



## Fact Sheets

The following town-specific fact sheets were distributed to all the participants prior to the engagement workshops.

This section contains the following documents:

- Selby Fact Sheets
- Sherburn in Elmet Fact Sheets
- Tadcaster Fact Sheets

Let's Talk

# PLAN SELBY

SELBY FACT SHEETS

Selby District Market Town Study

24<sup>th</sup> June 2015 Revision D

## Introduction

This facts sheets booklet provides a summary of the key issues and recommendations identified following a baseline review of recent evidence base studies undertaken by consultants on behalf of Selby District Council to inform and support the PLAN Selby preparation process.

The facts sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

The Draft evidence base studies have been published in full on the Council website as part of the Let's Talk PLAN Selby focussed engagement, which provides an opportunity to comment from the 29<sup>th</sup> June to Monday 10<sup>th</sup> August 2015.

## Fact Sheets: Deficits Needs and Aspirations

The fact sheets are for use to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
SM5	Selby	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Summary of Deficits, Needs and Aspirations

THEME	KEY ISSUES
<b>Deficits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shortage of good hotels</li> <li>• Poor distribution of parking areas</li> <li>• Lack of riverside walkways and cycle paths (fragmented waterside access)</li> </ul>
<b>Needs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved and cheaper parking</li> <li>• Up to 4700m<sup>2</sup> comparison retail floor space</li> <li>• Focus higher value Business, Professional and Financial Services/BI office development in and around Selby town centre and the urban periphery.</li> <li>• Employment need during next Plan Period will be met by Olympia Park and site east of Bawtry Road</li> <li>• 2061 new dwellings (including Olympia Park site), however if Tadcaster is unable to meet its housing needs, Sherburn and Selby could be required to provide the additional shortfall of 476 houses.</li> <li>• To provide affordable housing (1- and 2-bed properties, 25% : 75% split of intermediate and social/affordable rented provision)</li> <li>• To provide mid-market homes with 2 and 3 bedrooms and satisfy strong demand for bungalows</li> <li>• To provide additional care/support and specialist housing</li> <li>• To register and identify plots in larger developments for custom build</li> <li>• The Council commissioned Highways Assessments has shown that for the baseline situation, all junctions are operating within their practical reserve capacity with minimal queues and delays. When the traffic likely to be generated by unimplemented committed development is taken into account, the following junctions are shown to be over-capacity.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Junction 2 (A19 and A163 Market Weighton Road priority T-junction)</li> <li>• Junction 10 (A162 / A63 Main Street roundabout)</li> <li>• One other junction is at or above their practical reserve capacity (not yet over-capacity).</li> <li>• Junction 4 (A63/A1041 roundabout)</li> </ul>
<b>Aspirations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new dedicated cinema, accompanied by national restaurant chains</li> <li>• Improved street furniture/floral displays</li> <li>• Improved/new facilities for young adults</li> <li>• Pedestrianise the main shopping streets</li> <li>• Free parking</li> <li>• More specialist and upmarket shops with good quality restaurants</li> <li>• A unique festival</li> <li>• Zoning or organising the town into quarters e.g. a cultural and leisure quarter around the leisure centre</li> <li>• Parking signage in the town</li> </ul>

## Retail and Leisure

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE								
<b>Deficits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shortage of good hotels</li> <li>• Poor distribution of parking areas</li> <li>• Lack of riverside walkways and cycle paths (fragmented waterside access)</li> <li>• Insufficient range of quality shops</li> <li>• Lack of brand identity and USP</li> </ul>	STEP Enterprise Strategy 2014-2017 (January 2014)								
<b>Needs</b>	<p>The following table sets out the identified retail and leisure need in Selby based on the conclusions of the RLS:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Location</th> <th>Convenience</th> <th>Comparison</th> <th>Leisure</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Selby</td> <td>None</td> <td>Need to plan for up to 4,700m<sup>2</sup> gross new floorspace in the period up to 2027.</td> <td>Need for further investigation to identify market potential to deliver new provision.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Location	Convenience	Comparison	Leisure	Selby	None	Need to plan for up to 4,700m <sup>2</sup> gross new floorspace in the period up to 2027.	Need for further investigation to identify market potential to deliver new provision.	<p>Selby District Council Final Selby Retail and Leisure Study (RLS), May 2015, GVA Grimley</p>
Location	Convenience	Comparison	Leisure							
Selby	None	Need to plan for up to 4,700m <sup>2</sup> gross new floorspace in the period up to 2027.	Need for further investigation to identify market potential to deliver new provision.							
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selby should grow in a sustainable manner balancing the environment and the growth needs. As there is no Flood Zone 1 development should be</li> </ul>	Summary of 'Needs'								

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
	<p>directed to Flood Zone 2 and only if this is exhausted directed to Flood Zone 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development should avoid strategic gaps and sensitive landscape areas.</li> <li>• More small sites which are preferable to large ones like Olympia Park.</li> <li>• The land to the NW of Selby Town is the most suitable as its Flood Zone 2 and wont impact on the strategic gaps.</li> <li>• English Heritage - Selby should not grow SW as this would harm the Brayton Conservation area, and St Wilfred's Church.</li> </ul>	<p>Identified through Representations Received on 'Town Centre' Visions as part of the Initial Consultation on PLAN Selby November 2014-January 2015</p>
<b>Aspiration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on shopper and retailer surveys the most popular suggested improvement in Selby was for a new / improved cinema.</li> <li>• Based on shopper and retailer surveys the most popular suggested improvements in relation to the quality of the environment in Selby town centre were improved street furniture/floral displays, improved/new facilities for young adults, pedestrianise the main shopping streets.</li> <li>• The most popular suggestions for the town centre improvements received from town centre businesses within Selby were for the provision of free parking.</li> </ul>	<p>Selby District Council Final Selby Retail and Leisure Study (RLS), May 2015, GVA Grimley</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The town needs to grow more specialist and upmarket shops with good quality restaurants.</li> <li>• Festivals (possibly developing a 'unique' festival e.g. swan racing; 'Swan around Selby' swan trail) could be used to attract people to the town, based on the historic heritage of the district.</li> <li>• Growing enterprise - To enable the entrepreneurial spirit to thrive in new and existing businesses a programme of support to be developed and delivered.</li> <li>• The town could benefit from zoning or organising into quarters. Possible cultural and leisure quarter around the leisure centre.</li> <li>• Access and technology - Parking signage in the town could be improved to help visitors and residents. The cost of car parking is critical here too and how charges could be set to encourage footfall to the town centre, whilst providing an income for the asset owners. Visit Selby' website and town portal.</li> </ul>	<p>STEP Enterprise Strategy 2014-2017 (January 2014)</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selby Town Council has formally applied to the District Council for a Neighbourhood Area Designation</li> </ul>	<p>Selby Town Council</p>

## Employment

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<b>Deficit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified</li> </ul>	

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<b>Need</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The report states there should be an emphasis on focusing higher value Business, Professional and Financial Services/BI office development in and around Selby town centre and the urban periphery.</li> <li>The Core Strategy requires an additional 37-52 ha of land for employment development during plan period. Comprising 22-27 ha for Selby (23ha of which is Olympia Park).</li> <li>In summary, this ELR Report does not recommend any additional employment land allocations in Selby, beyond Olympia Park site and the site East of Bawtry Road to meet demand. The majority of existing allocations are recommended for removal from the employment land supply. In particular, the Selby Business Park and Access 63 site in Selby,</li> <li>Other potential additional sites include the former civic centre site as a potential office site and the Back Micklegate Car Park.</li> </ul>	Employment Land Review (ELR) (Draft) June 2015, GVA GRIMLEY
<b>Aspiration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified</li> </ul>	

## Housing

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<b>Deficit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified</li> </ul>	
<b>Need</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PLAN Selby must identify sufficient housing land allocations to deliver 7200 homes in the district up to 2027 as set out in the Core Strategy. This equates to 450 new homes per year. The indicative amount of new allocations based on the Core Strategy and completion and planning permissions granted since adoption of the Core Strategy are as follows:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Selby Urban Area: <u>2061 new dwellings (including Olympia Park site)</u>. 51% of overall district requirement (potentially subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>Sherburn in Elmet: <u>54 new dwellings</u> 11% of overall district requirement (potentially subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>Tadcaster: <u>476 new dwellings</u> 7% of overall district requirement (subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> </ul> </li> <li>The purpose of the SHMA is to address housing need in Selby District and to develop a robust understanding of housing market dynamics, to provide an assessment of future needs for both market and affordable housing and the housing needs of</li> </ul>	<p>Selby District Council – Updated Figures as at 1 April 2015</p> <p>Selby District Council – Draft Selby Strategic Housing Market Assessment, June 2015, Prepared By GL Hearn</p>

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
	<p>different groups within the population.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some key draft findings are:</li> <li>The District's objectively assessed need for housing is about 430 dwelling per annum up to 2027. This supports the adopted policy position in the adopted Core Strategy.</li> <li>There remains a significant affordable housing need across the District and this supports the Council's adopted policy position.</li> <li>In terms of wider sub regional housing markets, the strongest relationship based on local authority areas is between Selby and York. However, in policy terms there should be recognition of the relationships with Leeds and Wakefield from a housing market point of view. This supports the production of a SHMA for Selby District.</li> <li>The analysis in the Assessment indicates that the majority of demand for market housing will be for mid-market homes with 2 and 3 bedrooms and a strong demand for bungalows. This should inform strategic policy and the 'portfolio' of sites which are considered through the PLAN Selby.</li> <li>The majority of the need for affordable housing is for 1- and 2-bed properties. This should inform strategic policy and the 'portfolio' of sites which are considered through the PLAN Selby</li> <li>The needs evidence suggests that a 25%/ 75% split of affordable housing provision between intermediate and social/ affordable rented provision would be appropriate.</li> <li>Demographic change likely to see a requirement for additional care/ support and specialist housing provision. Net need for 417 bed spaces. This should be considered in identifying potential sites in accessible locations.</li> <li>Custom build – Council should set up register and identify plots in larger developments.</li> </ul>	Limited
<b>Aspiration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified</li> </ul>	

## Site Specific

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<b>Aspiration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In November 2006, the three 'Renaissance Market Town Teams' for Selby, Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster, in partnership with Yorkshire Forward, Selby District Council, URBED and other consultants, published the Selby District Renaissance Strategic Development Framework (SDF) .</li> <li>This was the culmination of work during that year which sought to progress the Selby District Charter and its 25 year vision into specific development projects and environmental</li> </ul>	Strategic District Renaissance Strategic Development Framework (SDF), 2006

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
	<p>enhancements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The projects set out in the SDF include the creative use of architecture, urban design and landscaping to transform the quality of the public realm of the district, the streets, parks and spaces of the towns. As well as proposals for the enhancement of the public realm, the SDF also considered the future growth of the three towns and where new housing and employment should be planned.</li> <li>• Some of these projects were progressed and have since been completed. Some of these projects have not been pursued for a number of different reasons i.e. land assembly, deliverability. This engagement provides an opportunity to consider whether these projects are deliverable and worthy of pursuing during the next plan period.</li> <li>• The projects that have not been delivered and are relevant to consider here are identified on the Spatial Options Plan and listed below:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements to Selby Park. Not currently developed due to land assembly issues.</li> <li>• Landmark footbridge. Not deliverable at present. Not currently identified as part of recent planning permission for Olympia Park</li> <li>• Regional Water Park. Not currently developed due to land assembly issues</li> <li>• Acquisition and conversion of Abbot's Staithe for studio space, Selby Museum and Abbey facilities</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Development of the Station Quarter either as mixed-use neighbourhood or an alternative site for the Science Park. Not currently developed</li> </ul>	

## Infrastructure

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<b>Deficit</b>	<p>Using industry standard software the peak hour operation of the key highway junctions on the main traffic routes have been assessed as part of a Highways Assessment Working Paper. This assessment has shown that for the baseline situation, all junctions are operating within their practical reserve capacity with minimal queues and delays. When the traffic likely to be generated by unimplemented committed development is taken into account, the following junctions are shown to be <b>over-capacity</b>. Junction 2 (A19 and A163 Market Weighton Road priority T-junction)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Junction 2 (A19 and A163 Market Weighton Road priority T-junction)</li> <li>• Junction 10 (A162 / A63 Main Street roundabout)</li> <li>• One other junction is <b>at or above their practical reserve capacity</b> (not yet over-capacity).</li> <li>• Junction 4 (A63/A1041 roundabout) Other junctions are nearing their practical reserve capacity.</li> </ul>	Highways Assessment For Selby District Part A, Rev B – March 2015 Working Paper, Pell Frischmann Consultants on Behalf Of Selby District Council
<b>Need</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) outlines the presence of and planned delivery of infrastructure which is relevant to the area covered by the Local Plan for Selby District, including specific infrastructure requirements of sites allocated for development in PLAN Selby.</li> <li>• The IDP states that additional infrastructure provision necessary to support new development in the Selby includes additions to Schools and healthcare facilities, highways improvements and mitigation works, Extra Care housing, start-up funds to support any new bus routes, and the provision of lifts at the Railway Station.</li> </ul>	Selby District Council – Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), September 2014
<b>Aspiration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified</li> </ul>	

## Fact Sheets: Technical Issues - Spatial

The fact sheets, will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
SM8	Selby	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Flood Risk

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council has recently commissioned Aecom to refresh and update this 2010 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The conclusions referenced from the 2010 study below may change in the light of the findings of the 2015 SFRA.</li> <li>The 2010 Assessment confirms it is not possible for the Council to accommodate all proposed housing and employment land requirements, on land at the lowest risk of flooding if wider sustainability and regeneration objectives are to be achieved.</li> </ul>	Level 1 and 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment And Addendum (SFRA), Living Document, February 2010, Prepared By Scott Wilson On Behalf Of Selby District Council
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Level 1 and Level 2 SFRA should inform land allocations and the future growth of each town proposed as part of PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Flood Maps identified on the Technical Issues – Spatial Plan indicate those areas of each settlement that are at risk of flooding and those areas at low risk which will inform the approach to growth and will also inform proposed land allocations identified in PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Level 2 SFRA assessed in detail a number of potential strategic development sites which informed the Council's Core Strategy, which subsequently identified the Olympia Park site as its only strategic site.</li> <li>Site A, Cross Hills Lane, was not identified as a strategic site in the Core Strategy, however it still has potential to accommodate up to 1000 dwellings and should not be dismissed on flood risk grounds subject to appropriate mitigation. This site will need to be given further consideration as part of PLAN Selby.</li> <li>Further consideration may also need to be given to other potential sites discounted as part of the SFRA and the reasons why these were discounted.</li> <li>Including Land West of Wistow Road (25ha), Monk Lane/Bondgate (47ha), Baffam Lane (26ha) and Brackenhill Lane/Fox Hills Lane (31ha)</li> <li>The Wistow Road site was dismissed as Wistow Road does not have the capacity</li> </ul>	

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<p>to accommodate additional development on any significant scale and there is no realistic highway solution to overcome the problem;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other sites, were previously discounted as part of this Study on highways and flood risk grounds or that they would erode the open countryside gap between Selby and Brayton village, potentially leading to coalescence of the two settlements.</li> </ul>	

## Strategic Countryside Gap (SCG)

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Study undertaken by ARUP is part of the evidence base for PLAN Selby. It will inform, but not predetermine decisions to be made later in the process on whether Strategic Countryside Gaps (SCG's) should be designated in PLAN Selby. A recommendation in the finalised study, after focused engagement, that land is worthy of such a designation will be an important consideration in determining the appropriateness of land allocations for growth in PLAN Selby. Until these decisions are made, the proposed SCG's will be referred to as 'candidate' SCG's.</li> </ul>	<p>A Stage I Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gaps, and Development Limits For PLAN Selby - STRATEGIC COUNTRYSIDE GAPS, Prepared By ARUP on behalf of Selby District Council, Draft June 2015</p>
<p>The Strategic Countryside Gaps currently identified in the adopted Local Plan (2005) Policy SGI and Adopted Core Strategy relevant to Selby are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barlby/Osgodby.</li> <li>Barlby Top/Barlby Crescent.</li> <li>Brayton/Selby.</li> <li>Thorpe Willoughby/Selby and Brayton</li> <li>See Technical Issues – Spatial Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ARUP Assessment of the existing SCGs has been based on professional judgement informed desk based study and site work.</li> <li>The study considers the following three questions with regard to the designation and definition of SCG's within the District:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there a real risk that two settlements will coalesce?</li> <li>Is the land between the two settlements open in character?</li> <li>Is there a perception of leaving one settlement and entering open countryside before entering the next settlement?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This Assessment undertaken by ARUP only makes recommendations. The recommendations should be considered as part of this engagement event and assessed as part of the next stage of the Draft PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ARUP recommendations are identified in the Spatial Options Baseline Note.</li> </ul>	

## Development Limits

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ARUP recommend that PLAN Selby adopts a tight Development Limit boundary which will incorporate the outcomes of the separate Green Belt Study and Strategic Countryside Gaps review processes, as well as incorporating a check of existing defined Development Limits in order to correct any minor errors or discrepancies since the previous Limits were established, which will in turn inform the Housing and Employment Site Selection Process and dictate where future growth of the market towns can be accommodated in accordance with the Council's housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy.</li> </ul>	<p>A Stage I Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gaps, and Development Limits For PLAN Selby – DEFINITION OF DEVELOPMENT LIMITS, Prepared By ARUP on behalf of Selby District Council, Draft June 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria for defining Development Limits is recommended as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposed / Existing Site Allocations</li> <li>2. Check of Existing Development Limits in terms of the following                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Extant planning consents</li> <li>b) Functional relationship to physical form of built-up area</li> <li>c) Functional relationship to use of built-up area.</li> <li>d) Relationship to permanent physical boundaries</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ul>	

Please refer to the Selby Town Spatial Options Plan.

## Fact Sheets: Technical Issues – Town Centre

The fact sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
SMI I	Selby	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round I

### Town Centre

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Town Centre Conservation Area identified on Plan seeks to protect and preserve the special character of the Conservation Area and can in some instances, place limitations on the types and scale of development in the defined Conservation Area. This area is identified on the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan.</li> </ul>	Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map (53/53a)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The defined Town Centre Boundary identifies the extent of the retail area as currently defined by the Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map. This area is identified on the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map currently defines those parts of the town centre which are designated as Primary Shopping Frontage areas within Selby town. These are identified on the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map identifies areas of the town as car parking. These are identified on the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map identifies areas of the town as Local Amenity Space. These are identified on the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map identifies areas of the town as Recreation Open Space. These are identified on the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Areas of the town centre designated as Flood Zone 2 and 3 are identified on the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan.</li> </ul>	Environment Agency Flood Maps

Please refer to the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan for all technical issues.

## Fact Sheets: Technical Issues – Natural & Heritage Environment

The fact sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
<b>SMI4</b>	Selby	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Town Centre

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map identifies areas of the town as Local Amenity Space. These are identified in the Technical Issues – Natural &amp; Heritage Environment Plan.</li> </ul>	Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map (53/53a)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map identifies areas of the town identified as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation. These are identified on the Technical Issues – Natural &amp; Heritage Environment Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map identifies areas of the town identified as Recreation Open Space. These are identified on the Technical Issues – Natural &amp; Heritage Environment Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are 4 designated Conservation Areas in Selby Town (although only one is identified on the Selby District Local Plan as 3 post-dated that Plan). Conservation Areas seek to protect and preserve the special character of the Conservation Area and can in some instances, place limitations on the types and scale of development in the defined Conservation Area. The extent of the Conservation Areas are shown on the Technical Issues – Natural &amp; Heritage Environment Plan.</li> </ul>	

## Strategic Countryside Gap (SCG)

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Study undertaken by ARUP is part of the evidence base for PLAN Selby. It will inform, but not predetermine decisions to be made later in the process on whether Strategic Countryside Gaps (SCG's) should be designated in PLAN Selby. A recommendation in the finalised study, after focused engagement, that land is worthy of such a designation will be an important consideration in determining the appropriateness of land allocations for growth in PLAN Selby. Until these decisions are made, the proposed SCG's will be referred to as 'candidate' SCG's.</li> </ul>	<p>A Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gaps and Development Limits For Plan Selby - STRATEGIC COUNTRYSIDE GAPS, Prepared By ARUP on behalf of Selby District Council, Draft June 2015</p>
<p>The Strategic Countryside Gaps currently identified in the adopted Local Plan (2005) Policy SGI and Adopted Core Strategy relevant to Selby are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barlby/Osgodby.</li> <li>Barlby Top/Barlby Crescent.</li> <li>Brayton/Selby.</li> <li>Thorpe Willoughby/Selby and Brayton</li> <li>These are identified on the Technical Issues – Natural &amp; Heritage Environment Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ARUP Assessment of the existing SCGs has been based on professional judgement, informed desk based study and site work.</li> <li>The study considers the following three questions with regard to the designation and definition of SCG's within the District:</li> <li>Is there a real risk that two settlements will coalesce?</li> <li>Is the land between the two settlements open in character?</li> <li>Is there a perception of leaving one settlement and entering open countryside before entering the next settlement?</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This Assessment undertaken by ARUP only makes recommendations. The recommendations should be considered as part of this engagement event and assessed as part of the next stage of the Draft PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	

## Development Limits

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ARUP recommend that PLAN Selby adopts a tight Development Limit boundary which will incorporate the outcomes of the separate Green Belt Study and Strategic Countryside Gaps review processes, as well as incorporating a check of existing defined Development Limits in order to correct any minor errors or discrepancies since the previous Limits were established, which will in turn inform the Housing and Employment Site Selection Process and dictate where future growth of the market towns can be accommodated in accordance with the</li> </ul>	<p>A Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gaps And Development Limits For Plan Selby - DEFINITION OF DEVELOPMENT</p>

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<p>Council's housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria for defining Development Limits is recommended as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposed / Existing Site Allocations</li> <li>2. Check of Existing Development Limits in terms of the following                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Extant planning consents</li> <li>b) Functional relationship to physical form of built-up area</li> <li>c) Functional relationship to use of built-up area.</li> <li>d) Relationship to permanent physical boundaries</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p>LIMITS, Prepared By Arup On Behalf Of Selby District Council, June 2015</p>

Please refer to the Technical Issues – Natural & Heritage Environment Plan for all technical issues.

## Fact Sheets: Options - Spatial

The fact sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
SM17	Selby	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Flood Risk

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council has recently commissioned Aecom to refresh and update this 2010 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The conclusions referenced from the 2010 study below may change in the light of the findings of the 2015 SFRA.</li> <li>The 2010 Assessment confirms it is not possible for the Council to accommodate all proposed housing and employment land requirements, on land at the lowest risk of flooding if wider sustainability and regeneration objectives are to be achieved.</li> </ul>	Level 1 and 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment And Addendum (SFRA), Living Document, February 2010, Prepared By Scott Wilson On Behalf Of Selby District Council
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Level 1 and Level 2 SFRA should inform land allocations and the future growth of each town proposed as part of PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Flood Maps identified on the Technical Issues – Spatial Options Plan indicate those areas of each settlement that are at risk of flooding and those areas at low risk which will inform the approach to growth and will also inform proposed land allocations identified in PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	

### Housing

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Options to deliver the housing requirement for Selby were given in the Initial Consultation as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allocating larger sites than required to ensure delivery;</li> <li>Allocating sites not currently available and deliverable but will be by the end of</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	Selby District Council - The Site and Policies Local Plan – Initial Consultation 24 November to 19 January 2015

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<p>plan period;</p> <p>3. Identify contingency site allocations that could be released later on in plan period in the event of non-delivery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The approach to site allocation will be based on evidence and the site selection methodology in the SHLAA.               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PDL within existing settlements</li> <li>2. Suitable greenfield sites within settlements</li> <li>3. Extensions to existing settlements on PDL</li> <li>4. Extensions to existing settlements on greenfield land.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• In order to accommodate the scale of growth required, a review of current Development Limits and the boundary of the Urban Area of Selby (as defined in the Core Strategy) will be undertaken.</li> <li>• The most recent housing requirement figures based on April 2015 housing completions are as follows:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selby Urban Area: <u>2061 new dwellings (including Olympia Park site)</u> 51% of overall district requirement (potentially subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>• Sherburn in Elmet: <u>54 new dwellings</u> 11% of overall district requirement (potentially subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>• Tadcaster: <u>476 new dwellings</u> 7% of overall district requirement (subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SHLAA forms part of the evidence base for PLAN Selby and sets out potential land available for housing in the District that will inform the Site Allocations part of PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	<p>Selby District Council Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), June 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SHLAA identifies all sites (of 5 dwellings or more) on a map and provides an assessment of each site, in terms of its suitability, availability and achievability to determine whether a site is realistically expected to be developed.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on the information currently made available to the Council, the total number of sites considered as part of the SHLAA total of 513 sites. 204 of these sites were made up of planning permissions, SDLP allocations and Core Strategy allocations. A Further 309 were identified as 'potential sites'.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The results show that the amount than could be delivered over the plan period is in excess of what is shown to be needed in the Initial Consultation PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With specific reference to the Selby, the total number of sites assessed in the SHLAA are as follows:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selby – Total 7056 houses (capacity identified in SHLAA). Initial Consultation PLAN Selby requirement: 3, 700 houses (from Core Strategy) with 2, 466 from</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<p>new allocations. Currently updated figures at 2015 (see above) = 2061 dwellings required on new allocations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst most of these sites identified in the SHLAA could potentially be delivered in 0-5 years, the number of sites and total number of houses identified is far in excess of Selby's requirement set out in Initial Consultation PLAN Selby. Those sites identified should now be considered and assessed as part of the preparation of PLAN Selby and housing allocations identified in the Plan.</li> <li>• All Selby SHLAA sites are identified on the Spatial Options Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose of the SHMA is to address housing need in Selby District and to develop a robust understanding of housing market dynamics, to provide an assessment of future needs for both market and affordable housing and the housing needs of different groups within the population.</li> <li>• The purpose of the SHMA is to address housing need in Selby District and to develop a robust understanding of housing market dynamics, to provide an assessment of future needs for both market and affordable housing and the housing needs of different groups within the population.</li> <li>• Some key draft findings are:</li> <li>• The District's objectively assessed need for housing is about 430 dwelling per annum up to 2027. This supports the adopted policy position in the adopted Core Strategy.</li> <li>• There remains a significant affordable housing need across the District and this supports the Council's adopted policy position.</li> <li>• In terms of wider sub regional housing markets, the strongest relationship based on local authority areas is between Selby and York. However, in policy terms there should be recognition of the relationships with Leeds and Wakefield from a housing market point of view. This supports the production of a SHMA for Selby District.</li> <li>• The analysis in the Assessment indicates that the majority of demand for market housing will be for mid-market homes with 2 and 3 bedrooms and a strong demand for bungalows. This should inform strategic policy and the 'portfolio' of sites which are considered through the PLAN Selby.</li> <li>• The majority of the need for affordable housing is for 1- and 2-bed properties. This should inform strategic policy and the 'portfolio' of sites which are considered through the PLAN Selby</li> <li>• The needs evidence suggests that a 25%/ 75% split of affordable housing provision between intermediate and social/ affordable rented provision would be appropriate.</li> <li>• Demographic change likely to see a requirement for additional care/ support and specialist housing provision. Net need for 417 bed spaces. This should be considered in identifying potential sites in accessible locations.</li> <li>• Custom build - Council should set up register and identify plots in larger developments.</li> </ul>	<p>Selby District Council – Draft Selby Strategic Housing Market Assessment, June 2015, Prepared By GL Hearn Limited</p>

## Strategic Countryside Gaps

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Study undertaken by ARUP is part of the evidence base for PLAN Selby. It will inform, but not predetermine decisions to be made later in the process on whether Strategic Countryside Gaps (SCG's) should be designated in PLAN Selby. A recommendation in the finalised study, after focused engagement, that land is worthy of such a designation will be an important consideration in determining the appropriateness of land allocations for growth in PLAN Selby. Until these decisions are made, the proposed SCG's will be referred to as 'candidate' SCG's</li> <li>The Study states that all candidate SCG's identified on the Spatial Options Plan prevent the merging of settlements, the SCG are open in nature and there is a perception of leaving a settlement or part of a settlement and entering open countryside before entering the next settlement.</li> <li>The Spatial Options Plan identifies the boundaries of each candidate SCG.</li> </ul>	<p>A Stage I Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gaps, and Development Limits For Plan Selby - STRATEGIC COUNTRYSIDE GAPS, Prepared By ARUP on behalf of Selby District Council, Draft June 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This Assessment undertaken by ARUP only makes recommendations. The recommendations should be considered as part of this engagement event and assessed as part of the next stage of the Draft PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	

## Development Limits

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ARUP recommend that PLAN Selby adopts a tight Development Limit boundary which will incorporate the outcomes of the separate Green Belt Study and Strategic Countryside Gaps review processes, as well as incorporating a check of existing defined Development Limits in order to correct any minor errors or discrepancies since the previous Limits were established, which will in turn inform the Housing and Employment Site Selection Process and dictate where future growth of the market towns can be accommodated in accordance with the Council's housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy.</li> </ul>	<p>A Stage I Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gaps, and Development Limits For Plan Selby - DEFINITION OF DEVELOPMENT LIMITS -Prepared By Arup On Behalf Of Selby District Council, June 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criteria for defining Development Limits is recommended as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposed / Existing Site Allocations</li> <li>2. Check of Existing Development Limits in terms of the following                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Extant planning consents</li> <li>b. Functional relationship to physical form of built-up area</li> <li>c. Functional relationship to use of built-up area.</li> <li>d. Relationship to permanent physical boundaries</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ul>	

Please refer to the Selby Spatial Options Plan.

## Fact Sheets: Options – Town Centre

The facts sheets, released in advance of publication of the Draft Studies will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
SM20	Selby	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Retail & Leisure

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<p>The Study makes the following recommendations relevant to the town centre.</p> <p><b>Hotel</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Tesco (former Council offices) site on Portholme Road could provide for a new hotel to be delivered as part of a mixed-use scheme.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comparison Retail</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Tesco (former Council offices) site on Portholme Road could also provide an opportunity for accommodating new comparison retail development (site immediately available; no requirement for land assembly, quantum of substantive development already approved). (If no other deliverable sites available within sequentially preferable locations in the town centre this site is recommended to come forward)</li> </ul> <p><b>Leisure (Cinema)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recommended that the Council should actively seek to establish if there is prospective commercial interest in the town for a new cinema and if so the appropriate scale and format of provision so as to subsequently inform any site allocation exercise if necessary. The Tesco (former Council offices) site on Portholme Road provides a deliverable site development opportunity in the early part of the plan period.</li> <li>The Tesco (former Council offices) site on Portholme Road is identified on the Town Centre Options Plan.</li> </ul>	Selby District Council Final Selby Retail and Leisure Study (RLS), May 2015, GVA Grimley
<p><b>Town Centre Boundaries</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RLS recommends that the existing boundaries should be tightened to exclude areas of established residential uses and those areas which are located some distance from the Primary Shopping Area and do not function as part of the town centres.</li> <li>Recommendations for new town centre boundaries are identified on the Town</li> </ul>	

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
Centre Options Plan.	
<p><b>Primary Shopping Area (PSA) Boundaries</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Study only recommends the designation of a Primary Shopping Area (PSA) for Selby.</li> <li>If adopted, the recommended primary shopping area boundary will define the area of the town considered to be in-centre for retail purposes. The report recommends the PSA encompasses a significantly wider area than the existing primary shopping frontages, but is smaller than the existing Shopping and Commercial Centre boundary.</li> <li>Roughly speaking, a 300m area from the recommended PSA boundary in Selby provides an indication of the broad 'edge-of-centre area' of Selby. This 'edge-of-centre area' extends to: the River Ouse and railway through Selby to the east; south of Portholme Road to include the Police Station, former Civic Centre and Tesco store; along Gowthorpe to Armoury Road to the west; and north on Scott Road to Scott Road Medical Centre. However, the report emphasises that whether a site is edge- or out-of centre in sequential terms is dependent on the specific location of a site and its relationship with the PSA and is not strictly defined by distance from the PSA.</li> <li>Potentially, areas outside of the existing Shopping and Commercial Centre Boundary of Selby previously considered to be out-of-centre in sequential terms may become edge-of-centre, and vice-versa.</li> <li>The proposed Primary Shopping Area boundary and '300 metre area' are shown on the Town Centre Options Plan.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Frontage Policies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recommended that the Council undertake a review of the adequacy and relevance of the existing defined Primary Shopping Frontage designations within Selby town centre. The Primary Shopping Frontage will include a high proportion of retail uses. The study recommends the designation of Primary Shopping Frontage for Selby. GVA consider that Selby is too small in physical terms to necessitate the definition of secondary shopping frontages.</li> <li>The proposed Primary Shopping Frontage boundary is identified on the Town Centre Options Plan.</li> </ul>	

## Site Specific

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In November 2006, the three 'Renaissance Market Town Teams' for Selby, Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster, in partnership with Yorkshire Forward, Selby District Council, URBED and other consultants, published the Selby District Renaissance Strategic Development Framework (SDF) .</li> <li>This was the culmination of work during that year which sought to progress the Selby District Charter and its 25 year vision into specific development projects and environmental enhancements.</li> </ul>	Strategic District Renaissance Strategic Development Framework (SDF), 2006

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The projects set out in the SDF include the creative use of architecture, urban design and landscaping to transform the quality of the public realm of the district, the streets, parks and spaces of the towns. As well as proposals for the enhancement of the public realm, the SDF also considered the future growth of the three towns and where new housing and employment should be planned.</li> <li>• Some of these projects were progressed and have since been completed. Some of these projects have not been pursued for a number of different reasons i.e. land assembly, deliverability. This engagement provides an opportunity to consider whether these projects are deliverable and worthy of pursuing during the next plan period.</li> <li>• The projects that have not been delivered and are relevant to consider here are identified on the Spatial Options Plan and listed below:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements to Selby Park. Not currently developed due to land assembly issues.</li> <li>• Landmark footbridge. Not deliverable at present. Not currently identified as part of recent planning permission for Olympia Park</li> <li>• Regional Water Park. Not currently developed due to land assembly issues</li> <li>• Acquisition and conversion of Abbot's Staithe for studio space, Selby Museum and Abbey facilities</li> <li>• Development of the Station Quarter either as mixed-use neighbourhood or an alternative site for the Science Park. Not currently developed</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The "Station Quarter" is a 20ha site within Selby town, centred upon the railway station. The site is broadly defined by the River Ouse to the east, Selby Canal to the south, Bawtry Road to the west and New Street to the north.</li> <li>• This Draft SPD, subject of Informal Consultation, was prepared to explain Special Policy Area SEL6 and Policy SEL7 of the Saved Selby District Local Plan 2005, provides framework for allowing development to take place in the Station Quarter area of Selby.</li> <li>• It contained visionary ideas as well as detailed advice on architecture and other issues to shape any development that does take place. This was to help to ensure that the whole area is developed in a coordinated fashion over the years, rather than in an ad-hoc way.</li> </ul>	<p>Selby District Council – Selby Station Quarter Proposed Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) - Informal Consultation Document (2009)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SPD was to be used in three principal ways: 1. Promote the site to 3rd party developers 2. Be used to lever funds to deliver projects. 3. Be used in determining planning applications.</li> <li>• The SPD included a "Possible Masterplan" which was the result of all projects and proposals put forward at a public consultation event.</li> <li>• Proposals include a new train and bus station and highway and traffic improvements to access the new stations</li> <li>• Redevelop the existing station for small offices and commercial uses</li> <li>• Pedestrian bridge improvements over the railway and canal</li> </ul>	

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extension to existing Park</li> <li>• Development of a river barrage to remove the impact of tides and strong currents from the Ouse will promote a pleasure boating culture.</li> <li>• Residential uses</li> <li>• Commercial office park, shifting the focus from industry in this area to office based to complement residential uses.</li> <li>• The next stages of the SPD were to explore the suitability, feasibility, desirability and deliverability of all potential projects to assess which should be included in the SPD. This SPD has not been advanced since 2010.</li> <li>• This consultation provides an opportunity to consider whether these proposals identified as part of previous consultation in 2009 are worthy of pursuing during the next plan period.</li> <li>• The Station Quarter is identified on the Town Centre Options Plan.</li> </ul>	

Please refer to the Selby Town Centre Options Plan.

## Fact Sheets: Options – Natural & Heritage

### Environment

The fact sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
SM23	Selby	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Strategic Countryside Gaps

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Study undertaken by ARUP is part of the evidence base for PLAN Selby. It will inform, but not predetermine decisions to be made later in the process on whether Strategic Countryside Gaps (SCG's) should be designated in PLAN Selby. A recommendation in the finalised study, after focused engagement, that land is worthy of such a designation will be an important consideration in determining the appropriateness of land allocations for growth in PLAN Selby. Until these decisions are made, the proposed SCG's will be referred to as 'candidate' SCG's</li> <li>The Study states that all candidate SCG's identified on the Spatial Options Plan prevent the merging of settlements, the SCG are open in nature and there is a perception of leaving a settlement or part of a settlement and entering open countryside before entering the next settlement.</li> </ul>	A Stage I Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gaps , and Development Limits For Plan Selby - STRATEGIC COUNTRYSIDE GAPS, Prepared By ARUP on behalf of Selby District Council, June 2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This Assessment undertaken by ARUP only makes recommendations. The recommendations should be considered as part of this engagement event and assessed as part of the next stage of the Draft PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	

### Development Limits

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ARUP recommend that PLAN Selby adopts a tight Development Limit boundary which will incorporate the outcomes of the separate Green Belt Study and Strategic Countryside Gaps review processes, as well as incorporating a check of existing defined Development Limits in order to correct any minor errors or discrepancies since the previous Limits were established, which will in turn inform the Housing and Employment Site Selection Process and dictate where future</li> </ul>	A Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gaps, And Development Limits For Plan Selby - DEFINITION OF

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<p>growth of the market towns can be accommodated in accordance with the Council's housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>DEVELOPMENT LIMITS            Prepared By Arup On            Behalf Of Selby District            Council, June 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria for defining Development Limits is recommended as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposed / Existing Site Allocations</li> <li>2. Check of Existing Development Limits in terms of the following                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Extant planning consents</li> <li>b. Functional relationship to physical form of built-up area</li> <li>c. Functional relationship to use of built-up area.</li> <li>d. Relationship to permanent physical boundaries</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ul>	

## Housing

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Options to deliver the housing requirement for Selby were given in the Initial Consultation document as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Allocating larger sites than required to ensure delivery;</li> <li>2. Allocating sites not currently available and deliverable but will be by the end of plan period;</li> <li>3. Identify contingency site allocations that could be released later on in plan period in the event of non-delivery.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• The approach to site allocation will be based on evidence and the site selection methodology in the SHLAA.               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) PDL within existing settlements</li> <li>2) Suitable greenfield sites within settlements</li> <li>3) Extensions to existing settlements on PDL</li> <li>4) Extensions to existing settlements on greenfield land.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• In order to accommodate the scale of growth required a review of current Development Limits and the boundary of the Urban Area of Selby (as defined in the Core Strategy) will be undertaken.</li> <li>• The most recent housing requirement figures based on April 2015 housing completions are as follows:</li> <li>• PLAN Selby must identify sufficient housing land allocations to deliver 7200 homes in the district up to 2027 as set out in the Core Strategy. This equates to 450 new homes per year. The indicative amount of new allocations based on the Core Strategy and completion and planning permissions granted since adoption of</li> </ul>	<p>Selby District Council -            The Site and Policies            Local Plan – Initial            Consultation 24            November to 19 January            2015</p>

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<p>the Core Strategy are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Selby Urban Area: <u>2061 new dwellings (including Olympia Park site)</u> 51% of overall district requirement (potentially subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>Sherburn in Elmet: <u>54 new dwellings</u> 11% of overall district requirement (potentially subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>Tadcaster: <u>476 new dwellings</u> 7% of overall district requirement (subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SHLAA forms part of the evidence base for PLAN Selby and sets out potential land available for housing in the District that will inform the Site Allocations part of PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	<p>Selby District Council Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), June 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SHLAA identifies all sites on a map and provides an assessment of each site, in terms of its suitability, availability and achievability to determine whether a site is realistically expected to be developed.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on the information currently made available to the Council, the total number of sites considered as part of the SHLAA total of 513 sites. 204 of these sites were made up of planning permissions, SDLP allocations and Core Strategy allocations. A Further 309 were identified as 'potential sites'.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The results show that the amount than could be delivered over the plan period is in excess of what is shown to be needed in the Initial Consultation PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With specific reference to the Selby, the total number of sites assessed in the SHLAA are as follows:</li> <li><b>Selby</b> – Total 7056 houses (capacity identified in SHLAA). Initial Consultation PLAN Selby requirement: 3, 700 houses (from Core Strategy) with 2, 466 from new allocations. Currently updated figures at 2015 (see above) = 2061 dwellings required on new allocations.</li> <li>Whilst most of these sites identified in the SHLAA could potentially be delivered in 0-5 years, the number of sites and total number of houses identified is far in excess of Selby's requirement set out in Initial Consultation PLAN Selby. Those sites identified should now be considered and assessed as part of the preparation of PLAN Selby and housing allocations identified in the Plan.</li> <li>All Selby SHLAA sites are identified on the Spatial Options Plan.</li> </ul>	

Please refer to the Selby Natural & Heritage Environment Plan.



Let's Talk

**PLAN SELBY**

**SHERBURN FACT SHEETS**

Selby District Market Town Study

24<sup>th</sup> June 2015 Revision C



## Introduction

This facts sheets booklet provides a summary of the key issues and recommendations identified following a baseline review of recent evidence base studies undertaken by consultants on behalf of Selby District Council to inform and support the PLAN Selby preparation process.

The facts sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

The Draft evidence base studies have been published in full on the Council website as part of the Let's Talk PLAN Selby focussed engagement, which provides an opportunity to comment from the 29<sup>th</sup> June to Monday 10<sup>th</sup> August 2015.

## Fact Sheets: Deficits Needs and Aspirations

The fact sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
<b>SM7</b>	Sherburn in Elmet	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Summary of Deficits, Needs and Aspirations

THEME	KEY ISSUES
<b>Deficits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor choice of shops</li> <li>• Car parking availability</li> <li>• Housing requirement from previous Local Plan allocation not built out</li> </ul>
<b>Needs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To adequately meet daily shopping and service needs</li> <li>• To provide 54 new dwellings, however if Tadcaster is unable to meet its housing needs, Sherburn and Selby will be required to provide the additional shortfall of 476 houses.</li> <li>• To provide affordable housing (1- and 2-bed properties, 25% : 75% split of intermediate and social/affordable rented provision</li> <li>• To provide mid-market homes with 2 and 3 bedrooms and satisfy strong demand for bungalows</li> <li>• To provide additional care/support and specialist housing</li> <li>• To register and identify plots in larger developments for custom build</li> <li>• General junction improvements onto Strategic Road Network</li> <li>• Primary School Growth and Extra Care housing</li> </ul>
<b>Aspirations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved food store provision</li> <li>• Improved youth/young adult facilities. a new swimming pool and improved play areas for children</li> <li>• An improved range of places to eat</li> <li>• Improvements in quality of town centre environment</li> </ul>

## Retail and Leisure

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE								
<b>Deficits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A number of deficits have been identified from the in-centre shopper and business survey's undertaken as part of the Retail and Leisure Study. These are as follows:</li> <li>Unattractiveness of the environment</li> <li>Poor choice of shops</li> <li>Car parking availability.</li> <li>Lack of leisure facilities, particularly health and fitness facilities.</li> </ul>	Selby District Council Selby Retail and Leisure Study (RLS), May 2015, GVA Grimley								
<b>Needs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Study recommends that given that the limitations of the existing offer and that the town centre serves highly localised catchments, the forward strategy should focus on adequately meeting daily shopping and service needs.</li> <li>The following table sets out the identified retail and leisure need in Selby based on the conclusions of the RLS:</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Location</th> <th>Convenience</th> <th>Comparison</th> <th>Leisure</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Sherburn in Elmet</td> <td>None</td> <td>None</td> <td>None</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Location	Convenience	Comparison	Leisure	Sherburn in Elmet	None	None	None	Selby District Council Selby Retail and Leisure Study (RLS), May 2015, GVA Grimley
Location	Convenience	Comparison	Leisure							
Sherburn in Elmet	None	None	None							
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No more development needed</li> <li>The Parish Council is of the view no further housing or employment land needs to be allocated prior to 2027, there is also no need to discount Sherburn figures by 10%. Sherburn now needs to address the current infrastructure shortfall and over provision of employment land.</li> <li>Land should be removed from the Green Belt for Sherburn to grow.</li> <li>Review village centre and consider expansion to north to include shopping/supermarkets and include a bypass.</li> <li>The Parish Council considers:</li> <li>The village is in need of new indoor and outdoor leisure facilities including the replacement of the high school pool, SDC is working with the school on an allweather pitch but more needs to be done.</li> <li>The access to the A1 at Lumby needs improving while the 2 train stations need improved parking and services to Leeds and York.</li> <li>There is also a need for a household recycling centre to serve the SW of the district.</li> <li>The cemetery at All Saints Church will be at capacity in 2 years a site is urgently needed</li> <li>The Sherburn le Willows SSSI which is a Yorkshire Wildlife Trust reserve has very high quality grassland. Buffering and protection should be installed to stop new development/residents damaging the site.</li> </ul>	Summary of 'Needs' Identified through Representations Received on 'Town Centre' Visions as part of the Initial Consultation on PLAN Selby November 2014-January 2015								

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<b>Aspiration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The main suggested retail improvements that would encourage respondents to shop in the town centre more often was improved food store provision, however there is insufficient capacity to support significant new convenience provision within the town, since recent approval of ALDI store.</li> <li>When asked what leisure improvements would persuade them to visit the town centre more often, the most popular suggested improvement was an enhanced range of health and fitness facilities / gyms, followed by improved youth / young adult facilities, a new swimming pool, improved play areas for children and an improved range of places to eat.</li> <li>Local businesses consider the poor quality of the town centre environment and availability of car parking to be the main issues facing Sherburn in Elmet.</li> </ul>	Selby District Council Selby Retail and Leisure Study (RLS), May 2015, GVA Grimley

## Employment

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<b>Deficit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified</li> </ul>	
<b>Need</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ELR recommends the de-allocation of the existing allocated Sherburn Enterprise Park (1.46 ha)</li> <li>The ELR confirms that the Mine at Gascoigne Wood has potential to meet specialist freight terminal need.</li> <li>In summary, this ELR Report states that employment need and demands can be met by existing employment sites (Sherburn Enterprise Park)</li> </ul>	Employment Land Review (ELR) (Draft) June 2015, GVA GRIMLEY
<b>Aspiration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified</li> </ul>	

## Housing

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<b>Deficit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified</li> </ul>	

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
Need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLAN Selby must identify sufficient housing land allocations to deliver 7200 homes in the district up to 2027 as set out in the Core Strategy. This equates to 450 new homes per year. The indicative amount of new allocations based on the Core Strategy and completion and planning permissions granted since adoption of the Core Strategy are as follows:</li> <li>• Selby Urban Area: <u>2061 new dwellings (including Olympia Park site)</u> 51% of overall district requirement (potentially subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>• Sherburn in Elmet: <u>54 new dwellings</u> 11% of overall district requirement (potentially subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>• Tadcaster: <u>476 new dwellings</u> 7% of overall district requirement (subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> </ul>	Selby District Council – Updated Figures as at 1 April 2015
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose of the SHMA is to address housing need in Selby District and to develop a robust understanding of housing market dynamics, to provide an assessment of future needs for both market and affordable housing and the housing needs of different groups within the population.</li> <li>• Some key draft findings are:</li> <li>• The District’s objectively assessed need for housing is about 430 dwelling per annum up to 2027. This supports the adopted policy position in the adopted Core Strategy.</li> <li>• There remains a significant affordable housing need across the District and this supports the Council’s adopted policy position.</li> <li>• In terms of wider sub regional housing markets, the strongest relationship based on local authority areas is between Selby and York. However, in policy terms there should be recognition of the relationships with Leeds and Wakefield from a housing market point of view. This supports the production of a SHMA for Selby District.</li> <li>• The analysis in the Assessment indicates that the majority of demand for market housing will be for mid-market homes with 2 and 3 bedrooms and a strong demand for bungalows. This should inform strategic policy and the ‘portfolio’ of sites which are considered through the PLAN Selby.</li> <li>• The majority of the need for affordable housing is for 1- and 2-bed properties. This should inform strategic policy and the ‘portfolio’ of sites which are considered through the PLAN Selby</li> <li>• The needs evidence suggests that a 25%/ 75% split of affordable housing provision between intermediate and social/ affordable rented provision would be appropriate.</li> <li>• Demographic change likely to see a requirement for additional care/ support and specialist housing provision. Net need for 417 bed spaces. This should be considered in identifying potential sites in accessible locations.</li> </ul>	Selby District Council – Draft Selby Strategic Housing Market Assessment, June 2015, Prepared By GL Hearn Limited

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Custom build – Council should set up register and identify plots in larger developments.</li> </ul>	
<b>Aspiration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified</li> </ul>	

## Infrastructure

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<b>Deficit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified</li> </ul>	
<b>Need</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) outlines the presence of and planned delivery of infrastructure which is relevant to the area covered by the Local Plan for Selby District, including specific infrastructure requirements of sites allocated for development in PLAN Selby.</li> <li>The IDP states that in Sherburn in Elmet there is a need to accommodate Primary School growth, Extra Care housing, and to manage any additional traffic onto the Strategic Road Network. A recent planning application for large scale housing growth totalling 700 units is addressing these issues through the negotiation of a Section 106 agreement. <i>(Note: Update - There are 3 planning permissions totalling 702 dwellings as at 1 April 2015)</i></li> </ul>	Selby District Council – Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), September 2014
<b>Aspiration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified</li> </ul>	

## Fact Sheets: Technical Issues - Spatial

The fact sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
SM10	Sherburn In Elmet	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Flood Risk

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council has recently commissioned Aecom to refresh and update this 2010 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The conclusions referenced from the 2010 study below may change in the light of the findings of the 2015 SFRA.</li> <li>This Assessment confirms it is not possible for the Council to accommodate all proposed housing and employment land requirements, on land at the lowest risk of flooding if wider sustainability and regeneration objectives are to be achieved.</li> </ul>	Level 1 and 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment And Addendum (SFRA), Living Document, February 2010, Prepared By Scott Wilson On Behalf Of Selby District Council
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Level 1 and Level 2 SFRA should inform land allocations and the future growth of each town proposed as part of PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Sequential Test concluded that the housing requirement for Sherburn-in-Elmet and Tadcaster and 'low flood risk' sustainable villages can be satisfied on land at lowest risk of flooding (Flood Zone 1).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Flood Maps identified on the Technical Issues – Spatial Plan indicate those areas of each settlement that are at risk of flooding and those areas at low risk which will inform the approach to growth and will also inform proposed land allocations identified in PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	

### Green Belt

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The supporting Technical Issues - Spatial Plans identifies the current extent of the Green Belt around Sherburn in Elmet</li> </ul>	A Stage I Study Of Green Belt, Strategic

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose of the Stage 1 Study is to independently and objectively assess the extent to which areas of Green Belt within Selby District meet the five purposes of the Green Belt as defined within NPPF.</li> </ul>	Countryside Gaps, Safeguarded Land and Development Limits - Green Belt Study, Prepared By ARUP on Behalf Of Selby District Council, June 2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Stage 1 Green Belt Study, when finalised after focused engagement, will provide the findings on how well 'general areas' of the Green Belt perform against the five purposes of the Green Belt. It does not reach a judgement on what general areas should be taken forward for further consideration in Stages 2 and 3 to identify specific parcels of land that have the potential to be released from the Green Belt.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants of the focused engagement are being asked to comment on the Green Belt General Areas Assessment contained in the Stage 1 study and how the judgement should be made in Stage 2 of the Study to determine which General Areas of the Green Belt should be taken forward for further consideration.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will not be until these later two stages of the Green Belt Study are completed, along with the Council's site option assessment work, that the implications on potential release of Green Belt land for PLAN Selby will be known.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If changes to the Green Belt boundaries are to be proposed by the Council, exceptional circumstances must be demonstrated. The existence or not of exceptional circumstances cannot be made until the remainder of the Green Belt Study and further work on the site options contained in the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), Employment Land Review (ELR) and Retail site options have been assessed.</li> </ul>	

## Development Limits

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ARUP recommend that PLAN Selby adopts a tight Development Limit boundary which will incorporate the outcomes of the separate Green Belt Study and Strategic Countryside Gaps review processes, as well as incorporating a check of existing defined Development Limits in order to correct any minor errors or discrepancies since the previous Limits were established, which will in turn inform the Housing and Employment Site Selection Process and dictate where future growth of the market towns can be accommodated in accordance with the Council's housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy.</li> </ul>	A Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gap, and Development Limits For Plan Selby - Definition Of Development Limits, By Arup On Behalf Of Selby District Council, June 2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criteria for defining Development Limits is recommended as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposed / Existing Site Allocations</li> <li>2. Check of Existing Development Limits in terms of the following                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Extant planning consents</li> <li>b) Functional relationship to physical form of built-up area</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ul>	

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) Functional relationship to use of built-up area.</li> <li>d) Relationship to permanent physical boundaries</li> </ul>	

Please refer to the Technical Issues – Spatial Plan for all technical issues.

## Fact Sheets: Technical Issues – Town Centre

The fact sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
<b>SM13</b>	Sherburn In Elmet	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Town Centre

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The defined Town Centre Boundary identifies the extent of the retail area as currently defined by the Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map. These areas are identified on the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan.</li> </ul>	Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map (54)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map identifies areas of the town as car parking. These are identified on the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map identifies areas of the town as Local Amenity Space. These are identified on the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map identifies areas of the town as Recreation Open Space. These are identified on the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan.</li> </ul>	

Please refer to the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan for all technical issues.

## Fact Sheets: Technical Issues – Natural & Heritage Environment

The fact sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
<b>SMI6</b>	Sherburn in Elmet	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Town Centre

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map identifies areas of the town identified as Local Amenity Space. These are identified on the Technical Issues – Natural &amp; Heritage Environment Plan.</li> </ul>	Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map (54)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map identifies areas of the town identified as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation. These are identified on the Technical Issues – Natural &amp; Heritage Environment Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map identifies areas of the town identified as Recreation Open Space. These are identified on the Technical Issues – Natural &amp; Heritage Environment Plan.</li> </ul>	

### Green Belt

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose of the Stage 1 Study is to independently and objectively assess the extent to which areas of Green Belt within Selby District meet the five purposes of the Green Belt as defined within NPPF.</li> </ul>	A Study Of Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gaps, and Development Limits - Green Belt Study, Prepared By ARUP on Behalf Of Selby District Council, June 2015

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Stage 1 Green Belt Study, when finalised after focused engagement, will provide the findings on how well 'general areas' of the Green Belt perform against the five purposes of the Green Belt. It does not reach a judgement on what general areas should be taken forward for further consideration in Stages 2 and 3 to identify specific parcels of land that have the potential to be released from the Green Belt.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants of the focused engagement are being asked to comment on the Green Belt General Areas Assessment contained in the Stage 1 study and how the judgement should be made in Stage 2 of the Study to determine which General Areas of the Green Belt should be taken forward for further consideration.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will not be until these later two stages of the Green Belt Study are completed, along with the Council's site option assessment work, that the implications on potential release of Green Belt land for PLAN Selby will be known.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If changes to the Green Belt boundaries are to be proposed by the Council, exceptional circumstances must be demonstrated. The existence or not of exceptional circumstances cannot be made until the remainder of the Green Belt Study and further work on the site options contained in the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), Employment Land Review (ELR) and Retail site options have been assessed.</li> </ul>	

## Development Limits

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ARUP recommend that PLAN Selby adopts a tight Development Limit boundary which will incorporate the outcomes of the separate Green Belt Study and Strategic Countryside Gaps review processes, as well as incorporating a check of existing defined Development Limits in order to correct any minor errors or discrepancies since the previous Limits were established, which will in turn inform the Housing and Employment Site Selection Process and dictate where future growth of the market towns can be accommodated in accordance with the Council's housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy.</li> </ul>	<p>A Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gap, and Development Limits For Plan Selby - Definition Of Development Limits, By Arup On Behalf Of Selby District Council, June 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criteria for defining Development Limits is recommended as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Proposed / Existing Site Allocations</li> <li>2) Check of Existing Development Limits in terms of the following                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Extant planning consents</li> <li>b. Functional relationship to physical form of built-up area</li> <li>c. Functional relationship to use of built-up area.</li> <li>d. Relationship to permanent physical boundaries</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ul>	

Please refer to the Technical Issues – Natural & Heritage Environment Plan for all technical issues.

## Fact Sheets: Options - Spatial

The fact sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
<b>SM19</b>	Sherburn in Elmet	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Flood Risk

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council has recently commissioned Aecom to refresh and update this 2010 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The conclusions referenced from the 2010 study below may change in the light of the findings of the 2015 SFRA.</li> <li>This Assessment confirms it is not possible for the Council to accommodate all proposed housing and employment land requirements, on land at the lowest risk of flooding if wider sustainability and regeneration objectives are to be achieved.</li> </ul>	Level 1 and 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment And Addendum (SFRA), Living Document, February 2010, Prepared By Scott Wilson On Behalf Of Selby District Council
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Level 1 and Level 2 SFRA should inform land allocations and the future growth of each town proposed as part of PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Sequential Test concluded that the housing requirement for Sherburn-in-Elmet and Tadcaster and 'low flood risk' sustainable villages can be satisfied on land at lowest risk of flooding (Flood Zone 1).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Flood Maps identified on the Technical Issues – Spatial Options Plan indicate those areas of each settlement that are at risk of flooding and those areas at low risk which will inform the approach to growth and will also inform proposed land allocations identified in PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	

### Housing

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Options to deliver the housing requirement for Sherburn in Elmet given in the Initial Consultation are as follows:</li> </ul>	The Site and Policies Local Plan – Initial Consultation 24 November to 19 January

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Allocating larger sites than required to ensure delivery;</li> <li>2. Allocating sites not currently available and deliverable but will be by the end of plan period;</li> <li>3. Identify contingency site allocations that could be released later on in plan period in the event of non-delivery.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The approach to site allocation will be based on evidence and the site selection methodology in the SHLAA.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PDL within existing settlements</li> <li>2. Suitable greenfield sites within settlements</li> <li>3. Extensions to existing settlements on PDL</li> <li>4. Extensions to existing settlements on greenfield land</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The most recent housing requirement figures based on April 2015 housing completions are as follows:</li> <li>• Selby Urban Area: <u>2061 new dwellings (including Olympia Park site)</u> 51% of overall district requirement (potentially subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>• Sherburn in Elmet: <u>54 new dwellings</u> 11% of overall district requirement (potentially subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>• In order to accommodate the scale of growth required a review of current Development Limits will be undertaken and where a settlement is within or adjoining Green Belt a localised review of that boundary may also be undertaken.</li> </ul>	<p>2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SHLAA forms part of the evidence base for PLAN Selby and sets out potential land available for housing in the District that will inform the Site Allocations part of PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	<p>Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SHLAA identifies all sites on a map and provides an assessment of each site, in terms of its suitability, availability and achievability to determine whether a site is realistically expected to be developed.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on the information currently made available to the Council, the total number of sites considered as part of the SHLAA total of 513 sites. 204 of these sites were made up of planning permissions, SDLP allocations and Core Strategy allocations. A Further 309 were identified as 'potential sites'.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The results show that the amount than could be delivered over the plan period is far in excess of what is shown to be needed in the Initial Consultation PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With specific reference to Sherburn in Elmet the total number of sites assessed in the SHLAA is as follows:</li> <li>• Sherburn In Elmet – Total 3689 houses (capacity from SHLAA). Initial Consultation PLAN Selby requirement: 790 houses (from Core Strategy) with 57 from new allocations. Currently updated figures at 2015 (see above) = 54 dwellings required on new allocations.</li> </ul>	

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst most of these sites identified in the SHLAA could potentially be delivered in 0-5 years, the number of sites and total number of houses identified is in excess of Sherburn In Elmet's requirement set out in Initial Consultation PLAN Selby. Those sites identified should now be considered and assessed as part of the preparation of PLAN Selby and housing allocations identified in the Plan.</li> <li>• All Sherburn in Elmet SHLAA sites are identified on the Spatial Options Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose of the SHMA is to address housing need in Selby District and to develop a robust understanding of housing market dynamics, to provide an assessment of future needs for both market and affordable housing and the housing needs of different groups within the population.</li> <li>• The purpose of the SHMA is to address housing need in Selby District and to develop a robust understanding of housing market dynamics, to provide an assessment of future needs for both market and affordable housing and the housing needs of different groups within the population.</li> <li>• Some key draft findings are:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The District's objectively assessed need for housing is about 430 dwelling per annum up to 2027. This supports the adopted policy position in the adopted Core Strategy.</li> <li>• There remains a significant affordable housing need across the District and this supports the Council's adopted policy position.</li> <li>• In terms of wider sub regional housing markets, the strongest relationship based on local authority areas is between Selby and York. However, in policy terms there should be recognition of the relationships with Leeds and Wakefield from a housing market point of view. This supports the production of a SHMA for Selby District.</li> <li>• The analysis in the Assessment indicates that the majority of demand for market housing will be for mid-market homes with 2 and 3 bedrooms and a strong demand for bungalows. This should inform strategic policy and the 'portfolio' of sites which are considered through the PLAN Selby.</li> <li>• The majority of the need for affordable housing is for 1- and 2-bed properties. This should inform strategic policy and the 'portfolio' of sites which are considered through the PLAN Selby</li> <li>• The needs evidence suggests that a 25%/ 75% split of affordable housing provision between intermediate and social/ affordable rented provision would be appropriate.</li> <li>• Demographic change likely to see a requirement for additional care/ support and specialist housing provision. Net need for 417 bed spaces. This should be considered in identifying potential sites in accessible locations.</li> <li>• Custom build - Council should set up register and identify plots in larger developments.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Selby District Council –          Draft Selby Strategic          Housing Market          Assessment, June 2015,          Prepared By GL Hearn          Limited</p>

## Employment

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ELR recommends that there is sufficient existing supply and further sites do not need to be identified.</li> </ul>	Employment Land Review (ELR) (Draft) June 2015, GVA GRIMLEY

## Green Belt

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Stage 1 Green Belt Study, when finalised after focused engagement, will provide the findings on how well 'general areas' of the Green Belt perform against the five purposes of the Green Belt. It does not reach a judgement on what general areas should be taken forward for further consideration in Stages 2 and 3 to identify specific parcels of land that have the potential to be released from the Green Belt.</li> </ul>	A Stage 1 Study Of The Green Belt Strategic Countryside Gaps, Safeguarded Land and Development Limits For Plan Selby - Strategic Countryside Gaps, Prepared By ARUP on behalf of Selby District Council, June 2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants of the focused engagement are being asked to comment on the Green Belt General Areas Assessment contained in the Stage 1 study and how the judgement should be made in Stage 2 of the Study to determine which General Areas of the Green Belt should be taken forward for further consideration.</li> </ul>	

## Development Limits

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ARUP recommend that PLAN Selby adopts a tight Development Limit boundary which will incorporate the outcomes of the separate Green Belt Study and Strategic Countryside Gaps review processes, as well as incorporating a check of existing defined Development Limits in order to correct any minor errors or discrepancies since the previous Limits were established, which will in turn inform the Housing and Employment Site Selection Process and dictate where future growth of the market towns can be accommodated in accordance with the Council's housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy.</li> </ul>	A Study Of The Green Belt, Strategic Countryside Gap, Safeguarded Land and Development Limits For Plan Selby - Definition Of Development Limits, By Arup On Behalf Of Selby District Council, June 2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criteria for defining Development Limits is recommended as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Proposed / Existing Site Allocations</li> <li>2) Check of Existing Development Limits in terms of the following                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Extant planning consents</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ul>	

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Functional relationship to physical form of built-up area</li> <li>c. Functional relationship to use of built-up area.</li> <li>d. Relationship to permanent physical boundaries</li> </ul>	

## Site Specific

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In November 2006, the three 'Renaissance Market Town Teams' for Selby, Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster, in partnership with Yorkshire Forward, Selby District Council, URBED and other consultants, published the Selby District Renaissance Strategic Development Framework (SDF).</li> <li>• This was the culmination of work during that year which sought to progress the Selby District Charter and its 25 year vision into specific development projects and environmental enhancements.</li> <li>• The projects set out in the SDF include the creative use of architecture, urban design and landscaping to transform the quality of the public realm of the district, the streets, parks and spaces of the towns. As well as proposals for the enhancement of the public realm, the SDF also considered the future growth of the three towns and where new housing and employment should be planned.</li> <li>• Some of these projects were progressed and have since been completed. Some of these projects have not been pursued for a number of different reasons i.e. land assembly, deliverability. This engagement provides an opportunity to consider whether these projects are deliverable and worthy of pursuing during the next plan period.</li> <li>• The projects that have not been delivered and are relevant to consider here are identified on the Spatial Options Plan and identified below:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of a Country Park on the former Gascoigne Wood spoil heaps. Not currently developed.</li> <li>• The development of an Eco-Village linked to a Techno-pole and Country Park on the Gascoigne Wood mine site. Not currently developed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Strategic District Renaissance Strategic Development Framework (SDF), 2006</p>

Please refer to the Sherburn in Elmet Spatial Options Plan.

## Fact Sheets: Options – Town Centre

The fact sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
SM22	Sherburn in Elmet	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Retail & Leisure

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<p>The RLS Study makes the following recommendations relevant to the town centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GVA recommend that the Council consider the potential to provide enhanced public leisure facilities in Sherburn in Elmet.</li> </ul>	Selby District Council Selby Retail and Leisure Study (RLS), May 2015, GVA Grimley
<p><b>Town Centre Boundaries</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GVA recommend that the existing boundaries should be tightened to exclude areas of established residential uses and those areas which are located some distance from the Primary Shopping Area and do not function as part of the town centres. In parts of Sherburn in Elmet, GVA have further recommended the inclusion of small areas adjacent to but outside of the existing Shopping &amp; Commercial Centre (SCC) boundary, that is predominantly occupied by main town centre uses and is well related to the existing SCC area.</li> <li>The recommended new town centre boundaries are identified on the Town Centre Options Plan.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Primary Shopping Area (PSA) Boundaries</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is considered that Sherburn in Elmet is too small in physical terms to robustly define a primary shopping area boundary. The study therefore only recommends the designation of a Primary Shopping Area for Selby.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Frontage Policies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the case of smaller centres, such as Sherburn in Elmet, the town centre may not extend beyond the primary shopping area or indeed frontages. As such, GVA consider that Sherburn in Elmet is too small to necessitate the definition of primary or secondary shopping frontages.</li> </ul>	

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<p><b>Town Centre Initiatives identified through RLS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In completing the study exercise, a number of overarching themes have arisen from the individual survey exercises which would enhance their attractiveness as retail destinations. Several initiatives which are not specific to any one particular market town. High quality public realm is essential in creating an attractive town centre and thus increasing dwell time and enhances the character of the towns and therefore promotes their Unique Selling Point.</li> <li>• Digitising the High Street</li> <li>• Marketing &amp; Promotion</li> </ul>	

## Site Specific

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In November 2006, the three 'Renaissance Market Town Teams' for Selby, Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster, in partnership with Yorkshire Forward, Selby District Council, URBED and other consultants, published the Selby District Renaissance Strategic Development Framework (SDF) .</li> <li>• This was the culmination of work during that year which sought to progress the Selby District Charter and its 25 year vision into specific development projects and environmental enhancements.</li> <li>• The projects set out in the SDF include the creative use of architecture, urban design and landscaping to transform the quality of the public realm of the district, the streets, parks and spaces of the towns. As well as proposals for the enhancement of the public realm, the SDF also considered the future growth of the three towns and where new housing and employment should be planned.</li> <li>• Some of these projects were progressed and have since been completed. Some of these projects have not been pursued for a number of different reasons i.e. land assembly, deliverability. This engagement provides an opportunity to consider whether these projects are deliverable and worthy of pursuing during the next plan period.</li> <li>• The projects that have not been delivered and are relevant to consider here are identified on the Spatial Options Plan and identified below:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements and calming of Low Street. Not currently developed due to land assembly issues.</li> <li>• Calming of traffic at the cross roads of Low Street / Finkle Hill with Kirkgate / Moor Lane. Not currently developed due to land assembly issues.</li> <li>• The recreation of the village square between the Social Club and Kirkgate. Not currently developed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Strategic District Renaissance Strategic Development Framework (SDF), 2006</p>

Please refer to the Sherburn in Elmet Town Centre Options Plan.

## Fact Sheets: Options – Natural & Heritage Environment

The fact sheet will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
SM25	Sherburn in Elmet	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Green Belt

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Stage 1 Green Belt Study, when finalised after focused engagement, will provide the findings on how well 'general areas' of the Green Belt perform against the five purposes of the Green Belt. It does not reach a judgement on what general areas should be taken forward for further consideration in Stages 2 and 3 to identify specific parcels of land that have the potential to be released from the Green Belt.</li> </ul>	A Stage 1 Study Of The Green Belt Strategic Countryside Gaps, Safeguarded Land and Development Limits For Plan Selby - Strategic Countryside Gaps, Prepared By ARUP on behalf of Selby District Council, June 2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants of the focused engagement are being asked to comment on the Green Belt General Areas Assessment contained in the Stage 1 study and how the judgement should be made in Stage 2 of the Study to determine which General Areas of the Green Belt should be taken forward for further consideration.</li> </ul>	

### Development Limits

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ARUP recommend that PLAN Selby adopts a tight Development Limit boundary which will incorporate the outcomes of the separate Green Belt Study and Strategic Countryside Gaps review processes, as well as incorporating a check of existing defined Development Limits in order to correct any minor errors or discrepancies since the previous Limits were established, which will in turn inform the Housing and Employment Site Selection Process and dictate where future</li> </ul>	A Study Of The Green Belt, Strategic Countryside Gap, Safeguarded Land and Development Limits For Plan Selby - Definition

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<p>growth of the market towns can be accommodated in accordance with the Council's housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Of Development Limits, By Arup On Behalf Of Selby District Council, June 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria for defining Development Limits is recommended as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Proposed / Existing Site Allocations</li> <li>2) Check of Existing Development Limits in terms of the following                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Extant planning consents</li> <li>b) Functional relationship to physical form of built-up area</li> <li>c) Functional relationship to use of built-up area.</li> <li>d) Relationship to permanent physical boundaries</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ul>	

## Housing

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Options to deliver the housing requirement for Sherburn in Elmet given in this consultation are as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Allocating larger sites than required to ensure delivery;</li> <li>2) Allocating sites not currently available and deliverable but will be by the end of plan period;</li> <li>3) Identify contingency site allocations that could be released later on in plan period in the event of non-delivery.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• The approach to site allocation will be based on evidence and the site selection methodology in the SHLAA.               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) PDL within existing settlements</li> <li>2) Suitable greenfield sites within settlements</li> <li>3) Extensions to existing settlements on PDL</li> <li>4) Extensions to existing settlements on greenfield land</li> </ol> </li> <li>• The most recent housing requirement figures based on April 2015 housing completions are as follows:</li> <li>• Selby Urban Area: <u>2061 new dwellings (including Olympia Park site)</u> 51% of overall district requirement (potentially subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>• Sherburn in Elmet: <u>54 new dwellings</u> 11% of overall district requirement (potentially subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>• In order to accommodate the scale of growth required a review of current Development Limits will be undertaken and where a settlement is within or adjoining Green Belt a localised review of that boundary may also be undertaken.</li> </ul>	<p>The Site and Policies Local Plan – Initial Consultation 24 November to 19 January 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SHLAA forms part of the evidence base for PLAN Selby and sets out</li> </ul>	

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<p>potential land available for housing in the District that will inform the Site Allocations part of PLAN Selby.</p>	<p>Availability Assessment (SHLAA), 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SHLAA identifies all sites on a map and provides an assessment of each site, in terms of its suitability, availability and achievability to determine whether a site is realistically expected to be developed.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on the information currently made available to the Council, the total number of sites considered as part of the SHLAA total of 513 sites. 204 of these sites were made up of planning permissions, SDLP allocations and Core Strategy allocations. A Further 309 were identified as 'potential sites'.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The results show that the amount than could be delivered over the plan period is far in excess of what is shown to be needed in the Initial Consultation PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With specific reference to Sherburn In Elmet the total number of sites assessed in the SHLAA is as follows:</li> <li>Sherburn In Elmet – Total 3689 houses (capacity from SHLAA). Initial Consultation PLAN Selby requirement: 790 houses (from Core Strategy) with 57 from new allocations. Currently updated figures at 2015 (see above) = 54 dwellings required on new allocations.</li> <li>Whilst most of these sites identified in the SHLAA could potentially be delivered in 0-5 years, the number of sites and total number of houses identified is far in excess of Sherburn in Elmet's requirement set out in Initial Consultation PLAN Selby. Those sites identified should now be considered and assessed as part of the preparation of PLAN Selby and housing allocations identified in the Plan.</li> <li>All Sherburn in Elmet SHLAA sites are identified on the Spatial Options Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose of the SHMA is to address housing need in Selby District and to develop a robust understanding of housing market dynamics, to provide an assessment of future needs for both market and affordable housing and the housing needs of different groups within the population.</li> <li>The purpose of the SHMA is to address housing need in Selby District and to develop a robust understanding of housing market dynamics, to provide an assessment of future needs for both market and affordable housing and the housing needs of different groups within the population.</li> <li>Some key draft findings are:</li> <li>The District's objectively assessed need for housing is about 430 dwelling per annum up to 2027. This supports the adopted policy position in the adopted Core Strategy.</li> <li>There remains a significant affordable housing need across the District and this supports the Council's adopted policy position.</li> <li>In terms of wider sub regional housing markets, the strongest relationship based on local authority areas is between Selby and York. However, in policy terms there should be recognition of the relationships with Leeds and Wakefield from a housing market point of view. This supports the production of a SHMA for Selby District.</li> </ul>	<p>Selby District Council – Draft Selby Strategic Housing Market Assessment, June 2015, Prepared By GL Hearn Limited</p>

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The analysis in the Assessment indicates that the majority of demand for market housing will be for mid-market homes with 2 and 3 bedrooms and a strong demand for bungalows. This should inform strategic policy and the 'portfolio' of sites which are considered through the PLAN Selby.</li> <li>• The majority of the need for affordable housing is for 1- and 2-bed properties. This should inform strategic policy and the 'portfolio' of sites which are considered through the PLAN Selby</li> <li>• The needs evidence suggests that a 25%/ 75% split of affordable housing provision between intermediate and social/ affordable rented provision would be appropriate.</li> <li>• Demographic change likely to see a requirement for additional care/ support and specialist housing provision. Net need for 417 bed spaces. This should be considered in identifying potential sites in accessible locations.</li> <li>• Custom build - Council should set up register and identify plots in larger developments.</li> </ul>	

Please refer to the Sherburn in Elmet Natural & Heritage Environment Options Plan.







Let's Talk

# PLAN SELBY

TADCASTER FACT SHEETS

Selby District Market Town Study

24<sup>th</sup> June 2015 Revision D

## Introduction

This facts sheets booklet provides a summary of the key issues and recommendations identified following a baseline review of recent evidence base studies undertaken by consultants on behalf of Selby District Council to inform and support the PLAN Selby preparation process.

The facts sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

The Draft evidence base studies have been published in full on the Council website as part of the Let's Talk PLAN Selby focussed engagement, which provides an opportunity to comment from the 29<sup>th</sup> June to Monday 10<sup>th</sup> August 2015.

## Fact Sheet: Deficits Needs and Aspirations

The fact sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
SM6	Tadcaster	Community & Technical	Round 1

### Summary of Deficits, Needs and Aspirations

THEME	KEY ISSUES
<b>Deficits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing convenience (food store) deficiencies</li> <li>Limited realistic potential for Tadcaster to significantly improve its performance and attractiveness as a comparison retail destination (clothes, shoes, electrical goods etc)</li> <li>No formal park</li> <li>Insufficient areas of equipped children's play space</li> <li>Housing requirement from previous Local Plan allocation not built</li> </ul>
<b>Needs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To improve the appearance and vitality of Tadcaster town centre, and make it easier for people to shop locally, including restoration of boarded-up properties and dealing with derelict sites within the town</li> <li>To address the volume and patterns of heavy goods vehicles in town</li> <li>To provide 476 new dwellings</li> <li>To provide affordable housing (1- and 2-bed properties, 25% : 75% split of intermediate and social/affordable rented provision</li> <li>To provide mid-market homes with 2 and 3 bedrooms and satisfy strong demand for bungalows</li> <li>To provide additional care/support and specialist housing</li> <li>To register and identify plots in larger developments for custom build</li> <li>To accommodate future growth with water, drainage and flood alleviation proposals, and additions to education facilities and extra care housing</li> </ul>

<b>Aspirations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create facilities that will not only be enjoyed by local people but that will also encourage visitors to come and enjoy all the area has to offer</li> <li>• Continue with uniqueness of independently owned shops to attract more interest at a time when town centres are becoming more and more bland</li> <li>• Maximise potential of existing community buildings</li> <li>• Identify further employment sites through PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>
--------------------	---

## Retail and Leisure

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE								
<b>Deficits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Study recommends the Council seek to proactively plan for new convenience provision in Tadcaster to address existing convenience deficiencies.</li> </ul>	Selby District Council Selby Retail and Leisure Study (RLS), May 2015, GVA Grimley								
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No formal park</li> <li>• Insufficient areas of equipped children's play space</li> </ul>	Tadcaster & Villages Community Engagement Forum – Tadcaster And Villages Community Development Plan 2012 – 2015.								
<b>Needs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With respect to Tadcaster, given that the limitations of the existing offer and that the centre serves highly localised catchments, the forward strategy should focus on adequately meeting daily shopping and service needs.</li> <li>• The following table sets out the identified retail need in Tadcaster based on the conclusions of the RLS:</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="437 1480 1125 1615"> <thead> <tr> <th>Location</th> <th>Convenience</th> <th>Comparison</th> <th>Leisure</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Tadcaster</td> <td>Need to accommodate a new food store</td> <td>None</td> <td>None</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Location	Convenience	Comparison	Leisure	Tadcaster	Need to accommodate a new food store	None	None	Selby District Council Selby Retail and Leisure Study (RLS), May 2015, GVA Grimley
Location	Convenience	Comparison	Leisure							
Tadcaster	Need to accommodate a new food store	None	None							
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A need to improve the appearance and vitality of Tadcaster town centre, and make it easier for people to shop locally</li> <li>• Locate and support new housing development in Tadcaster</li> <li>• Although Tadcaster has a certain amount of green space in Tadcaster, it doesn't have a formal park; many would like to see one created as a feature in the town centre</li> </ul>	Tadcaster & Villages Community Engagement Forum – Tadcaster And Villages Community								

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more equipped play space, in particular skate board park (Leisure and culture)</li> <li>• Action is needed to address the volume and patterns of heavy goods vehicles in town</li> </ul>	<p>Development Plan 2012 – 2015.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to review the Leeds City Council Headley Hall site which must be resisted at all costs.</li> <li>• The CS examination confirmed that previously allocated sites in Tadcaster are not available for development. However the Grimston Park Estate has a number of sites (24 hectares) to the South of Tadcaster that need to be considered for development and removed from the GB.</li> <li>• The following are concerns in Tadcaster:</li> <li>• Empty shops in the town centre</li> <li>• Empty offices like the old work house</li> <li>• Empty buildings owned by the breweries</li> <li>• Lack of footfall in town centre</li> <li>• The high number of PP that are not built</li> <li>• Lack of industrial land</li> <li>• A64/A162 interchange and A64 Tadcaster junction need improving.</li> <li>• Under use of River Wharfe for recreation</li> <li>• The narrowness of the one bridge over the Wharfe in the town</li> <li>• Objection to the housing target figures and general approach to Tadcaster. A master plan has been submitted.</li> <li>• A local land owner would like to propose a Town Riverside Park on its residual land and it would also be willing to provide the Council with employment land in Tadcaster.</li> </ul>	<p>Summary of 'Needs' Identified through Representations Received on 'Town Centre' Visions as part of the Initial Consultation on PLAN Selby November 2014-January 2015</p>
<b>Aspiration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is concluded that there is no specific requirement for the Council to proactively plan for new comparison retail provision in the Tadcaster over the Local Plan period. The strategy for the town centre should be based on qualitative grounds in terms of promoting Tadcaster as a distinguishable place in the wider retail hierarchy.</li> <li>• Improvements to Tadcaster town centre environment / public realm have been identified in both the health check and retailer business surveys and must be addressed going forward in order to enhance the vitality and viability of the centre; current vacancies and downgraded environment are detracting from the significant physical / environmental assets which the town has (Castle, River Wharf setting).</li> </ul>	<p>Selby District Council Selby Retail and Leisure Study (RLS), May 2015, GVA Grimley</p>

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create facilities that will not only be enjoyed by local people, but that will also encourage visitors to come and enjoy all the area has to offer.</li> <li>• The overall attractiveness of the town centre is a major concern for local people and for the businesses that trade there, and a high priority for change. The restoration of boarded-up properties, and dealing with derelict sites within the town, are clear and widely-shared priorities.</li> <li>• Explore options to re-use empty homes and restore abandoned sites.</li> <li>• Apart from Sainsbury's and now Costa, all the shops in Tadcaster are independently owned, a unique feature that could be exploited to attract more interest at a time when town centres are becoming more and more bland, and offering the same large chains of stores and outlets.</li> <li>• Community buildings such as community centres are enormously important and must take a high priority; but they are not necessarily being used to their full advantage</li> </ul>	<p>Tadcaster &amp; Villages Community Engagement Forum – Tadcaster And Villages Community Development Plan 2012 – 2015.</p>

## Employment

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<b>Deficit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing allocation - 9.00ha, London Road is not recommended for retention as an allocation</li> <li>• The existing Papyrus Works site at Newton Kyme already has permission so will not need to be allocated</li> <li>• The ELR confirms that between 2005-2015 there has been no take up of allocated employment land</li> <li>• The ELR confirms that there are limited alternative locations for potential allocation if the London Road site not carried forward. The merits of site and alternative sites should be considered through Market Town Study.</li> <li>• The ELR states that the small town centre site at Robin Hood Yard, Kirkgate has the potential to contribute to the identified office requirement.</li> <li>• In summary, the ELR confirms that Tadcaster has insufficient existing supply and further sites need to be identified through PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	<p>Employment Land Review (ELR) (Draft) June 2015, GVA GRIMLEY</p>
<b>Aspiration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified</li> </ul>	

## Housing

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
Deficit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified</li> </ul>	
Need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PLAN Selby must identify sufficient housing land allocations to deliver 7200 homes in the district up to 2027 as set out in the Core Strategy. This equates to 450 new homes per year. The indicative amount of new allocations based on the Core Strategy and completion and planning permissions granted since adoption of the Core Strategy are as follows:</li> <li>Selby Urban Area: <u>2061 new dwellings (including Olympia Park site)</u> 51% of overall district requirement (potentially subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>Sherburn in Elmet: <u>54 new dwellings</u> 11% of overall district requirement (potentially subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>Tadcaster: <u>476 new dwellings</u> 7% of overall district requirement (subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> </ul>	Selby District Council – Updated Figures as at 1 April 2015
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose of the SHMA is to address housing need in Selby District and to develop a robust understanding of housing market dynamics, to provide an assessment of future needs for both market and affordable housing and the housing needs of different groups within the population.</li> <li>Some key draft findings are:</li> <li>The District's objectively assessed need for housing is about 430 dwelling per annum up to 2027. This supports the adopted policy position in the adopted Core Strategy.</li> <li>There remains a significant affordable housing need across the District and this supports the Council's adopted policy position.</li> <li>In terms of wider sub regional housing markets, the strongest relationship based on local authority areas is between Selby and York. However, in policy terms there should be recognition of the relationships with Leeds and Wakefield from a housing market point of view. This supports the production of a SHMA for Selby District.</li> <li>The analysis in the Assessment indicates that the majority of demand for market housing will be for mid-market homes with 2 and 3 bedrooms and a strong demand for bungalows. This should inform strategic policy and the 'portfolio' of sites which are considered through the PLAN Selby.</li> <li>The majority of the need for affordable housing is for 1- and 2-bed properties. This should inform strategic policy and the 'portfolio' of sites which are considered through the PLAN Selby</li> <li>The needs evidence suggests that a 25%/ 75% split of affordable housing provision between intermediate and social/ affordable</li> </ul>	Selby District Council – Draft Selby Strategic Housing Market Assessment, June 2015, Prepared By GL Hearn Limited

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
	<p>rented provision would be appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demographic change likely to see a requirement for additional care/ support and specialist housing provision. Net need for 417 bed spaces. This should be considered in identifying potential sites in accessible locations.</li> <li>Custom build – Council should set up register and identify plots in larger developments.</li> </ul>	
<b>Aspiration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified</li> </ul>	

## Site Specific

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<b>Aspiration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>November 2006, the three 'Renaissance Market Town Teams' for Selby, Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster, in partnership with Yorkshire Forward, Selby District Council, URBED and other consultants, published the Selby District Renaissance Strategic Development Framework (SDF) .</li> <li>This was the culmination of work during that year which sought to progress the Selby District Charter and its 25 year vision into specific development projects and environmental enhancements.</li> <li>The projects set out in the SDF include the creative use of architecture, urban design and landscaping to transform the quality of the public realm of the district, the streets, parks and spaces of the towns. As well as proposals for the enhancement of the public realm, the SDF also considered the future growth of the three towns and where new housing and employment should be planned.</li> <li>Some of these projects were progressed and have since been completed. Some of these projects have not been pursued for a number of different reasons i.e. land assembly, deliverability. This engagement provides an opportunity to consider whether these projects are deliverable and worthy of pursuing during the next plan period.</li> <li>The projects that have not been delivered and are relevant to consider here are identified on the Spatial Options Plan and identified below:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High Street improvements. Not currently developed due to land assembly issues.</li> <li>Implementation of traffic management strategy. Not currently developed due to land assembly issues. Delivery unlikely.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Junction improvements on the bypass to remove through</li> </ul>	Strategic District Renaissance Strategic Development Framework (SDF), 2006

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
	<p>traffic. Not currently developed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Robin Hood Yard improvements. Not currently developed.</li> <li>• Flood alleviation strategy. Not currently developed.</li> <li>• Riverside landscaping and circular walk. Not currently developed.</li> </ul>	

## Infrastructure

THEME	KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<b>Deficit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified</li> </ul>	
<b>Need</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) outlines the presence of and planned delivery of infrastructure which is relevant to the area covered by the Local Plan for Selby District, including specific infrastructure requirements of sites allocated for development in PLAN Selby.</li> <li>• The IDP states that for Tadcaster to accommodate the growth indicated in the Core Strategy and keep pace with the rest of the District - water, drainage and flood alleviation – need to be supplemented, together with the need for additions to education facilities, and extra care housing.</li> </ul>	Selby District Council – Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), September 2014
<b>Aspiration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified</li> </ul>	

## Fact Sheet: Technical Issues - Spatial

The fact sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
<b>SM9</b>	Tadcaster	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Flood Risk

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council has recently commissioned Aecom to refresh and update this 2010 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The conclusions referenced from the 2010 study below may change in the light of the findings of the 2015 SFRA.</li> <li>This 2010 Assessment confirms it is not possible for the Council to accommodate all proposed housing and employment land requirements, on land at the lowest risk of flooding if wider sustainability and regeneration objectives are to be achieved.</li> </ul>	Level 1 and 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment And Addendum (SFRA), Living Document, February 2010, Prepared By Scott Wilson On Behalf Of Selby District Council
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Level 1 and Level 2 SFRA should inform land allocations and the future growth of each town proposed as part of PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Sequential Test concluded that the housing requirement for Sherburn-in-Elmet and Tadcaster and 'low flood risk' sustainable villages can be satisfied on land at lowest risk of flooding (Flood Zone 1).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Flood Maps identified on the Technical Issues – Spatial Plan indicate those areas of each settlement that are at risk of flooding and those areas at low risk which will inform the approach to growth and will also inform proposed land allocations identified in PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	

## Green Belt

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The supporting Technical Issues - Spatial Plans identifies the current extent of the Green Belt around Tadcaster.</li> </ul>	<p>A Study Of Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gaps And Development Limits - Green Belt Study, Prepared By ARUP on Behalf Of Selby District Council, June 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose of the Stage 1 Study is to independently and objectively assess the extent to which areas of Green Belt within Selby District meet the five purposes of the Green Belt as defined within NPPF.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Stage 1 Green Belt Study, when finalised after focused engagement, will provide the findings on how well 'general areas' of the Green Belt perform against the five purposes of the Green Belt. It does not reach a judgement on what general areas should be taken forward for further consideration in Stages 2 and 3 to identify specific parcels of land that have the potential to be released from the Green Belt.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants of the focused engagement are being asked to comment on the Green Belt General Areas Assessment contained in the Stage 1 study and how the judgement should be made in Stage 2 of the Study to determine which General Areas of the Green Belt should be taken forward for further consideration.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will not be until these later two stages of the Green Belt Study are completed, along with the Council's site option assessment work, that the implications on potential release of Green Belt land for PLAN Selby will be known.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If changes to the Green Belt boundaries are to be proposed by the Council, exceptional circumstances must be demonstrated. The existence or not of exceptional circumstances cannot be made until the remainder of the Green Belt Study and further work on the site options contained in the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), Employment Land Review (ELR) and Retail site options have been assessed.</li> </ul>	

## Strategic Countryside Gap (SCG)

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Study undertaken by ARUP is part of the evidence base for PLAN Selby. It will inform, but not predetermine decisions to be made later in the process on whether Strategic Countryside Gaps (SCG's) should be designated in PLAN Selby. A recommendation in the finalised study, after focused engagement, that land is worthy of such a designation will be an important consideration in determining the appropriateness of land allocations for growth in PLAN Selby. Until these decisions are made, the proposed SCG's will be referred to as 'candidate' SCG's.</li> </ul>	<p>A Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gap, and Development Limits For Plan Selby - Strategic Countryside Gaps, Prepared By ARUP on behalf of June 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are currently no SCG's in Tadcaster. The ARUP Assessment identifies a potential Candidate SCG in Tadcaster. This is identified in the Spatial Options</li> </ul>	

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
Fact Sheet.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ARUP Assessment of the existing has been based on professional judgement informed desk based study and site work.</li> <li>The study considers the following three questions with regard to the designation and definition of SCG's within the District:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there a real risk that two settlements will coalesce?</li> <li>Is the land between the two settlements open in character?</li> <li>Is there a perception of leaving one settlement and entering open countryside before entering the next settlement?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This Assessment undertaken by ARUP only makes recommendations. The recommendations should be considered as part of this engagement event and assessed as part of the next stage of the Draft PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ARUP recommendations are identified in the Spatial Options Fact Sheet.</li> </ul>	

## Development Limits

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ARUP recommend that PLAN Selby adopts a tight Development Limit boundary which will incorporate the outcomes of the separate Green Belt Study and Strategic Countryside Gaps review processes, as well as incorporating a check of existing defined Development Limits in order to correct any minor errors or discrepancies since the previous Limits were established, which will in turn inform the Housing and Employment Site Selection Process and dictate where future growth of the market towns can be accommodated in accordance with the Council's housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy.</li> </ul>	A Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gap, and Development Limits For Plan Selby - Definition Of Development Limits, By Arup On Behalf Of Selby District Council, June 2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criteria for defining Development Limits is recommended as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed / Existing Site Allocations</li> <li>Check of Existing Development Limits in terms of the following                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extant planning consents</li> <li>Functional relationship to physical form of built-up area</li> <li>Functional relationship to use of built-up area.</li> <li>Relationship to permanent physical boundaries</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ul>	

Please refer to the Technical Issues – Spatial Plan for all technical issues.

## Fact Sheets: Technical Issues – Town Centre

The fact sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
SM12	Tadcaster	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Town Centre

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Town Centre Conservation Area identified on the Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map seeks to protect and preserve the special character of the Conservation Area and can in some instances, place limitations on the types and scale of development in the defined Conservation Area. This area is identified on the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan.</li> </ul>	Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map (60)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The defined Town Centre Boundary identifies the extent of the retail area as currently defined by the Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map. These areas are illustrated on the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map identifies areas of the town as car parking. These areas are illustrated on the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map identifies areas of the town as Local Amenity Space. These areas are illustrated on the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map identifies areas of the town as Recreation Open Space. These areas are illustrated on the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Areas of the town centre identified as Flood Zone 2 and 3 are illustrated on the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan.</li> </ul>	Environment Agency Flood Maps

Please refer to the Technical Issues – Town Centre Plan for all technical issues.

## Fact Sheets: Technical Issues – Natural & Heritage Environment

The fact sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
SM15	Tadcaster	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Town Centre

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map identifies areas of the town as Local Amenity Space. These are identified in the Technical Issues – Natural &amp; Heritage Environment Plan.</li> </ul>	Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map (60)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map identifies areas of the town as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation. These are identified in the Technical Issues – Natural &amp; Heritage Environment Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Selby District Local Plan Proposals Map identifies areas of the town as Recreation Open Space. These are identified in the Technical Issues – Natural &amp; Heritage Environment Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Town Centre Conservation Area identified on Plan seeks to protect and preserve the special character of the Conservation Area and can in some instances, place limitations on the types and scale of development in the defined Conservation Area. This is identified on the Technical Issues – Natural &amp; Heritage Environment Plan.</li> </ul>	

## Green Belt

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The supporting Technical Issues – Natural &amp; Heritage Environment Plan identifies the current extent of the Green Belt around Tadcaster.</li> </ul>	<p>A Study Of Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gaps And Development Limits - Green Belt Study, Prepared By ARUP on Behalf Of Selby District Council, June 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose of the Stage 1 Study is to independently and objectively assess the extent to which areas of Green Belt within Selby District meet the five purposes of the Green Belt as defined within NPPF.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Stage 1 Green Belt Study, when finalised after focused engagement, will provide the findings on how well 'general areas' of the Green Belt perform against the five purposes of the Green Belt. It does not reach a judgement on what general areas should be taken forward for further consideration in Stages 2 and 3 to identify specific parcels of land that have the potential to be released from the Green Belt.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants of the focused engagement are being asked to comment on the Green Belt General Areas Assessment contained in the Stage 1 study and how the judgement should be made in Stage 2 of the Study to determine which General Areas of the Green Belt should be taken forward for further consideration.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will not be until these later two stages of the Green Belt Study are completed, along with the Council's site option assessment work, that the implications on potential release of Green Belt land for PLAN Selby will be known.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If changes to the Green Belt boundaries are to be proposed by the Council, exceptional circumstances must be demonstrated. The existence or not of exceptional circumstances cannot be made until the remainder of the Green Belt Study and further work on the site options contained in the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), Employment Land Review (ELR) and Retail site options have been assessed.</li> </ul>	

## Strategic Countryside Gap (SCG)

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Study undertaken by ARUP is part of the evidence base for PLAN Selby. It will inform, but not predetermine decisions to be made later in the process on whether Strategic Countryside Gaps (SCG's) should be designated in PLAN Selby. A recommendation in the finalised study, after focused engagement, that land is worthy of such a designation will be an important consideration in determining the appropriateness of land allocations for growth in PLAN Selby. Until these decisions are made, the proposed SCG's will be referred to as 'candidate' SCG's.</li> </ul>	<p>A Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gap, and Development Limits For PLAN Selby - Strategic Countryside Gaps, Prepared By ARUP on behalf of SDC, June 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are currently no SCG's in Tadcaster. The ARUP Assessment identifies a potential Candidate SCG in Tadcaster. This is identified on the Natural &amp;</li> </ul>	

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
Heritage Environment Plan and Options Fact Sheet.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ARUP Assessment of SCGs has been based on professional judgement informed desk based study and site work.</li> <li>The study considers the following three questions with regard to the designation and definition of SCG's within the District:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there a real risk that two settlements will coalesce?</li> <li>Is the land between the two settlements open in character?</li> <li>Is there a perception of leaving one settlement and entering open countryside before entering the next settlement?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This Assessment undertaken by ARUP only makes recommendations. The recommendations should be considered as part of this engagement event and assessed as part of the next stage of the Draft PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ARUP recommendations are identified in the Natural &amp; Heritage Environment Plan Options Plan and Fact Sheet.</li> </ul>	

## Development Limits

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ARUP recommend that PLAN Selby adopts a tight Development Limit boundary which will incorporate the outcomes of the separate Green Belt Study and Strategic Countryside Gaps review processes, as well as incorporating a check of existing defined Development Limits in order to correct any minor errors or discrepancies since the previous Limits were established, which will in turn inform the Housing and Employment Site Selection Process and dictate where future growth of the market towns can be accommodated in accordance with the Council's housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy.</li> </ul>	A Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gap, and Development Limits For PLAN Selby - Definition Of Development Limits, By Arup On Behalf Of Selby District Council, June 2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criteria for defining Development Limits is recommended as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Proposed / Existing Site Allocations</li> <li>2) Check of Existing Development Limits in terms of the following                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Extant planning consents</li> <li>b. Functional relationship to physical form of built-up area</li> <li>c. Functional relationship to use of built-up area.</li> <li>d. Relationship to permanent physical boundaries</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ul>	

Please refer to the Technical Issues – Natural & Heritage Environment Plan for all technical issues.

## Fact Sheets: Options - Spatial

The fact sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
SM18	Tadcaster	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Flood Risk

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council has recently commissioned Aecom to refresh and update this 2010 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The conclusions referenced from the 2010 study below may change in the light of the findings of the 2015 SFRA.</li> </ul>	Level 1 and 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment And Addendum (SFRA), Living Document, February 2010, Prepared By Scott Wilson On Behalf Of Selby District Council
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This 2010 Assessment confirms it is not possible for the Council to accommodate all proposed housing and employment land requirements, on land at the lowest risk of flooding if wider sustainability and regeneration objectives are to be achieved.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Level 1 and Level 2 SFRA should inform land allocations and the future growth of each town proposed as part of PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Sequential Test concluded that the housing requirement for Sherburn-in-Elmet and Tadcaster and 'low flood risk' sustainable villages can be satisfied on land at lowest risk of flooding (Flood Zone 1).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Flood Maps identified on the Technical Issues – Spatial Options Plan illustrate those areas of each settlement that are at risk of flooding and those areas at low risk which will inform the approach to growth and will also inform proposed land allocations identified in PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	

## Housing

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Options to deliver the housing requirement for Tadcaster given in the Initial Consultation are as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Allocating larger sites than required to ensure delivery;</li> <li>2. Allocating sites not currently available and deliverable but will be by the end of plan period;</li> <li>3. Identify contingency site allocations that could be released later on in plan period in the event of non-delivery.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• The approach to site allocation will be based on evidence and the site selection methodology in the SHLAA.               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PDL within existing settlements</li> <li>2. Suitable greenfield sites within settlements</li> <li>3. Extensions to existing settlements on PDL</li> <li>4. Extensions to existing settlements on greenfield land.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• In order to accommodate the scale of growth required a review of current Development Limits and the boundary of the Tadcaster will be undertaken.</li> <li>• The most recent housing requirement figures based on April 2015 housing completions are as follows:</li> <li>• Selby Urban Area: <u>2061 new dwellings (including Olympia Park site)</u> 51% of overall district requirement (potentially subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>• Sherburn in Elmet: <u>54 new dwellings</u> 11% of overall district requirement (potentially subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>• Tadcaster: <u>476 new dwellings</u> 7% of overall district requirement (subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>• Tadcaster's approach to meeting their housing requirement is based on a phased approach set out in the Core Strategy, whereby three phases of sites should be identified to ensure delivery in the light of potential land availability issues. Phase 1 and the contingency phase 2 are to be in Tadcaster and will follow the site selection methodology referred to above. The Phase 3 (contingency) sites could be located outside the town and should be considered as part of the focussed engagement.</li> <li>• Phase 1 sites in/on edge of Tadcaster to be released on adoption of PLAN Selby. Phase 2 sites only released if less than one third of the minimum dwelling requirement has been completed after 5 years of adoption of PLAN Selby and Phase 3 sites, on the edge of settlements will be released after 3 years of release of Phase 2, if completions are less than 50% of minimum dwelling requirement.</li> <li>• In order to accommodate the scale of growth required a review of current Development Limits will be undertaken and where a settlement is within or adjoining Green Belt a localised review of that boundary may also be undertaken.</li> </ul>	<p>The Site and Policies Local Plan – Initial Consultation 24 November to 19 January 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SHLAA forms part of the evidence base for PLAN Selby and sets out potential land available for housing in the District that will inform the Site Allocations part of PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	<p>Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), June 2015</p>

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SHLAA identifies all sites (of 5 dwellings or more) on a map and provides an assessment of each site, in terms of its suitability, availability and achievability to determine whether a site is realistically expected to be developed.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on the information currently made available to the Council, the total number of sites considered as part of the SHLAA total of 513 sites. 204 of these sites were made up of planning permissions, SDLP allocations and Core Strategy allocations. A Further 309 were identified as 'potential sites'.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The results show that the amount than could be delivered over the plan period is in excess of what is shown to be needed in the Initial Consultation PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With specific reference to Tadcaster, the total number of sites assessed in the SHLAA are as follows:</li> <li>Tadcaster – Total 966 houses (capacity identified in the SHLAA). Initial Consultation PLAN Selby requirement: 500 houses (from the Core Strategy) with 470 from new allocations. Currently update figures at 2015 (see above) = 476 dwellings required on new allocations.</li> <li>Whilst most of these sites identified in the SHLAA could potentially be delivered in 0-5 years, the number of sites and total number of houses identified is in excess of Tadcaster's requirement set out in Initial Consultation PLAN Selby. Those sites identified should now be considered and assessed as part of the preparation of PLAN Selby and housing allocations identified in the Plan.</li> <li>All Tadcaster SHLAA sites are identified on the Spatial Options Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose of the SHMA is to address housing need in Selby District and to develop a robust understanding of housing market dynamics, to provide an assessment of future needs for both market and affordable housing and the housing needs of different groups within the population.</li> <li>The purpose of the SHMA is to address housing need in Selby District and to develop a robust understanding of housing market dynamics, to provide an assessment of future needs for both market and affordable housing and the housing needs of different groups within the population.</li> <li>Some key draft findings are:</li> <li>The District's objectively assessed need for housing is about 430 dwelling per annum up to 2027. This supports the adopted policy position in the adopted Core Strategy.</li> <li>There remains a significant affordable housing need across the District and this supports the Council's adopted policy position.</li> <li>In terms of wider sub regional housing markets, the strongest relationship based on local authority areas is between Selby and York. However, in policy terms there should be recognition of the relationships with Leeds and Wakefield from a housing market point of view. This supports the production of a SHMA for Selby District.</li> <li>The analysis in the Assessment indicates that the majority of demand for market housing will be for mid-market homes with 2 and 3 bedrooms and a strong demand for bungalows. This should inform strategic policy and the 'portfolio' of sites which are considered through the PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	<p>Selby District Council – Draft Selby Strategic Housing Market Assessment, June 2015, Prepared By GL Hearn Limited</p>

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The majority of the need for affordable housing is for 1- and 2-bed properties. This should inform strategic policy and the 'portfolio' of sites which are considered through the PLAN Selby</li> <li>The needs evidence suggests that a 25%/ 75% split of affordable housing provision between intermediate and social/ affordable rented provision would be appropriate.</li> <li>Demographic change likely to see a requirement for additional care/ support and specialist housing provision. Net need for 417 bed spaces. This should be considered in identifying potential sites in accessible locations.</li> <li>Custom build - Council should set up register and identify plots in larger developments.</li> </ul>	

## Employment

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ELR recommends that there is insufficient existing supply in Tadcaster and further sites need to be identified. The Market Town Study should consider alternatives sites.</li> </ul>	Employment Land Review (ELR) (Draft) June 2015, GVA GRIMLEY

## Green Belt

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Stage 1 Green Belt Study, when finalised after focused engagement, will provide the findings on how well 'general areas' of the Green Belt perform against the five purposes of the Green Belt. It does not reach a judgement on what general areas should be taken forward for further consideration in Stages 2 and 3 to identify specific parcels of land that have the potential to be released from the Green Belt.</li> </ul>	A Stage 1 Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gaps, Safeguarded Land and Development Limits For Plan Selby - Strategic Countryside Gaps, Prepared By ARUP on behalf of Selby District Council, June 2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants of the focused engagement are being asked to comment on the Green Belt General Areas Assessment contained in the Stage 1 study and how the judgement should be made in Stage 2 of the Study to determine which General Areas of the Green Belt should be taken forward for further consideration.</li> </ul>	

## Strategic Countryside Gaps

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ARUP Assessment identifies a potential Candidate SCG in Tadcaster as follows:</li> </ul> <p><b>Potential SCG to south of the town centre on the eastern side of River Wharfe</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This potential gap is located between the Development Limits for Tadcaster either side of the River Wharfe to the south of the town centre. It comprises open grass fields with some tree cover.</li> <li>Overall, due to the development pressures on Tadcaster, it is considered that further consideration should be given to this gap as a potential Candidate SCG.</li> <li><b><u>ARUP recommend that the potential Tadcaster Candidate SCG is taken forward as a SCG, based on the boundaries identified on the Spatial Options Plan on land only at the eastern side of the River.</u></b></li> <li>See parcel of land identified on the Spatial Options Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>A Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land Strategic Countryside Gaps and Development Limits For Plan Selby - <u>Strategic Countryside Gaps</u>, Prepared By ARUP on behalf of Selby District Council, June 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This Assessment undertaken by ARUP only makes recommendations. The recommendations should be considered as part of this engagement event and assessed as part of the next stage of the Draft PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	

## Development Limits

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ARUP recommend that PLAN Selby adopts a tight Development Limit boundary which will incorporate the outcomes of the separate Green Belt Study and Strategic Countryside Gaps review processes, as well as incorporating a check of existing defined Development Limits in order to correct any minor errors or discrepancies since the previous Limits were established, which will in turn inform the Housing and Employment Site Selection Process and dictate where future growth of the market towns can be accommodated in accordance with the Council's housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy.</li> </ul>	<p>A Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gap, and Development Limits For Plan Selby - Definition Of Development Limits, By Arup On Behalf Of Selby District Council, June 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criteria for defining Development Limits is recommended as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Proposed / Existing Site Allocations</li> <li>2) Check of Existing Development Limits in terms of the following                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e) Extant planning consents                       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Functional relationship to physical form of built-up area</li> <li>b. Functional relationship to use of built-up area.</li> <li>c. Relationship to permanent physical boundaries</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ul>	

## Site Specific

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In November 2006, the three 'Renaissance Market Town Teams' for Selby, Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster, in partnership with Yorkshire Forward, Selby District Council, URBED and other consultants, published the Selby District Renaissance Strategic Development Framework (SDF).</li> <li>• This was the culmination of work during that year which sought to progress the Selby District Charter and its 25 year vision into specific development projects and environmental enhancements.</li> <li>• The projects set out in the SDF include the creative use of architecture, urban design and landscaping to transform the quality of the public realm of the district, the streets, parks and spaces of the towns. As well as proposals for the enhancement of the public realm, the SDF also considered the future growth of the three towns and where new housing and employment should be planned.</li> <li>• Some of these projects were progressed and have since been completed. Some of these projects have not been pursued for a number of different reasons i.e. land assembly, deliverability. This engagement provides an opportunity to consider whether these projects are deliverable and worthy of pursuing during the next plan period.</li> <li>• The projects that have not been delivered and are relevant to consider here are identified on the Spatial Options Plan and identified below:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High Street improvements. Not currently developed due to land assembly issues.</li> <li>• Implementation of traffic management strategy. Not currently developed due to land assembly issues. Delivery unlikely.</li> <li>• Junction improvements on the bypass to remove through traffic. Not currently developed.</li> <li>• Robin Hood Yard improvements. Not currently developed.</li> <li>• Flood alleviation strategy. Not currently developed.</li> <li>• Riverside landscaping and circular walk. Not currently developed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Strategic District Renaissance Strategic Development Framework (SDF), 2006</p>

Please refer to the Tadcaster Spatial Options Plan.

## Fact Sheets: Options – Town Centre

The fact sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
SM21	Tadcaster	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Retail & Leisure

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<p>The RLS Study makes the following recommendations relevant to the town centre.</p> <p><b>Town Centre Boundaries</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GVA recommend that the existing boundaries should be tightened to exclude areas of established residential uses and those areas which are located some distance from the Primary Shopping Area and do not function as part of the town centres. In parts of Tadcaster, GVA have further recommended the inclusion of small areas adjacent to but outside of the existing Shopping &amp; Commercial Centre (SCC boundary) as defined by the Selby District Local Plan, that is predominantly occupied by main town centre uses and is well related to the existing SCC area.</li> <li>The recommended new town centre boundaries are identified on the Town Centre Options Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>Selby District Council            Selby Retail and Leisure Study (RLS), May 2015,            GVA Grimley</p>
<p><b>Primary Shopping Area (PSA) Boundaries</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GVA consider that Tadcaster is too small in physical terms to robustly define a primary shopping area boundary. The study therefore only recommends the designation of a Primary Shopping Area for Selby.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Frontage Policies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the case of Tadcaster the town centre may not extend beyond the primary shopping area or indeed frontages. As such, GVA consider that Tadcaster is too small to necessitate the definition of primary or secondary shopping frontages. The proposed Primary Shopping Frontage boundary is identified on the Town Centre Options Plan.</li> </ul>	

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<p><b>Town Centre Initiatives identified through RLS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In completing the study exercise, a number of overarching themes have arisen from the individual survey exercises which would enhance their attractiveness as retail destinations. Several initiatives which are not specific to any one particular market town. High quality public realm is essential in creating an attractive town centre and thus increasing dwell time and enhances the character of the towns and therefore promotes their Unique Selling Point.</li> <li>• Digitising the High Street</li> <li>• Marketing &amp; Promotion</li> <li>• The strategy for the town centre should be based on qualitative grounds in terms of promoting Tadcaster as a distinguishable place in the wider retail hierarchy.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Primary Shopping Area Boundaries</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GVA consider that Tadcaster is too small in physical terms to robustly define a primary shopping area boundary. The study therefore only recommends the designation of a Primary Shopping Area for Selby.</li> </ul>	

## Employment

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The small town centre site at Robin Hood Yard, Kirkgate has the potential to contribute to the identified office requirement.</li> </ul>	Draft Employment Land Review (ELR) June 2015, GVA GRIMLEY

## Site Specific

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selby District Council should actively look for site opportunities to accommodate a new food store in the region of 1,000sq metres</li> <li>• Given that the Sainsbury's store is centrally located within the town centre and facilitates linked trips (shared car park etc.), it is essential that any potential site allocation made by the Council is not in a sequentially inferior location.</li> </ul>	Selby District Council Selby Retail and Leisure Study (RLS), May 2015, GVA Grimley
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In November 2006, the three 'Renaissance Market Town Teams' for Selby, Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster, in partnership with Yorkshire Forward, Selby District Council, URBED and other consultants, published the Selby District Renaissance Strategic Development Framework (SDF) .</li> <li>• This was the culmination of work during that year which sought to progress the Selby District Charter and its 25 year vision into specific development projects</li> </ul>	Strategic District Renaissance Strategic Development Framework (SDF), 2006

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<p>and environmental enhancements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The projects set out in the SDF include the creative use of architecture, urban design and landscaping to transform the quality of the public realm of the district, the streets, parks and spaces of the towns. As well as proposals for the enhancement of the public realm, the SDF also considered the future growth of the three towns and where new housing and employment should be planned.</li> <li>• Some of these projects were progressed and have since been completed. Some of these projects have not been pursued for a number of different reasons i.e. land assembly, deliverability. This engagement provides an opportunity to consider whether these projects are deliverable and worthy of pursuing during the next plan period.</li> <li>• The projects that have not been delivered and are relevant to consider here are identified on the Spatial Options Plan and identified below:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High Street improvements. Not currently developed due to land assembly issues.</li> <li>• Implementation of traffic management strategy. Not currently developed due to land assembly issues. Delivery unlikely.</li> <li>• Junction improvements on the bypass to remove through traffic. Not currently developed.</li> <li>• Robin Hood Yard improvements. Not currently developed.</li> <li>• Flood alleviation strategy. Not currently developed.</li> <li>• Riverside landscaping and circular walk. Not currently developed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create facilities that will not only be enjoyed by local people, but that will also encourage visitors to come and enjoy all the area has to offer.</li> <li>• The overall attractiveness of the town centre is a major concern for local people and for the businesses that trade there, and a high priority for change. The restoration of boarded-up properties, and dealing with derelict sites within the town, are clear and widely-shared priorities.</li> <li>• Explore options to re-use empty homes and restore abandoned sites.</li> <li>• Apart from Sainsbury's and now Costa, all the shops in Tadcaster are independently owned, a unique feature that could be exploited to attract more interest at a time when town centres are becoming more and more bland, and offering the same large chains of stores and outlets.</li> <li>• Community buildings such as community centres are enormously important and must take a high priority; but they are not necessarily being used to their full advantage</li> </ul>	<p>Tadcaster &amp; Villages Community Engagement Forum – Tadcaster And Villages Community Development Plan 2012 – 2015.</p>

Please refer to the Tadcaster Town Centre Options Plan.

## Fact Sheets: Options – Natural & Heritage

### Environment

The fact sheets will be used to inform discussions at the focussed engagement workshops. The recommendations and key issues summarised in these sheets will inform, but not predetermine, decisions to be made by the Council about what PLAN Selby should look like.

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUPS	EVENTS
SM24	Tadcaster	To inform both Community and Technical Groups	Round 1

### Green Belt

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Stage 1 Green Belt Study, when finalised after focused engagement, will provide the findings on how well 'general areas' of the Green Belt perform against the five purposes of the Green Belt. It does not reach a judgement on what general areas should be taken forward for further consideration in Stages 2 and 3 to identify specific parcels of land that have the potential to be released from the Green Belt.</li> </ul>	A Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gap, and Development Limits For Plan Selby - Strategic Countryside Gaps, Prepared By ARUP on behalf of Selby District Council, June 2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants of the focused engagement are being asked to comment on the Green Belt General Areas Assessment contained in the Stage 1 study and how the judgement should be made in Stage 2 of the Study to determine which General Areas of the Green Belt should be taken forward for further consideration.</li> </ul>	

### Strategic Countryside Gaps

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ARUP Assessment identifies a potential Candidate SCG in Tadcaster as follows:  <b>Potential SCG to south of the town centre on the eastern side of River Wharfe</b></li> <li>This potential gap is located between the Development Limits for Tadcaster either side of the River Wharfe to the south of the town centre. It comprises open grass fields with some tree cover.</li> </ul>	A Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gaps, and Development Limits For Plan Selby - Strategic Countryside Gaps, Prepared By ARUP on behalf of Selby District Council, June

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall, due to the development pressures on Tadcaster, it is considered that further consideration should be given to this gap as a potential Candidate SCG.</li> <li><b><u>ARUP recommend that the potential Tadcaster Candidate SCG is taken forward as a SCG, based on the boundaries identified on the Spatial Options Plan on land only at the eastern side of the River.</u></b></li> <li>See parcel of land identified on the Spatial Options Plan.</li> </ul>	2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This Assessment undertaken by ARUP only makes recommendations. The recommendations should be considered as part of this engagement event and assessed as part of the next stage of the Draft PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	

## Development Limits

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ARUP recommend that PLAN Selby adopts a tight Development Limit boundary which will incorporate the outcomes of the separate Green Belt Study and Strategic Countryside Gaps review processes, as well as incorporating a check of existing defined Development Limits in order to correct any minor errors or discrepancies since the previous Limits were established, which will in turn inform the Housing and Employment Site Selection Process and dictate where future growth of the market towns can be accommodated in accordance with the Council's housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy.</li> </ul>	A Study Of The Green Belt, Safeguarded Land, Strategic Countryside Gap, and Development Limits For Plan Selby - Definition Of Development Limits, By Arup On Behalf Of Selby District Council, June 2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criteria for defining Development Limits is recommended as follows:           <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Proposed / Existing Site Allocations</li> <li>4. Check of Existing Development Limits in terms of the following               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>f) Extant planning consents</li> <li>g) Functional relationship to physical form of built-up area</li> <li>h) Functional relationship to use of built-up area.</li> <li>i) Relationship to permanent physical boundaries</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ul>	

## Housing

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Options to deliver the housing requirement for Tadcaster given in this consultation are as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Allocating larger sites than required to ensure delivery;</li> <li>5. Allocating sites not currently available and deliverable but will be by the end of plan period;</li> <li>6. Identify contingency site allocations that could be released later on in plan period in the event of non-delivery.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• The approach to site allocation will be based on evidence and the site selection methodology in the SHLAA.               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. PDL within existing settlements</li> <li>6. Suitable greenfield sites within settlements</li> <li>7. Extensions to existing settlements on PDL</li> <li>8. Extensions to existing settlements on greenfield land.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• In order to accommodate the scale of growth required a review of current Development Limits and the boundary of the Urban Area of Selby (as identified in the Core Strategy) will be undertaken.</li> <li>• The most recent housing requirement figures based on April 2015 housing completions are as follows:</li> <li>• Selby Urban Area: <u>2061 new dwellings (including Olympia Park site)</u> 51% of overall district requirement (potentially subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>• Sherburn in Elmet: <u>54 new dwellings</u> 11% of overall district requirement (potentially subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>• Tadcaster: <u>476 new dwellings</u> 7% of overall district requirement (subject to an additional 476 dwellings to conform with Policy SP6 (D) of the Core Strategy)</li> <li>• Tadcaster's approach to meeting their housing requirement is based on a phased approach set out in the Core Strategy, whereby three phases of sites should be identified to ensure delivery in the light of potential land availability issues. Phase 1 and the contingency phase 2 are to be in Tadcaster and will follow the site selection methodology referred to above. The Phase 3 (contingency) sites could be located outside the town and should be considered as part of the focussed engagement.</li> <li>• Phase 1 sites in/on edge of Tadcaster to be released on adoption of PLAN Selby. Phase 2 sites only released if less than one third of minimum dwelling requirement has been completed after 5 years of adoption of PLAN Selby and Phase 3 sites, on the edge of settlements will be released after 3 years of release of Phase 2, if completions are less than 50% of minimum dwelling requirement.</li> <li>• In order to accommodate the scale of growth required a review of current Development Limits will be undertaken and where a settlement is within or adjoining Green Belt a localised review of that boundary may also be undertaken.</li> </ul>	<p>The Site and Policies Local Plan – Initial Consultation 24 November to 19 January 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SHLAA forms part of the evidence base for PLAN Selby and sets out potential land available for housing in the District that will inform the Site</li> </ul>	<p>Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment</p>

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<p>Allocations part of PLAN Selby.</p>	<p>(SHLAA), 2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SHLAA identifies all sites (of 5 dwellings or more) on a map and provides an assessment of each site, in terms of its suitability, availability and achievability to determine whether a site is realistically expected to be developed.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on the information currently made available to the Council, the total number of sites considered as part of the SHLAA total of 513 sites. 204 of these sites were made up of planning permissions, SDLP allocations and Core Strategy allocations. A Further 309 were identified as 'potential sites'.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The results show that the amount than could be delivered over the plan period is far in excess of what is shown to be needed in the Initial Consultation PLAN Selby.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With specific reference to Tadcaster, the total number of sites assessed in the are as follows:</li> <li>Tadcaster – Total 966 houses (capacity identified in the SHLAA). Initial Consultation PLAN Selby requirement: 500 houses (from the Core Strategy) with 470 from new allocations. Currently update figures at 2015 (see above) = 476 dwellings required on new allocations.</li> <li>Whilst most of these sites identified in the SHLAA could potentially be delivered in 0-5 years, the number of sites and total number of houses identified is far in excess of Tadcaster's requirement set out in Initial Consultation PLAN Selby. Those sites identified should now be considered and assessed as part of the preparation of PLAN Selby and housing allocations identified in the Plan.</li> <li>All Tadcaster SHLAA sites are identified on the Spatial Options Plan.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose of the SHMA is to address housing need in Selby District and to develop a robust understanding of housing market dynamics, to provide an assessment of future needs for both market and affordable housing and the housing needs of different groups within the population.</li> <li>The purpose of the SHMA is to address housing need in Selby District and to develop a robust understanding of housing market dynamics, to provide an assessment of future needs for both market and affordable housing and the housing needs of different groups within the population.</li> <li>Some key draft findings are:</li> <li>The District's objectively assessed need for housing is about 430 dwelling per annum up to 2027. This supports the adopted policy position in the adopted Core Strategy.</li> <li>There remains a significant affordable housing need across the District and this supports the Council's adopted policy position.</li> <li>In terms of wider sub regional housing markets, the strongest relationship based on local authority areas is between Selby and York. However, in policy terms there should be recognition of the relationships with Leeds and Wakefield from a housing market point of view. This supports the production of a SHMA for Selby District.</li> </ul>	<p>Selby District Council – Draft Selby Strategic Housing Market Assessment, June 2015, Prepared By GL Hearn Limited</p>

KEY ISSUES	REFERENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The analysis in the Assessment indicates that the majority of demand for market housing will be for mid-market homes with 2 and 3 bedrooms and a strong demand for bungalows. This should inform strategic policy and the 'portfolio' of sites which are considered through the PLAN Selby.</li> <li>• The majority of the need for affordable housing is for 1- and 2-bed properties. This should inform strategic policy and the 'portfolio' of sites which are considered through the PLAN Selby</li> <li>• The needs evidence suggests that a 25%/ 75% split of affordable housing provision between intermediate and social/ affordable rented provision would be appropriate.</li> <li>• Demographic change likely to see a requirement for additional care/ support and specialist housing provision. Net need for 417 bed spaces. This should be considered in identifying potential sites in accessible locations.</li> <li>• Custom build - Council should set up register and identify plots in larger developments.</li> </ul>	

Please refer to the Tadcaster Natural & Heritage Environment Plan.



