

In assessing housing need and allocating sites in DSV's and secondary villages especially those in the Green Belt the PLAN Selby must comply with Planning Practice Guidance reference ID: 50-001-20140306 below, which states that,-

'assessing housing need and allocating sites should be considered at a strategic level and through the local plan process. However, all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided'.

The Core Strategy should be amended to take this into account.

It appears that the way things are going that less sustainable development is being encouraged as most housing is further away from Leeds, Wakefield and York Districts (the main employment areas) and greater commuting journey lengths are arising, (out commuting is now over 75% and rising). The Villages in the Green Belt, closer to the main employment areas are therefore more sustainable than the ones in the Countryside further east!

With regard to the West 3 Green Belt Assessment I must comment that comparing scruffy pieces of land adjacent to existing dwellings and scoring it the same as land over a mile away from any development is wrong as the score of land at a village edge would be far lower than land miles away!

Regarding defining Development Limits in secondary villages particularly those in the Green Belt it is essential that development limits are moved outwards as there is no available and deliverable development land left for dwellings or essential services such as shops, schools, leisure and recreational facilities.

What needs to happen is assess the need of each village and the availability of land to meet the need and review the Green Belt and move the development limit to provide the land for the foreseeable future for beyond the local plan length ie. for the next 30+ years.

Regarding the Selby Retail and Leisure Study no mention is made of any settlement outside the main 3 settlements, provision should be made in the Plan for leisure and recreational need in all other settlements if any potential sites come forward.

I note that Arup state there are a high number of windfall developments and some people want to use this to restrict development. I suggest the reason for a high numbers of windfalls is the tightness of development limits of villages and the historic lack of Selby local plans providing enough development land, this should not continue.