

**Selby District Council Local Plan Background Paper:
Preferred Spatial Strategy
January 2021**

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this paper is to provide further details on how the spatial approach proposed in the Preferred Options Local Plan has been developed.
- 1.2 The National Planning Policy Framework states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are independent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways:
 - a) An economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;
 - b) A social objective – to support strong, vibrant and health communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and
 - c) An environmental objective – to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.
- 1.3 This paper considers the spatial approach options against the overarching objectives for the three strands of sustainable development outlined above and focusses primarily on housing growth. Consideration has been given to a range of evidence including environmental constraints, availability of sites and the capacity of local infrastructure.
- 1.4 The Preferred Options for the spatial strategy were developed in summer 2020 during which MHCLG consulted on changes to the standard housing methodology which would increase the housing requirements for Selby District from a baseline figure of 342 dwellings per annum to 589 dwellings per annum. A number of alternative approaches to accommodate this higher level of growth were also considered in establishing the preferred approach.

2. Background

- 2.1 The current spatial approach for the growth of the District is set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The existing settlement hierarchy is based on the principal town of Selby, the two smaller Local Service Centres of Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster, 18 Designated Service Villages and 40 Secondary Villages with defined Development Limits.
- 2.2 In view of the close proximity to Selby Town it was anticipated that the adjoining villages of Barlby/Osgodby, Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby would fulfil a complimentary role.
- 2.3 As part of the review of the Local Plan the settlement hierarchy has been reviewed and informed by the results of the 2019 Parish Facilities Survey in addition to a range of evidence in relation to bus services and service capacity.

2.4 Since 2011 over 4035 dwellings have been completed. Table 1 shows that there has been limited delivery in both Selby Town and Tadcaster, but high levels of development in Sherburn in Elmet and the Designated Service Villages.

Table 1

Settlement	Core Strategy Target	Completions	Permissions	Total	Provision
Selby	3700	1026	468	1494	-2,206
Sherburn	790	707	633	1340	550
Tadcaster	500	30	164	194	-306
18 DSV's	2000	1855	1079	2934	934
SV's	170	417	215	632	462
Total	7200	4035	2559	6594	-606

Based on data at 31st March 2020

3. Issues and Options Consultation Responses

- 3.1 The Issues and Options Consultation asked for views on 6 broad spatial options for new housing growth:-
- Option 1 – New housing development to be dispersed across all settlements
 - Option 2 – Focus development in towns and larger villages which have a number of key facilities and have good rail and highway connections
 - Option 3 - Focus new housing development in close proximity to future employment sites, through the expansion of villages in these locations
 - Option 4 – Development along strategic transport corridors
 - Option 5 – Provision of a new settlement
 - Option 6 – A mix of options
 - Option 7 – An alternative approach
- 3.2 In addition the consultation document sought views on broad spatial options for new employment growth:-
- Option 1 – Focus new development in locations which are in close proximity to existing large scale employment hubs
 - Option 2 - The re-use of brownfield sites for development
 - Option 3 – Focus new employment development in close proximity to settlements along strategic transport corridors
 - Option 4 – Focus new employment development in close proximity to key transport hubs
 - Option 5 – Mix of Options
 - Option 6 – An alternative approach
- 3.3 In response to the spatial options suggested the majority of respondents considered a mix of options to be the best approach.

Table 2

Preferred Option for Housing Growth	Percentage of Responses
Option 1	11%
Option 2	4%
Option 3	2%
Option 4	0%
Option 5	5%
Option 6	53%
Option 7	19%
No preference indicated	6%

3.4 In terms of the mix of options there was general support for some development in villages and recognition that they need some growth to support their sustainability but also a recognition that growth near stations and employment sites would help reduce carbon emissions. There was much less support for development along strategic transport corridors due to environmental implications but also an acknowledgement that people will commute outside the District for work. There was some recognition that a new settlement is necessary but concern over the time this will take to develop. Many of the comments received pointed to the lack of deliverability of the current spatial approach. The full comments received in response to the Issues and Options consultation are available on the Council's website at <https://selby-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/folder/80107>

3.5 Response to the proposed options for employment growth are set out in Table 3.

Table 3

Preferred Option for Employment Growth	Percentage of Responses
Option 1	6%
Option 2	1%
Option 3	7%
Option 4	1%
Option 5	61%
Option 6	13%
No preference indicated	11%

3.5 Similarly to the housing spatial growth options the large majority of respondents considered a mix of options to be the most appropriate option. There was some concern about focussing employment growth in locations with road linkages only. Generally respondents supported the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the first instance but there was recognition that each one should be considered in terms of the infrastructure and accessibility and that flexibility was also needed to support future economic growth. There was also a degree of support for locating development where they can be accessed by employees without the need for commuting. The full comments received in response to the Issues and Options consultation are available on the Council's website at <https://selby-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/folder/80107>

3.6 The responses to the Issues and Options consultation gave a clear indication that a mix of these different spatial approaches is likely to be the most appropriate. In order

to consider the most appropriate “blend” of options it is important to review the key constraints which would prevent their delivery.

4. Constraints to Spatial Approach

- 4.1 The starting point for determining the spatial approach has been to steer development to more suitable locations. Constraints can be categorised into two elements; those which are a key barrier to development such as areas of high flood risk or with statutory protections and those which are a result of policy such as Green Belt and Strategic Countryside Gaps.
- 4.2 Selby District has several protected area designations including 12 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) including Bolton Percy Ings, Brockadale, Eskahmhorn Meadows, Sherburn Willows, Derwent Ings, Forlorn Hope Meadow, Stutton Ings, Tadcaster Mere, Fairburn and Newton Ings, Skipwith Common, Burr Closes and Kirkby Wharfe. The Lower Derwent Valeely is a Ramsar sites which are wetland sites designated to be of international importance under the Ramsar Convention. The Lower Derwent Valley is also designated as a Special Protection Area, a designation under the European Union Directive on Wild Birds, part of the Natura 2000 network of nature protection areas. The River Derwent/Lower Derwent Valley and Skipwith Common are also designated as Special Areas of Conservation are protected sites designated under the EC Habitats Directive.
- 4.3 In addition to the internationally designated sites there are also two National Nature Reserves within the District, the Lower Derwent Valley and Skipwith Common. Local Nature Reserves have been designated at Barlow Common, Bolton Percy Nature reserve at Tadcaster, Sherburn Willows at Sherburn in Elmet, Brayton Barff and Hambleton Hough. There are also a number of areas of ancient woodland across the District.
- 4.4 Assets of the highest significance notably scheduled monuments, registered battlefields, grade I and grade II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens have also been considered as constraints to development and includes areas such as Town Battlefield.
- 4.5 The District’s low-lying topography surrounded by an extensive network of broad, tidal rivers draining the district render a large area of central Selby vulnerable to flooding. The river channels of the Ouse and its tributaries (the Wharfe, Derwent and Aire) are lined with alluvial deposits controlled by engineered embankments throughout the District and much of the low-lying areas fall within Flood Zone 3 and Flood Zone 2. The NPPF says that all plans should apply a sequential, risk based approach to the location of development- taking into account the current and future impacts of climate change.
- 4.6 These three significant constraints therefore provide the logical starting point in considering spatial growth options in the District. The future spatial strategy will seek to preserve these special areas of ecological and historical importance and steer development away from the areas at the highest risk of flooding.
- 4.7 Having considered the constraints above consideration has then be given to the existing policy constraints of Green Belt and Strategic Countryside Gaps.

Green Belt

- 4.8 The Green Belt in Selby equates to a total of 19,240 hectares and incorporates parts of both the West Yorkshire and City of York Green Belts. The NPPF says that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. The policy goes on to say that once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified.
- 4.9 Paragraph 137 of the NPPF says that before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development. Given the wording of the NPPF it is considered that in developing the spatial strategy approach that consideration should firstly be given to that which does not require removal of land in the Green Belt.
- 4.10 The removal of Green Belt land to support further growth in sustainable locations has been considered as a potential spatial option, however in line with National Policy this will only be considered in exceptional circumstances and therefore the approach has been to allocate land in sustainable locations outside of the Green Belt in the first instance.

Strategic Countryside Gaps

- 4.11 The Selby District Local Plan identifies 10 Strategic Countryside Gaps, which are located at Barlby/Osgodby, Barlby Top/Barlby Crescent, Brayton/Selby, Church Fenton East/West, Cliffe/Hemingbrough, Gateforth, Hensall North/South, Skipwith, Stillingfleet and Thorganby. The purpose of this designation is to ensure that the separate identity of the villages are maintained. Although largely a policy to prevent the coalescence of settlements it also provides areas of openness around settlements which provide opportunities for leisure and recreation. The Strategic Countryside Gaps have proved a useful policy tool to help prevent the coalescence of some villages particularly those under the greatest pressure for growth such as those around Selby Town.
- 4.12 A review has been undertaken on the Strategic Countryside Gaps and is being consulted on separately as part of the Preferred Options consultation.

5. Settlement Hierarchy

- 5.1 Paragraph 103 of the Framework states that significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes
- 5.2 In order to determine a spatial strategy approach, it is crucial to undertake a detailed analysis of the sustainability and capacity for each settlement in the District to accommodate further growth.
- 5.3 The settlement analysis was undertaken in two parts. Firstly to ascertain those villages which are considered to be the most sustainable in terms of access to services, public transport and employment opportunities, whilst the second part considered the known constraints to further growth.

- 5.4 As part of the preparation of the Local Plan the existing Settlement Hierarchy set out in the adopted Core Strategy was reviewed to reflect information on recent growth and changes to local services. Further details of this are set out in a separate paper on the Settlement Hierarchy, however in summary the review considered the latest position on local facilities, employment opportunities, the current number of households, residents and access to public transport.
- 5.5 The proposed new Settlement Hierarchy is set out below and is being consulted on separately as part of the Preferred Options consultation.

Table 4

Hierarchy	Settlement
Principal Town	Selby Urban Area
Local Service Centre	Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster
New Settlement Option	Stillingfleet or Church Fenton Airbase or Burn Airfield
Tier 1 Villages	Barlby & Osgodby; Brayton; Byram and Brotherton; Eggborough & Whitley; Hemingbrough; Riccall; South Milford; and Thorpe Willoughby
Tier 2 Villages	Appleton Roebuck; Camblesforth; Carlton; Cawood; Church Fenton; Cliffe; Escrick; Fairburn; Hambleton; Hensall; Kellington; Monk Fryston & Hillam; North Duffield; Ulleskelf and Wistow
Smaller Villages	Barkston Ash; Barlow; Beal; Bilbrough; Bolton Percy; Burn; Burton Salmon; Chapel Haddlesey; Church Fenton Airbase; Drax; Hirst Courtney; Kelfield; Kirk Smeaton; Little Smeaton; Saxton; Skipwith; Stillingfleet; Stutton; Thorganby; Towton; West Haddlesey; Womersley; Biggin; Birkin; Colton; Cridling Stubbs; Gateforth; Healaugh; Heck; Kellingley; Little Fenton; Lumby; Newland; Newton Kyme; Ryther cum Ossendyke; and South Duffield

Selby Town

- 5.6 Selby Town is the largest town in the District with a population of approximately 13,000 and continues to be the District's Principal Town and the main shopping centre, focus for housing, employment and local facilities. It is also served by a railway station with direct access to the cities of Leeds or York, Hull and Leeds and therefore the most sustainable location in terms of access to public transport.
- 5.7 Although Selby Town is the most sustainable location in the District the opportunities for further development are restricted due to much of the land being identified by the Environment Agency as falling within Flood Zone 3. The National Planning Policy Framework is clear in that development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk.

- 5.8 In 2016 Selby District Council designated the first Air Quality Management Area in the District which covers two rows of terraced buildings flanking New Street and is limited to the area of New Street, and the Crescent between Selby Abbey and Ousegate. The impact on the Air Quality Management Area is a key concern in relation to any new development proposals in Selby Town.
- 5.9 There remain opportunities for the regeneration of previously developed land for example around the town centre and railway station. Selby is still the most sustainable location and therefore it is considered that new development should be supported where flood risk can be appropriately and viably mitigated. In addition opportunities may arise through the Selby Transforming Cities Fund project which aims to transform the town through investment to improve public and sustainable transport and stimulate regeneration. The scheme seeks to achieve better integration of the train station with the bus station and create a multi modal hub that drives the revitalisation from the town centre and enable journeys from local communities to the town centre and wider Leeds City Region.
- 5.10 Improvements to walking and cycling improvements connecting to Selby station from new development sites and other areas of the town have been also identified as priorities as part of the emerging Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan. The Selby Town Centre Action Plan 2020-25 seeks to ensure that Selby Town becomes a 21st Century connected, accessible and progressive town with a lively, historic centre surrounded by high quality urban neighbourhoods and with diverse thriving businesses.

Tadcaster

- 5.11 Tadcaster is one of three main settlements in the District and benefits from a wide range of facilities and services, with a population of approximately 6,000. The town has rich historic assets with its Conservation Area including Listed Buildings and ancient monuments. The town continues to be a key location for employment with three breweries in the town contributing to its unique character. The surrounding Green Belt and designated Locally Important Landscape Area, along with the important green wedge along the river side also make a significant contribution to the context of the town.
- 5.12 Despite its designation as a Local Service Centre in the Core Strategy and a requirement to deliver 500 new dwellings only 30 dwellings have been completed since 2011. Development progress has been hindered by a combination of land ownership issues and by the fact much of the town is within the designated Green Belt despite these issues the town continues to play a key role within Selby's settlement hierarchy and therefore further growth is supported.

Sherburn In Elmet

- 5.13 Sherburn in Elmet has seen significant employment and housing growth in recent years largely due to its proximity to Leeds and the motorway network. Some further growth could be supported reflecting the scale of growth which has already taken place.

Tier 1

- 5.14 These settlements have all four types of key services, have more than 10 services overall and have a population of more than 2,000. These characteristics ensure that

residents of these villages and surrounding smaller villages have a satisfactory range of nearby essential services. Further development in these villages of an appropriate scale and reflecting their character is considered sustainable.

Tier 2 Villages

- 5.15 These settlements have at least 1000 residents, it must have at least 7 different types of services and have at least 2 key services. Exceptions to this rule have been made for Appleton Roebuck and Kellington, as they have populations just under 1,000 but they do have 8 and 9 different services and have 2 key services (a school and a community hall). Another exception has been for Wistow which has only one key service (a primary school) but has a population of 1300 and has 10 different services. Further development in these villages of an appropriate scale and reflecting their character is considered sustainable.

Smaller Villages

- 5.16 In order to be classed as a smaller village, a settlement must have less than 800 residents, must have less than 2 key services and they must have no more than 10 total services. Some very small-scale development to support the sustainability of these villages may be appropriate.
- 5.17 Although several villages are considered sustainable there are constraints to further development as a result of flood risk and their location in the Green Belt. These villages include Byram and Brotherton, South Milford, Escrick and Fairburn (this is because the entire settlement is enveloped by greenbelt), Cawood, Church Fenton and Wistow (large parts of which are in Flood Zones 2 and 3).

New Settlement

- 5.18 The benefits of a new settlement are set out in Paragraph 72 of the NPPF and offer the option for meeting longer term growth in a sustainable way, can plan adequately for local infrastructure and can avoid areas with environmental constraints.
- 5.19 The provision of a new settlement in principle is considered to be a sustainable option to meet further growth in the long term beyond the plan period of 2040. It is considered that with two development outlets the provision of a new settlement could help to provide approximately 1260 new dwellings within the timeframe of the Local Plan (up to 3,500 dwellings in total).

Eggborough Urban Extension

- 5.20 Although not on the same scale as a new settlement proposal for a large submission has also been put forward to the west of Eggborough Village. Although currently a Tier 1 village, Eggborough is located in close proximity to the former Kellingley Colliery and former Eggborough Power Station, which have recently been granted permission for employment use. The village has good access to the strategic highway network and to Whitley station. In addition, Wakefield District Council are proposing a new link road to the A1 around Knottingley which will connect to Weeland Road. For this reason the proposal is considered to a sustainable opportunity, which will deliver new housing in association with local facilities including the provision of a new primary school, whilst linking with existing communities.

Developing the Preferred Spatial Approach

- 5.21 The starting point for distributing new growth is set out in table 5 below. This shows the current target using both the Housing Economic Development Needs Assessment figure and the proposed standard methodology figure, which was consulted on during 2020 by the Ministry of Housing and Local Government but has subsequently been abandoned.

Table 5

	HEDNA Housing Figure	Proposed Figure in MHCLG consultation
Dwellings Per Annum	402	589
20 Year Plan Target	8040	11780
Supply @ 31.03.2020	2293	2293
Residual Target	5747	9487

- 5.22 As part of the Call for Sites Exercise a total of 412 sites were submitted for consideration and this provides important information on the availability of land in the District. This included three options for new settlements and a proposed urban extension.
- 5.23 Using the proposed settlement hierarchy as the basis for the emerging spatial strategy further consideration was then given to how growth should be distributed. Table 6 sets out 5 options which considered the distribution of growth to meet the District's housing requirements in accordance with the proposed settlement hierarchy. Further details of what these options mean for each village is set out in Table 7.
- 5.24 Three options to meet the higher housing figure which was proposed as part to the consultation on the revised standard housing methodology were also considered, although MHCLG have since announced a reversion to the existing methodology.
- 5.25 Option A considered a focus on Selby Town, Tadcaster and Sherburn recognising their roles as the settlements with the greatest number of facilities and accessibility, an urban expansion to Eggborough and a New Settlement. Under this option no sites in the Green Belt would be released. Development in Tier 1 and Tier 2 villages would be distributed equally except for villages in the Green Belt and subject to high flood risk.
- 5.26 Under Option B there would be less development in Selby Town but greater levels of development distributed to the villages, again this option would not result in the release of Green Belt sites.
- 5.27 Option C considered the distribution of less development in Selby Town and the redistribution of growth to villages in the absence of the Urban Expansion at Eggborough. This approach could have a negative impact on the character of villages and local infrastructure as it represents almost double the distribution outlined in Option A.

- 5.28 Option D considered the distribution of less growth in Selby Town, the urban expansion of Eggborough and growth in the villages. This option considered how growth could be redistributed away from lots of villages to a larger strategic site.
- 5.29 The release of sites in the Green Belt have been considered in principle through Option E. Although the release of sites in the Green Belt would be subject to review it is anticipated that the focus would be on those most sustainable locations first and therefore a broad number has been apportioned to both Tadcaster and Sherburn, with up to 1,000 dwellings elsewhere in the settlement hierarchy. In line with the NPPF the release of Green Belt land will only be considered in exceptional circumstances and first consideration will be given to land which is previously-developed and/or is well-served by public transport.
- 5.30 Options F, G and H outlined options for meeting the figure of 589 dwellings per year, which was consulted on by MHCLG during summer 2021 and demonstrate how challenging it will be to deliver higher levels of growth in the District as it would require the provision of two new settlements in addition to the release of Green Belt land. More significant Green Belt release has also been considered under Options G and H. Both these options have considered the balance between Green Belt Release and the provision of three new settlements rather than two.
- 5.31 As can be seen from Table 6 focussing development in Selby Town as the most sustainable location reduces the volume of growth which would then need to be distributed to the smaller villages, which are considered less sustainable and would require greater improvements to local infrastructure.
- 5.32 Of all the options presented Option A is considered the most appropriate as it continues to focus the bulk of development in the most sustainable locations, which have access to a range of employment opportunities, access to public transport and facilities, with less development proposed in locations with smaller numbers of facilities and poorer accessibility. This option includes the provision of both a new settlement and urban expansion at Eggborough, which provide the opportunity to plan properly for new infrastructure through the scale of development proposed, whilst linking to existing communities and employment opportunities.
- 5.33 As can be seen from Table 6 increasing growth to the levels set out in the proposed standard housing methodology would have require significant growth around villages or consideration of either release of Green Belt land or the provision of more than one new settlement in the District. This is due to the limited opportunities for further growth around Selby Town due to flood risk and the location of Tadcaster and Sherburn in Elmet in the Green Belt.

Table 6 – Spatial Distribution Options

	Option A (Preferred)	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E	Option F	Option G	Option H
Spatial Strategy Option Description	Focus on Selby with smaller distribution elsewhere	More development in the smaller villages, less development in Selby Town	No Eggborough Urban Expansion and Selby, more growth in smaller villages	Less development in Selby Town, Eggborough Urban Expansion and more growth in smaller villages	Green Belt Release. Less development in Selby Town, Eggborough Urban Expansion	Focus on Selby, 2x New Settlements, No Green Belt Release	Substantial Green Belt Release and 2x New Settlements	Limited Green Belt Release and 3 x New Settlements
Dwellings Per Annum	402	402	402	402	402	589	589	589
20 Year Plan Target	8040	8040	8040	8040	8040	11780	11780	11780
Supply @ 31.03.2020	2285	2285	2285	2285	2285	2285	2285	2285
Residual Target	5755	5755	5755	5755	5755	9495	9495	9495
Selby Town	1750	550	550	550	550	2050	1750	1750
Tadcaster	400	400	400	400	600	400	400	400
Sherburn in Elmet	300	300	300	300	800	300	800	300
New Settlement	1260	1260	1260	1260	1260	2520	2520	3780
Eggborough Expansion	1350	1350	400	1350	1350	1350	1350	1350
Green Belt Development outside of Selby, Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster	0	0	0	0	0	0	1000	500
Tier 1 Villages	810	1350	1650	1200	1200	2100	1320	810
Smaller Villages	Windfall	Windfall	Windfall	Windfall	Windfall	Windfall	Windfall	Windfall
TOTAL	6570	6410	6085	6110	6660	10,320	10,240	9,740
Oversupply	815	655	330	355	905	825	745	245

Table 7 - Detailed split for each settlement under options

	Option A (Preferred)	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E	Option F	Option G	Option H
Spatial Strategy Option Description	Focus on Selby with smaller distribution elsewhere	More development in the smaller villages, less development in Selby Town	No Eggborough Urban Expansion and Selby, more growth in smaller villages	Less development in Selby Town, Eggborough Urban Expansion and more growth in smaller villages	Green Belt Release. Less development in Selby Town, Eggborough Urban Expansion	Focus on Selby, 2x New Settlements, No Green Belt Release	Substantial Green Belt Release and 2x New Settlements	Limited Green Belt Release and 3 x New Settlements
Dwellings Per Annum	402	402	402	402	402	589	589	589
20 Year Plan Target	8040	8040	8040	8040	8040	11780	11780	11780
Supply @ 31.03.2020	2285	2285	2285	2285	2285	2285	2285	2285
Residual Target	5755	5755	5755	5755	5755	9495	9495	9495
Selby Town	1750	550	550	550	550	2050	1750	1750
Tadcaster	400	400	400	400	600	400	400	400
Sherburn in Elmet	300	300	300	300	800	300	800	300
New Settlement	1260	1260	1260	1260	1260	2520	2520	3780
Eggborough Expansion	1350	1350	400	1350	1350	1350	1350	1350
Green Belt Development outside of Selby, Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster	0	0	0	0	0	0	1000	500

	Option A (Preferred)	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E	Option F	Option G	Option H
Spatial Strategy Option Description	Focus on Selby with smaller distribution elsewhere	More development in the smaller villages, less development in Selby Town	No Eggborough Urban Expansion and Selby, more growth in smaller villages	Less development in Selby Town, Eggborough Urban Expansion and more growth in smaller villages	Green Belt Release. Less development in Selby Town, Eggborough Urban Expansion	Focus on Selby, 2x New Settlements, No Green Belt Release	Substantial Green Belt Release and 2x New Settlements	Limited Green Belt Release and 3 x New Settlements
Tier 1 Villages	810	1350	1650	1200	1200	2100	1320	810
Barlby with Osgodby	135	225	275	200	200	350	220	135
Brayton	135	225	275	200	200	350	220	135
Byram & Brotherton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eggborough & Whitley	135	225	275	200	200	350	220	135
Hemingbrough	135	225	275	200	200	350	220	135
Riccall	135	225	275	200	200	350	220	135
South Milford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Thorpe Willoughby	135	225	275	200	200	350	220	135
Tier 2 Villages	700	1200	1525	1050	900	1600	1100	850
Appleton Roebuck	70	120	155	105	90	160	110	85
Carlton	70	120	155	105	90	160	110	85
Camblesforth	70	120	155	105	90	160	110	85
Cawood	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Church Fenton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cliffe	70	120	155	105	90	160	110	85
Escrick	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fairburn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Option A (Preferred)	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E	Option F	Option G	Option H
Spatial Strategy Option Description	Focus on Selby with smaller distribution elsewhere	More development in the smaller villages, less development in Selby Town	No Eggborough Urban Expansion and Selby, more growth in smaller villages	Less development in Selby Town, Eggborough Urban Expansion and more growth in smaller villages	Green Belt Release. Less development in Selby Town, Eggborough Urban Expansion	Focus on Selby, 2x New Settlements, No Green Belt Release	Substantial Green Belt Release and 2x New Settlements	Limited Green Belt Release and 3 x New Settlements
Hambleton	70	120	155	105	90	160	110	85
Hensall	70	120	155	105	90	160	110	85
Kellington	70	120	155	105	90	160	110	85
Monk Fyston/Hillam	70	120	155	105	90	160	110	85
North Duffield	70	120	155	105	90	160	110	85
Ulleskelf	70	120	155	105	90	160	110	85
Wistow	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Smaller Villages	Windfall	Windfall	Windfall	Windfall	Windfall	Windfall	Windfall	Windfall
TOTAL	6570	6410	6085	6110	6660	10,320	10,240	9,740
Oversupply	815	655	330	355	905	825	745	245

Conclusion

Having considered the range of options identified above it was concluded that Option A, which includes the provision of an urban extension to Eggborough and a new settlement provides the most sustainable option as the levels of development could be supported without significant harm to the character of existing communities and their local services. In the absence of the provision of a new settlement and the urban expansion at Eggborough it would be necessary to significantly increase development in existing settlements, which will require improvements to existing infrastructure and have adverse impacts on the character and form of settlements.

The sites set out as Preferred Sites in the Local Plan Preferred Options consultation document are considered the most appropriate to deliver the level of growth set out in Option A having been examined through the site assessment methodology.

The Housing Economic Development Needs Assessment concludes that current employment land supply exceeds demand and therefore the preferred options suggests the allocation of two additional employment sites at Olympia Park and Gascoigne Wood. The Gascoigne Wood is a former employment site located on an important rail interchange, whilst Olympia Park is well related to existing employment uses and in close proximity to Selby Town, the District's most sustainable location.

