



Mr Robert Yuille

Examiner

25 August 2017

**Re: Appleton Roebuck and Acaster Selby Neighbourhood Development Plan (ARAS NDP) 'fact check' Report**

Thank you for your email dated 17 August 2017 containing the 'fact check' Report to the ARAS NDP.

The Council has reviewed the Fact Check Report and attached to this letter is a copy of your appendix tables accompanying the report containing comments from both the qualifying body (Parish Council) and the District Council.

In particular, I would like to highlight that we are concerned about the conclusions arrived at in the main report regarding your proposed modifications to Policy H1 (Paragraph 4.26) and that the report is factually incorrect in respect of the suggested modification wording at PM3 in the Appendix.

**Paragraph 4.26**

The Council found it disappointing that at Paragraph 4.26 you acknowledged that both 5 dwellings and 10 dwellings are arbitrary limits but then consider the 10 dwelling threshold be retained. It is unclear how this would boost significantly the supply of housing.

**PM3 - 'Small scale development' definition**

Firstly, there is a discrepancy between the wording in Policy H1 and the wording in PM3 and the supporting text to policy H1. The policy states 'small scale development' as 10 houses or less, however Policy H1 states that 'small scale' is under 10 units.

Secondly, and fundamentally, as set out in our previous response (dated 10 August 2017), the Council does not have a policy definition of 'small site' and the plan promoters therefore agreed to remove reference to SDC policy.

Further, to be absolutely clear, the Council does not '*favour defining 'small scale development' as 10 houses or less*'. This is considered an arbitrary limit and there is no evidence to support the proposed limit of 10 dwellings. Previous correspondence on this issue makes it clear that the Council does not have a definition of small scale housing development and therefore it cannot be correct to say that the Council agrees to, or favours, the setting of an arbitrary figure. A modification with this wording does not correct the existing error as to the Council's position identified as the reason for making it.

Indeed, your wording suggests that this will '*give greater flexibility when considering the allocation of housing sites in the emerging plan*' but it is the Council's view that a defined limit of 10 or less

would in fact restrict flexibility when considering the allocation of housing sites through the emerging local plan process and would not serve to boost significantly the supply of housing (as set in the NPPF and consistent with the Council's adopted Core Strategy). Each site should be treated on its merits both through the Local Plan process and dealing with planning applications.

We would therefore respectfully suggest that the modification simply delete the inaccurate comment without substituting the wording suggested.

Kind regards

Phil Crabtree

Interim Head of Planning

**'Fact checking' Report Appendix with comments from the qualifying body and the District Council.**

*Schedule 1: Modifications to meet the Basic Conditions (and other legal requirements)*

Examiner's recommend modifications			Selby District Council & Appleton Roebuck and Acaster Selby Parish Council response
Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no./ other reference	Modification	Proposed modification / amendment
PM1	Policies Map	Remove the Local Green Space designation from the 'Ridge and Furrow Field'.	Agreed
PM2	Page 24, paragraph 4.3.4	<del>(most-at-risk)</del> <u>(least at risk)</u>	Amend to Page 21
PM3	Page 29, paragraph 4.5.1	<del>However, Selby District Council's definition of small scale development' is 10 houses or fewer. Therefore, this figure has been adopted in order to comply with their policy. However, Selby District Council favour</del> <u>defining 'small scale development' as 10 houses or less as this will give greater flexibility when considering the allocation of housing sites in the emerging local plan</u>	Please see covering letter
PM4	Page 30, Policy H3	<del>b) Car parking spaces must be suitable for the average family-sized car unless alternative and accessible car parking arrangements can be made which do not create on-street parking.</del>  e) <u>b)</u>	Agreed
PM5	Page 31 Policy WB2	Support will be given for the re-use of redundant buildings for new economic use where:	Amend policy reference to WB1.
PM6	Page 31, Policy	b) .....(Grade 1, <del>and 2 and 3a)</del>	Agreed

	WB2		
--	-----	--	--

*Schedule 2: Further Modifications to Correct Errors and to Improve Clarity and Accuracy*

Examiner's further recommended modifications		Selby District Council & Appleton Roebuck and Acaster Selby Parish Council response
Page no./other reference	Modification	Proposed modification / amendment
Page 5, paragraph 1.1	Largely arable grassland that surrounds the main settlement. <u>There are in addition substantial areas of floodplain grassland around the confluence of the rivers Wharfe and Ouse."</u>	Agreed
Page 25, Policy ELH 2  Appendix 1, Page 38, The Ings, Wildlife of Green Infrastructure Value	<del>Other types of</del> Ancient Woodland and Ancient/Veteran Trees  SSSI <u>SINC</u>	Agreed
Page 22, third paragraph	.....wider Vale of York regional <u>national</u> character area.	Agreed
Page 14, paragraph 4.31	...in rural areas and with Core Strategy Policy <u>SP13</u>	Include 'SP' to policy reference.
Page 8, paragraph 4.3 – line 3.	...fourthly, <u>Housing development</u> ;	Include 'development' wording to text.