

CONTENTS

How To Comment

Introduction 1

The Context 3

Strategy Vision and Objectives 5

Issues for the Core Strategy

1. The Role of Selby District 7

2. Sustainable Communities 8

3. Jobs and Business 16

4. Environment 20

5. Travel and Accessibility 29

The Distribution of New Development 34

Choice of Options 36

How To Comment

Fill in the Questionnaire and return it to

Planning Policy Manager
Selby District Council
Civic Centre
Portholme Road
SELBY
YO8 4SB

Copies of the form are available on the Council's website www.selby.gov.uk or by contacting the Planning Policy Team on 01757 292063 or at ldf@selby.gov.uk.

You need only respond to those issues, which are of interest to you. You do not have to complete the questionnaire comprehensively. All views, however brief will be welcomed.

All comments should reach us by Friday 23 June 2006.

If you would like to talk to a planning officer working on the Core Strategy about any aspect of the document, please contact the Planning Policy Team.

What Happens Next?

All comments received during this consultation will be considered carefully by the Council and will be taken into account in the next stage of preparing the Core Strategy, which will be a Preferred Options Report. This will set out the range of policies and proposals, which the Council proposes should form the basis of the final version of the Core Strategy.

INTRODUCTION

The Council is preparing a series of new documents to guide the use of land and development in the District, under the term 'Local Development Framework' (LDF). The Framework, preparation of which is an ongoing process involving a series of documents¹, will replace the Selby District Local Plan, the policies of which are saved under the transitional legislation until February 2008 or until replaced by documents which comprise the new plan.

The Core Strategy is one of the first documents to be produced within the LDF and will provide a context with which other subsequent document within the Framework must conform.

The Core Strategy will provide:

- A spatial vision for Selby District and strategic objectives to achieve that vision.
- A development strategy to provide:
 - The context for designating areas where specific policies will apply, either encouraging development to meet economic and/or social objectives or constraining development in the interests of environmental protection and
 - A framework for the subsequent allocation of sites for specific uses (e.g. housing).

Site specific designations for housing and employment allocations will be set out in subsequent Local Development Documents. (See the Local Development Scheme¹ for the timetabling of these documents.)

The Core Strategy will also contain policies to provide the context for more detailed policies and guidance to be included in other LDF documents. It is currently proposed they should broadly cover:

- Protection of local character and distinctiveness, and general design standards;
- Location of development (setting out the factors which will determine appropriate locations for proposed development);
- Local needs housing/mixed housing/gypsy accommodation;
- Transport;
- Efficient use of land and mixed uses;
- Environmental protection – flood protection, noise air quality, visual intrusion;
- Biodiversity

¹ Local development Scheme for Selby District - Selby District Council , April 2005

- Energy conservation/renewable energy
- Green Belt

The Core Strategy must also include a monitoring and implementation framework showing how development and change will be measured and assessed against set targets.

Many of the general core policies will apply throughout the District and will often represent a continuation of a number of the general policies currently being saved from the Selby District Local Plan, such as the need to ensure that development meets a high standard of design and access. This document, however, focuses on the new spatial options available to cater for the distribution of new development throughout the District over the next fifteen years. The documents purpose is to provide an opportunity for everyone to be involved and give their views on issues which they consider have an important bearing on future development within the District.

The report includes the following:

1. A set of draft objectives for the Core strategy which give an indication of the expected scope of the Strategy.
2. Our view of the main issues and options relevant to future development in the District and which will be addressed within the Core Strategy.
3. Four potential scenarios for the distribution of new development within the District, together with the implications of each for all the issues identified.

In the report we ask a number of questions which we would like you to consider and comment on. You may wish to comment on all or only on one or two aspects. In addition, we would be very pleased to receive comments on any other aspects, which you consider have not been adequately covered in the report.

THE CONTEXT

The Core Strategy is not being prepared in a vacuum. It must take account of national planning policies and regional policies contained in the Regional Spatial Strategy.

Currently the RSS is under review but will not be fully completed until it receives Government approval, which is expected to be in summer 2007. However, Draft RSS proposals were submitted to the Deputy Prime Minister on 23rd December 2005 in the form of 'The Yorkshire and Humber Plan' and substantial weight has been given to its proposals, given the importance of the RSS for the Core Strategy.

Key RSS Policies and Proposals Specific to Selby District.

- Selby District included within York sub-area as well as the Leeds City Region
- Support the role of Selby town as a Principal Service Centre and Sherburn-in-Elmet and Tadcaster as Local Service Centres.
- Mitigate the risk of flooding and provide appropriate protection
- Improve public transport links between York and Selby;
- Strengthen Leeds – Selby – Hull public transport corridor.
- Support an appropriate scale of economic growth in Selby
- Promote significant development at Selby (as a focus for growth along with York) to foster regeneration and strengthen and diversify its economy.
- Develop the York sub area economy with new development and initiatives including support for the location of the European Spallation Source at Burn.
- Promote partnership approaches to economic diversification, regeneration, development and flood risk management at York and Selby.
- 400 new dwellings per annum to be provided between 2004 and 2016 and 450 pa. new dwellings between 2016 and 2021.

Although the Draft RSS sets firm guidelines for new development within the Region, it still leaves many substantial decisions to be made on future development within the District, particularly on the distribution of that development, and the Council's aim is to offer as many opportunities as possible for local views to be included within the Core Strategy preparation.

The Core Strategy should also give effect to the spatial elements of the District's Community Strategy² prepared by the Council in conjunction with its partners in

² Community Strategy 2005 - 2010 - Selby Strategy Forum

the Selby Strategy Forum, and to the Council's individual strategies, particularly for economic development, housing, social inclusion, culture and recreational open space. It should also take into account the North Yorkshire County Council Community Strategy. The Core Strategy will aim to accommodate the relevant aspects of these local strategies and provide a smooth transition from the current Selby District Local Plan whose provisions are saved until February 2008, subject to maintaining conformity with national and regional policy guidance, particularly as expressed in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). Yorkshire Forward, together with the Council, undertook a Renaissance Study³ which focussed on the three market Market Towns, with a view to addressing regeneration issues.

A key national policy requirement of the LDF is that it should deliver sustainable development. In order to assist this process each stage of the preparation of LDF documents will be subject to sustainability appraisal, which will also take account of Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations⁴, which govern implementation of European legislation on this matter. To undertake this process for the Core Strategy preparation in an objective and impartial manner, the Council have employed consultants, Waterman Environmental. A Scoping Report, which establishes the nature of the process and the appraisal framework, has already been produced and been the subject of limited consultation. An appraisal of the options being put forward in this document, as well as your views, will aid the Council in selecting a preferred option. A full sustainability appraisal of that Preferred Option will be available when the option is published.

³ Selby District Renaissance sponsored by Yorkshire Forward (2004)

⁴ European Directive 2001/42/EC “on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment.”

CORE STRATEGY VISION AND OBJECTIVES

Bearing in mind the contextual aims and objectives set in the above documents, the following draft vision and objectives have been developed as a basic reference for the development of the Core Strategy and its policies.

Vision

To continue to enhance Selby District as an attractive location to live, work and play. This will require a continued emphasis on diversifying the economy to provide for modern employment opportunities and reduce the need to travel outside the District for work; ensuring the availability of an appropriate range of affordable housing; uncovering and protecting the District's heritage and developing leisure and other community facilities to meet the needs of District residents. New development will be encouraged to be as energy efficient and sustainable as possible. In directing new development full advantage will be taken of the potential of the three market towns – Selby, Sherburn-in-Elmet and Tadcaster – and their centres, to provide the most sustainable locations for growth and facilities.

Objectives

1. To enhance the role of the three Renaissance market towns – Selby, Sherburn-in-Elmet and Tadcaster – as accessible service centres within the District and particularly Selby as a principal service centre.
2. To locate new development where it will minimise the need to travel by car and enhance accessibility to local services, shops and jobs by promoting the use of public transport, walking and cycling.
3. To reduce the outward commuting from the District particularly by private car.
4. To locate or mitigate new development so as to minimise flood risk.
5. To promote efficient use of land and maximise the reuse of previously developed land within settlements.
6. To encourage the provision of transport infrastructure in tandem with new development, and to increase transport choice throughout the District by improving accessibility via safe and convenient public transport.
7. To support the diversification of the economy of the District, including its rural areas, through the provision of suitable range and quality of sites and premises for employment uses, and encourage activities to increase skill levels.

8. To protect and enhance the existing range of community facilities and ensure additional provision is made to match changing needs and requirements from new development.
9. To protect and enhance the character of the historic built environment, including both buildings and open spaces, and acknowledge the contribution of the District's heritage to economic prosperity and local community well-being.
10. To promote high quality design of new development and create and maintain attractive, safe, accessible and diverse urban areas which enhance the image of the District generally.
11. To improve the range and quality of cultural and leisure opportunities across the District and improve tourism facilities.
12. To protect and enhance sensitive natural habitats and the wider countryside for its landscape, amenity, bio-diversity, recreation potential and natural resources.
13. To promote energy efficient forms of development and renewable forms of energy.
14. To improve the quality of air, land and water and help reduce the negative impact of climate change.

Qu. 1 Do you agree with the vision and objectives?

If no, what would you add to, or remove from, them?

ISSUES FOR THE CORE STRATEGY

1. THE ROLE OF SELBY DISTRICT

Background

One of the most striking statistics to emerge from the 2001 Census was that around 49% of the District's workforce travels to work outside the District, principally to Leeds and York Districts. This percentage is at least 10% higher than any other District in the Region. This means that one of Selby's principal roles at present is as a dormitory for surrounding towns and cities, within the sub-region.

Clearly this is partly a function of the District's location in relation to the West Yorkshire Conurbation and York, and the Regional Spatial Strategy includes the bulk of the District within both the Leeds City Region and the York sub area. Commuting distance between Selby town and York are not too excessive by current standards, but longer commuting journeys occur between the District and West Yorkshire. All these commuting trips create their main congestion problems within their workplace areas rather than in Selby District.

Regional Context

Both the current, approved Regional Spatial Strategy and the recent draft revised RSS place the prime focus for new development on the major urban areas and have a strong emphasis on reducing the need to travel especially by private car. The overall approach in Draft RSS (Policy YH1) is to reverse the long-term trend of population and investment dispersal away from cities and major towns and transform them as attractive, cohesive and safe places where people want to live, work, invest and spend time in. The proposed distribution of housing within the Draft RSS contains a strong emphasis on seeking to co-locate homes and jobs, thereby creating opportunities to reduce the need to travel. Particular emphasis is given to facilitating fewer and shorter journeys with less reliance on the car and increasing opportunities for using public transport, cycling and walking. At the same time the Draft strategy also supports the enhancement of the roles of the Principal Service Centres such as Selby in providing the main focus for employment development in rural areas.

Local Context

One of the general aims (Aim 3) of the Selby District Local Plan is 'To shape development patterns and concentrate development in a way which minimises the need to travel by car and ensures that future growth is sustainable.'

The Renaissance Study recognised the current pressure on the District's housing market arising from outside the District and considered ways of managing this so that it is not intrusive and reinforces the qualities and social infrastructure of the existing towns. The Renaissance Team also acknowledge that their proposed strategy is based on economic growth as much as housing development.

Issues

The recent trend towards higher levels of commuting from the District is a function of a number of factors, including higher rates of employment growth, particularly in Leeds and a more car orientated society which has extended the housing market areas of the larger towns and cities. Transport links to both the Leeds and York areas are generally very good and as the economy of the Region and District has changed to an increasingly mobile, knowledge based and serviced based industries, often based in the larger towns and cities, increased commuting activity has occurred.

This trend, however, is not compatible with the general aims and approach of the RSS policy. It is the Council's view that the Core Strategy should attempt to limit the future growth of lengthy commuting outside the District and, if possible, reduce it – see Objective 3. Probably the two main areas of the strategy, which could have an impact on this issue are firstly improving the range and number of employment opportunities available within the District for local residents and secondly limiting the amount of normal market housing developed in those areas most attractive to inter-District commuters. Insisting on a high proportion of affordable housing for local people in new residential developments will assist this process.

Qu. 2 What should the role of Selby District be in the Leeds City Region and the York Sub Area?

Qu. 3 Do you agree that the further growth in commuting from the District to neighbouring towns and cities should be limited and if possible be reduced?

2. SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

Background

The importance of creating sustainable communities and sustainable patterns of development has become a central theme of planning policy in recent years. In the local context sustainability is related to the quality of life in a community. Specifically, this refers to whether the economic, social and environmental systems in a community are providing opportunities for residents to live healthy, productive and meaningful lives, now and in the future⁵.

The Core Strategy will address all three aspects of sustainability. However, this section deals principally with the social issues associated with the provision of housing, health and safety, and services and facilities for residents within the District.

⁵ Selby District Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report - Waterman Environmental - December 2005

National Policy Context

National Planning policy has an overriding objective of achieving sustainable development, as set out in PPS1 Creating Sustainable Communities (ODPM 2005). This Statement has specific objectives aimed at achieving inclusive, healthy and safe communities.

In addition to the broad policies on sustainability National Planning Policy related to housing is currently contained in PPG3⁶, which is currently being revised through Draft PPS3 (ODPM December 2005). Draft PPS3 indicates that the Government seek to:

- Ensure that a wide choice of housing types is available, for both affordable and market housing, to meet the needs of all members of the community;
- Deliver a better balance between housing demand and supply in every housing market and to improve affordability where necessary; and
- Create sustainable inclusive, mixed communities in all areas. Developments should be attractive, safe and designed to a high quality. They should be located in areas with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure,.

The Draft PPS3 indicates that Local Development Frameworks should amongst other matters:

- Set out the level of housing provision for the plan period and how it will be met;
- Set out any arrangements for managing the release of land within the relevant sub-regional housing market area in accordance with the regional spatial strategy;
- Set out the density ranges which will apply across the plan area;
- Set out the balance between different household types to be provided for across the plan area, and, where necessary to achieve mixed communities, the circumstances or broad locations in which this balance may be different;
- Where there is a need for affordable housing set out appropriate targets and threshold levels for achieving them through market housing developments.
- Set out the approach to meeting rural housing and rural affordable housing needs;
- Set out policies to address the particular accommodation needs and demands of specific groups e.g gypsies and travellers.

Regional Context

The RSS adds to national policy above by establishing:

- the targets for future housing provision in the District

⁶ PPG3 Housing (2000)

- threshold targets for achieving affordable housing within the District

Housing Provision

The draft RSS indicates that Selby District should be providing 400 dwellings per annum between 2004 –2016 and 450pa between 2016 and 2021. It should be noted that these figures will be subject to monitoring and review

Affordable Housing Targets

The draft RSS indicates that Selby District, along with the other North Yorkshire authorities is an area of high demand for affordable housing and recommends the following (Policy H3):

- On developments of more than 15 homes (or a site area of more than 0.5ha) authorities should seek over 40% of those homes as affordable.
- Where opportunities for the provision of new housing are generally limited to sites below the national threshold a lower threshold for provision should be set and/or off site contributions should be sought.
- In rural areas where opportunities are limited Local Planning Authorities should identify exceptions sites in their Development Plan Documents.

Local Context

Housing Needs Study

In order to determine the most up to date requirements for affordable housing within the District, the Council commissioned a Housing Needs Study (2005) The Study (2005) identified a current need to provide 294 affordable dwellings per annum within the District over the next five years. The Council is currently revising its guidance on seeking contributions from housing developers towards affordable housing in the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document which was published for public consultation in March.

Community Strategy

The District's Community Strategy places strong emphasis on developing sustainable communities within the District where people can get jobs and enjoy a healthy and safe lifestyle which engenders a feeling of pride and respect for the environment and their neighbours.

The provision of affordable, decent and safe housing within the District is seen as an important element of developing sustainable communities. In working towards this aim, the Council recognises that a balance needs to be achieved between providing more affordable housing and increasing income and salaries through the development of the local economy, to make sure more people can afford to rent or buy houses.

The Strategy also recognises that feeling safe at home in our neighbourhood has a major effect on people's wellbeing. Community safety is therefore included as an important aim of developing sustainable communities.

Access to local services and information is a further important element of the Community Strategy and in this respect emphasis is particularly placed on

improving the amount of good quality recreation and open spaces and access to them. The Community Strategy also aims to reduce health inequalities in the area.

The Council is also currently revising its guidance on seeking contributions from housing developers towards local recreation open space, education and health facilities in the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document, a draft of which was published for public consultation in March 2006.

Housing Strategy

The Council's Housing Strategy Action Plan 2004 –2005 contains a policy for encouraging, through the planning system, the use of Lifetime Homes Standards in the design of all residential developments. Lifetime Homes are constructed to a higher standard than currently required in the Building Regulations, adding a greater degree of flexibility and adaptability. This adaptability allows homes to be easily adapted to meet the potential long-term needs of older people. Homes built to these standards can help to reduce future costs for adaptations or for residential care. The action sets out a gradually increasing target for the proportion Lifetime Homes as a percentage of all new dwellings, which reaches 25% in 2007/8.

Issues

1. Market Housing

i) Managing Housing Markets

The latest draft of PPG3 places greater emphasis on local development frameworks managing sub-regional housing markets in a balanced manner, in accordance with the Regional Spatial Strategy. If this advice remains in the final version of PPS3, further work will be required at both regional and local authority level to try and more rigorously identify sub-regional housing markets. At present, the draft RSS's disaggregates housing targets to local authority level only, rather than into market areas, which clearly overlap. Identifying the extent of housing markets will not be an easy task and they may well vary depending upon the type of housing involved. Selby District, in addition to an internally based market around Selby itself, is also strongly influenced, particularly in the north and west, by the housing markets of York and Leeds. In the south and south west there are weaker influences from Doncaster and Wakefield (Pontefract, Castleford and Knottingley). Identifying and managing housing markets on this basis is therefore extremely complex and in this first version of the Core Strategy, before regional/sub-regional frameworks and an improved evidence base through monitoring have been established, it will be difficult to be prescriptive at the housing market level. Nevertheless, even broad assumptions regarding the influence of the Leeds and York housing markets within the District will be important, particularly when addressing the commuting issue.

Qu. 4 Do you have any comments/evidence on the definition of housing markets within the District?

Qu. 5. Do you have any comments/evidence on the influence of externally based sub-regional housing markets within Selby District?

ii) Windfall Policy

A further issue relates to the granting of permission for sites not allocated in the development plan. Currently the Selby District Local Plan policy (Policy H2A) only permits residential development, in appropriate circumstances within defined Development Limits, on previously developed land ('brownfield' sites). This policy precludes any small scale development of greenfield sites within Development Limits of towns and villages.

The main points for and against windfall are:

For:

- If utilising previously developed land then development will help to make more efficient use of land and lessen the requirement for greenfield sites/allocations.

Against

- Windfall sites are generally of small scale nature, below the threshold for affordable housing, and will therefore not produce as much affordable housing as the equivalent on larger scale allocated sites.
- If there is no restriction on the scale of settlement within which windfall sites are accepted a high proportion will be located in smaller, less sustainable settlements than would development on planned allocated sites. Windfall development could therefore distort overarching strategic policies for achieving sustainable development. (e.g. Draft RSS policy suggests that only development catering for local needs should be allowed in settlements outside the vicinity of the Principal Service Centre, Selby).
- When coupled with the need to achieve high densities windfall development can give rise to problems of impact on the form and character of settlements. The dangers of impact would be particularly present, but not exclusively so, in the case of 'greenfield' sites within settlements

Bearing in mind the strong emphasis placed nationally and regionally on utilising previously developed land and the difficulties within Selby District of meeting the 'brownfield' targets being set for the District, it is considered that a continued policy of permitting 'brownfield' development which is acceptable in local planning terms is likely to remain appropriate. There is an issue, however, as to whether windfalls on 'greenfield' sites should also be acceptable and if so, should the size of site be limited and/or should they be limited to the larger, more sustainable villages and towns?

In the case of development of 'previously developed land', a further issue has arisen through the inclusion of garden curtilages within that definition. Current policies have led to pressure for many larger gardens accommodating further dwellings either through infilling or complete redevelopment, which is often seen as having an adverse effect on character and form of the surrounding residential area, particularly when it is coupled with the pressure to achieve higher densities within the new development itself. Draft PPS states that 'Although residential gardens are defined as brownfield land, this does not necessarily mean that they are

suitable for development. However, in determining the policy approach, local planning authorities will need to have regard to the positive contribution that intensification can make, for example, in terms of minimising the pressure on Greenfield sites.’ There is therefore an issue as to whether a more restrictive approach to development within residential curtilages is justified and, if so, in what form?

- Qu. 6** Do you consider that windfall development on previously developed land should be supported and given greater priority?
- Qu. 7** Should windfall development on previously developed land be limited to the more sustainable settlements – market towns or market towns and larger villages?
- Qu. 8** Should a more restrictive approach to development within residential curtilages be developed?
- Qu. 9** Are there any circumstances in which development on ‘greenfield’ windfall sites be supported?

iii) Density of Residential Development

Current District Local Plan policy (Policy H2B) reflects national policy in PPG3(2000) which requires local planning authorities to ensure higher densities for new residential development. Draft PPS3 now seeks even higher densities in urban and suburban areas. In Selby District, where the majority of settlements are small villages, the enforcement of higher densities has led to concerns that the form and character of some settlements is being eroded. PPS3 indicates that local planning authorities should develop density policies for their area with local stakeholders and communities having regard to factors which include: the importance of promoting good design, the importance of resource efficiency, minimisation of environmental impacts, and the desirability of maintaining the character of particular residential areas or environment. However, the PPS goes on to state the presumption is that in developing density policies, the minimum density should be no less than 30 dwellings per hectare.

The draft PPS does, however, suggest indicative development ranges for different types of area including urban, suburban and rural. In Selby District one option could be to apply higher density ranges in the three towns of Selby, Sherburn and Tadcaster, where the bulk of development is anticipated, from the remainder of the District.

- Qu.10** Do you consider that the pursuit of higher densities in the interests of more efficient use of land should not be at the expense of the existing form and character of existing villages?
- Qu.11** Do you consider that it would be appropriate to differentiate between housing densities in the three towns and the remainder of the District?

2. Local Needs Housing

In addition to adequately catering for normal market housing Draft PPS3 indicates that the local development framework should set out policies to address the particular accommodation needs and demands of specific groups within the District.

i) Affordable Housing

Selby District has seen a higher than average increase in house prices in recent years which has limited the ability of local people to enter the housing market for the first time or purchase property adequate for their needs. Several factors have combined to exacerbate the problem, notably the influence of York and Leeds on the housing market, and the reduction in Council housing as tenants continue to exercise their right to buy. If additional affordable housing is not made available local people may be forced to leave the District. It may also increase pressure on the existing terrace housing stock, potentially inflating prices still further. Clearly future development will need to increase the provision of affordable housing in the District and a strong policy is required to achieve this.

Providing adequate affordable housing for local people broadly in their current locality does have implications for the overall distribution of market housing. For example, even with the affordable housing requirement set at 40%, for every 2 affordable dwellings required, land for 5 dwellings needs to be allocated, unless more sites and schemes reserved solely for social housing can be obtained. There is therefore an issue for the strategy in how closely it is possible to match supply and demand for affordable housing.

The Council has recently been formalising its current guidance on affordable housing delivery through the Developer Contributions SPD which was published for consultation in March 2006. However, this does not preclude further consideration of the issue in the wider context of the Core Strategy which may lead to further future amendment of SPD.

Draft PPS3 states that 'Local authorities should set a minimum site-size threshold, expressed as numbers of homes or area, above which affordable housing will be sought. The indicative national minimum threshold is 15 dwellings, but local planning authorities may set a different threshold or series of thresholds where this can be justified.' Consideration could therefore be given to operating lower thresholds in smaller settlements. This will raise questions on the number of dwellings to be used and the size range of settlements to which it might apply.

In the smaller rural settlements where opportunities to provide affordable housing are limited Draft RSS indicates that local planning authorities should identify 'exceptions' sites allocated exclusively for a small number of affordable housing.

Issues associated with this approach are:

- In the past, exceptions sites have not proved attractive to land owners or private developers.
- What level of provision should the policy apply to? Is it practical or sustainable to identify sites in the smaller villages? Should the need from a

group of villages be satisfied at one village with a reasonable level of services?

Qu.12 Do you agree that the Council should aim to remove the backlog of affordable housing need within the next five years, or as soon as practical thereafter?

Qu.13 The Council's current policy is to require developers to provide affordable housing on sites of 15 dwellings or more. Do you agree with this threshold or should lower thresholds apply to smaller villages? If so, what site-size threshold should be used and what size of settlement should it apply to?

Qu.14 Should small 'exceptions' sites exclusively for local needs housing be identified in smaller settlements?

ii) Lifetime Homes

In order to implement the Council's strategy for Lifetime Homes the Core Strategy will need to provide a general policy which seeks the requirement from new developments. The detailed mechanisms for achieving the provision would then be added into the Developer Contributions SPD, in a similar manner to the requirement for affordable homes.

Qu.15 Do you agree that a proportionate provision of Lifetime Homes within new developments should be sought?

Qu.16 Is a target percentage of 25% about right? If not, what percentage do you consider appropriate?

iii) Gypsies and Travellers

The Core Strategy will review the provision for gypsies and travellers within the District and accordingly set out an appropriate policy in accordance with Government guidance.

3. Community Safety

Community safety features highly within the Council's Corporate Strategy and the Community strategy, as well as in the Government's current agenda. Whilst the District has a relatively good record in this respect compared with other larger towns and cities within the region, any opportunity to create a safer environment need to be taken. The Core Strategy will not play a central role on this topic but every effort will be made to include policies to assist in meeting the Council's aims and Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act (1998) responsibilities.

4. Provision of Local Facilities.

The Council places high priority on ensuring that the provision of local services and facilities keeps pace with new development. The Core Strategy will set out a general policy to cover this point and carry forward the District Local Plan enabling policy which seeks contributions from housing developers towards local recreation open space, education, health and other facilities. The Developer Contributions

Supplementary Planning Document, which was published for public consultation in March 2006 is also intended to address the issue. It should be noted that the Government have issued a consultation on A Planning-gain Supplement⁷ which is aimed at considering mechanisms for the Government to capture a portion of the land value uplift arising from the planning process in a manner which creates a fair and efficient and transparent levy. This will enable a portion of the wealth created by the planning system to be released for the benefit of the wider community and would involve a reform of the planning obligations system and changes to current policies on this issue.

3. JOBS AND BUSINESS

Background

‘Achieving a sustainable economy’ is one of the Government’s five principles of sustainable development as set out in its 2005 sustainability strategy⁸.

Regional Context

Draft RSS aims to diversify the urban and rural economies and help deliver a better performing and more competitive economy. Sub-regional policies for the Leeds City Region are intended to spread the benefits of the Leeds economy, particularly to Principal Service Centres in the sub-region such as Selby. The Draft RSS notes that Selby’s growth over the last 20 years has been based on exploiting the eastward extent of the Yorkshire coalfield and its rise as a commuter settlement with good connections to Leeds and York. More local employment is needed to increase job opportunity following the decline of coal mining in the Selby area and to support Selby’s Principal Service Centre role. The Draft RSS notes that within the York sub-area that the process of growth and diversification of the local economy is likely to continue with the focii of residential and employment growth being in York, particularly noting the Science City initiative, and to a lesser extent Selby.

The Draft RSS endorses the safeguarding of the potential site for the European Spallation project at Burn Airfield south of, Selby. Burn is only one of a number sites being considered across Europe and whether or not the site will be chosen is a major unknown for the Core Strategy at the present time.

Although the Draft RSS has undertaken a broad overview of the range of employment land needs in each District, the strategy does recognise the difficulties in predicting future employment land needs and expects more local studies based on more detailed and up-to-date data will be required to supplement this. The Draft RSS states that all of the North Yorkshire Districts will require employment land portfolios based on small-medium, high quality, specialist sites located in accordance with the RSS Core Approach. The Strategy indicates that ‘Local Authorities, working in partnership with Yorkshire Forward, other agencies and sub-

⁷ Planning-gain Supplement – a consultation (Decemeber 2000) HM Treasury, HM Revenue&Customs and Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

^{8 8} Securing the Future – UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy March 2005

regional and local economic/investment partnerships should ensure that there is a suitable range and choice of employment land, sites and premises, and acknowledges that long term provision for a full range of employment sites will be required to meet forecasted growth and to support the role of Selby in the Leeds City Region and the York sub-area. It notes that any review will need to specifically consider the implications of the York Science City initiative.

Local Context

Sub-Regional Investment Plan for York and North Yorkshire

The York and North Yorkshire Partnership Unit has prepared an Investment Plan for the period 2004- 2009, which was approved in July 2004. The Plan identifies the development of the renaissance of Selby, through transforming its economic base as one of its seven main spatial themes, which provide a framework for its action priorities. The Plan aims to build upon the assets and investment in the Selby economy to address the economic structural issues and to benefit from its location within the transport network and from being adjacent to the economic growth centres of York and Leeds. The Plan's priority actions are to:

- 1) support the current Renaissance programme,
- 2) develop inward investment opportunities and
- 3) address the needs of disadvantaged communities

- 1) Renaissance

The Renaissance team's report was published subsequently to the Invest Plan and contained priorities to:

- Produce masterplans to revitalise the town centres of Selby, Sherburn and Tadcaster,
- Produce a water management strategy which including managing flooding and perhaps creating a regional water park;
- Produce a business strategy which would include consideration of a Science Park at Selby.
- Produce an energy strategy to consider the future of the power station and to exploit other forms of renewable energy and encourage energy efficiency

- 2) Develop Inward Investment

The aims under this heading are to:

- to co-ordinate the physical and skills activities to create job opportunities and improve company productivity
- to open up employment land

- to improve the communications infrastructure.

The Plan notes the opportunities provided by the Selby By-pass to open up pockets of land and looks in the longer term to promote a green business park and hotel and leisure/tourism.

3) Address the Needs of Disadvantaged Communities

This priority focuses on skills training and confidence building to assist people in disadvantaged communities to access employment opportunities.

Economic Development Strategy 2003 -2008

The District Council's Economic Development Strategy⁹ aims to facilitate and encourage sustainable enterprise and employment . It places emphasis on encouraging support services that will enhance skills, raise confidence and improve the ability of local people to access local job opportunities or community schemes. It also stresses the importance of presenting a positive image of the District to attract further investment.

Selby District Local Plan

The objectives of the Plan for Economic Development are as follows:

1. To ensure an adequate supply of employment land and a range of sites in terms of type and location to cater for the needs of differing businesses, and to encourage inward investment..
2. To safeguard existing employment land and premises
3. To promote diversification of the local economy, including rural diversification, where this is compatible with the character of the area.
4. To support the needs of agriculture where compatible with the Plan's environmental objectives.
5. To encourage the expansion of existing businesses and the establishment of small firms.
6. To create opportunities to improve the quality of the existing business environment and to ensure a high standard of design and landscaping in new economic development.
7. To improve opportunities for people to live near their work and minimise traffic movements.

Issues

i) Amount of Employment Land

Notwithstanding the difficulties of forecasting employment land requirements, it is proposed to undertake a review of future requirements, with more detailed site specific proposals being brought forward in a separate Development Plan Document. The Draft RSS endorses the requirement for a net addition in

⁹ Economic Development Strategy and Improvement Plan 2003 – 2008 (Selby District Council 2003)

employment land and clearly indicates that the majority should be focussed on Selby itself.

ii) Diversification

The continued decline, in employment terms, of the traditional industries of Selby District such as agriculture and associated industries and power generation, when coupled with the closure of the Selby Coalfield, has created a need to diversify the economy.

It is difficult to predict precisely the requirements of new employment activity, including leisure and retail, that could be beneficially attracted to the District, but national trends suggest strongly that service and knowledge based employment sectors will continue to increase. These sectors provide a wide range of employment opportunities but the knowledge based sector, particularly, offers the prospect of desirable high quality opportunities. ('Good jobs for local people'). Growth in these sectors will require increased office space which could include Science Park type development. The food and drink sector is also considered to be a potential growth sector for the District as is distribution and logistics which is currently centred at the Sherburn Enterprise Park and at Selby, where there are rail transshipment facilities.

The District is well placed to accept some 'spin-off' from the newer service industries currently centred in Leeds and York. Consideration needs to be given to creating the appropriate conditions for attracting science based industries if the association with the Science City designation of York is to be strengthened.

To capitalise on these trends the District must provide attractive and appropriate accommodation but in sustainable locations, which are easily accessed by public transport, and which support, as far as possible, the regeneration of the market towns.

The European Spallation project represents a potential major opportunity for the District should Burn be chosen as the preferred site. It would provide a major boost to the image and economy of the District, provide a catalyst for other knowledge based industries and create a York-Selby-Burn axis for the science based sector. There would be a substantial lead time before it became operational and it would no doubt require an early review of the Core Strategy during that time in order to ensure that the District fully understood, catered for and capitalised on the full implications of the project.

Diversification of the rural economy through broadening agricultural enterprises and/or re-using redundant agricultural buildings has been a feature of the District's economy in recent years. The Selby District Local Plan Policy EMP8 accepts such changes as long as they do not significantly alter the character of the buildings or the local area. There is an issue, however, as to how much new commercial activity is sought by the smaller rural settlements or whether it is more appropriately located in and adjacent to the larger settlements. For example, how should relatively large, isolated redundant areas of commercial/industrial land be managed in the future.

iii) Existing Industrial/Commercial Areas

A further issue is the treatment and/or protection of existing industrial/commercial areas. Many jobs in the service sectors are not found in traditional industrial areas and many of these areas are not kept exclusively for industrial use. Increasingly employers are looking to locate in more attractive surroundings often with better and more appropriate access for commercial vehicles. The Holmes in Selby was designated as a Special Policy Area in the Local Plan and will shortly benefit from redevelopment largely for housing purposes. There are potentially other areas which would benefit from a flexible mixed use approach to redevelopment.

Equally, however, there are other industrial areas where industrial/commercial uses need the security of a firm designation. This issue is most relevant to Selby town.

Qu.17 What proposals could be included in the Core Strategy to assist the District in capitalising on employment growth associated with the increase in knowledge based and other service employment sectors which are currently centred on Leeds and York?

Qu.18 Are there any other policies or proposals which might be helpful to the economy of the District in the future?

Qu.19 Do rural communities want higher levels of commercial activity? Should the size of buildings be limited? How should large, isolated redundant commercial/industrial areas be treated in planning terms?

Qu.20 Do you consider that the Council should adopt a flexible approach to employment land or should specific sites be designated and safeguarded for specific uses?

4. ENVIRONMENT

The planning system has an important role to play in controlling the quality of both the built and natural environment. Selby District contains a range of important environmental assets including listed buildings, conservation areas, internationally important wetlands and wildlife habitats. It also exhibits a range of landscapes including undulating mixed agricultural landscapes to the west and low lying arable drainage basins to the east. However, changes in agricultural practices and increasing development pressures combine to threaten loss of landscape character and biodiversity.

More recently the impact of climate change and the related issues of flood risk management and energy efficiency and renewable energy have become of critical importance. As these are relatively new policy areas, it is proposed to concentrate on these issues within this report in order to obtain as wider cross-section of views on them as possible

a) Protection and Enhancement of the Built and Natural Environment

Background

National Policy Context

National planning policies place strong emphasis on safeguarding wildlife habitats, landscapes and the historic environment.

Regional Context

Both the current and draft RSS set out specific policies for the protection of the region's landscape, biodiversity, historic and cultural resources.

Local Context

The Council undertook a landscape appraisal Of the District in 1999 which provides a detailed assessment of landscape character and identifies the features which contribute to the character and setting of settlements as well as opportunities for strengthening and/or upgrading specific landscape areas.

The Selby District Biodiversity Action Plan¹⁰ helps to translate the UK Biodiversity Strategy into effective action at the local level.

The Council has a firm commitment to high quality design and ensuring that new development is in keeping and scale with its surroundings. The Renaissance programme has also highlighted the importance of local distinctiveness and of creating well designed and safe public spaces and environments.

Issues

Biodiversity, landscape and built heritage considerations feature strongly in the current Selby District Local Plan and a number specific policies are 'saved' for three years under the Government's transitional arrangements for replacing old style plans with Local Development Frameworks. These policies will be reviewed and updated as part of a new development plan document for detailed development control policies to be prepared in the future. However, consideration could be given to including a strategic policy in the Core strategy to ensure that all proposals for development respect their surroundings and refer to local significance.

Qu.21 Should the Core Strategy contain a general environmental protection policy setting out a strategic approach to protection and enhancement of both the built and natural environment?

¹⁰ The Selby Biodiversity action Plan - North Yorkshire County Council, Selby District Council and the Selby BAP Partnership 2004

Qu.22 If so, should reference be made in the policy to local distinctiveness?

b) Climate Change

Background

National Policy Context

Awareness of the relatively rapid recent changes in climate and its potential implications continues to grow. The Government has established the UK Climate Impacts Programme (UKCIP) to monitor, assess and advise on the issue. Annex B to PPS25 on Climate Change, indicates that further work will be undertaken on climate change scenarios which will be expanded and developed to better meet stakeholder needs.

The Government published 'The Planning Response to Climate Change - Advice on Better Practice' in 2004 which sets out background information and advice on a range of topics that planning authorities and developers will need to take into account in relation to climate change.

Regional Context

Policy YH2 of the Draft RSS proposes that:

'All plans strategies, investment decisions and programmes in the Region should

- A Help to meet the Region's target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 20% below 1990 levels by 2010 and 25% below 1990 levels by 2015 by:
 - i) Increasing urban density
 - ii) Encouraging better built homes and energy efficiency
 - iii) Reducing traffic growth and promoting competitive alternatives to the car
 - iv) Promoting walking, cycling and use of public transport
 - v) Minimising resource demands from development
 - vi) Encouraging redevelopment of previously developed land
 - vii) Facilitating effective waste management
 - viii) Increasing renewable energy capacity and carbon capture.

- B Plan for the successful adaptation to the predicted impacts of climate change by:
 - i) Minimising threats from and impact of coastal erosion, increased flood risk, increased storminess, habitat disturbance, increased pressure on water resources supply and drainage systems;
 - ii) Maximise opportunities from:; increased growing season; greater tourism potential; and warmer environments.

In discussing the issue, the Draft RSS recognises that although the Strategy can influence transport, economic development, housing, energy, waste and infrastructure, it has little direct influence over emissions from housing, power generation infrastructure, industry and commerce. The Draft RSS suggests that its greatest impact on greenhouse gases is through increased urban density and related public transport networks, especially in the Leeds City Region. This will have the added benefits of making public transport more viable, and helping to achieve a transformation of urban areas.

Local context

Selby District Local Plan

The current Selby District Local Plan includes the 'Promotion of Sustainable Development' as a key aim and within has the following two objectives relating to climate change:

- To assist in meeting the national goal of reducing harmful CO₂ emissions.
- To encourage energy efficient forms of development and renewable forms of energy.

Community Strategy

Creating sustainable communities is also a main theme of the Community Strategy, which includes recognition of climate change issues. The Strategy suggests a focus on:

- Upgrading flood defences;
- Preparing catchment management plans for main rivers;
- New developments carrying out risk assessments;
- Promoting energy conservation and domestic sources of renewable fuels;
- Encouraging local power stations to use renewable fuels; and
- Contributing to the regional targets for renewable energy.

Issues

There are two aspects to climate change; firstly reducing its cause through reducing CO₂ emissions and secondly planning for potential resulting impacts. Actions which can be influenced by the Core Strategy to reduce emissions are encouraging renewable energy, minimising the need to travel and encouraging efficient use of energy in the built environment. The latter two are discussed immediately below and renewable energy has been separated out to form a separate topic. In terms of planning for the anticipated effects of climate change, the heightened impact of flood risk is also an important consideration and this is also the subject of a separate sub-section below.

i) Reducing Greenhouse Gases - Minimising the need to travel, particularly by private car

Draft RSS suggests that the greatest impact spatial plans can have is through reducing the need to travel, particularly by private car. The RSS indicates that increased urban densities coupled with improvements to public transport are important factors in achieving this objective. The small size of Selby District settlements give these factors less impact within the District, but there is a clear inter-relationship with the issue of commuting identified in Issue 1 - The Role of Selby District above.

ii) Reducing Greenhouse Gases – Encouraging Energy Efficiency

The Council considers that the Core Strategy should contain policies which ensure energy efficiency forms an integral part of design briefs and guides. Planning considerations include site layout, building design, use of materials, use of water and energy supply.

Qu.23 Apart from the above considerations, (and excepting renewable energy which is considered next), are there any other areas where Core Strategy policies could contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions?

Qu 24 Apart from flood risk management, are there any other areas where new planning policies are required to accommodate the impacts of climate change on the District?

c) Encouraging Renewable Energy Generation

Background

National Policy Context

The Government's policy on Renewable Energy is set out in PPS22. The Statement provides key principles which planning authorities should adhere to when planning for renewable energy. These are summarised as follows:

- i) Renewable energy developments should be capable of being accommodated in locations where the technology is viable and environmental, economic and social impacts can be addressed satisfactorily
- ii) Local development documents contain policies designed to promote and encourage, rather than restrict, the development of renewable energy resources.
- iii) Planning authorities should set out the criteria that will be applied in assessing applications for planning permission for renewable energy projects
- iv) The wider economic benefits of all proposals for renewable energy projects, whatever their scale, are material consideration that should be given significant weight in determining whether proposals should be granted planning permission.

- v) Planning authorities should not make assumptions about the technical and commercial feasibility of renewable energy projects.
- vi) Small scale projects can provide a limited but valuable contribution to overall outputs of renewable energy.
- vii) Local planning authorities and Strategic Partnerships should foster community involvement in renewable energy projects.
- viii) Development proposals should demonstrate any environmental, economic and social benefits as well as how any environmental and social impacts have been minimised through careful consideration of location, scale, design and other measures.

Regional Context

Policy ENV5 on energy, of the Draft RSS, set outs targets for the installation of renewable energy capacity within the Region. It states that all development strategies, plans and decisions will maximise renewable energy capacity by:

- i) Delivering at least the sub-regional targets for installed renewable energy capacity to 2010 (North Yorkshire 209MW) and to 2021 (North Yorkshire 350MW)
- ii) Helping to develop and deliver local authority targets for installed renewable energy capacity to 2010 in line with those provided in table 15.12.
- iii) Requiring at least 10% of the energy to be used in sizeable new development to come from on-site RE sources.

The Draft RSS expects most of the renewable energy up to 2010 will come from wind turbines and biomass for co-firing in the power stations. After that other technologies such as photovoltaics should be more commercially viable.

North Yorkshire authorities are currently considering how this target should be broken down between authorities.

Issues

Draft RSS indicates that wind power and biomass may be the main providers of renewable energy in the short term. Accommodating proposals of these types will raise issues of scale, impact and location and the Core Strategy will need to contain policies which outline the general circumstances and locations in which renewable energy proposals will be accepted.

Opportunities for small scale renewable energy projects often arise as part of new development and the Core Strategy could set down criteria governing the circumstances in which on-site renewable energy equipment would be sought.

Qu.25 Should the Core Strategy contain a strategic policy on Renewable Energy and should this contain a target for production?

Qu.26 Are specific policies required about certain types of development such as windpower?

Qu.27 **Should there be a new policy requiring a percentage of the energy to be used in large new residential, commercial or industrial developments to come from on-site renewable sources?**

d) Flood Risk Management

Background

National Policy Context

PPS1 - Delivering Sustainable Development sets out the Government's objectives for the planning system and how planning should facilitate and promote sustainable patterns of development, avoiding flood risk and accommodating the impacts of climate change.

Specific policy on flood risk is currently provided through PPG25 – Development and Flood Risk (2001); although this is at present being reviewed. The draft of PPS25 – Development and Flood Risk, which was published for consultation in December 2005, now indicates the latest Government views on the subject and continues the sustainability theme from PPS1.

Annex D of Draft PPS25 sets out a sequential test aimed at steering new development to areas at the lowest probability of flooding. The Environment Agency have designated areas with three probability levels of flooding. The overall aim should be to steer all new development to Flood Zone 1, with the lowest probability of flooding. Where this is not possible the local planning authority should demonstrate that there are no reasonable options available in a lower risk category and should take into account the flood risk vulnerability of land uses.

Draft PPS25 recommends that a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRAs) should be carried out to inform the preparation of a planning authorities Development Plan Documents (LDDs). SFRAs are seen as providing more refined information for an area on which to base the sequential approach.

Regional Context

Draft RSS Policy ENV1 indicates that allocation of areas for development will take place in line with strategic flood risk assessments. It notes that the purpose of the policy is to inform development on the basis of strategic flood risk assessments (SFRAs) and ensure flood management reflects regional spatial and economic priorities, as well as environmental objectives, thereby helping to maintain protection of the major conurbations and vulnerable communities alike.

The Draft RSS also notes the need to help mitigate flooding through proactive planning and management and provide appropriate protection - especially in York and Selby.

Local Context

Community strategy

As discussed under climate change, the Community Strategy acknowledges the need to focus on upgrading flood defences, preparing catchment management plans and carrying out risk assessments for new developments.

In response to PPG25, the District Council commissioned a SFRA of the Selby and Barlby area which was not only a high risk area but also contained large areas of previously developed land which would otherwise provide very sustainable development sites. The SFRA will be a key factor in informing the Core Strategy and other DPD documents of potential flood risk impacts. It is intended to update the SFRA and extend coverage to the whole District.

Issue

Selby District is generally low lying and is crossed by four main rivers. A significant area has the potential to flood at certain times and approximately half the District falls within the Environment Agency's High Risk Flood Zone 3. The towns of Selby on the River Ouse and Tadcaster on the River Wharfe have been, or are in the process of being, better protected through flood defence schemes. However, there will remain an increased risk in parts of these areas of flooding in the case of an exceptional event. In these cases critical attention will be paid to the Environment Agencies advice.

The spatial strategy for Selby District in the Draft RSS concentrates future growth in the Selby area, much of which carries a degree of flood risk, despite recently reinforced flood defences. The RSS recognises the sustainable opportunities for continued development in Selby town and environs, which is further reflected in the emerging renaissance strategy. At the same time dispersing growth to other parts of the District closer to Leeds and York would be less sustainable because it would tend to attract more commuters and perhaps create pressures on existing areas of Green Belt.

A key question therefore is what should be the acceptable level of flood risk. For example, should otherwise sustainable development sites in urban areas such as Selby, often utilising previously developed land, be sterilised even though their risk level is no higher than surrounding areas. In many cases, where development is permitted, additional mitigating measures such as raising floor levels, incorporating flood proof designs and providing space for flood water storage and evacuation, can be included to minimise any consequential damage.

Qu.28 Do you consider that development should be directed to areas with the lowest probability of flooding regardless of other sustainability criteria or:

Qu.29 Should significant importance be attached to regeneration and sustainability objectives when developing the spatial strategy for future growth, provided robust mitigation measures are incorporated in the design and layout of new development to minimise the risk?

e) Development in the Countryside

Selby District is largely rural in character with numerous villages and smaller settlements. Current policy at all levels tends to discourage development which would impact upon the openness and character of the countryside, protecting it for its own sake, although there is a recognition that a degree of small scale development, particularly for local jobs and services, and local needs housing may contribute to the vitality of rural communities. There may also be instances where larger developments of various types, e.g. tourist developments and renewable energy projects, may, on balance, particularly in non-Green Belt areas, be viewed as beneficial for the local economy or provide valuable local facilities. There is therefore an issue as to how far it is possible to provide a strategic policy in the Core Strategy which is sufficiently robust to cover all types of these situations, or whether individual proposals should be judged on their merits.

Qu.30 Should the Core Strategy adopt a very restrictive approach to development in the countryside or should there be scope for small scale local needs housing and local employment/service opportunities?

Qu.31 Should the Core strategy contain a strategic policy on major development in the countryside?

f) Green Belt

Draft RSS indicates that the general extent of the Green Belt should remain as at present. (Policy YH9). The policy acknowledges that more localised reviews may be necessary through Development Plan reviews, but only if justified by exceptional local circumstances.

The Green Belt in Selby District is longstanding although its boundaries were reviewed in the Selby District Local Plan. In addition, the spatial strategy in the Draft RSS concentrates development in the Selby area which is not affected by Green Belt considerations. It is therefore considered that it is not necessary to review Green Belt boundaries in the period covered by the Core Strategy unless exceptional local circumstances arise. A policy to this effect could be included in the Core Strategy.

Qu.32 Do you agree there is no requirement to review Green Belt boundaries?

5. TRAVEL AND ACCESSIBILITY

Background

National Policy Context

National planning guidance on transport is contained in PPG13 – Transport (2001).

Key objectives of the guidance are to actively manage the pattern of urban growth and the location of major travel-generating development to make full use of public transport, and to encourage walking and cycling and reduce the need to travel, especially by car. Land use planning should facilitate a shift in transport of freight from road to rail and water. Attention should be paid to the value of disused transport sites and effort made to prevent their loss to different land uses.

Regional Context

The Draft RSS contains the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS). The headlines of the RTS are as follows:

- Reduce the need to travel wherever possible by both positive interventions such as improved public transport or by demand restraint and promote modal shift from the car.
- Seek a consistent approach to parking strategies
- Promote improved public transport
- Promote the movement of goods by water and rail whilst recognising the key role road has to play in moving freight
- Encourage access to tourist locations by public transport and promote the journey component to be considered as part of the tourism offer
- Seek to improve surface access to airports
- Support expansion of the Regions ports and waterways and improve surface access to them
- Seek to improve access to services in rural areas by improving transport provision but also by innovative means
- Support a range of transport and investment priorities that underpin the wider spatial strategy.

The Draft RSS also contains accessibility criteria relating to travelling times to essential facilities by public transport which can be applied to major new developments to ensure that public transport offers a fully acceptable alternative to the private car at all new developments.

The Draft RSS's approach to parking policy is set out Policy T2, which states:

The Region will have a consistent approach to parking. Parking strategies will include:

- A. The use of maximum parking standards for new developments

- B. The use of Controlled Parking Zones
- C. A progressive reduction in long stay parking (other than at railway stations to serve rail users and at other locations serving a park and ride function) and transfer of some spaces to short stay, subject to consideration of possible traffic implications for traffic congestion
- D. A reduction of on-street parking to maximise pedestrianisation with high quality walking and cycling networks and environmental improvements
- E. Park and ride facilities coupled with increased use of public transport through service level improvements
- F. Consideration of controlling private non-residential parking by the introduction of parking levies
- G. Parking charges that are related to demand and to the strength of the local economy with differential pricing being used to discourage all-day parking.

Policies in the Draft RSS specifically related to Selby District within the Strategy include:

- The recognition of Selby as a public transport interchange location of sub-regional importance. The RSS policy includes developing and improving interchanges supporting a hierarchy of strategic public transport services with seamless connection to local and national networks.
- Strengthen key public transport corridors which include Hull–Selby-Leeds and York-Selby Doncaster.
- Support for strategies to improve the quality and availability of public transport ticketing (The Regional Assembly is funding research into the possibility of enabling concessionary travel across local authority boundaries. The outcome could have significant implications for travel between Selby District and West Yorkshire particularly.)

Local Context

Local Transport Plan

Transport policy for the District is established in the North Yorkshire County Council's Local Transport Plan 2006 –2011 (2005). The current Local Transport places more emphasis on making best use of existing networks, whether highway or public transport, than on undertaking expensive, specific highway schemes such as by-passes.

Selby District Local Plan

The Transportation and Vehicle Parking policies of the District Local Plan have the following main objectives:

- 1) To promote alternative forms of transport to the private motor car and to minimise the need to travel by appropriate location and layout of housing, employment and other uses.

- 2) To ensure that new development is served or could be served by satisfactory transport networks giving adequate access and taking into account public health, safety and energy/resource efficiency.
- 3) To maintain and support the improvement of transport links while managing the roads network to provide a safe and efficient system to serve different functions.
- 4) To promote appropriate traffic management measures to reduce pedestrian and vehicular conflict and enhance the local environment.
- 5) To support and encourage and wherever possible, improve public transport services and associated facilities.
- 6) To provide a better and safer environment for cyclists, pedestrians and those with mobility problems.
- 7) To encourage movement of freight by rail and water as an alternative to road transport.
- 8) To ensure that an appropriate level of car parking is available.

Community Strategy

The community strategy aims to make transport in the District as safe and as convenient as possible by:

- Improving all resident's access to services and opportunities, particularly in rural areas
- Continue to improve road safety
- Continue to reduce road traffic accidents
- Reduce pedestrian accidents
- Encourage people to use transport which does not damage the environment.

Issues

The amount of travel is directly related to the distribution of varying land uses and the interaction between them. The role of transport policies in the Core Strategy is to encourage sustainable development by minimising the resulting need to travel, particularly by car by;

- Ensuring new development is well located in relation to existing and future transport networks and
- Improving accessibility for all sections of the community, especially by public transport, walking and cycling.

Policies in the Core Strategy will need to ensure:

- New development is located where public transport services are or can be provided;

- Development can be accessed safely and does not generate traffic which cannot be accommodated safely within the road network;
- Development contributes to meeting the resulting additional costs of public transport and highway improvements;
- Developers are encouraged to adopt green travel plans;
- Maximum parking standards for different types of new development are established.

i) The Location of New Development - Accessibility

All new development has the potential to create additional travel demands and its location will influence how many journeys are made, how long they are and what means of transport are used. The spatial relationships between different land uses will influence these factors. In general terms development within larger settlements allows good interconnectivity between uses – jobs to homes, homes to services etc. Public transport also operates more economically in larger towns and can offer an attractive alternative to the private car over the shorter distances involved. In general the more dispersed development is, the least sustainable it is in transport terms.

The Core Strategy will take into account the relative accessibility of general locations and the nature of likely travel patterns arising from spatial strategy options. Reference will be made to the accessibility criteria within Draft RSS and, when considering the role of villages in the settlement hierarchy more detailed consideration will be given to accessibility to, and availability of, local services.

ii) Transport Provision

National policy guidance in PPG13, states that where development proposals will have significant transport implications a 'Transport Assessment' should be prepared and submitted alongside the relevant planning application. For major proposals the assessment should illustrate accessibility to the site by all forms of transport and the likely modal split of journeys to and from the site. It should give details of proposed measures to improve access by public transport and cycling, to reduce the need for parking and to mitigate transport impacts e.g. including car sharing schemes.

In addition larger new developments can sometimes be made acceptable by providing new transport investment both in terms of new roads and increasingly new public transport facilities. If these contributions are planned they can be an effective way of providing new transport investment. 'Travel Plans' are required to be submitted for larger developments which detail how people will get to and from a new development. They cover all aspects of transport for development including site parking, public transport provision and incentives to persuade people not to use their cars e.g. car sharing schemes. Travel Plans can form part of a Transport Assessment.

It is intended that the Core Strategy policies will outline the general framework for requiring Travel Plans and developer contributions towards transport. However, the detailed mechanisms for delivery and implementation are included in the Developer Contributions SPD which was published for consultation in March 2006.

iii) Parking

In accordance with PPG13, maximum parking standards are operated by the District Council, in accordance with those set out by North Yorkshire County Council in the Local Transport Plan. These standards may need to be reviewed in the light of the revised standards now being proposed in the Draft RSS.

Two areas where parking issues are most critical are within the town centres and parking in relation to rail services. Within town centres it is important that restricted parking does not undermine vitality and that adequate parking is available for short term parking rather than being occupied by town centre employees on a daily basis. The RSS policy recommends a progressive change in the balance between long and short stay parking. As only Selby, currently, has actively managed car parking, there may be a need to review the position in Tadcaster and Sherburn as to whether more emphasis needs to be applied to short term parking.

The second issue concerns the need for additional park and ride facilities at rail stations is in line with schemes to promote public transport for commuters. This would occur, for example, if the Regional Assembly made progress on better coordinated ticketing between North and West Yorkshire increasing demand for park and ride facilities within the District.

Qu.33 Do you agree with the general approach to parking being proposed for town centres, described above in draft RSS Policy T2?

Qu.34 Would you like to see any changes to parking arrangements within the centres of Selby, Tadcaster and Sherburn.

Qu.35 Do you have any views on the park and ride facilities required at rail stations within the District to encourage greater use of rail services?

THE DISTRIBUTION OF NEW DEVELOPMENT

Core Strategy Options

The Core Strategy will set out the long term spatial vision for the District, its objectives and strategy, and provides a framework for delivering development in the District up to 2021. A major element of the Strategy is how new development, particularly residential, be distributed throughout the District.

The Draft Regional Spatial Strategy requires Selby District to accommodate approximately 400 new dwellings between 2004 and 2016. However it should be noted that there are currently existing planning permissions for almost 2000 dwellings across the District that will govern the distribution of new development in the next three to four years. In addition there is potential for previously developed sites to be brought forward e.g. Olympia Park, Barlby which often have problems associated with infrastructure and flooding to be overcome before being fully confirmed as viable options. A plan, monitor and manage approach is therefore seen as essential as it is difficult to plan as far ahead as 2021 with any certainty.

The Draft Regional Spatial Strategy Policy -

Location of Development

The Draft Regional Spatial Strategy's general policy for the location of development (Policy YH8) concentrates the majority of new development and redevelopment on the Regional and Sub-Regional Centres, whilst allowing sufficient development at Principal Service Centres, such as Selby to enable them to fulfil their service centre role. Finally it allows limited development to take place in Local Service Centres (Tadcaster and Sherburn-in-Elmet in Selby District) with a focus on meeting local needs for affordable housing and economic diversification.

The Draft RSS requests that local planning authorities adopt a transport orientated approach to ensure that development:

- i) Makes the best use of existing transport infrastructure and capacity*
- ii) Is focused along existing or planned public transport corridors*
- iii) Maximises accessibility by public transport, walking and cycling*
- iv) Maximises the use of rail and water for uses generating large freight movements*

The Strategy also recommends a sequential approach for allocating development sites which promotes the re-use of previously developed land ahead of other infill sites and urban extensions in that order.

In order to aid debate on the issue four scenarios have been identified, ranging from highly concentrated development in and around Selby to a dispersed strategy. It is considered that these scenarios could cater for the levels of development currently being proposed by the RSS, but, as indicated above, the implementation of the eventual preferred strategy will be the subject of continuous monitoring which could lead to appropriate strategy amendments, at appropriate stages, well before 2021.

1. *Growth Concentrated in Selby Town and Adjoining Parishes*

This option would concentrate housing and employment growth in Selby and its immediate hinterland which contains a number of interdependent communities that have benefited from the construction of the Selby By-pass*. In particular land in Barlby parish opposite Selby Town, and which is contained by the River Ouse and the new bypass, offers considerable potential for regeneration and redevelopment utilising previously developed land, provided constraints such as flood risk can be overcome.

The remainder of development would be limited to the service centres of Tadcaster and Sherburn-in-Elmet/South Milford**. Growth in Tadcaster and Sherburn/South Milford would be limited to sites within the current built up areas and extensions to or large green field infilling of the currently developed area would not be considered.

Development in all other settlements would be strictly limited.

* *Selby Town, Barlby, Barlby Bridge, Osgodby, Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby.*

** *For planning purposes it is also considered appropriate to link Sherburn and South Milford because of the proximity of the settlements within the by-pass and the sharing of facilities including two railway stations.*

2. *Principal and Local Service Centres Strategy*

Retains the highest proportion of growth in the Selby area but with a larger proportion distributed between the Local Service Centres of Tadcaster, Sherburn-in-Elmet/South Milford where employment opportunities exist and can be expanded. Development in other settlements would be strictly limited.

3. *Service Centres and Largest Villages Strategy*

Development in the three service centres plus larger villages. This scenario would give a more even distribution of new development throughout these settlements, although there would still be regard to relative size, with the larger settlements accommodating proportionately more. In defining the larger villages only those having a higher level of sustainability would be included. The list would be considerably shorter than the list of villages currently included in the Selby District Local Plan under Policy.H6 – villages where development in accordance with the general policy for release (H2A) is currently permitted.

4. *Dispersed Growth Strategy*

This strategy would aim to distribute new growth, based on evidence of need, as widely as possible throughout the District's settlements (although proportionately to size).

Bearing in mind sustainability issues there would still be limitations on the number of villages where development would be acceptable but significantly more development would be allocated to villages than in Option 3. The list of villages would be more in line with the current list of villages in Policy H6 of the Selby District Local Plan, where development in accordance with the general principles of land release (Policy H2A) is currently accepted. This strategy is the least compliant with the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy.

A fifth option of promoting a new settlement (for example as identified in the Renaissance Towns Study) has been considered and rejected at this stage. This is because the Council takes the view that such a proposal would not be in conformity with the latest Draft Regional Spatial Strategy and it is not a deliverable option within the a short to medium term timescale. This decision does not preclude consideration of a new settlement in any subsequent review or role forward of the Regional Spatial Strategy and the Local Development Framework, should monitoring demonstrate that housing supply is failing to meet requirements.

Future consideration of a new settlement would need to take account of:

- *its potential role within the sub-region,*
- *potential alternative sites;*
- *impact on existing settlements*
- *viability and practicality of implementation e.g. access arrangements, provision of services etc.*

Impact of Options on Key Issues

In assessing the relative value of the individual options it is necessary to appreciate how each would impact on the key issues identified above as being important for the District. As a guide, a summary is given below of the potential impacts each option could have on each issue.

Choice of Options

It should be noted that these scenarios are designed only to aid discussion. Each will have its 'pros' and 'cons' and any preferred strategy is most likely to represent a balance containing elements of more than one scenario. The preferred option

will be created following this consultation and consultees may, if they so wish, put forward their own preferred blend of the above options.

Issue 1 Role of Selby District	
<p>Option1 Growth Concentrated in Selby Town and Adjacent Parishes</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimises development in areas and settlements most prone to commuting outside the District. • Encourages the Selby area to be increasingly self sufficient in terms of housing, jobs and services • Strongly accords with RSS strategy <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limits role of local service centres and other settlements within the District • May limit opportunities to distribute affordable housing to more local areas. 	<p>Option 2 Principal and Local Service Centres</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distributes growth to Tadcaster and Sherburn/South Milford as well as Selby area which may encourage improvement in the range of facilities available in the centres of those towns. • Will assist more than Option 1 in obtaining a better distribution of affordable housing within the District. <p>Negative Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New development in Tadcaster and Sherburn/South Milford will probably have a higher proportion of commuters to York and Leeds than that in the Selby Town area.
<p>Option 3 Service Centres and Larger Villages</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages more localised affordable housing which may reduce the need for local people to move from District. <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smaller developments in smaller settlements are more attractive to commuter households. • Less compliant with RSS 	<p>Option 4 Highly Distributed Growth</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages more localised affordable housing which may reduce the need for local people to move from District. <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small developments in smaller settlements are more attractive to commuter households. • May conflict with RSS.

Issue 2 Sustainable Communities	
<p>Option1 Growth Concentrated in Selby Town and Adjacent Parishes</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates opportunities for mixed and balanced communities. • Potential for a high level of provision of affordable housing. <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would not be well located to satisfy need for affordable housing across the rest of the District. 	<p>Option 2 Principal and Local Service Centres</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for a high level of provision of affordable housing. • Would ensure an improved distribution of affordable housing • Would be supportive of regeneration of three market towns <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would not be well located to provide affordable housing in smaller settlements.
<p>Option 3 Service Centres and Larger Villages</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for a high level of provision of affordable housing. • Would probably provide the best distribution of affordable housing in relation to need. <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restricts opportunities for affordable housing in smaller rural settlements. 	<p>Option 4 Highly Distributed Growth</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potentially could provide for more localised affordable housing in all areas of need. <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dispersed smaller sites would make it more difficult to achieve District wide affordable housing target.

Issue 3 Jobs and Business	
<p>Option1 Growth Concentrated in Selby Town and Adjacent Parishes</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good option for providing new employment close to new housing and with good public transport interlinkage and access to services. • Good strategy for avoiding job opportunities being taken by workers from outside the District <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited job growth in other towns and villages outside Selby Town area. • May restrict rural diversification 	<p>Option 2 Principal and Local Service Centres</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good option in terms of locating new jobs close to workforce. • Supportive of regeneration of market towns. <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May restrict rural diversification.
<p>Option 3 Service Centres and Larger Villages</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonable match between jobs and workforce, but higher commuting levels than Option 2. <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More dispersed pattern of housing and employment will lead to more vehicle journeys both for goods vehicles and private cars. • Reduced regenerative effect for market towns. • Less attractive to commercial investors 	<p>Option 4 Highly Distributed Growth</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages rural diversification <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More dispersed pattern of housing and employment will lead to more vehicle journeys both for goods vehicles and private cars. • Reduced regenerative effect for market towns. • Difficulties of finding suitable sites. • Environmental impacts of development in the countryside including difficulty in controlling impact of future expansion. • Not attractive to investors.

Issue 4 Environment	
<p>Option 1 Growth Concentrated in Selby Town and Adjacent Parishes</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Probably the least impact on sensitive urban and rural environments. <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too great a concentration on Selby could create congestion and other problems in the historic centre of Selby and approach roads. Flooding issues could be a constraint on development in and around Selby. 	<p>Option 2 Principal and Local Service Centres</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On balance, the impacts on the three service centres is likely to be regenerative for centres. <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More limited than Option 1 Care needed with environments of Tadcaster and Sherburn
<p>Option 3 Service Centres and Larger Villages</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Balance of impacts on three market towns likely to be regenerative for centres. <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No substantial negative impacts 	<p>Option 4 Highly Distributed Growth</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No substantial positive impacts <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More development in smaller, rural settlements will have a greater impact on both the form and character of settlements and open countryside.

Issue 5 Travel and Accessibility	
<p>Option1 Growth Concentrated in Selby Town and Adjacent Parishes</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best strategy for reducing car journeys to work. • Best strategy for encouraging use of public transport. <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible increased congestion in centre of Selby and approach roads. 	<p>Option 2 Principal and Local Service Centres</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good strategy for linking homes and jobs. • Will help maximise use of public transport <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May not be as effective as Option 1 in reducing commuter trips to surrounding areas.
<p>Option 3 Service Centres and Larger Villages</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May assist the viability of local public transport <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More dispersed settlement pattern not conducive to increased public transport usage. 	<p>Option 4 Highly Distributed Growth</p> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May assist the viability of local public transport <p>Negative Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More dispersed pattern of housing and employment will lead to more vehicle journeys both for goods vehicles and private cars. • Not conducive to public transport usage

Qu.36a Do you have a preference for any of the options 1-4?

Qu.36b Would you prefer a combination of elements from more than one option? If so please outline.

Qu.36c Are there any other options? If so please outline.