
- Two smaller sites are for residential development are involved; the 1.2ha Fircroft and former Barnardo's Home site at Wighill Lane (TAD-AD) for up to 5 dwellings. The 0.3ha land to the rear of 46 Wighill lane and former Coal Yard for 17 dwellings. Both of these sites are within residential areas and close to local employment and services.

Option E adds additional development in the Green Belt on the edge of the existing settlement. Although development on Green Belt sites is likely to be further away from the main service and retail area at the centre of town, there are locations that are relatively close to existing built up areas and the town centre. There are also employment locations on the edge of the settlement that could be exploited.

There are no AQMAs in Tadcaster and the sites proposed are all within short distance of the Town Centre, employment areas and services which should reduce the need to travel by private vehicle. However, the proposed growth, under all options for Tadcaster, is predicted to have **minor negative effects** on air quality in the short term, as the scale of development proposed will lead to increase traffic and associated increase in GHG emissions.

Sherburn in Elmet

Sherburn in Elmet lies 15km west of Selby town and is the District's third largest centre, with a population of 7,854. The settlement has seen a significant amount of housing and employment development over the last decade including the successful development of the Sherburn in Elmet Enterprise Park.

All options propose at least 300 dwellings in Sherburn in Elmet, located at Land adjacent to Prospect Farm, Low Street. The 17.4ha site lies to the south-east, adjacent to the built-up edge of Sherburn in Elmet. There is a residential area just to the north of the site. The site is well served by local supermarkets, Schools and is 0.7 miles from the town centre. There are two train stations within 0.4miles and 1.3 miles; South Milford and Sherburn in Elmet stations, respectively.

All of the options are predicted to have **minor negative effects** (in the short to medium term) on air quality as there are no AQMAs in the area and the development is well placed for access to local employment, retail and service centres within Sherburn in Elmet. The scale of

development should create opportunities for viable public transport routes; particularly to the two train stations at Sherburn in Elmet and South Milford.

Option E involves additional growth in the green belt (the associated effects are discussed below in the green belt section).

Settlement Expansion

Option C involves 400 units with the remaining options including 945 units at land west of Kellington Lane, Eggborough. The larger site is proposed for mixed use development; (mostly residential) and would likely include integrated cycle paths and footpaths to the adjoining village. A new primary school and new train station gateway at Whitley Bridge, are also planned. Growth here will inevitably lead to increased vehicular traffic and associated emissions. However, this is counteracted to some extent by the location being adjacent to existing residential development, local services, schools and retail. The planned cycle ways and foot paths should also encourage more active travel modes such walking and cycling. The site is located over 1.25 miles from the nearest AQMA at Knottingley and 6.5 miles from the New Street AQMA. Overall the settlement expansion on this site is predicted to have **minor negative effects** on air quality due to the scale of growth proposed and likely increase in GHG emissions. Option C will produce a smaller increase in GHG due to the lower level of growth, however it is also less likely to provide new sustainable travel infrastructure.

Green Belt Release

Only Option E involves green belt release. Therefore, for the other options, neutral

Option E allocates also allocates 500 units in Sherburn in Elmet and 200 units in Tadcaster. The Sherburn in Elmet allocation is predicted to have **minor negative effects** on air quality. It does raise the overall amount of growth in this location, but pressures are unlikely to lead to major air quality issues

Although additional growth in Tadcaster would be further away from the main service and retail area at the centre of town there still ought to be relatively good links to employment and services. Therefore, Option E is predicted to have **minor negative effects** on air quality overall as the increase in traffic will be offset by the proximity to essential services, employment and social infrastructure.

New Settlement

Options A, B, C, D, E and I all propose a growth of 945 units in the plan period (3000 total) based on a new settlement at Heronby. SDC has determined that the site is of sufficient size to accommodate approximately 3,000 new dwellings including new local infrastructure requirements such as new schools, health facilities, recreation areas and shops.

The site comprises greenfield land of around 176 ha. The is adjacent to the A19 which links it to York in the North and Selby in the South. The site is over 5 miles from the New Street AQMA.

The site allows for substantial development, potentially. The development would include new schools, employment opportunities as well as health and retail facilities.

The new settlement is predicted to have unfavourable effects on air quality due to the scale of growth proposed and the likelihood of increased car trips. However, this will be offset to some extent by the onsite services and employment opportunities which should help reduce the need to travel further afield. Option A, B, C, D, E and I which involve the new settlement are predicted to have **minor negative effects** on air quality.

Tier-1 and Tier-2 Villages

These locations are generally remote from employment and service centres and therefore residents here would rely mostly on private cars as they travel further afield to access services and employment. The nearest locations to the AQMA in Selby Town are of Brayton, Barlby and Osgodby, each being around 1.5-1.8 miles away (as the crow flies). Although the locations are relatively far from the AQMA the growth proposed is likely to lead to increased car journeys as residents travel further afield to access employment and services.

Option A involves the lowest levels of growth and is therefore predicted to have **neutral effects** on air quality.

Option C and J (3175 units overall) propose the highest levels of growth and are therefore predicted to have **moderate negative effects** as they would lead to an overall increase in GHG emissions and pollutants due to the increase in car travel (some of which would likely be to the higher order settlements such as Selby Town).

All remaining options involve more modest levels of growth and are therefore predicted to have **minor negative effects** on air quality.

	Summary effects matrix: Air Quality						
Options	A	B	C	D	E	I	J
Selby							?
Tadcaster							
Sherburn in Elmet							
Expansion							
New Settlement							

<i>Green Belt</i>							
<i>Villages</i>							
Overall	?		?				

Summary

Each option is likely to give rise to some negative effects in terms of air quality, either through a concentration of development into areas that contain AQMAs (for example Option A and its focus on Selby Town), or by dispersing growth to locations that are more likely to encourage car use (Option C). Option J involves elements of both these approaches by focusing development in Selby Town and the Tier1 and 2 villages.

Due to the high levels of growth proposed within Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages for Option C and J. These locations are generally remote from employment and service centres and therefore residents here would rely mostly on private cars as they travel further afield to access services and employment. In common with the other options these options also allocate substantial development within Selby Town on sites located within 700m of the AQMA at New Street.

Option A involves the most growth in areas that already suffer from air quality issues, and this creates the potential for further pressures. Whilst the area is generally better served by public transport and services, an increase in car trips is likely on the road networks. This option would draw less traffic from smaller settlements though.

Options B, D, E and I are also likely to generate negative effects in terms of air quality. However, they involve a lower level of growth in Selby compared to Options A and J, and a lower level of dispersal. In this respect, the magnitude of negative effects is considered to be **minor negative effects** rather than **moderate negative effects** for Options A, C and J.

BIODIVERSITY

The District supports a rich and diverse range of species and habitats. Selby has several protective area designations including; 12 site of special scientific interest (SSSI) such as, Skipwith Common, Fairburn Ings (also RSPB reserve) and Sherburn in Elmet Willows SSSI (also a Local Wildlife Site). The majority of the central part of the District lies in a flood plain of the river Ouse and its tributaries. Historically a boggy area, it has since been drained creating rich farmland, but flooding remains an extant risk. In this context there is notable potential for wetland habitats which is reflected by a number of Lowland Fens (a UK BAP priority habitat), such as, at Wharfe Ings, Wharfe's mouth, Mash Hill/ Great Marsh and some Reed Beds at Skipwith Common and Shakleton Spring. Furthermore, human activities have resulted in the creation of wetlands, such as those created through mining subsidence and borrow pits created by flooding of sites where material had been extracted for construction, creating valuable habitats teeming with flora and fauna.

Ramsar sites are wetland sites designated to be of international importance under the Ramsar Convention. There is one such site within the District, namely; the Lower Derwent Valley and Derwent Ings Ramsar to north east at the boundary with East Riding. The seasonally inundated flood plain here represents an important habitat for several species of breeding waders including ducks and swans. The Lower Derwent Valley is also designated a Special Protection Areas (SPA); a designation under the European Union Directive on Wild Birds, part of the Natura 2000 network of nature protection areas. The SPA is of importance for a range of water birds

Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) are protected sites designated under the EC Habitats Directive. There are two Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) within Selby District. The River Derwent / Lower Derwent Valley and Skipwith Common are designated SAC.

Selby

The majority of options would involve development at the same set of sites within Selby Town. In the main these sites are in urban or intraurban and include Brownfield, or previously developed land (PDL), such as; the former Rigid Paper site, the Industrial Chemicals site and the Olympia Park site. The latter is proposed as an employment site. There is one small SSSI; Burr Closes, which lies in the vicinity of one of the development site options proposed north of Selby town. This SSSI comprises 1.3ha of damp alluvial meadowland, agriculturally unimproved and rich in flowering plant species, of a type which is now scarce in the Vale of York⁹. The SSSI site is 860m from the northern tip of the Cross Hills Lane development site involved under options A, B, E, and J. The scale of development here has the potential to adversely impact the SSSI through recreation pressures, noise and light pollution.

⁹ Source: Natural England <https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/PDFsForWeb/Citation/1003159.pdf>

However, the Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) for the SSSI just overlaps with the site at its northern tip, an area of around 2ha (figure 3). The size of the site provides scope for including a green buffer area north of the plot by way of mitigation so that no housing is placed in the area overlapping the IRZ. Therefore, options A, B, E and J are predicted to have **minor adverse effects** on biodiversity due to the scale and proximity of the proposed development and potential impact on the Burr Closes SSSI.

There are no further nationally or internationally designated sites within Selby Town, in the vicinity of the sites involved. However, there are several locally designated Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). The SINC or Local Wildlife Site designation seeks to protect areas rich in wildlife, including ancient woodland and flower-rich grassland. As a result of increasing development pressures, these are often small and fragmented. Of the sites around Selby, the Industrial Chemicals, Canal View site (SELB-B), abuts a SINC at Three Lakes and Oakney Wood. This is an area of around 19ha comprising the Three Lakes area to the north of the site and Oakney Wood to the south. The SINC is adjacent to the Three Lakes retail park to the North, the Selby Canal and the railway line to the West and the A63 and Bawtry Rd., to the East. The lakes are set amongst 9.5ha of deciduous woodland (broadleaved habitat). SINC can help conserve and enhance biodiversity and also contribute towards achieving biodiversity net gains. Although the site is physically separated from the SINC by the canal and mature trees along the western boundary of the site, the substantial development (450 dwellings) could create recreational pressures, noise and light pollution impacts on biodiversity in this SINC. Therefore, all options (with the exception of Option I) are predicted to have **minor negative effects** on biodiversity due to the potential adverse effects on the Burr Closes SSSI and the Three Lakes/ Oakney Wood site.

Tadcaster

There is one SSSI; Tadcaster Mere, an area of 8.7ha notified for its geological, Earth Heritage interest. The Wighill Lane site is the nearest potential development to the SSSI, however, it lies around 980m away and is outside the SSSI's IRZ and therefore residential development is not expected to have adverse effects on the SSSI.

There are no other nationally or internationally designated sites within the town or in the vicinity of development sites allocated under the various options. However, there are a few SINC or local wildlife sites, in Tadcaster. Two of these are closely located to several of the potential sites for growth. The first of these is a 4.2ha area on the west of the River Wharfe, north of Westgate. The site is classed as coastal floodplain grazing marsh habitat.

There are also two strips of deciduous woodland habitats at the top and bottom boundaries of the site. Just across the River Wharfe to the East of this SINC lies the Land at Mill Lane site that is proposed for residential development under all options. The site is approximately 65m across from the SINC and whilst the Wharfe forms a physical barrier between them, development (up to 248 dwellings) on this site could adversely affect biodiversity in the SINC

through recreational pressures, noise and pollution. The Chapel St./ Central Area Car Park site (up to 43 dwellings allocated here) also lies around 200 m away from this SINC and could have similar impacts on the SINC (though to a lesser extent). Development in these locations could potentially lead to **minor negative effects** on biodiversity due to their proximity to the SINC.

The other SINC closely located to development sites, is the 2.65ha area south of Broadfields Farm which comprises some deciduous, broadleaf woodland habitat. This area is just over 130m away from the 'Fircroft' and Former Barnardo's Home, Wighill Lane site. However, development here would involve bringing back existing buildings into use. With mitigation this site is unlikely to have significant effects on the SINC due to the small scale of development (5 dwellings).

Sherburn in Elmet

Six of the options (A, B, C, D, I and J) involve the same level of growth in this location; 300 dwellings located at Land adjacent to Prospect Farm, Low Street. The 17.4ha site lies to the south-east, adjacent to the built-up edge of Sherburn in Elmet. There is a residential area just to the north of the site. There are no designated biodiversity sites or SINC's in the vicinity of the site. However, at the western part of site; around 25% of the area, lies within the impact risk zone for Sherburn in Elmet Willows SSSI. The proximity of this 300-unit development has the potential to adversely affect the SSSI through increases in pollution, and disturbance caused by increased noise and light, as well as recreational pressures. However, there ought to be potential to secure mitigation measures on site. Therefore, options A, B, C, D, I and J are predicted to have **minor negative effects** on biodiversity in the short term.

Settlement Expansion

All options involve 945 dwellings in the form of a settlement expansion in Eggborough at land west of Kellington Lane, Eggborough. The site proposed; land west of Kellington Lane, is a 70.8 ha site.

Option C allocates only 400 units utilising a smaller portion of the same site. There are no local, national or international biodiversity designations in the vicinity of the site. The size of the site provides scope for enhancing biodiversity and creating biodiversity net gains (BNG) on site. For example, this may be facilitated by incorporating wildlife features such as nectar-rich planting, provision of ecological networks, wildlife boxes and newt ponds throughout the development. Development on this site is therefore predicted to have **neutral effects** on biodiversity as the development is less likely to adversely impact biodiversity sites. Similarly, option C, which utilises a smaller portion of the same site, is also predicted to have **neutral effects** on biodiversity for the reasons outlined above.

Green Belt Release

Option E proposes an additional 500 dwellings in Sherburn in Elmet. The site abuts Sherburn in Elmet Willows; a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), along its western boundary. The 4.66ha site is currently in 100% favourable condition and therefore it is particularly important to ensure that development does not lead to any deterioration in current status. Sherburn in Elmet Willows is primarily of interest for its Magnesian limestone grassland which is situated on a south-westerly facing slope¹⁰. The habitats found here include “Calcareous Grassland-Lowland” and “Fen, Marsh and Swamp-Lowland”. The site includes grasses, such as quaking grass and red fescue together with flowering plants, such as purple milk vetch, common spotted orchid and bee orchid. The site is also home to the bugs, such as Mother Shipton’s moth, in addition to a variety of butterflies. Below the grassland, a swamp is dominated by common reed and contains a number of typical reedbed plants.

Together with two pools at the northern end of the site it provides an important habitat for such water birds as mallard, wigeon, teal, water rail, snipe, reed bunting and grasshopper warbler, as well as breeding grounds for reed and sedge warblers.

The remainder of the site largely comprises areas of goat willow and hawthorn scrub and a small piece of woodland containing Ash. The scale and location of the additional 500-unit development proposed under option E can potentially unfavourably affect the Sherburn in Elmet Willows SSSI due to environmental impacts such as recreational pressures, noise and light pollution. Storm water runoff from the development could also negatively impact water quality in the Fen/Swamp areas within the SSSI which can upset the delicate balance (e.g. dissolved oxygen, biological oxygen demand and nutrient cycles) in these valuable habitats. Growth at Tadcaster has the potential to affect biodiversity assets, as there are a range of SINCs surrounding the settlement, and a large area surrounding Tadcaster Mere SSSI whereby development could give rise to negative effects. The effects would depend upon the location of growth, but, a precautionary approach is taken and potential negative effects are predicted.

Therefore, overall, Option E is predicted to have **moderate negative effects** on biodiversity with regards to Green Belt development.

New Settlement

All of the options apart from Option propose a growth of 950 units in the plan period (3000 total) based on a new settlement at Heronby.

The Heronby site, which is to the east of the former Stillingfleet mine (land south of Cawood Rd.) comprises greenfield land of around 176 h. The is adjacent to the A19 which links it to York in the North and Selby in the South. The site allows for substantial development. Just to the north of the site (275m away) there is Moreby Far Wood and Moreby Wood, a SINC comprising 31ha of ancient woodland. There are several SSSIs within a radius of 6.5km around

¹⁰ Source: Natural England;
<https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/sitedetail.aspx?SiteCode=S1003201&SiteName=&countyCode=&responsiblePerson=&unitId=&SeaArea=&IFCAAarea=>

the site. The nearest is Acaster South Ings SSSI along the River Ouse; around 1.7km north of the proposed development site. The 40ha SSSI site consists of two flood meadows adjacent to the River Ouse. These grasslands represent an increasingly rare habitat type which is threatened nationally as a result of drainage and agricultural improvement and are of particular importance for their neutral grassland flora¹¹. South Ings provides one of the few suitable breeding areas for waders in the Ouse valley, south of York, and is used regularly by curlew. The condition of the site is classed as 100% 'unfavourable recovering'. Therefore, it is particularly important to ensure that the site does not suffer adverse impacts from development. Nature conservation here is dependent on the continuation of traditional management for hay cropping followed by aftermath grazing⁴. The aftermath is then grazed in late summer/autumn. However, the development is 1.7km away from the SSSI and it is outside the SSSI's Impact Risk Zones (IRZ)¹². Nonetheless, the scale of development will produce an increase in traffic with associated increases in particulate and nitrogen dioxide emissions. The scale of urbanisation may also impact the tradition of grazing stock in the SSSI, a process vital for its conservation. Other effects such as noise, light and storm water pollution and recreational pressures could also adversely affect the SSSI.

Overall, a **minor negative effect** is predicted. Whilst there is a possibility of negative effects arising, the site is relatively distant from SSSIs, and the scale of development ought to allow for mitigation and enhancement measures to be implemented.

Tier-1 and Tier-2 Villages

Within Tier-1 villages; the proposed growth is spread across Barlby and Osgodby, Brayton, Eggborough and Whitley, Hemingbrough, Riccall and Thorpe Willoughby. The nearest designated biodiversity site is Skipwith Common SSSI which is around 2km-3.2 km from the sites within Riccall and Barlby and Osgodby. However, these are outside the IRZ for Skipwith Common SSSI and therefore are unlikely to have a significant effect on this SSSI. There are no nationally or internationally designated sites in the vicinity of Brayton, and Thorpe Willoughby.

The River Derwent and Brighton Meadows SSSIs are within 1.2km and 2.6km, respectively, from the sites allocated in Hemingbrough. All of the proposed development sites fall within the River Derwent IRZ (for residential development of 50 units and over). The River Derwent SSSI contains five main habitats; broadleaved mixed and yew woodland-lowland, fen marsh and swamp-lowland, rivers and streams and standing open water and canals. The majority of the SSSI (94%) is classed as 'unfavourable recovering', 5.5% is classed as 'favourable'. This lowland section of the river, stretching from Ryemouth to the confluence with the Ouse, supports diverse communities of aquatic flora and fauna, many elements of which are nationally significant¹³. The SSSI is exceptionally rich with invertebrates and noted for its

¹¹ Source: Natural England; <https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/PDFsForWeb/Citation/1004526.pdf>

¹² For Residential Developments larger than 100 units

¹³ Source: Natural England <https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/PDFsForWeb/Citation/1003398.pdf>

diversity of fish species. The river also supports breeding birds including common sandpiper, dipper, kingfisher, and yellow and grey wagtails. The Derwent is also one of the few rivers in lowland Britain which still supports a breeding population of otters.

Stretches of the river are also included within the Brighton Meadows SSSI. The latter comprises Neutral Grassland-Lowland habitat notified for its nationally and internationally important alluvial flood meadow plant community and its outstanding assemblage of breeding birds associated with lowland damp grasslands¹⁴. It is an important habitat for a range of wetland bird species, such as snipe, lapwing, redshank and curlew.

The development sites proposed in Hemingbrough are within the Brighton Meadows SSSI IRZ (for residential developments of 50 unit and over). The scale proposed under the different option ranges from 135 units in options A and H to 350 in option F.

Development allocated in Tier-2 villages is spread across; Appleton Roebuck, Carlton, Camblesforth, Cliffe, Hambleton, Hensall, Kellington, Monk Fryston/Hillam, North Duffield and Ulleskelf.

The Eskamhorn Meadows SSSIs are in the vicinity of the development sites allocated in Carlton and Camblesforth. Eskamhorn Meadows SSSI is a nationally important site comprising species-rich neutral grassland. The Impact Risk Zones (IRZ) for developments of 100 units or more overlaps with the sites allocated under options B (allocates 120 units) and options F (160 units).

The allocations in North Duffield lie between two SSSIs; Skipwith Common, 1.2km to the west and Derwent Ings, 560m to the East. The development sites proposed fall outside of the IRZ for Skipwith Common. However, the two sites proposed (all options) are within the Derwent Ings SSSI IRZ (for residential development of 10 or more units). Derwent Ings; form a series of alluvial flood meadows, fen and swamp communities and freshwater habitats along the River Derwent. They represent one of the most important examples of agriculturally unimproved species-rich alluvial flood meadow habitat remaining in the UK¹⁵. Derwent Ings is also designated as a Wetland of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention and as a Special Protection Area (SPA) under the terms of the European Community Directive 79/409/EEC. Therefore, these grasslands form part of an internationally threatened resource. The site is an important habitat for a wide range of wetland bird species including; shoveler, shelduck, mallard, teal, pintail, gadwall, garganey, snipe, lapwing, redshank and curlew.

Development within North Duffield is likely to affect the Derwent Ings SSSI through increases in noise and light levels, recreational pressures, domestic animals and also water pollution

¹⁴ Source: Natural England <https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/PDFsForWeb/Citation/1002003.pdf>

¹⁵ Source: Natural England; <https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/PDFsForWeb/Citation/1002114.pdf>

through surface runoff and potentially treated wastewater discharge. These factors can potentially upset the delicate ecosystems within SSSI.

The Tier-2 village of Ulleskelf lies between two SSSIs; Kirkby Wharfe and Bolton Percy Ings (figure 4). The Kirkby Wharfe SSSI comprises two important habitats; Broadleaved, mixed and Yew Woodland and Neutral Grassland (lowland). The area comprises floodland in the valley of Dorts Dike, a tributary of the Wharfe. Low-lying land adjacent to the dyke supports a rich marshland flora, and at the higher margins there is drier neutral grassland. The marshland communities are dominated either by sedges and rushes. The osier bed has a rich ground flora and the site is one of a very few remaining sedge and rush dominated marshland communities in the Vale of York¹⁶.

The Bolton Percy Ings SSSI comprises two unimproved alluvial flood meadows adjacent to the River Wharfe in the Vale of York. These are important for their neutral grassland plant community which is an increasingly rare habitat, threatened nationally as a result of drainage and agricultural improvement¹⁷. The nature conservation interest is dependent upon the maintenance of a high water table and on management by mowing for hay followed by aftermath grazing.

In view of the rich biodiversity found in and around these villages, all options could have unfavourable effects on biodiversity in these locations. Option A which allocates the lowest growth here is predicted to have **minor negative effects**. Options C and J propose the highest levels of growth and are therefore more likely to have **major negative effects** on biodiversity. The remaining options propose intermediate levels of growth and therefore likely to have **moderately negative effects** on biodiversity.

	Summary effects matrix: Biodiversity						
Options	A	B	C	D	E	I	J
Selby	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Blue	Yellow
Tadcaster	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Sherburn in Elmet	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Expansion	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue
New Settlement	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Blue
Green Belt	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Brown	Blue	Blue
Villages	Yellow	Brown	Red	Brown	Brown	Brown	Red

¹⁶ Source: Natural England; <https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/PDFsForWeb/Citation/1000661.pdf>

¹⁷ Source: Natural England; <https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/PDFsForWeb/Citation/1006037.pdf>

Overall							
----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Summary

Where the level of growth and similar site options are involved between the different options, the effects in terms of biodiversity are more or less the same. This also applies to the new settlement element of each option (apart from option J).

The main differences between the options are as follows:

Option A focuses more growth to Selby, and less to the tier 1 and 2 settlements. This reduces pressure on biodiversity in the countryside and means that more sensitive locations can be avoided. Growth in Selby Town under Option A is higher compared to the other options, but would not be likely to lead to significantly different effects compared to the other options that involve lower growth. Therefore, overall only **minor negative effects** are recorded overall.

Option C involves less growth in Selby and Eggborough and more at the Tier 1 and 2 villages. Though most of the smaller settlements are not sensitive to small scale developments, there is less scope for strategic enhancements (in these locations) and at specific villages there are notable constraints. This creates a more negative picture overall; so **moderate negative effects** are predicted.

Option E involves higher levels of growth in Sherburn in Elmet, which could potentially have negative effects on a SSSI. It also still involves growth in some of the smaller villages that could be affected by biodiversity constraints. As such **moderate negative effects** are predicted overall.

Whilst Option J avoids negative effects at a new settlement, it is more likely to have major negative effects in the Tier 1 and Tier 2 villages, which is considered to be a **moderate negative effect** overall.

Options B, D and I are less likely to give rise to issues in Sherburn in Elmet and give more flexibility in the tier 1 and 2 areas compared to options C and J, and hence the effects are also **minor negatives** overall.

NB: It is important to acknowledge, that although negative effects are predicted for all of the options, this is a precautionary approach, which focuses on avoidance of biodiversity loss and pressures on existing important sites.

In practice, there will be a legal requirement to achieve net gain of 10% biodiversity for all developments. Therefore, development ought to lead to an overall positive effect in the long term, regardless of distribution and overall growth.

Where the benefits occur, and the extent of enhancements would be dependent upon successful identification of land to accommodate enhancements. Local Nature Recovery Strategies will be extremely important in this respect. However, the location and type of new development can facilitate nature recovery strategies. In particular, large new settlements and urban expansions ought to have good potential to secure improvements on site. If

habitat banks are established in the district, smaller schemes can also make a contribution in this respect. The overall effects in the long term are predicted to be positive provided that the Plan Policies are proactive, and the planning system is linked to wider measures for nature recovery and the enhancement of ecosystem services across Selby.

Whilst net gain is extremely important, it is still important to avoid negative effects on existing habitats and ecological networks. The negative effects are therefore identified in this context at this stage of SA.

LAND AND SOILS

Selby Town

Each of the options involve development (to varying extents) on a set of sites at Selby Town. In the main these sites are in areas comprised of urban or non-agricultural land. These include Brownfield, or previously developed land (PDL), such as; the former Rigid Paper site, the Industrial Chemicals site and the Olympia Park site. The latter is proposed as an employment site. These constitute efficient uses of land and will reduce the pressure on greenfield land as a result, which is a positive effect.

Option A involves 1750 dwellings. As discussed above, the majority of sites allocated to development are within urban, non-agricultural land with the exception of the Cross Hills Lane site which comprises around 75ha of Grade 2 BVM agricultural land (PALC data).

Partial, Post 1988 survey data is available which that shows at least 15 ha of the site area is classed as Grade 3a and around 5 ha as Grade 2 and 6 ha as Grade 1, BVM agricultural land. Therefore, this option will lead to the loss of some high quality, best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a) and consequently predicted to have a **moderate negative effect** on land and soils (factoring in the positive effects which offset this to an extent by promoting previously developed land).

Options C and D involve lower levels of growth within Selby Town, allocating 550 dwellings in total. Development centres around the brownfield sites mentioned above thus development will be located on non-agricultural land. These options do not utilise the Cross Hills Lane site. However, there are segments of high quality agricultural land (BVM) around the Olympia Park brownfield site (allocated to Employment) which results in the loss of around 5ha grade 1, 5ha Grade 2, and 14ha of Grade 3a BVM, agricultural land. Therefore, options C and D are predicted to have a **neutral effect** on land and soils overall. Whilst they will result in result in the loss of some high quality BVM agricultural land, it is not a substantial amount, and there are positives associated with brownfield land development.

Options B and E involve 550 dwellings each. Both options presume the use of the Cross Hills Lane site, which is located on non-urban, agricultural land and will therefore lead to some loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. Around 5ha Grade 1, 41ha Grade 2 and 29ha Grade 3a, BVM agricultural land would be lost to development. Therefore, options B and E are predicted to have a **moderate negative effect** on land and soils due to the amount of agricultural land lost to development.

Option I would involve lower growth in Selby, presumably on sites that are not at risk of flooding. The sites would therefore be outside of the Selby urban area on greenfield land that could be best and most versatile agricultural land. This constitutes **minor negative effects**.

Option J would involve 1000 dwellings, presumably on brownfield sites in the first instance, but also with a requirement for some greenfield release. The extent of land affected would be lower compared to option A and thus only **minor negative effects** are predicted when also taking into account the benefits of brownfield regeneration.

Tadcaster

With the exception of option E, all options involve the same level of growth in this location (400 homes), and thus the effects are the same.

There is no post 1988 survey data for the majority of the area, however, the provisional Agricultural Land Classification data (PALC) shows that for all options excluding E, around 1.2 ha. of Grade 3 and 3 ha. of Grade 2 BVM agricultural land will be lost to development. The remaining area is mainly urban, non-agricultural, land. Therefore, these options are predicted to have a **minor negative effect** on land and soils as they would lead to small amount of BVM agricultural land being lost to development.

Option E allocates 200 additional units in the green belt; the effects are discussed under the green belt release section below.

Sherburn in Elmet

Sherburn in Elmet lies 15km west of Selby town and is the District's third largest centre, with a population of 7,854. The settlement has seen a significant amount of housing and employment development over the last decade including the successful development of the Sherburn in Elmet Enterprise Park.

All of the options are presumed to involve 300 dwellings located at Land adjacent to Prospect Farm, Low Street. This location comprises mainly Grade 3a (12ha.) and some Grade 2 (1.75 ha.) agricultural land, the rest being Grade 3b. Therefore, development here will have a **minor negative effect** on land and soils due to the loss of agricultural land.

Option E allocates an additional 500 dwellings in the Green Belt south of Sherburn in Elmet . The effects of this is discussed under the green belt release section below.

Settlement Expansion

All options except C allocate 945 units in Eggborough in the form of a settlement expansion. Option C involves 400 units utilising a smaller portion of the same site. The larger site area comprises around 10ha. of Grade 2 agricultural land (BMV) with the rest of the area classed as Grade 3 (PALC data). Whilst no Post 1988 survey data is available; some of this land is likely to be Grade 3a. Development here would therefore lead to **minor negative effects** on land and soils due to the loss, of some Grade 2 and Grade 3 (a/b) agricultural land to development.

Option C involves the lowest level of growth of 400 units. This option utilises a smaller portion of the site used for the other options. Whilst the allocation can potentially lead to some loss

Grade 3a BVM land there is scope to minimise loss due to the smaller allocations in this large site (which would also not extend beyond the plan period as per the expansion options). Therefore, **neutral effects** on land and soils are predicted.

Green Belt Release

Only option E involves green belt release. Therefore, for the other options, **neutral effects** are predicted with regards to land and soils.

Option E includes 500 units at Sherburn in Elmet and a further 200 units in Tadcaster. This could involve the loss of agricultural land in Tadcaster, but it is unclear without knowing the sites involved. Therefore, this option is predicted to have a **minor negative effect** on land and soils as it could result in a relatively small loss of high quality (Grade 2) agricultural land at Tadcaster and the loss of some Grade 3 (potentially including Grade 3a) land at Sherburn in Elmet

New Settlements

Options A, B, C, D, E and I all propose a growth of 945 units in plan period (3000 total) based on a new settlement at Heronby. The site is greenfield, to the east of the former Stillingfleet mine (land south of Cawood Rd.). The site comprises greenfield land of around 178 ha including around 83 ha of Grade 2 agricultural land (PALC data). Therefore, locating the new settlement here is likely to have an adverse effect as development would definitely lead to the loss of a large amount of agricultural land within and beyond the plan period. It would be difficult to avoid Grade 2 areas completely, given the eventual scale of the settlement. Therefore, **major negative effects** are predicted for each option.

Tier 1 and 2 Villages

Option A involves 1500 new homes across Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages. Outside built-up areas, Brayton is surrounded by Grade 2/ Grade 3 (potentially some 3a) BVM land. Potential sites (around 22 ha total) lie within Grade 3 land, there is no post 1988 survey data for this location but it's likely to be a mix of Grade 3a and 3b land, therefore development here could potentially result in loss of some high quality agricultural land (3a BVM).

Thorpe Willoughby has a mixture of Grade 3 (a and b) Grade 2 and Grade 4 agricultural land, the largest parcel (Land south of Leeds Rd.) is Grade 3a and development here would lead to a loss of around 5 ha. of Grade 3a BVM agricultural land.

Development in Riccall could lead to a loss of around 9 ha. of high quality Grade 2 agricultural land.

Barlby and Osgodby are surrounded by Grade 2 and Grade 3 (a and b) agricultural land (Provisional ACL data). Approximately 5 ha. of Grade 2 agricultural land could be affected though.

The sites around Hemingbrough involve Grade 1 (2.85 ha) and Grade 2 agricultural land (around 1 ha).

Sites within Tier-2 villages would be distributed across Appleton Roebuck, Camblesforth, Carlton, Cliffe, Hambleton, Hensall, Kellington, Monk Fryston / Hillam, North Duffield and Ulleskelf. The allocations here will lead to some loss of Grade 2 and Grade 3 (a and b) agricultural land. In total Tier-2 allocation could lead to around 50 ha of Grade 3 land (potentially including some Grade 3a) and 26 ha of Grade 2 BVM agricultural land being lost.

Overall, **major negative effects** on land and soils due to the loss to development of some high-quality agricultural land; including around 41 ha. of Grade 2 BVM agricultural land.

Options B, D, E and I allocate a similar amount of new homes in Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages; between 2100 to 2550 units. These allocations will have similar (but magnified) effects to those in option A discussed above and would lead to a **major negative effect** on land and soils due to the loss of high-quality agricultural land.

Options C and J propose higher levels of growth in Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages; which magnifies the negative effects discussed above further. These options will result in the development of around 170 ha of greenfield land including at least 13 ha of Grade 3a, 34 ha Grade 2 and 3 ha Grade 1 BVM agricultural land. Therefore, this option will have a **major negative effect** on land and soils.

Smaller Villages

Only windfall development is proposed for smaller villages and therefore all options are predicted to have the same **neutral effects** on land and soils due to the small scale of development that's likely to result.

	Summary effects matrix: Land and Soils						
Options	A	B	C	D	E	I	J
Selby	Orange	Orange	Blue	Blue	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
Tadcaster	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Sherburn in Elmet	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Expansion	Yellow	Yellow	Blue	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
New Settlement(s)	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Blue

<i>Green Belt</i>							
<i>Villages</i>							
Overall							

Summary

All of the options will involve a significant loss of non-urban land, and much of this is also best and most versatile agricultural land (over 150ha in total for each option). In this respect, **major negative effects** are predicted for all of the options.

There is little to differentiate the options in this respect, but Option J involves the lowest amount of Grade 1 and 2 land overall at this scale of growth given that it avoids negative effects associated with a new settlement.

CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION

Selby Town

In terms of climate change adaptation, much of the central area in Selby District is vulnerable to flooding due to the low lying topography and extensive surrounding network of broad, tidal rivers. The river channels of the Ouse and its tributaries (the Wharfe, Derwent and Aire) are lined with alluvial deposits, controlled by engineered embankments throughout the district. Much of the low-lying areas fall within Flood Zone 3 and Flood Zone 2. However, the area benefits from extensive flood defences which reduce the risk of flooding from the river Ouse. There are areas within lower flood risk zones in Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster. However, surface water flooding can occur almost anywhere whenever short intense rainfall exceeds the capacity of the ground and the local drainage network to absorb it. This type of flooding is often localised and difficult to predict in advance. It can occur well away from existing watercourses and it can be exacerbated by local topography and impermeable ground. The main sources of flood risk are from rivers, tidal influence, surface water drainage and sewer flooding.

The options for growth within Selby Town involve a combination of development sites; a large greenfield site at Cross Hills Lane, the former Rigid Paper site, the Industrial Chemical site, land west of Bondgate, and the Olympia Park employment site.

The Cross Hills Lane Selby (SELB-BZ) is an 80.4ha site to the north west of Selby town. This is the largest site allocated for development here. The site is partially within a floodplain of the Selby Dam watercourse. The majority of site (around 80%) is at risk from flooding during the 1 in 100 year (high risk, Flood Zone 3). The remaining 20% of site is at risk from flooding 1 in 1000 year (medium risk Flood Zone 2). Therefore, a phased sequential approach should be adopted for this site; allocating 'more vulnerable' residential development within lower flood risk areas. 'less vulnerable' commercial/industrial development should alternatively be located within the higher flood risk areas (Flood Zones 3). The scale of this site provides scope for onsite mitigation measures such as sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), surface water attenuation ponds, blue corridors, and green spaces can help reduce flood risk.

The former Rigid Paper site (SELB-AG), Denison Road, Selby is a 7.5ha site proposed for mixed use (primarily residential). The entire site lies within a flood risk zone 3 and would require a flood risk assessment, in accordance with the requirements set out in the Council's level 2 SFRA. Again, mitigation measures such as SuDS can reduce risk. However, as the entire site lies within a flood risk zone 3 it is predicted to have a negative effect on climate change adaptation.

The Industrial Chemicals, Canal View site (SELB-B) is a 14.3ha site for up to 450 units. The majority of this site is in flood zone 3 with around 18% of site in Zone 1. However, unlike the

Cross Hills site there is less scope for onsite mitigation due to the smaller area. Therefore, this site is predicted to have a negative effect on climate change adaptation.

The land west of Bondgate (SELB-D) site is a 0.27ha site proposed for up to 9 dwellings. The site is partially (around 35% of site) in a flood zone 3 with the rest in a zone 1. With mitigation this site is predicted to have neutral effects on climate change adaptation as a substantial part of the site is in lower flood Zone 1.

The site at Olympia Park is a 33.6ha site allocated to provide 14ha of employment development. The site is located to the north east of Selby town, entirely within the floodplain of the River Ouse. The whole site lies in a flood risk zone 3, however the size of the site provides scope for incorporating flood risk mitigation measures and SuDS. Furthermore, Commercial / employment developments are considered less vulnerable to flood risk compared to residential development.

Option A involves the highest level of growth at 1750 dwellings. This involves residential growth to the sites discussed above plus an employment site at Olympia Park. Overall 76% of the total area allocated for residential development is within flood risk Zone 3, 20% in Zone 2 and the remaining 4% in Zone 1. However, the largest residential (mixed use but mostly residential) site; at Cross Hills Lane, has scope for onsite mitigation due to its substantial size. Overall this option is predicted to have **moderate negative effects** on climate change adaptation with regards to flooding.

Options C and D involve lower levels of growth within Selby Town with growth focused around the Industrial Chemicals and Rigid Paper sites. The majority of the area of these two sites is in flood Zone 3 (87% of total area). Therefore, these options have limited areas of land that are not in Zone 3. Overall options C and D are therefore predicted to have **moderate negative effects** on climate change adaptation too.

Options B and E involve 550 dwellings each. Both options utilise the Cross Hills Lane site for housing Olympia Park for employment. The former site provides better scope for mitigation due to its size. Therefore, these options are predicted to have **minor negative effects** on climate change adaptation with regards to flooding.

Option I involves limited growth in Selby Town, and there is a presumption that this would be on land that is sequentially acceptable in terms of flood risk (given that this is a key element of this option). Therefore, **neutral effects** are predicted.

Whilst Option J involves a lower level of growth than Option A, it would require similar sites to be utilised that are at risk of flooding. Therefore, **moderate negative effects** are predicted.

Tadcaster

With the exception of Option E, all remaining options involve the same level of growth in this location (400 homes), and thus the effects are the same. Of the sites involved under these

options; the land at Mill Lane site (TADC-I) is partially in flood zone 3 (45% of site). This affects the western most part of the site where it abuts the River Wharfe. However, the remaining area of site (55%) is in a low risk, flood Zone 1. The remaining sites involved under these options are at low risk of flooding, being in a Zone 1 area. Therefore, with appropriate mitigation at the Mill Lane site, these options are predicted to have **minor negative effects** on climate change with regards to flooding.

Option E allocates an additional 200 homes in the Green Belt, the effects are discussed below in the Green Belt section.

Sherburn in Elmet

With the exception of Option E, all other options involve the same level of growth in this location; 300 dwellings located at Land adjacent to Prospect Farm, Low Street. The majority of this site is not in a flood risk zone. A small area at the eastern edge site is in a flood zone 3, this covers an area of around 2.4ha or around 7% of the site. Therefore the options are predicted to have a **neutral effect** on climate change adaptation as the majority of the area allocated to development is at low risk of flooding.

Option E involves an additional 500 dwellings at an area to the south of Sherburn in Elmet . The effects of these are discussed below under green belt release.

Settlement Expansion

All options except C involve 945 dwellings at land west of Kellington Lane, Eggborough. Option C allocates a smaller growth of 400 units utilising a smaller portion of the same site. Only a small part of this site lies within a flood zone 2, an area of 3.7ha along the southern boundary of the site. The remaining area is at low risk of flooding and there is no overlap with flood zone 3. Therefore, all options are expected to have **neutral effects** on climate change adaptation as the majority of the site proposed for development is in a low flood risk area. The scale of the site should also allow for good opportunities to incorporate blue and green infrastructure enhancements.

Green Belt Release

Only option E involves green belt release. Therefore, for the other options **neutral effects** are predicted with regards to climate change adaptation.

Option E proposes Green Belt release in Sherburn in Elmet (500 units) and Tadcaster (200 units). The Sherburn in Elmet Green Belt release comprises a 60ha site south of Sherburn in Elmet . The majority of this site is at low risk of flooding (Zone 1) with less than 3% of site being in flood zone 3 area. Option E also involves an additional 200 homes in the Green Belt at Tadcaster. Some areas are not at risk of flooding, whilst others have greater constraint. Therefore potential / uncertain **minor negative effects** are predicted at this stage.

New Settlement

All options with the exception of Option J involve growth of 945 units in the plan period (3000 total) based on a new settlement at Heronby.

The site to the east of the former Stillingfleet mine (land south of Cawood Rd.) comprises greenfield land of around 178 ha, the majority of site is in a low flood risk area with around 10.8ha (around 6% of area) is in a Zone 2 flood risk area. The site does not overlap any zone 3 areas. Therefore, the Stillingfleet site is predicted to have **neutral effects** on climate change adaptation as the majority of site is in a low flood risk area. There is also likely to be good opportunities to incorporate blue and green infrastructure enhancements due to the scale of the site.

Tier 1 and 2 Villages

Option A proposes a total of around 1510 new homes; involving 810 units across Tier-1. Amongst the Tier-1 villages; the sites in Barlby and Osgodby are in a low risk area with none of the sites overlapping flood zone 2 or 3. In Brayton one of the sites; 'land south of Brackenhill' overlaps with a flood zone 2 area (around two thirds of site). However, the second site in Brayton is in a low flood risk area (Zone 1). The sites at Eggborough and Whitley, Thorpe Willoughby and Hemingbrough do not overlap flood zone 2 or 3 areas. The site at Riccall partially overlaps a zone 2 /3 area (around 16% of total site area).

Within Tier-2 villages the sites involved at Appleton Roebuck, Camblesforth, Carlton, Cliffe, Hambleton, Kellington, Monk Fryston / Hillam, Hensall, North Duffield and Ulleskelf do not overlap any areas of fluvial flood risk (Zones 2 or 3).

Overall option A is predicted to have **minor negative effects** on climate change adaptation as all but one site are in areas at low risk of flooding (Zone 1). However, one of the sites in Brayton (Land south Brackenhill Lane) partially overlaps (65%) a flood zone 2 area.

Options E, D and I allocate a similar amount of new homes in Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages; between 2100 - 2250 units.

Amongst the Tier-1 villages; one of the sites involved in Brayton; land south of Brackenhill Lane, overlaps with a flood zone 2 area (35% of site area). However, the second site in Brayton is in a low flood risk area (Zone 1). In Hemingbrough, two of the sites (north of A63) overlap (42% and 10% of total site areas) a flood zone 2. However, the remaining three sites in Hemingbrough are in a low flood risk area (Zone 1).

The sites for development at Eggborough and Whitley and Thorp Willoughby do not overlap flood zone 2 or 3 areas. The site at Riccall partially overlaps a zone 2 /3 area (around 16% of total site area). The remaining site options in Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages do not overlap flood risk zones 2 and 3. Overall, Options D, E and I are predicted to have **minor negative effects** on

climate change adaptation due to some of the sites involved overlapping areas of flood zone 2 and 3.

Option B involves slightly higher growth in the Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages. One of the sites in Barlby and Osgodby; at land south of A63, overlaps a Zone 3 area by around 67%. However, this site comprises a substantial area (40ha) and only contributes an additional 90 dwellings. The northern part of the site comprises a 13.4 ha area of low flood risk (Zone 1). Therefore, it should be possible to accommodate the proposed development in the northern part of the site well away from the Zone 3 overlap area of site. In Brayton; the site; land south of Brackenhill Lane, overlaps with a flood zone 2 area (35% of site area). However, the remaining sites in Brayton are in a low flood risk area (Zone 1). As under the other options, the Riccall development site partially overlaps a zone 2 /3 area (around 16% of total site area). In Hemingbrough, two of the sites (north of A63) overlap (42% and 10% of total site areas) a flood zone 2 area. However, the remaining three sites in Hemingbrough are in a low flood risk area (Zone 1). The sites in Tier-2 villages do not overlap high flood risk areas (Zones 2 and 3). Overall **minor negative effects** are predicted on climate change adaptation due to some of the sites overlapping areas of flood zone 2 and 3.

Options C and J propose a total of around 3150 new homes; 1625 units in Tier-1 villages and 1525 units in Tier-2 villages. The Barlby and Osgodby site discussed above; land south of A63, overlaps a Zone 3 area by around 67%. However, it should be possible to accommodate the additional 140 dwellings (compared to the lower amounts of growth in options A and H) within the 13.4 ha, Zone 1 area of the site. Similarly, the sites within Brayton (land south of Brackenhill Lane) and Riccall and Hemingbrough, partially overlap flood Zones 2 and 3. In Tier-2 villages the development sites in Hensall, land south of Wand Lane and south of Field Lane, partially overlap a flood zone 2 and Zone 3 areas. Overall the sites involved under options C and J are also predicted to have **minor negative effects** on climate change adaptation due to some of the allocated sites overlapping areas of flood zone 2 and 3.

Smaller Villages

Only windfall development is proposed for smaller villages and therefore all options are predicted to have the same **neutral effects** on climate change adaptation due to the small scale of development that’s likely to result.

	Summary effects matrix: Climate Change Adaptation						
Options	A	B	C	D	E	I	J
Selby	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Blue	Orange
Tadcaster	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Sherburn in Elmet	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue

<i>Expansion</i>							
<i>New Settlement(s)</i>							
<i>Green Belt</i>					?		
<i>Villages</i>							
Overall						?	

Summary

Selby is characterised by large areas of floodplain, and as such many of the key settlements have experienced flooding issues. However, there are a range of areas that benefit from flood defences, which reduce the risks somewhat. In the longer term, with increased risks posed by climate change, it is important to manage flood risk and avoid areas that fall within vulnerable locations. If food defences become overwhelmed, then these areas would undoubtedly be affected.

All the options involve growth in Selby Town, with a range of sites involved. For Option A, growth is maximised, and as such several sites that fall within areas of flood risk are included. Though flood defences protect these areas, this is still a negative effect. For options B-E the growth in Selby is lower, and for options B and E, this means that negative effects ought to be of a lower magnitude or easier to mitigate. For C, D and J however, the same areas as those included in option A are involved. Option I would avoid all impacts in Selby Town.

The options are all likely to score similarly in terms of growth in Tadcaster, with some minor negative effects for all options. The expansion of Eggborough is unlikely to cause particular issues, and though there is some flooding risk at certain Tier 1 and 2 villages, there are locations where growth can be accommodated for all of the options.

As a result, each of the options are predicted to have **minor negative effects** overall. The best performing option is Option I, as it directs growth away from flood risk areas in Selby Town, and to areas where growth can be accommodated without being at significant risk of flooding. Therefore, there is a degree of uncertainty whether the effects would indeed be negative for this option (i.e. they are more likely to be neutral overall compared to the other options). Options B and E perform better than A, C and D as the amount of new development proposed in flood zones 2/3 is slightly lower overall (mostly due to growth in Selby Town).

In terms of new settlements, the Heronby site is considered to be of low sensitivity, and so neutral effects are likely for all options in this respect.

HOUSING

The objective for the housing topic in the SEA framework is; to ensure that new development meets the varied housing needs of the area and provides affordable, decent housing for all¹⁸.

Proposals that support the timely delivery of sufficient homes of varied types and tenures and maximise the potential from strategic brownfield opportunities are judged positively.

Similarly, proposals that support managed expansion of rural communities are likely to be positive if this helps to improve the sustainability of those settlements.

Whilst large schemes are often considered as a solution to the housing shortage, small sites can cumulatively make a significant contribution to supply and offer a flexibility that larger sites cannot. The location of new housing developments is also an important consideration; providing housing in the right areas where there are more prospects for employment for example will make proposals more sustainable.

Selby Town

The Cross Hills Lane Selby (SELB-BZ) is the largest site for residential development in Selby town. It has a capacity to deliver up to 1270 dwellings including provision of affordable homes. The site would also include open space, leisure and education provision. It is closely located to the strategic employment area at Olympia Park and employment opportunities, services and retail within Selby's Town centre. The site is well served by highways network such as the A19, A63, A1 and M62.

Overall development of the site is predicted to have positive effects on housing as it will help provide a substantial number of new homes, including affordable ones, in a very accessible location close to the main employment and services centre in Selby Town centre and strategic employment sites such as the Olympia Park.

The former Rigid Paper site (SELB-AG), Denison Road, Selby is a 7.5ha site is proposed for mixed use (primarily residential). A higher density design (50 dph) of up to 330 dwellings is envisaged here. Development would include affordable homes and multi-storey buildings (up to 4) which is likely to provide a greater range of types and tenures for specific community members. The site is very close to Selby Town Centre, within a short distance of many amenities, services and employment opportunities. It is also close (1.2 miles) to the strategic employment site at Olympia Park development. This site is also predicted to have positive effects on housing as it will help provide greater types and tenures of housing, including affordable homes. Its location close to employment opportunities, facilities and services makes it more sustainable.

¹⁸ AECOM report Selby Local Plant Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Jan.2020; <https://selby-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/event/35204>

The Industrial Chemicals site is proposed for up to 450 dwellings. Again, a higher density approach (50dph) is to be followed in designing the development which will include buildings up to three stories high. The development would also include affordable homes. Development of this site is also predicted to have positive effects on housing as it would provide a substantial number of new homes, including affordable ones. The inclusion of higher density and multi-story buildings can potentially deliver a more varied mix of homes of different types and tenures. The location is again very close to main employment, amenities and services within Selby Town and the Olympia Park development.

The Land West of Bondgate is located close to Selby Town centre and to the Olympia Park employment area. Although this is a relatively small site to provide around 9 homes, it still makes a contribution to the housing need in Selby and therefore predicted to have positive effects on housing.

Option A involves 1750 dwellings in Selby Town and would involve residential growth most likely at the sites discussed above. The three larger sites (Cross Hills La., Rigid Paper and Industrial Chemicals) are predicted to have positive effects on housing due to their proximity to main employment opportunities within Selby town and the strategic employment sites in the District. The mix of densities and designs will likely produce more varied housing types and tenures. The scale of the developments should contribute a substantial number of affordable homes. Therefore, Options A is predicted to have **major positive effects** on housing. Furthermore, the inclusion of the brownfield sites (Rigid Paper and Industrial Chemicals) will positively contribute to SDC's Selby Town regeneration project.

Options C and D involve a lower level of growth of 550 units within Selby Town with growth focused within the Industrial Chemicals and Rigid Paper sites. As discussed above both of these sites are predicted to have positive effects on housing. However, the smaller development proposed under these options will provide fewer homes within Selby Town and therefore their effects are likely to be less positive than those in option A. Therefore, options C and D are predicted to have **moderately positive effects** on housing due to the smaller scale of development proposed.

Options B and E also propose a growth of 550 units within Selby Town. These utilise the Cross Hills Lane site. Again, these sites are well connected to employment and service centres within Selby Town and the rest of the District. However, the effects are likely to be less positive than the higher growth options due to the lower number of new homes proposed here. Therefore, these options are predicted to produce **moderately positive effects** on housing as they provide a smaller amount of new homes in Selby Town.

Option I involves a smaller amount of growth in Selby Town (200 units) and therefore only **minor positive effects** are envisaged.

Option J would involve 1000 dwellings, which could potentially bring about **major positive effects** in Selby Town.

Tadcaster

With the exception of option E, all remaining options involve the same level of growth in this location of 400 homes.

A mix of sites would be required, each of which have relatively good access to services and would need to include affordable housing. A range of types of housing would likely be involved given the nature of the sites. Therefore, overall, each option is predicted to have **moderate positive effects** on housing as they provide a substantial number of new dwellings, including affordable homes, to fulfil some of Tadcaster's housing needs. Furthermore, they are located in sustainable locations being close to community facilities, services and employment areas, including the strategic employment sites of Sherburn 2 and the Gascoigne Wood Interchange.

Option E adds further growth in the green belt. The effects are discussed below under green belt release.

Sherburn in Elmet

All of the options involve 300 dwellings, presumed to be located at Land adjacent to Prospect Farm, Low Street. The development is mainly residential but will include some mixed use to provide community facilities and amenity space. All of the options are predicted to have **moderate positive effects** on housing as they provide 300 new homes in Sherburn in Elmet which is one of the main three settlements in the District. The location is made more sustainable by its location close to two railway stations, Sherburn in Elmet and South Milford. Furthermore, the site is adjacent to a proposed new employment development (land adjacent to prospect farm low street); a 57ha site to comprise B2 and B8 uses. The site is also close to employment opportunities in the town centre, Sherburn in Elmet 2 and Gascoigne Wood Interchange strategic employment sites. The location also has good access to major highways such as the A63 and A1(M).

Options E allocates an additional 500 dwellings at an area to the south of Sherburn in Elmet , in the green belt. The effects of this additional allocation are discussed below under the Green Belt release section.

Settlement Expansion

All options except C allocate 1350 dwellings at land west of Kellington Lane, Eggborough, in the form of a settlement expansion. The site has railway access to Leeds and is closely located to the strategic employment locations at the former Kellingley Colliery and the former Eggborough Power Station. Therefore, all options except C are predicted to have **major positive effects** on housing as they will serve to provide a substantial number of new homes

(1350) including affordable homes. It is also closely located to two large strategic employment sites and is well connected to surrounding major cities via railway and the M62. Option C involves a smaller growth of 400 units utilising a smaller portion of the same site. This option is predicted to have **moderately positive effects** as it enjoys the same benefits discussed above but proposes a smaller scale of development thus contributing fewer new homes compared to the other options.

Green Belt Release

Only options E, G and H involve green belt release. Therefore, for the other five options (A,B,C,D and F) **neutral effects** are predicted with regards to housing.

Option E proposes greenbelt release in Sherburn in Elmet (500 units) and Tadcaster (200 units). The Sherburn in Elmet site is close to a range of facilities, services and employment opportunities, including Sherburn in Elmet Enterprise Park, Gascoigne Wood Interchange and Sherburn in Elmet 2. It is also well served by the railway and highways network. Growth at the edge of Tadcaster should be well placed to benefit from the strategic employment sites of Sherburn 2 and the Gascoigne Wood Interchange; as these are approximately 8 – 10 miles away; a 15 -20 minute journey. Therefore, option E is predicted to have **moderate positive effects** on housing as the sites allocated to development will yield a substantial number of new homes that are located close to strategic employment sites on attractive land.

Option G also involves green belt development at Sherburn in Elmet and adds a further 1000 dwellings around Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements. The Sherburn in Elmet allocation will have positive effects as explained above. The release of multiple Green Belt sites across the smaller settlements is likely to give rise to attractive housing that can be brought forward in the short to medium term. This is positive for housing, but the new homes would not necessarily be located in the most accessible settlements. Overall, option G is predicted to have **moderately positive effects** on housing in this respect.

Option H involves less growth in the Greenbelt, with 500 units surrounding the Tier 1 and Tier 2 villages. Similar to Option G, this should create a range of housing site options across the District, which contribute **moderate positive effects**.

New Settlements

Options A,B,C,D, E and I all propose a growth of 945 units in the plan period (3000 total) based on a new settlement at Heronby.

The new settlement provides an opportunity for the creation of new sustainable communities comprising mixed uses including a range of employment opportunities and local facilities. The site is of sufficient size to accommodate approximately 3,000 new dwellings and local infrastructure requirements such as new schools, health facilities, recreation areas and shops.

The proposed site is relatively remote from the main towns and strategic employment sites in the District. However, the site has good road links to York (8 miles away) and Selby (8 miles away) via the A19 and the site will make a significant contribution to housing numbers in the District and potentially provide further growth in the future beyond the plan period.

Given the large scale of growth that would be accommodated in this location, and the potential for a wide range of housing types, potential **major positive effects** are predicted. However, there are uncertainties as to the extent to which these would be realised in the plan period given that new settlements can have longer lead-in times. There is also a need to ensure that infrastructure can be secured before development.

Tier 1 and 2 Villages

Option A involves a total of 1510 new homes across Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages. The developments proposed here are likely to positively contribute to the long-term viability of these village communities by ensuring a proportional amount of growth in housing to fulfil local housing need.

Development will positively contribute to local housing needs in these villages on a range of smaller sites. This will help to meet locally specific needs as well as housing need within the District. Due to the large number of sites involved, there should also be a wide range of housing choice in different locations and at different periods of the plan. As a result, **major positive effects** are predicted.

Options D and E and I allocate a similar amount of new homes in Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages ; between 2250 and 2100 units in total. This is also predicted to have **major positive effects** on housing as they provide for local housing need within the Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages, thus helping maintain viable communities in rural areas. Due to the large number of sites involved, there should also be a wide range of housing choice in different locations.

Option B proposes higher levels of growth still in Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages; allocating 2550. This option is also predicted to have **major positive effects** on housing as it will fulfil local demand for housing and contribute to the overall housing within the District.

Options C and J proposes a total of around 1650 in Tier-1 villages and 1525 units in Tier-2 villages. Therefore, a significant **major positive effect** is predicted. These options are most likely to benefit the tier 1 and 2 villages in terms of the overall amount of housing, and the number of affordable units.

Smaller Villages

Only windfall development is proposed for smaller villages and therefore all options are predicted to have the same **neutral effects** on housing due to the small scale of development that's likely to result.

	Summary effects matrix: Housing						
Options	A	B	C	D	E	I	J
Selby	Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green with ?
Tadcaster	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green
Sherburn in Elmet	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green
Expansion	Green	Green	Light Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
New Settlement(s)	Light Green with ?	Light Green with ?	Light Green with ?	Light Green with ?	Light Green with ?	Green	Blue
Green Belt	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Blue
Villages	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
Overall	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green

Summary

All of the options are predicted to have positive effects as they will meet identified housing needs, supporting economic growth and providing an element of flexibility. The areas that would benefit under each option vary slightly, with the smaller villages benefiting greatest from a dispersed approach (options B, C and J), but less housing being directed to larger key settlements such as Selby. Managed expansion of rural areas, on smaller sites is a component of the SA Objective for housing, and so specific benefits are likely in this respect. However, this approach would perhaps be less well placed to promote strategic brownfield sites and to focus housing in populous areas which are more likely to experience demand. Option A is beneficial in this respect, whilst still maintaining a degree of dispersal. However, the dispersal approaches may be more likely to achieve a wider range of housing locations and choice, which makes them preferable in this respect.

LANDSCAPE

The SEA objective for landscape¹⁹ is to; *protect and enhance the quality, character and local distinctiveness of the natural and cultural landscape and the built environment*. Therefore, in terms of settlement level effects development proposals that protect / enhance the character, quality and diversity of Selby's landscapes and townscapes through appropriate layout of new development, including the preservation of important open space between settlements are likely to have favourable effects on the landscape.

Selby Town

The landscape in Selby Town is predominately flat, low-lying, and interspersed with large scale arable fields. Large parts of the area comprise flood plain landscapes. The SDC's Landscape Sensitivity Study (LSS)²⁰; divides the landscape surrounding the settlement into three parcels, namely; SE1-Selby Western Fringe, SE2-Selby A19 Corridor and SE3-River Ouse Corridor. The development sites involved under the various options utilise combinations of several residential sites and the employment site at Olympia Park. The largest residential (including mixed-use) development site is the Cross Hills Lane site, the majority of which lies within parcel SE1, Selby Western Fringe. This parcel is characterised as flat low-lying predominantly arable farmland with little tree cover. There is a sparse settlement layout with occasional isolated properties and farmsteads. The area has a predominantly rural character with a strong sense of openness. However, the LSS rates SE1 as having a low to moderate sensitivity to residential development. The development site as land West of Bondgate is also within SE1. However, the site currently contains recreational open space which would be lost. The remaining sites are brownfield sites within the urban area of town.

Option A involves 1750 units. The larger sites involved are likely to provide greater scope for mitigation and the redevelopment of brownfield sites is likely to engender improvements to the landscape and townscape if sensitively designed. However, given the scale of growth proposed, it is likely there will be some adverse effects, particularly due to the flat low-lying nature of the area which affords extensive views across Selby town. Overall a **moderate negative effect** on landscape is predicted for Option A .

Options B, C, D and E involve a lower level of growth of 550 units within Selby Town. The options that involve only brownfield allocations are predicted to have neutral effects, whilst those involving partial greenbelt are likely to have a minor negative effect on landscape due to the dispersed, smaller allocations of growth proposed (compared to Option A).

¹⁹ AECOM report Selby Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Jan.2020; <https://selby-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/event/35204>

²⁰ LUC 2019 report; Selby District Landscape Sensitivity Study; <https://www.selby.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Selby%20LSS%20Report%20Final.pdf>

Option I involves a low level of growth, presumably on greenfield land out of the centre on areas not at risk of flooding. This amounts to **minor negative effects**.

Option J would likely involve a mix of brownfield and greenfield sites, but at a lesser extent to Option A, therefore whilst **moderate negative effects** are identified, there is less certainty that these would arise.

Tadcaster

Tadcaster includes a mixture of settlement size and pattern around its historic core which encompasses a pattern of historic buildings and streetscapes displaying a vernacular tradition of local building materials. The surrounding landscape comprises gently rolling landform dominated by large-scale arable fields and low-lying flood meadows with a strong sense of openness²¹. The LSS divided the surrounding landscape in 4 parcels;

- TA1 Tadcaster Western Fringe;
- TA2: River Wharfe Corridor;
- TA3: Tadcaster Eastern Fringe; and
- TA4: Land to the North of the A64.

The at Land at Mill Lane (248 dwellings) site is adjacent to the River Wharfe and partially overlapping the Tadcaster conservation area. The site is in a prominent location and can be viewed from the west across the river where there are a number of important heritage assets and a locally important landscape area. The plot lies in the TA2-River Wharfe Corridor assessment parcel which is rated as being of moderate sensitivity to residential development. The remaining sites are within the settlement boundaries and therefore were not assessed as part of the LSS. However, in view of the numerous heritage assets and historical townscapes in Tadcaster, these are also predicted to have unfavourable impacts in terms of townscape. Conversely, the smaller sites which bring back into use existing buildings and brownfield sites are potentially favourable to the townscape. Therefore, all options are predicted to have **moderate negative effects** on landscape due to the sensitivity of much of the landscape and historic townscape to development.

Option E allocates an additional 200 in the green belt. The effects of this additional growth are discussed below under green belt release.

Sherburn in Elmet

The main development site proposed in Sherburn in Elmet is the Land adjacent to Prospect Farm, Low Street. The 17.4ha site is proposed for up to 300 dwellings. This plot falls within the LSS's; SH3-Land to the West of the A162, assessment parcel. The landscape is flat, low-

²¹ Ibid., pp.25.

lying, predominantly arable farmland, with sparse tree cover and hedgerows. It is mostly rural in character with a strong sense of openness with dominant industrial-scale human elements around Sherburn in Elmet. SH3 is assessed as being moderately sensitive to residential developments. All of the options involve the same level of growth in this location; presumed to be 300 dwellings located at Land adjacent to Prospect Farm, Low Street.

Development is likely to have **minor negative effects** on landscape due to the scale of growth proposed and the sensitivity of this site (and the broader area) to development. Options E allocates an additional 500 dwellings at an area to the south of Sherburn in Elmet, the effects of this are discussed under the green belt release section below.

Settlement Expansion

The Eggborough landscape is flat and low-lying including industrial-scale farm buildings and major energy and transport infrastructure. The Selby Landscape Character Assessment (2019)²² identifies the area as landscape character area (LCA) LCA16: Eggborough, incorporating the major transport corridors of the M62 and the Aire and Calder Navigation (Knottingley and Goole Canal). Eggborough Power Station forms a prominent feature in the landscape here. The proposed site for the expansion falls within the LSS's EG1-Eggborough North Eastern Fringes, assessment parcel which is assessed as having low to moderate sensitivity to residential development.

All options except C, allocate 945 dwellings in the plan period at land west of Kellington Lane, Eggborough, in the form of a settlement expansion (though this paves the way for a larger site in the longer term). The substantial site and scale of development proposed has the potential to provide attractive landscaping elements in the design of the development such as accessible attractive green spaces. However, the substantial size of growth may lead to coalescence with Kellington in the longer term; just north of the proposed site. Therefore, these options are predicted to have **moderate negative effects** on landscape due to the sensitivity of the landscape to development and potential risk of coalescence. Ensuring a clear area of separation between the expanded settlement and Kellington should help to minimise these effects though.

Option C allocates a smaller growth of 400 units utilising a smaller portion of the same site. This level of growth may offer more scope for mitigation and is less likely to lead to coalescence with Kellington. Therefore, this option is predicted to have **minor negative effects** on landscape.

Green Belt Release

²² LUC report (Nov.2019) Selby Landscape Character Assessment;
<https://www.selby.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Selby%20LCA%20Report%20Combined.pdf>

Only option E involves Green Belt release. Therefore, for the other options **neutral effects** are predicted with respect to landscape.

Option E proposes greenbelt release in Sherburn in Elmet (500 units) and Tadcaster (200 units). The Sherburn in Elmet location would result in the loss of around 35ha of locally important landscape area (LILA) within the green belt. The scale involved and proximity to South Milford is likely to lead to coalescence.

Growth at Tadcaster could have potential for a range of effects, depending upon the sites involved. Parts of the Green Belt fall within areas that contributes to the setting of the settlement with views both into and out of Tadcaster. Sensitivity to development around the settlement is broadly moderate due to the type and scale of existing built form, and the Locally Important Landscape Area designation and Green Belt. Overall option E is predicted to have **moderate negative effects** on landscape due to the sensitivity of the setting to development, the potential of coalescence (Sherburn in Elmet and south Milford) and the encroachment on LILA and the green belt.

New Settlement

The Heronby site is located to the south west of Escrick Village to the East of the Former Selby Mine. The area comprises flat low-lying topography comprising agricultural fields. There is an area (8ha) of ancient and semi-natural Woodland (Heron Wood) at the centre of the site. The historical landscape and conservation area in Escrick, including designated landscape of Escrick Park is adjacent to the northern tip of this site. Development of the site could affect the character of the landscape and settlements in the wider vicinity, and so is predicted to have **moderate negative effects** on landscape for all options involving the new settlement.

Tier 1 and 2 Villages

SDC's LSS assessed the landscapes around the Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages in the District. The study generally found medium or lower sensitivity to development. However, areas of Monk Fryston, Escrick, Carlton, Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby were assessed as having moderate to high sensitivity to development. The parcel between Selby and Brayton was assessed as being particularly sensitive to development due to its essential role in maintaining the separate identities of the two settlements and the potential impacts on Brayton's conservation area. Highest sensitivity was attached to parkland landscapes, which are considered to be vulnerable to change from built development, and often make positive contributions to the setting of the settlements²³.

Option A proposes the lowest growth at 1510 new homes across Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages. The modest levels of growth involved for most settlements is likely to lead to **moderate negative effects** on landscape. However, the growth involved at Carlton and Appleton Roebuck could

LUC 2019 report; Selby District Landscape Sensitivity Study;
<https://www.selby.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Selby%20LSS%20Report%20Final.pdf>

potentially have more prominent negative effects due to development sites being adjacent to conservation areas in these locations.

All remaining options involve higher levels of growth to Tier 1 and Tier 2 villages. Therefore, these options are predicted to have **major negative effects** on landscape due to the scale of development proposed which is likely to significantly alter the landscape in and around these particularly sensitive locations. The effects are more likely to occur at the higher scales of growth for Options C and J, with a degree of uncertainty for the other options.

Smaller Villages

Only windfall development is proposed for smaller villages and therefore all options are predicted to have the same **neutral effects** on landscape due to the small scale of development that's likely to result.

	Summary effects matrix: Landscape						
Options	A	B	C	D	E	I	J
Selby							?
Tadcaster							
Sherburn in Elmet							
Expansion							
New Settlement(s)							
Green Belt							
Villages		?		?	?	?	
Overall	?	?		?		?	

Summary

All options are predicted to have potential **major negative effects** on landscape because there are sensitive landscapes across the district with the flat, low-lying, open nature of the landscape affording extensive views from the surrounding areas into proposed sites and outward from the sites into the surrounding landscape.

The effects are more or less prominent in different areas depending upon the scale of growth in different settlements. Therefore, whilst major negative effects are predicted overall for

each option, there ought to be some scope to avoid and mitigate effects. There is also likely to be some positive effect in town centre areas such as Selby and Tadcaster, where regeneration of brownfield sites will occur.

Some of the options are considered more likely to have major negative effects given that they generate major negative effects with greater certainty and / or involve moderate negative effects are several settlements.

WATER

The SEA objective for water (resources and quality)²⁴ is to; *conserve water resources and protect / enhance the quality of water bodies in the District*. Therefore, it is important that development minimises pressure on water resources (e.g. by minimising leakage, using water efficient systems in buildings, recycling, and sustainable drainage to capture run-off and storm water). Measures that minimise wastewater discharges into local water courses and ensure there is no further deterioration in polluted water bodies are also important.

Large parts of the district are designated as Nitrate Vulnerable Zones (NVZ), and there are a number of countryside stewardship schemes operating through the district, with priority locations identified in term of pollutants and sedimentation from farming. This includes Sherburn in Elmet , Eggborough, South Duffield, Barlby with Osgodby, and Church Fenton. This suggests that pollution from agriculture is an issue in parts of the district, but also that agreements are in place to help manage water quality and biodiversity interests. A change in use could therefore have mixed effects in terms of water quality.

Selby Town

The locations and capacity of waste water treatment plants has not been determined. However, it is assumed that the larger urban centres are supported by sufficient infrastructure, whilst smaller and more remote villages may be more likely to require upgrades to support substantial levels of growth. The redevelopment of previously industrial sites may serve to reduce more polluting industrial wastewater effluents going into local treatment works.

Development on larger sites currently in intensive agricultural use may also reduce agricultural effluent (particularly nitrate and phosphate rich effluents) being discharged into local water courses. Nonetheless the scale of development proposed is likely to substantially increase water demand leading to increased abstraction and depletion of existing water reservoirs. It will also lead to increased pressure on existing wastewater treatment infrastructure.

With regards to ground water source protection zones, none of the site options in the Selby urban area fall within these areas, and so effects would be expected to be manageable.

Options proposing higher growth in Selby Town, namely; option A and to a lesser extent Option I (1000 dwellings) are predicted to have **minor negative effects** on water.

Options B, C, D, E and I involve a lower level of growth of 550 units within Selby Town or lower. Due to the smaller scale of development proposed these options will place less pressure on the existing water supply and treatment infrastructure. Therefore, **neutral effects** are predicted upon water.

²⁴ AECOM report Selby Local Plant Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Jan.2020; <https://selby-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/event/35204>

Tadcaster

All options involve at least 400 new homes in Tadcaster. As Tadcaster is one of the three main settlements in the District, it is likely that the town has sufficient water and wastewater infrastructure capacity for the relatively modest levels of growth proposed and therefore, **neutral effects** on water are predicted in this respect.

However, several of the sites likely to be involved fall within Zone 2 of a groundwater source protection zone, and some are adjacent or within Zone 1. Although residential uses are not considered to be sensitive uses with regards to groundwater pollution, there is potential for polluting activities (particularly during construction phases) that could pose a risk to groundwater. It is recommended that specific measures are identified to mitigate and manage such risks, but at this stage, **potential moderate negative effects** are highlighted for each option.

Option E involves an additional 200 dwellings in the green belt. The effects of this additional growth are discussed below under green belt release.

Sherburn in Elmet

Six of the options (A,B,C,D, I and J) involve the same level of growth in this location; 300 dwellings located at Land adjacent to Prospect Farm, Low Street. These are likely to benefit from the existing water infrastructure here. However, some of the water courses close to Sherburn in Elmet are of poor quality (according to WFD) and therefore these developments can potentially exacerbate the situation by placing further pressure on local water bodies. Therefore, **minor negative effects** are envisaged for these options.

Option E allocates an additional 500 dwellings at an area to the south of Sherburn in Elmet , the effects of this are discussed under the green belt release section below.

Settlement Expansion

All Options except C, allocate 945 dwellings at land west of Kellington Lane, Eggborough, in the form of a settlement expansion. The scale of the scheme will increase water demand in the area. It is important that the capacity of existing water and wastewater infrastructure is verified prior to development to ascertain if there is sufficient capacity to cope with the added demand. Whilst the water quality of local water bodies is classed as moderate the additional treated effluent discharge from the local wastewater treatment works can potentially have unfavourable effects. Overall these options are predicted to have **minor negative effects** on water due to the additional demands on sources and the potential pressures on water quality in local water courses.

Option C allocates a smaller growth of 400 units utilising a smaller portion of the same site. This option is predicted to have **neutral effects** on water as the scale proposed is much lower than the remaining options and therefore less likely to adversely impact water sources and the quality of water bodies in Sherburn in Elmet

Green Belt Release

Only option E involves green belt release. Therefore, for the other options **neutral effects** are predicted with respect to water resources.

Option E proposes greenbelt release in Sherburn in Elmet (500 units) and Tadcaster (200 units). Both locations are likely to benefit from the existing water/ wastewater infrastructure. The Sherburn in Elmet allocation takes the total growth proposed to 800 under Option E. WFD data shows that the status of some of the water bodies in the vicinity of Sherburn in Elmet are in poor status. The additional allocation here can potentially exacerbate the issue. There is also the matter of additional sites also being located in groundwater source protection zones in Tadcaster. Therefore, option E is predicted to have **moderate negative effects** on water with regards to Green Belt development.

New Settlement

The scale of the new settlement proposed will increase water demand in the area. It is important that the capacity of existing water and wastewater infrastructure is verified prior to development to ascertain if there is sufficient capacity to cope with the added demand. Similarly, additional treated effluent discharge from the local wastewater treatment works can potentially have unfavourable effects on water in the local watercourses. Therefore, these options are predicted to have **minor negative effects** on water due to the additional demands on water sources and the potential pressures on water quality in local water bodies.

Tier 1 and 2 Villages

Smaller and more remote villages are more likely to require upgrades to support substantial levels of growth. Several of the tier 1 and 2 villages also fall within or close to drinking water protection areas and / or safeguard zones (Barlby with Osgodby, North Duffield, Carlton, Hensall, Hemingbrough). Consequently, the water environment in such locations is likely to be sensitive to change and ought to be carefully managed. Furthermore, new development within villages in the vicinity of the River Derwent SSSI such as Hemingbrough and North Duffield may lead to additional discharges into water bodies within the SSSI. This can potentially have adverse effects on these sensitive habitats and the flora and fauna they support. Therefore, Option A which proposes the lowest levels of growth is predicted to have **minor negative effects** on water. Options B, C, D, E, I and J propose higher levels of growth in Tier-1 and Tier-2 villages and therefore are expected to have **moderately negative effects**. Options C and J involve the highest level of growth and therefore, the potential for **moderate negative effects** is considered to be more likely compared to options B, D, E and I, which have some uncertainty.

Smaller Villages

Only windfall development is proposed for smaller villages and therefore all options are predicted to have the same **neutral effects** on water due to the small scale of development that's likely to result.

	Summary effects matrix: Water						
Options	A	B	C	D	E	I	J
Selby							?
Tadcaster	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Sherburn in Elmet							
Expansion							
New Settlement(s)							
Green Belt							
Villages		?		?	?	?	
Overall	?	?		?		?	

Needs-led growth

Development will require servicing in terms of water supply, water treatment and drainage. The locations and headroom capacity of treatment plants will need to be established. Assumptions made that the larger urban centres are supported by sufficient infrastructure, whilst smaller and more remote villages may be more likely to require upgrades to support notable levels of growth. In this respect, option A is likely to be appropriate, whilst dispersed approaches (Options C and J in particular) could be more problematic.

Large parts of the district are designated as Nitrate Vulnerable Zones, and there are a number of countryside stewardship schemes operating through the district, with priority locations identified in term of pollutants and sedimentation from farming. This includes Sherburn in Elmet , Eggborough, South Duffield, Barlby with Osgodby, Church Fenton.

This suggests that pollution from agriculture is an issue in parts of the district, but also that agreements are in place to help manage water quality and biodiversity interests. A change in use could therefore have mixed effects in terms of water quality.

On one hand, the effects might be reduced in terms of polluting activities, but on the other, management measures may no longer be in place, and there would be greater pressure on drainage and treatment networks. The areas most likely to be affected in this respect are Sherburn in Elmet and the tier 1 and 2 settlements. Therefore, options C and E could be more likely to give rise to such effects.

Several of the tier 1 and 2 villages also fall within or close to drinking water protection areas and / or safeguard zones (*Barlby with Osgodby, North Duffield, , Carlton, Hensall,*

Hemingborough). Whilst non-statutory designations, these show that the water environment in such locations is sensitive to change and ought to be carefully managed. The sites at Tadcaster are also within sensitive areas with regards to groundwater protection, and thus for each option potential negative effects are identified.

Some smaller villages are also close to and may lead to discharges into the River Derwent SSSI (For example Hemmingborough and south Duffield).

Water Framework Directive data shows that there is currently moderate water quality in watercourses passing through Tadcaster, Selby Town and Eggborough. Other watercourses in the district are of poor quality, and this includes some close to Sherburn in Elmet. This means option E could potentially have more notable effects in terms of water quality.

At this stage, potential **moderate negative effects** are presumed for each option from a precautionary point of view (acknowledging a greater degree of uncertainty for Options A, B, D and I)

