

**Addendum to  
Core Strategy Background Paper No. 6**

**Designated Service Villages**

**January 2011**

## **Introduction**

- A1 This Addendum to the Background Paper identifies changes to the evidence which has resulted in the Council amending the list of Designated Service Villages between publication of Background Paper No.6 and the Draft Core Strategy Document and the publication of the Submission Draft (Publication version) of the Strategy. The changes are attributable to updated flood risk data released by the Environment Agency, the availability of information on potential development sites arising from work on the Site Allocations DPD, and additional evidence provided through responses to the draft Core Strategy.

## **Flood Risk**

- A2 Subsequent to the publication of Background Paper No.6, the Environment Agency has released more up to date information on flood risk. This principally affects the River Ouse catchment and indicates that a number of settlements are now affected by a higher probability of flood risk, although the risk of flooding is reduced to a low residual risk where there are modern flood defences such as at Selby. At the same time land at reduced risk has been identified in villages such as Cawood and Ulleskelf, which were previously regarded as high flood risk.
- A3 As a number of changes have also been made to the District housing requirement and the planned spatial distribution of development (after consultation on the Draft Core Strategy), the Council has undertaken a review of the PPS25 Sequential Test. This has resulted in a reassessment of the growth potential and 'Service Village' status of Cawood, Ulleskelf and Wistow.
- A4 Designated Service Villages have been selected on the basis of sustainability criteria (location, access to services etc), and potential to accommodate additional housing development. At the time of publishing the Draft Core Strategy, while Cawood and Ulleskelf were considered to have sustainable characteristics they were not considered suitable for continued growth owing to high flood risk. The updated flood risk data suggests that there is potential for limited housing development which avoids high flood risk land in both villages. Cawood and Ulleskelf have therefore been added to the list of Designated Service Villages.
- A5 Conversely, Wistow which was previously identified as a designated Service Village has been reclassified as a Secondary Village as a result of a higher flood risk assessment.

## **Growth Potential**

- A6 Byram and Brotherton are relatively sustainable settlements which share a good range of local services and have good accessibility to services and employment in nearby Castleford and Pontefract. Neither was previously proposed as a Designated Service Village because of constraints on future growth. However, work in connection with the Site Allocations DPD has identified a number of potential development sites and both villages have been Designated as 'linked' Service Villages.

## **The Role of Villages**

### *Appleton Roebuck*

- A7 Information provided by Appleton Roebuck Parish Council demonstrates the role played by the village within a network of surrounding settlements. This is underpinned by the proactive approach being taken in the village to the improvement of local services, and the suggestion that modest housing development would help support this objective. As a consequence it is considered that Appleton Roebuck meets the provisions of Paragraph 4 of PPS7, (as referred to in the Background Paper) which endorses the encouragement of limited development in smaller settlements where these fulfil a valuable function within their local area. The Council supports the view that limited growth can strengthen the local role of settlements, and is satisfied that there is potential for further growth in the village. Appleton Roebuck is therefore reclassified as a Designated Service Village.

### *Whitley*

- A8 In response to consultation on the Draft Core Strategy mixed views were received on the 'status' of Whitley and whether there should be further growth in the village. While there is insufficient evidence to justify designating Whitley as a Service Village in its own right a number of consultees suggested that because Eggborough and Whitley are located in close proximity and share a number of facilities (the local primary school is situated in Whitley) there is a case for classifying them as 'Linked' Service Villages. This view is supported by the Council particularly since it will provide a degree of flexibility when considering potential development sites through the Site Allocations DPD.