

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
<b>Spatial portrait</b> (13 responses)	<p>Representations mainly supported the spatial portrait. Individual comments related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Burn Gliding Club requested that the 3 active airfields in the District should be mentioned and that “former” is deleted from references to Burn as the airfield is still in use.</li> <li>• East Yorkshire buses stated the importance of buses to sustainability and social inclusion. Request that text is included regarding the importance of buses for social inclusion, sustainability etc.</li> <li>• Historic England supported the spatial portrait. They requested changes to para 3.37 regarding non-designated heritage assets and 3.9 regarding the historic core of Tadcaster</li> <li>• Samuel Smiths Old Brewery (Tadcaster) made comments regarding the historic core of Tadcaster, the utilisation of rail infrastructure at Gascoigne Wood, rural housing and the fact that Samuel Smith Old Brewery is much smaller than the other breweries in Tadcaster. Changes to the text were suggested.</li> </ul>	<p>Paragraphs 3.9 (3<sup>rd</sup> sentence) and 3.37 are amended to reflect the response from Historic England.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.47 of the spatial portrait Transport and Infrastructure amended as requested by Burn Gliding Club.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.52 of the spatial portrait Transport and Infrastructure is amended to reflect the response from East Yorkshire Buses.</p> <p>Paragraphs 3.9 (2<sup>nd</sup> sentence) and 3.24 are amended in response to Samuel Smiths Old Brewery (Tadcaster)</p>
<b>District Vision and Objectives</b> (15 responses)	<p>There was support for the Vision for the District from Historic England. Changes suggested include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the vision does not match the emerging spatial strategy and Local Plan policies</li> <li>• mention should be given to the redevelopment of brownfield land</li> <li>• the Selby Gateway Area to be specifically mentioned</li> <li>• the minimum housing and employment figures should be referred to in the vision</li> <li>• there should be a separate vision for the villages</li> <li>• there should be a separate vision for Eggborough</li> <li>• the Vision should refer to net zero carbon emissions.</li> </ul> <p>Support was received to the objectives in general and to the pattern of development. Specific comments suggested changes including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it should be made clear that the housing target is a minimum</li> </ul>	<p>Paragraph 4 of the Vision for the District is amended to reflect the responses from The National Grid and CPRE regarding net zero carbon emissions. Revised Publication Local Plan does not include Heronby.</p>

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>there should be mention of the Selby Gateway</li> <li>the objectives do not relate to the new settlement of Heronby</li> </ul>	
<b>Vision for Selby</b> (1 response)	Support was received from Historic England.	No changes in response to comments.
<b>Vision for Sherburn in Elmet</b> (1 response)	Support was received from Historic England.	No changes in response to comments.
<b>Vision for Tadcaster</b> (2 responses)	Support was received from Historic England and Tadcaster Town Council. Although the Town Council expressed concern to the approach unless engineering feasibility studies for the underground car park confirm the idea is deliverable.	No changes in response to comments.
<b>SG1</b> (17 responses)	<p>There was both support and objection to this policy. Support was provided by Historic England and the promoters of some sites. A number of responses suggested that further consideration should be made to reviewing the Green Belt to better reflect the contribution villages can make to sustainable growth of the District. There was some disagreement with allocating a new settlement instead of distributing growth across the settlement hierarchy. To support unallocated sites for allocation, some respondents considered the policy did not align fully with or reflect the NPPF.</p> <p>East Yorkshire Buses suggested text to address the lack of reference to sustainable transport options and proposed revised wording.</p>	Point D amended to reflect the comment by East Yorkshire Buses.
<b>SG2</b> (41 responses)	<p>There was both support and objection to this Policy. Support was provided for Eggborough urban extension and some support to this policy was to further support rejected sites to be an allocation in Osgodby, Monk Fryston and Hillam. Specific comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that housing requirement figure is too low. The housing requirement figure should be uplifted to reflect recent levels of delivery in the District and to meet demand of 141 affordable dwellings per annum. Consideration should be given to a higher</li> </ul>	<p>Criterion A.1. amended in response to the comment from ForFarmers UK Ltd regarding special policy areas.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.10 deleted and references to Heronby and the New Settlement deleted from point 5 and the table in response to comments on the new settlement Heronby.</p>

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>housing requirement figure. The Plan relies on large complex sites, so will impact on viability and deliverability. Do not agree with the allocation of sites above housing requirement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns regarding the provision of affordable homes and the allocation of Eggborough urban extension.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the HEDNA employment forecasts and the impact on uplift for housing, the HEDNA housing requirement figure and robustness of the HEDNA,</li> <li>• Over inflated levels of employment land supply.</li> <li>• Spatial strategy approach should have reviewed Green Belt.</li> <li>• There are anomalies in the spatial approach given the decision to allocate a new settlement at Heronby.</li> <li>• There are concerns about the deliverability of sites in Selby and Tadcaster given previous allocations. Tier 1 and 2 villages should therefore play a greater role in delivery.</li> <li>• Concern about the deliverability of sites in Selby and an over reliance on the Heronby site. Further growth should be distributed to the most sustainable locations.</li> <li>• The boundaries of Selby should include Brayton, Barlby and Osgodby and further growth should be directed to these settlements.</li> <li>• Object to the identification of Appleton Roebuck as a Tier 2 village.</li> <li>• The Spatial approach does not include support to renewable energy at the Olympia Park site.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>SG3</b> (26 responses)</p>	<p>There was some support for this policy, although the majority suggested changes, some of which were to support rejected sites for allocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development limits could be expanded to include contingency sites, which could be used if the allocated sites are not deliverable.</li> <li>• Keep development limits for Smaller Villages to avoided sprawling growth in these settlements.</li> </ul>	<p>No changes in response to comments.</p>

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan should remove all development limits and be replaced by a criteria-based approach.</li> <li>Development limits should be based on defensible boundaries which provide flexibility for the future and therefore the Council should look at a combination of Approach 1 and 2 in the Development Limits Methodology.</li> </ul>	
<b>Development Limits: Methodology / Review</b> (12 responses)	<p>Support for the proposed development limits for including an allocated site (BRAY-X).</p> <p>Changes requested for the proposed development limits methodology to support the allocation of rejected sites in Brayton and Hambleton.</p> <p>Changes requested for the proposed development limits in Church Fenton to include the curtilages of the properties west of Busk Lane.</p> <p>Change requested to the proposed development limit boundary which excluded land which is currently within the defined development limits for Ulleskelf.</p> <p>There was one request to remove Development Limits.</p>	<p>The development limit boundaries are amended in Church Fenton and Ulleskelf in response to comments.</p>
<b>SG4</b> (7 responses)	<p>Support for the policy from Historic England and CPRE North Yorkshire. However, those objecting provided the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No clear justification for the distinction between smaller villages and Tier 1 and Tier 2 villages.</li> <li>Should have a criteria-based approach to all villages.</li> <li>Further clarity required on the approaches to best and most versatile agricultural land.</li> <li>Samuel Smith Old Brewery suggested wording to reflect how judgements will be made and to make the policy clearer.</li> </ul>	<p>No changes in response to comments.</p>
<b>SG5</b> (7 responses)	<p>Those commenting on this policy provided the following responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A full review of the Green Belt is required in order for allocations to be made in accordance with the settlement hierarchy and to allocate land for development in the most sustainable locations.</li> <li>Land which has ceased to function as Green Belt should be removed from the Green Belt.</li> </ul>	<p>No changes in response to comments.</p>

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The need to sustain rural communities constitutes exceptional circumstances for a Green Belt review.</li> </ul>	
<b>SG6</b> (6 responses)	<p>Those commenting on this policy provided the following responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional safeguarded land designations should be made to ensure the effectiveness of the Local Plan, given there are concerns regarding the delivery rates of some of the larger allocations.</li> <li>It is considered necessary to safeguard land to protect against non-delivery in Tadcaster and given the growth of Sherburn industrial park and to ensure that Green Belt boundaries will endure and provide permanence in the long term.</li> <li>The Council can't currently demonstrate that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period.</li> <li>Land identified in the 2005 SDLP as safeguarded should be allocated for residential development during this plan period.</li> <li>The safeguarded sites focus only on Sherburn in Elmet.</li> <li>Given that the housing figure exceeds that in the HEDNA Addendum, in order to provide flexibility, there is no requirement for any safeguarded land. As such, the 2 identified sites should either be allocated for development or deleted.</li> </ul>	<p>No changes in response to comments.</p>
<b>SG7</b> (5 responses)	<p>Support for the policy by Historic England. Comments from those objecting included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The size of Strategic Countryside Gaps should be reconsidered to only include the minimum amount absolutely necessary to achieve the purest aims of the policy.</li> <li>Existing rural businesses within Strategic Countryside Gaps should be allowed to develop in an appropriate manner to ensure such businesses remain viable.</li> <li>The gap between Eggborough and Kellington is not necessary or justified.</li> </ul>	<p>No changes to the Policy in response to comments.</p>

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
<p><b>SG8</b> (2 responses)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baylis &amp; Baylis Ltd suggest that paragraph 4.40 is updated to set out that no weight should be afforded to housing policies of any made Neighbourhood Plans within the District where they would conflict with the up-to-date new Local Plan, noting that allocations in Appleton Roebuck in particular would lead to the Appleton Roebuck and Acaster Selby Neighbourhood Plan becoming 'out-of-date'.</li> <li>• Concern raised by Grimston Park Estate regarding the approach to emerging Neighbourhood Plans which seeks to limit the size of additional 'small' and 'medium' sized allocations, where the size is not determined, to those identified through the site allocations in the Local Plan. Strategy relies on sites in high flood risk such as Selby Town.</li> </ul>	<p>The last paragraph of SG8 is amended to reflect the comment of the Grimston Park Estate.</p>
<p><b>SG9</b> (8 responses)</p>	<p>Half of the representations supported the policy approach (Historic England, the Canal and River Trust, Baylis &amp; Baylis Ltd and Glade Developments Ltd.)</p> <p>East Yorkshire Buses commented on the lack of reference to sustainable transport options and proposed revised wording.</p> <p>The CPRE suggested that the policy could be strengthened by reference to “beautiful”.</p> <p>Countryside Partnerships expressed concerns about reference to sufficient amenity space and how this will be applied.</p> <p>The Banks Group suggested wording regarding Health Impact Assessments.</p>	<p>To reflect comments received from CPRE and changes to the NPPF, the second sentence of A is amended.</p> <p>To reflect the comment by East Yorkshire Buses, a new criterion 12 is added.</p> <p>To reflect the comments of the Banks Group, criterion B.6 is amended and a new sentence is added into 4.46.</p>
<p><b>SG10</b> (9 responses)</p>	<p>General support to the approach was made by Historic England, the Coal Authority, Greencore Group plc, Banks Property and ForFarmers UK Ltd.</p> <p>The CPRE North Yorkshire requested that a separate policy is included to deal with mitigating and adapting to climate change.</p> <p>National Grid requested the insertion of text to more accurately reflect the specific nature of the Humber Low Carbon Pipelines project which is</p>	<p>To reflect the response from National Grid, the introductory sentence and paragraph 4.51 are amended.</p>

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>establishing Co2 and hydrogen transportation networks to facilitate the delivery of carbon capture proposals.</p> <p>Burn Gliding Club and the Aviation Awareness Council requested a new policy on operational airfields.</p>	
<p><b>SG11</b> (8 responses)</p>	<p>All respondents suggested changes to the policy suggesting that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Council must look at alternative strategies to accommodate the identified need of the district in areas which are not currently, or in the future, vulnerable to flooding.</li> <li>• if the spatial strategy avoided such a considerable amount of development in high-risk flood areas there would not be the need for such a complicated Flood Risk policy, and the Council could then rely on the National Planning Policy Framework, NPPG, other policies in the Plan, and a sequential test.</li> <li>• the Council should consider where sites are protected by flood defences. They suggested a more holistic approach in the policy, where if it can be demonstrated that a site can be successfully mitigated against flooding issues then the fact it is in Flood Zone 2 or 3 should not prevent development coming forward.</li> <li>• Green Belt land should be considered before areas of flood risk</li> </ul> <p>Ainsty IDB have a requirement of 9 metres (not 7) from the top of the embankment of a watercourse.</p> <p>The Environment Agency provided the following comments and suggested changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of clarity about how to select sites at lowest overall risk.</li> <li>• Some of the criteria appear to replicate national planning policy. The purpose of the Local Plan is to supplement and guide the framework and to help make it locally relevant. Large parts of the NPPF do not seem to be utilised.</li> <li>• Confusion between sequential test and the sequential approach.</li> </ul>	<p>Further updates to SFRA have been undertaken.</p> <p>To reflect the wording provided by the Environment Agency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a new criterion regarding sewerage systems is added after B.5,</li> <li>• B.7 is reworded,</li> <li>• paragraph 4.62 is amended to clarify the difference between sequential test and the sequential approach,</li> <li>• a new paragraph regarding existing culverts is added after 4.69</li> </ul> <p>Paragraph 4.69 is amended to reflect the information provided by the Ainsty Internal Drainage Board.</p>

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update the policy with the latest NPPF and NPPG guidance.</li> <li>• Needs to link to an SFRA which covers areas rather than individual sites.</li> <li>• Amend B7 part of the policy, relating to culverts.</li> </ul>	
<b>SG12</b> (2 responses)	<p>Historic England ask that the policy acknowledges that work has yet to be completed on appraisals of all the designated areas within the District and that these will be reviewed with priority given to those areas considered at risk and/or under pressure from development.</p> <p>Samuel Smith Brewery requests that Grade I and Grade II listed buildings are added to the list of elements which contribute towards a distinctive sense of place.</p>	No changes in response to comments
<b>SG13</b> (2 responses)	<p>Support for the policy including support from Historic England.</p> <p>Although some concerns raised by site promoter that the policy is not properly represented in the SAM as it is currently difficult to understand the negative effects caused by sites simply from the high-level approach applied at the allocation stage. Suggest that sites which could cause negative harm to heritage assets should not be allocated unless there are no other suitable sustainable sites within the settlement.</p>	No changes in response to comments.
<b>EM1</b> (6 responses)	<p>All respondents to this policy suggested changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The level of employment proposed at Heronby is small given the scale of residential proposed. Employment is unlikely to come forward until latter stages of phasing i.e. not in plan period. Consider that STIL-D will not be found sound so doubtful employment will be delivered on this site at all.</li> <li>• Excessive development at Eggborough and there is a chance that the employment market may become saturated in this part of the District.</li> <li>• There is a lack of employment allocations in Tadcaster and the northern parts of the District - over reliance on large isolated brownfield sites. Only Olympia Park is identified for Selby Town's</li> </ul>	No changes in response to comments.



Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>employment needs. The approach to employment allocations isn't aligned with those areas of residential growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It should be noted in EM1 that redevelopment of Gascoigne Wood must be closely linked to the re-use of existing rail infrastructure on site.</li> <li>• Over-reliance on Olympia Park and Gascoigne Wood - complex sites with uncertainty over viability, deliverability etc - which may not come forward in the plan period.</li> <li>• There are not sufficient sites proposed in terms of size and location - the plan should be proposing employment along main routes (e.g. A64 or close to the motorway).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>EM2</b> (4 responses)</p>	<p>There was one respondent in support of the policy. Comments where changes were suggested include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small employment sites in the District which are not identified by policy EM2 and are not adjacent to Development Limits are precluded from opportunities to expand.</li> <li>• There appears to be an absence of strategic sites in the north of the District.</li> <li>• Part C of the policy is too restrictive - development for any non-employment uses should also be supported where there is evidence that the existing buildings/land are considered to be non-viable in terms of market attractiveness, business operations, age or condition.</li> </ul>	<p>No changes in response to comments.</p>
<p><b>EM3</b> (4 responses)</p>	<p>There was one respondent in support of the policy. Changes suggested include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further flexibility is required and a definition of what is meant by "adjacent to settlement limits".</li> <li>• Windfalls, whilst allowed within or adjacent to Development Limits, are not allowed elsewhere - this is contrary to national policy.</li> <li>• Objection to the supporting text which states that Stillingfleet Mine is remote.</li> </ul>	<p>Criterion C.5 is amended to reflect the response from Historic England.</p>

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Historic England suggested removing the request for schemes to be supported by a robust landscaping scheme, but rather to refer to landscaping that reflects the site's locality and setting.</li> </ul>	
<b>EM4</b> (4 responses)	Historic England was the one respondent in support of the policy. Changes suggested include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy requires greater flexibility.</li> <li>Request that the policy refers to the protection of the highest quality agricultural land.</li> </ul>	No changes in response to comments.
<b>EM5</b> (3 responses)	Historic England was the one respondent in support of the policy. Changes suggested include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Environment Agency requests that reference to water quality and lack of provision of wastewater treatment facilities in rural areas should be identified, but notes that this is dealt with under Policy NE5 which stresses that all development to impact on the water environment will have regard to the Water Framework Directive objectives set out in the Humber River Basin Management Plan.</li> <li>Response sets out that criterion A) applies equally to proposals both in and outside settlement boundaries suggesting that this is an insufficient guard against inappropriate development outside settlement boundaries. Response also suggests proposals in locations outside of development limits should be required to demonstrate that they are the most sustainable option or the proposal requires an open countryside location.</li> </ul>	No changes in response to comments.
<b>EM6</b> (3 responses)	The policy is considered by one respondent to be too restrictive to types of development in rural areas which are consistent with national policy. Suggest redrafting section A.(iii) to remove the wording "the highest possible standards of siting, design and landscaping" as there are no standards against which these requirements can be measured. In addition, they suggest that hotels are not necessarily town centres uses and the policy should be amended to identify circumstances in which a sequential test would not be necessary for hotels.	No changes in response to comments

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>The Environment Agency requests that reference to water quality and lack of provision of wastewater treatment facilities in rural areas should be identified, but notes that this is dealt with under Policy NE5.</p> <p>Historic England consider the policy does not provide sufficient protection for the historic environment and recommends adding "heritage assets" after 'harm' and before 'recognised' under part B.1. of the Policy.</p>	
<p><b>EM7</b> (4 responses)</p>	<p>The majority of responses support the proposed policy approach including Historic England and Samuel Smiths Old Brewery.</p> <p>East Yorkshire Buses considered that recognition and support should also be given to the role of town centres as transport hubs.</p>	<p>No changes in response to comments.</p>
<p><b>EM8</b> (2 responses)</p>	<p>Banks Group state that the policy should make it clear that local shops are appropriate on strategic housing sites where the need for a local centre has been identified.</p> <p>Samuel Smiths Old Brewery state it is unclear whether the reference to shops of 280 sqm or under refers to net or gross floorspace.</p>	<p>Criterion B.1 amended in response to the comment from Banks Group.</p> <p>Criterion B.1 amended in response to the comment from Samuel Smiths Old Brewery.</p>
<p><b>EM9</b> (0 responses)</p>	<p>No responses to this policy.</p>	<p>No changes in response to comments.</p>
<p><b>EM10</b> (1 response)</p>	<p>One response from Historic England in support of the policy.</p>	<p>No changes in response to comments.</p>
<p><b>IC1</b> (1 response)</p>	<p>One response from Historic England in support of the policy.</p>	<p>No changes in response to comments.</p>
<p><b>IC2</b> (2 responses)</p>	<p>NHS Property Services are keen to encourage that flexibility be granted to the NHS via the wording of this policy. Request an additional bullet point to allow that development which results in the loss of existing community facilities will be supported where the loss or change of use of existing facilities is part of a wider public service estate reorganisation.</p> <p>The Banks group are concerned that where existing community facilities are replaced within large strategic allocations criterion C might not be clear/too restrictive as existing dwellings/residents may have a slightly longer journey to the replacement community facility. Request that the</p>	<p>Additional supporting text added to clarify that public service estate reorganisation can be considered through existing 4 policy criteria.</p> <p>Further additional supporting text added to clarify the meaning of "Accessibility" for this policy relating to inclusive design and no specific walking distances.</p>

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
	term "accessibility" in Criteria C is clarified as relating to the quality of entering the community facility and not the length of journey.	
<b>IC3</b> (10 responses)	<p>Support for the policy from 4 respondents. Those that sought changes to the policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Burn Gliding Club and the General Aviation Awareness Council suggest that all recreational/sports open spaces including general aviation airfields should be protected in line with para 98 and 99 of the NPPF. Modification suggested to protect airfields within the district through an additional policy and amendments to IC3 to remove reference to the policies map and latest evidence base. Support for this approach from other respondees including by the British Gliding Association.</li> <li>• One respondent suggests the policy is not justified as the assessment does not assess all green space and sports facilities, noting large facilities such as airfields are excluded.</li> <li>• Historic England suggested that sufficient safeguards against significant harm to heritage assets should be added as a criterion, given that green space assets are likely to contain, or affect, heritage assets.</li> <li>• The CPRE North Yorkshire state that paragraph 103 of the NPPF sets out that policies for managing development within the Green Belt should be consistent with those for Green Belts and not infer that the designation should be within Green Belt. The wording should be amended to reflect that Local Green Space should be managed in the same way as Green Belt designations in that development should only occur in very special circumstances.</li> <li>• Concerns were raised by Countryside Partnerships plc that off-site provision is too general and should identify the area/Parish in which it will be sought.</li> </ul>	<p>IC3 Local Green Space section and paragraph 6.22 amended to reflect the comments of CPRE North Yorkshire.</p> <p>Criterion B.2 amended to reflect the comments by Countryside Partnerships plc.</p>
<b>IC4</b> (2 responses)	The HBF and Johnson Mowatt consider that it is unnecessary to place any burden for identifying strategic solutions to water supply, wastewater treatment and drainage-related infrastructure investment on the	In response to comments from HNF and Johnson Mowatt, supporting text has been amended to recognise latest Levelling Up and Regeneration Act requirements on Water

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>development industry, as this responsibility lies elsewhere. They also reference written ministerial statement<sup>3</sup> (WMS) and the package of measures that the Government will introduce through the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act to tackle the challenge of nutrient pollution, and new statutory duties to be placed on water and sewerage companies in England to upgrade wastewater treatment works to the highest technically achievable limits by 2030, to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Natural England suggest that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• part B of the policy should make specific reference to policy NE1.</li> <li>• part C of the policy should reference the need for package treatment plants to include tertiary treatment of effluent to substantially reduce phosphates, such as through wetlands, reedbed systems and phosphate removal systems.</li> <li>• specific reference to be made in the policy or supporting text for individual developments to provide appropriate mitigation where the HRA identified adverse effects on site integrity from water quality impacts cannot be ruled out in the absence of mitigation.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to the 25 year Environment plan and the newly published UK Water Efficiency Strategy to 2030 and encourage the adoption the optional minimum building standard of 110 litres per person per day for all new builds where there is a clear local need in line with the Ministerial Statement.</li> <li>• Natural England would also strongly support policies which move towards greater water efficiency in new developments and retrofits, including the exploration of revised building regulations and how the development of new technologies can contribute to meeting these standards.</li> </ul>	<p>and Sewerage companies to upgrade the capacity of specific water treatment works by 2030.</p> <p>In response to issues raised by Natural England, policy updated to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to policies NE5 and NE1 added to main policy text for clarity and completeness</li> <li>• Require tertiary treatment of effluent to reduce phosphates from package treatment plants.</li> </ul> <p>Supporting text updated to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Give clarity on water infrastructure and requirements.</li> <li>• consider potential impacts of water abstraction on water flow and ecological sites</li> <li>• Consider potential impacts of water discharge on water quality</li> <li>• Identify sites from HRA where mitigation may be needed to remove adverse effects on water quality and flow</li> <li>• Provide links to policies NE1 and NE5 where appropriate</li> <li>• Set out details of how package treatment plants should address tertiary treatment of effluent.</li> </ul>
<p><b>IC5</b> (1 response)</p>	<p>Historic England support the policy.</p>	<p>No changes in response to comments.</p>

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
<b>IC6</b> (6 responses)	<p>There is broad support for the policy from The Harworth Goup, Baylis and Baylis Ltd, Banks Group, Glade Developments, Canal and River Trust and East Yorkshire Buses.</p> <p>The Harworth Group however have concerns that the policies ambition to safeguard existing rail freight halts and siding could conflict with site allocations such as Gascoigne Wood where comprehensive development of the site will help Selby to move towards a net zero carbon economy and national policy already encourages a modal shift towards rail and low carbon transport.</p> <p>Other suggestions to strengthen the policy include recommendations to insert the word “bus” into point 1 of Criterion C, adding an additional point to Criterion B - that development should facilitate direct and efficient access to bus routes and services and simplifying criterion F to state that contributions may be sought from all development to on and off site mitigation and where necessary post development monitoring may be required.</p> <p>The Canal and River Trust highlight that their freight strategy categorises the Ouse as a Priority Freight Route.</p>	<p>No changes in response to these comments.</p> <p>Canal and river comment into para 6.50-6.52</p>
<b>IC7</b> (1 response)	<p>The Canal and River Trust support the policy.</p>	<p>No changes in response to comments.</p>
<b>HG1</b> (28 responses)	<p>There was some support for the policy from promoters of allocated sites. Objections to the policy include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10% buffer to supply requested. Plan must allocate 10% of the housing requirement on sites under 1 hectare.</li> <li>• Objections to Heronby and the scale of the buffer above the supply.</li> <li>• It was observed that the housing trajectory from 2032/33 onwards won’t be able to meet the minimum housing target and so more sites should be allocated.</li> <li>• Tadcaster TADC-I is calculated incorrectly.</li> <li>• The windfall calculation has been calculated incorrectly with arbitrary figures.</li> </ul>	<p>Criterion C amended to state that windfalls are not part of the planned supply.</p> <p>Site details amended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EGGB-Y amended to 1015 dwellings</li> <li>• SELB-BZ amended to 1015 dwellings</li> <li>• TADC-I amended to 180 dwellings</li> <li>• TADC-L amended to 10 dwellings</li> <li>• New settlement, Heronby, removed from table and the following paragraphs.</li> </ul> <p>Table 7.1 amended to reflect the latest planning permission, completions and commitments information.</p>

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The number of dwellings that could be built within the plan period on EGGB-Y can be increased from 945 to 1500.</li> <li>There should be a non-implementation discount on sites.</li> <li>The build rate/lead in time for Heronby is not realistic.</li> <li>Over reliance on large sites. Need smaller sites.</li> </ul>	<p>A non-implementation discount is added on planning permissions for small sites that have not started.</p> <p>Para 7.9 amended to show how non implementation of residential sites has been considered.</p>
<b>HG2</b> (12 responses)	<p>Support for the policy from Historic England.</p> <p>Natural England requested that the policy is cross referenced to NE1.</p> <p>Several responses asked for the development limits to be reviewed or removed completely.</p> <p>There were also requests on what is meant by very small-scale development.</p>	<p>No changes in response to comments.</p>
<b>HG3</b> (0 responses)	<p>No responses to this policy.</p>	<p>No changes in response to comments.</p>
<b>HG4</b> (2 responses)	<p>Support for the policy from Historic England.</p> <p>Samuel Smiths Old Brewery requested that the policy should have a restriction of size on replacement dwellings, in order to make sure any replacement building is not substantially larger than the dwelling currently on the site.</p>	<p>No changes in response to comments.</p>
<b>HG5</b> (1 response)	<p>Samuel Smiths Old Brewery requested that the policy criteria should limit the curtilage of any new residential use to that required for the reasonable needs of the new dwelling.</p>	<p>No changes in response to comments.</p>
<b>HG6</b> (11 responses)	<p>Comments requested changes to the following parts of the policy:</p> <p>Part A: Allow for alternate forms of evidence including for example the Council’s Waiting List or information in relation to the market demand and aspirations from home builders?</p> <p>Part B: Need to have evidence for space standards.</p> <p>Part C: Clarity needed in policy and supporting text on whether requirement is for M4(3) homes is for M4(3(2a)) wheelchair adaptable, or</p>	<p>Part A is amended by referring to North Yorkshire Home Choice for affordable housing.</p> <p>Part B – the Nationally Described Space Standards information is included in the Housing Background Paper. No change to the Policy.</p> <p>Part C is amended to clarify that the requirement is for M4(3(2a)) wheelchair adaptable homes.</p>

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>M4(3(2b)) wheelchair accessible. There are significant cost and evidence base implications for this policy. The evidence in the HEDNA is from the national level and is from 2010. No understanding as to how many houses are already built to M4(3) standard. Ensure that the requirement is proportionate to need.</p> <p>Part D: This should refer to SG9 rather than SG10. The section of the policy it is cross-referring to is no longer included within SG10 and refers to a previous policy at the Preferred Options stage.</p> <p>Part E: The density of 35 dwellings should be reduced for Tadcaster. The ability for applicants to vary from the prescribed density levels (as described in the supporting text) need to be stated in the policy as well.</p>	<p>Paragraph 7.36 amended to include the latest number of applicants on the housing register for wheelchair adaptable accommodation.</p> <p>Part D amended to refer to correct policy in response to comment.</p>
<p><b>HG7</b> (9 responses)</p>	<p>There were two responses in support of the policy. Those objecting identified the following issues and suggested changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable Housing rates for Cross Hills and Eggborough strategic sites must be consistent with the typologies in the Local Plan Viability Study.</li> <li>• Allocations will not meet the affordable housing requirement identified in the HEDNA so the Council needs to allocate more sites.</li> <li>• The local plan should give clarity on how the Community Infrastructure Levy is to be removed.</li> <li>• The policy should set out the mechanism for undertaking regular review of viability across the district, across different typologies to ensure the objectives of the plan are delivered.</li> <li>• Set out the mechanism for project specific viability review through S.106 agreements.</li> <li>• The fact that we have set rates for individual allocated sites should be explained in the policy as well as in the supporting text.</li> <li>• The word “minimum” should be removed.</li> </ul>	<p>Criterion A amended for clarity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By the addition of text to set out that affordable housing requirements for individual sites are set out in the site policies</li> <li>• to state that “...Extra care/Sheltered Housing in Class C2 will be exempt...”</li> </ul>



Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extra care and sheltered housing to be exempt from affordable housing provision</li> </ul>	
<b>HG8</b> (1 response)	Historic England considered that policy criteria A3 (protection for green belts and wildlife sites) should be moved to part C as this criterion should be used for entry level sites and not exceptions sites.	Part A amended by removing A.3 and adding it to the end of part C stating “In all cases”
<b>HG9</b> (2 responses)	Support for the policy from Historic England. Samuel Smiths Old Brewery requested that a criteria should be added for applications outside of development limits, to ensure that the development of residential uses in isolated and unsustainable locations is adequately controlled and that the site is capable of being served by a range of services and facilities necessary for the everyday needs of the residents.	No changes in response to comments.
<b>HG10</b> (6 responses)	The HEDNA has not undertaken the in-depth analysis or market review for Self-Build, as described within the PPG. Therefore, the evidence base for the policy is not robust and should be revisited. Sites larger than 50 units are more suited for self-build developments. Responders stated that self-builders will not want to live on larger developments.	No changes in response to comments.
<b>HG11</b> (1 response)	Due to viability concerns, the objection was a request to scrap the requirement to provide services on sites with housing for older persons.	Criterion B amended by deleting the text in response to comment.
<b>HG12</b> (1 response)	One response from Historic England in support of the policy.	No changes in response to comments.
<b>HG13</b> (1 response)	One response from Historic England in support of the policy.	No changes in response to comments.
<b>HG14</b> (3 responses)	Support for the policy from Historic England. However, those objecting stated that the GTAA is out of date and needs updating and the results need incorporating into policy.	No changes to the policy in response to comments.
<b>NE1</b> (2 responses)	Natural England advise that NE1 requires further detail to ensure that the plan will not have significant adverse impacts on designated sites. This includes the need to incorporate the advice of the HRA and SA particularly in consideration of the most relevant impact pathways such as functionally linked land; recreational pressure; water quality; water supply; and	Policy NE1 and supporting paragraphs amended in response to comments by Natural England, NYCC and approved by AECOM as part of HRA

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>atmospheric pollution. Part B could include additional wording which highlights that applicants will be required to demonstrate that impacts will be adequately mitigated where adverse effect on integrity cannot be ruled out and compensation measures should only be considered in the context of imperative reasons of overriding public interest, in line with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations. Clarity could be added by setting out that applicants will be required to submit appropriate levels of information and evidence to allow a HRA to be undertaken at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Environment Agency Support the policy, but also suggest reinforcing the need for a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net gain through this policy Criterion E.</p>	
<p><b>NE2</b> (4 responses)</p>	<p>Historic England, The Canal and River Trust and CPRE all support the policy. Countryside Properties suggest removing reference to the need for a masterplan and the terms green infrastructure and blue infrastructure given the lack of consistency with the NPPF, and as such requirements are unreasonable and unjustified. Suggest that applicants should be asked to include within application details of how the proposed layout and landscaping scheme will contribute to enhancing and protecting existing green corridors and waterways.</p>	<p>No changes in response to comments.</p>
<p><b>NE3</b> (10 responses)</p>	<p>Natural England, the Environment Agency, CPRENY, Baylis and Baylis Ltd all support policy NE3, Glade Developments have no objection.</p> <p>The House Builders Federation, Johnson Mowatt, Persimmon Homes, Brierley Homes and Countryside Partnerships suggest this policy should be deleted or modified to align with National Policy requirements as 10% Biodiversity Net Gain has not been tested for need or viability in the former Selby district alone, and is relying on the wider national policy evidence base, which following roll out and testing may be subject to change.</p>	<p>Removal of 10% requirement replaced with alignment to national policy targets and testing address concerns raised by HBF, Johnson Mowatt, Persimmon Homes, Brierley Homes and Countryside Partnerships.</p> <p>To address comments raised by Natural England and the Environment Agency, additional supporting text has been amended to clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how rivers, streams, canals and riparian zones and habitats can be considered through this policy and</li> </ul>

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>Countryside Partnerships and Persimmon Homes also have concerns regarding the ability of allocated sites to meet identified quanta for development together with a 10% net gain requirement on the same land. Countryside Properties are particularly worried about the impact on agricultural land to be used for habitat creation and the financial, time and administrative burdens of S106 Agreements and question whether such costs have been taken into consideration in the local plan evidence base.</p> <p>They and Baylis and Baylis note that it will be important that the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (or other document) identifies potential locations in the District where off-site gains can be achieved and that a positive approach to habitat banks therefore needs to be adopted in order to ensure that there are no delays to housing delivery in the early years of the Plan period.</p> <p>The Environment Agency and Natural England both advise further links could be made to NE5 Protecting and Enhancing Rivers and Waterbodies and stronger reference to riverine habitat within the NE3 policy and supporting text. They also suggest further information could be provided regarding how applicants should apply the strategic significance value to weighting of habitats or priorities identified within Local Plans and strategies by the metric.</p> <p>Natural England suggest that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clarity could be added to the supporting text in respect of Biodiversity Net Gain applying to all types of development which have the potential to impact on existing habitats, regardless of a habitats' recognised importance, 'designation" or current biodiversity.</li> <li>• the need for bespoke advice on protected sites, irreplaceable habitats or habitats of very high distinctiveness should be highlighted as these are likely to require mitigation and/or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that emerging Local Nature Recovery strategies and North Yorkshire Local Plan Evidence base can provide values for the application of strategic significance values for areas of habitat loss and gain.</li> <li>• consideration of how BNG can be applied to all habitats and not just nature conservation designation and where impacts on designated nature conservation sites should also consider the requirements of policies NE1 and NE5</li> <li>• a baseline value of 0 does not necessary mean that a site cannot be expected to provide any BNG.</li> <li>• provide clarity on baseline date for assessing original habitat value of sites as 30th of January 2020</li> </ul>

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>compensation requirements to be dealt with separately from BNG provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• criterion B2 could be amended to make it clear BNG should be on-site in the first instance, and only where it can be demonstrated this is not deliverable alternative locations may be sought with a preference for those in the immediate vicinity, followed by strategic landscape biodiversity initiatives, such as the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, Nature Recovery Network or Green/Blue Infrastructure (where appropriate).</li> <li>• Reference to sites that have a "0" baseline Biodiversity unit score not being able to provide net gain should be removed as some improvements could still be implemented and specific measures could be set out in a separate SPD.</li> <li>• specific reference should be made to the baseline date given in schedule 14 of the Environment Act for when original baseline habitat values of sites should be taken.</li> </ul> <p>CPRENEY would like to see a greater level of detail within the plan in regard to detailed requirements for specific nature, green infrastructure and and climate related infrastructure and requirements on site such as targets for tree canopy cover or buffering of protected sites and think policy NE3 could go further by setting out specific examples for delivery.</p>	
<b>NE4</b> (1 response)	One response from Historic England in support of the policy.	No changes in response to comments.
<b>NE5</b> (3 responses)	<p>Historic England, The Canal and River Trust and The Environment Agency all support the policy.</p> <p>The Environment Agency also suggest updating references to European Water Framework Directive to The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017, and linking Criterion B9 to policy SG11 in regard to re-naturalising waterbodies, including de-culverting.</p>	Changes made in response to the comments from the Environment Agency
<b>NE6</b>	No comments received.	No changes in response to comments.

Policy	Summary of responses	Changes made in light of responses
(0 responses)		
<b>NE7</b> (1 response)	Natural England supports the policy but recommend the wording of Criterion C also includes protection for Ramsar designations and that further criterion are included to take account of potential impacts of Ammonia emissions from road traffic.	Criteria C.2.i, C.2.iii and C.2.iv and paragraphs 8.62, 8.63, 8.64 and 8.67 amended and a new paragraph added after 8.66 in response to the comments from Natural England.
<b>NE8</b> (3 responses)	The Coal Authority, Environment Agency and the Canal and River Trust all support the policy. The Canal and River Trust suggest adding land stability to the title of the policy. The Coal Authority suggests additional policy wording and requirements around land stability risks.	No changes in response to comments.

#### Summary of Site Policies responses and changes made in light of those responses

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
		<p><b>Please note:</b> The site policies and supporting text of the Publication Local Plan have been amalgamated, further changes made as necessary and the polices format reordered for the Revised Publication stage.</p> <p>The criteria and supporting information references below refer to the policy and supporting text as at Publication stage and may not necessarily match the Revised Publication stage.</p>
<b>S1</b> (2 responses)	Support from Historic England and the Canal and River Trust.	No changes in response to comments.
<b>S2</b> (3 responses)	Support from the site promoter who requests clarification in the supporting text that the new access road (from SELB-CA) will be provided all the way through to allow access for the Ousebank residents and allow the level crossing to close.	<p>No change to the Policy in response to comments.</p> <p>Para 11.6 amended to reflect comments regarding the new access road</p>

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>Support also for the site from Barlby and Osgodby Town Council, but request the site is restricted to commercial and employment uses only.</p> <p>The objection to the site was stated as no economic way to mitigate the degree of flood risk (given the proximity of the river Ouse and thus the likely speed of inundation).</p>	
<p><b>SELB-B</b> (11 responses)</p>	<p>Objections include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High flood risk area</li> <li>• No known plans for closing the chemical works or details of the appropriate relocation site.</li> <li>• Demolition, decontamination and flood risk mitigation makes the viability of the site in doubt.</li> <li>• 5% affordable housing a missed opportunity, when other sustainable sites could deliver 20%.</li> </ul> <p>Natural England advise that there could be possible impacts from the allocation SELB-B on the adjacent Three Lakes and Oakney Wood SINC that need to be considered. There may be opportunities to enhance the adjacent local site and improve habitat connectivity with the wider area.</p> <p>The Environment Agency set out standard flood risk mitigation measures for sites in high flood risk areas.</p> <p>There was support from the Canal and River Trust for the criteria in the policy which reference the canal.</p>	<p>Additional criterion 11 regarding mitigation measures in response to potential impact on nearby Three lakes and Oakney Wood SINC at the request of Natural England.</p>
<p><b>SELB-BZ</b> (18 responses)</p>	<p>There is both support for the site and objections for the site to be allocated.</p> <p>The reasons for objection include flood risk area.</p> <p>Natural England state that the site is in close proximity to Burr Closes SSSI and that consideration should be given to potential impacts on the SSSI due to increased recreational access. The site is also in close proximity to the ancient woodland habitat Barber Rein/Ash Rein. Natural England and the Forestry Commission have produced standing advice for planning authorities in relation to</p>	<p>Policy updated.</p>

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>ancient woodland. Appropriate assessment and mitigation should be specified as a requirement in the plan.</p> <p>Historic England advised that not all of the mitigation measures set out in the HIA are adequately reflected in the Site Requirements for this allocation. Provides recommended changes to policy criteria.</p> <p>The Environment Agency sets out standard flood risk mitigation measures for sites in high flood risk areas.</p>	
<p><b>SELB-CA</b> (4 responses)</p>	<p>Support for the site to be allocated.</p> <p>Concern raised regarding viability and deliverability of the site. Flood risk mitigation should be included within the policy for the site.</p> <p>The Environment Agency sets out standard flood risk mitigation measures for sites in high flood risk areas.</p>	<p>No changes to the policy in response to comments.</p>
<p><b>SELB-CB</b> (1 response)</p>	<p>Support for the site to be allocated for employment uses</p>	<p>No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.</p>
<p><b>SELB-AG</b> (7 responses)</p>	<p>Objections to the site include bad delivery history of the site and within a high flood risk area. Support for the site from the promoter, but considers the specific reference to storey heights as being too prescriptive.</p> <p>Historic England advise that currently, not all of the mitigation measures set out in the HIA are adequately reflected in the Site Requirements for this allocation. They provides recommended changes to policy criteria for a need for a Heritage Impact Assessment and the protection of Historic features</p> <p>The Canal and River Trust advise that there is the opportunity to amend the criterion for up to 3-4 storeys in height with an inclusion of the assessment of shading impacts on the canal.</p> <p>The Environment Agency set out standard flood risk mitigation measures for sites in high flood risk areas.</p>	<p>Criteria 1 and 8 and supporting points a and e amended to reflect the Historic England comments regarding the history of the site, waterside development and boundary treatment. And an additional criterion to set out the need for a Heritage Impact Assessment and the protection of historic features.</p> <p>Amend criterion 7 to reflect the comments of the Canal and River Trust regarding potential shading impacts on the canal.</p>

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
<b>SELB-CR</b> (3 responses)	<p>Objection to the site being allocated in a flood risk area.</p> <p>Historic England states that not all of the mitigation measures set out in the HIA are adequately reflected in the Site Requirements for this allocation. Provides recommended changes to policy criteria.</p> <p>The Environment Agency sets out standard flood risk mitigation measures for sites in high flood risk areas.</p>	<p>Criteria 1 and 3 amended to reflect the comments of Historic England regarding development reflecting the character of the area and sympathetic conversion the Old Maltings building.</p>
<b>SELB-CS</b> (1 response)	<p>Support for this rejected site to be allocated.</p>	<p>No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.</p>
<b>SELB-CU</b> (1 response)	<p>Site no longer has characteristics of a SINC. The biodiversity can be improved by developing the site through ecological enhancement, landscaping and ongoing management. The policy associated with allocating this site for employment development should include criteria such as the provision of a landscaped belt along the western boundary of the site in order to provide a buffer between residential and commercial uses, provide for a new habitat with public access.</p>	<p>No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.</p>
<b>T1</b> (4 responses)	<p>Support for the site from the landowner and from Tadcaster Town Council.</p> <p>The Environment Agency noted that Tadcaster is located on Principal Aquifer and as such groundwater is very sensitive in this location. The creation of a new underground car park has the potential to disturb the aquifer, impacting groundwater resources and quality. The Environment Agency refer to their documents and approach to groundwater protection and physical disturbance of aquifers.</p> <p>A petition to the redevelopment of the car park was received in addition to the objection to the loss of the Central Area Car Park, the parking and housing needs for the town as well as viability and delivery.</p>	<p>No changes to this policy in response to comments.</p> <p>However, criterion 12 of Policy TADC-H amended to reflect Environment Agency's concerns regarding disturbance to the principal aquifer.</p> <p>The issues raised through the petition to be addressed through the EIP.</p>



Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
<b>T2</b> (1 response)	One representation was received which objects to the phasing policy as it would restrict sites coming forward in the town which already had an historical lack of development and flagged that all the sites are inter-related and are needed to deliver the central proposals.	Policy deleted due to this comment and the comment to TADC-AG.
<b>T3</b> (1 response)	Support for new policy from the Town Council, but seeks clarification on ultimate ambition of the policy and the changes since the previous version of the Local Plan. They also raise concerns about the A64/A162 junction. The response to TADC-M (objection to the site not being allocated as TADC-M for sport and recreation) also sets out concern for the Special Policy area (T3) which includes retail, commercial and housing	No changes to the policy in response to these comments.
<b>TADC-B</b> (2 responses)	Responses by landowner and agent supporting this rejected site for development within the Green Belt.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.
<b>TADC-C</b> (2 responses)	Responses by landowner and agent supporting this rejected site for development within the Green Belt.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.
<b>TADC-AD</b> (3 responses)	Support for the site from Tadcaster Town Council. Natural England support the site stating that there is unlikely to be an adverse effect on the Tadcaster Mere SSSI due to its geological notified feature. Historic England concur with eh HIA and welcome the inclusion of appropriate site requirements and supporting text.	No changes to the policy in response to comments.
<b>TADC-AE</b> (4 responses)	Support for the site from the landowner and the Town Council who also suggested access could be a challenge and the development must take into account the surrounding houses. One objection stating there is a Roman Burial Ground on part of the site. Natural England support the site stating that there is unlikely to be an adverse effect on the Tadcaster Mere SSSI due to its geological notified feature.	No changes to the policy in response to comments.
<b>TADC-AG</b> (1 response)	Landowner supporting the rejected site within the Green Belt. Also consider the allocations in Tadcaster have technical constraints and issues around deliverability and developability and therefore	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>can't be relied on to deliver the required growth in this location. This representation also relates to their objection to the phasing policy (T2) for Tadcaster. Lack of delivery of housing over past two decades also impacted affordability and should approve development as swiftly as possible and not restrict sites coming forward. The phasing will also hinder the cross-funding required to deliver the underground Car Park. Further, how can TADC-H be in Phase 1 if it relies on sites in Phase 2?</p>	<p>However, Policy T2 is deleted in response to this comment.</p>
<p><b>TADC-H</b> (5 responses)</p>	<p>Support for the site from landowner. Historic England suggest amendment to the policy and supporting text regarding avoiding or minimising harm to heritage assets. Tadcaster Town Council support the policy but suggest 43 dwellings is too many and request more parking spaces than at present. Objections to underground car park. Objections from rejected sites landowners who are supporting their sites as allocations.</p>	<p>Criterion 12 amended to reflect Environment Agency's concerns regarding disturbance to the principal aquifer as stated in their response to T1. Additional supporting point added as requested by Historic England to support criterion 10. Supporting point c amended to reflect Historic England comments regarding avoiding harm to the significance of designated heritage assets. Supporting point d split into two to reflect the comments of Historic England regarding design and layout to be informed by a new Design Code.</p>
<p><b>TADC-I</b> (6 responses)</p>	<p>Support for the development from landowner but advise the total dwellings in Policy HG1 is 180, not 150. Historic England suggest amendment to the policy and supporting text regarding avoiding or minimising harm to heritage assets. Tadcaster Town Council suggest the inclusion of hydro-scheme and public parking at the town centre side of the site. Also point out the potential for increased traffic on Mill Lane and impact on the supermarket access. Objections from rejected sites landowners who are supporting their sites as allocations. The Environment Agency advise the scheme must take into account the Tadcaster FAS.</p>	<p>Criteria 8 and 10 amended to reflect the wording supplied by Historic England to correctly reflect the designated heritage assets in the vicinity of the allocation and to provide additional text for clarification. Supporting points c, d and e amended to reflect clarifying comments from Historic England.  Policy HG1 amended by total dwellings for site TADC-I to 180 in response to landowner comment.  Policy updated in relation to FAS.</p>
<p><b>TADC-J</b> (4 responses)</p>	<p>Support for the development from landowner. Natural England confirm that there is unlikely to be an adverse effect on Tadcaster Mere SSSI. Tadcaster Town Council suggest the inclusion of a small</p>	<p>No changes to the policy in response to comments.</p>

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
	number of retail units. Objection from a rejected site's landowner who are supporting their site as an allocation.	
<b>TADC-L</b> (4 responses)	Support for this site from Natural England, Historic England and the Town Council. Landowner confirms the total number of dwellings is 10 as in policy TADC-L. The figure in Policy HG1 is incorrect at 17.	No changes to this policy in response to comments.  Amend Policy HG1 total dwellings for site TADC-L to 10.
<b>TADC-M</b> (1 response)	Objection to the site not being allocated as TADC-M for sport and recreation. Concerned as the Special Policy area (T3) includes retail, commercial and housing.	No changes to the policy in response to this comment.
<b>TADC-Y</b> (1 response)	Support for this rejected site to be allocated for employment by landowner.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.
<b>TADC-X</b> (1 response)	Support for this rejected employment site to be reconsidered and allocated for employment and housing by landowner.	Site re-assessed. No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.
<b>SHER-AA</b> (4 responses)	Support for the site, but also for the whole of the site to be brought forward for development (SHER-BF) Concern that the greenfield land to the north identified for flood attenuation. The Policy should be amended to make clear that greenfield element of the site is only for SUDS and no built development. Concern that Plan is over-reliant on large brownfield employment sites which are complex in terms of delivery. The Coal Authority request that development proposals on the site should be supported by a Coal Mining Risk Assessment	Point 7 amended by the addition of a Coal Mining Risk assessment required by the Coal Authority.  Point 2 and supporting point b amended to be clearer that the northern part of the site is only for the drainage basin / pond.
<b>SHER-AK</b> (1 response)	Support for this rejected employment site to be allocated.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.
<b>SHER-AM</b> (1 response)	Support for this rejected site in the Green Belt to be allocated.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.
<b>SHER-BE</b> (1 response)	Support for this rejected site to be allocated.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.
<b>SHER-BF</b> (1 response)	Whilst there is support for the SHER-AA allocation this rep considers that the full site should be brought forward for development (i.e. SHER-BF, the greenfield element to the north).	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
<p><b>SHER-H</b> (32 responses)</p>	<p>Support for the site from developer. Access for northern part of site to be from Conference Court / Rochester Row and Bartlett View as the same developer. Access to southern part of site to be from Low Street. Consider the school drop-off point to be on the west side of Low Street as the same landowner. Sets out biodiversity and water attenuation areas. Sets out that all points in the Publication Policy SHER-H can be achieved but request that the contamination point is removed as not aware of any contamination as SHER-H is an arable, greenfield site. Request dialogue regarding the community facilities to be provided on the site.</p> <p>Significant objections to the use of Bramley Park Avenue / Rochester Row / Conference Court as an access to the site with a loss of Public Open Space, traffic and parking concerns also raised. Suggest using Bartlett View or Low Street for access. Request for more community facilities, shops and infrastructure in the town, especially public transport. Also concerns regarding the merging of Sherburn in Elmet and South Milford. Lack of consultation with residents also quoted.</p> <p>Natural England advise that the 10% biodiversity net gain established in the SA has not been reflected within the site allocation policies "The provision of SUDS and greenspace provides a key opportunity to promote new wildlife habitats and deliver a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain". In addition, SHER-H is in close proximity to Sherburn Willows SSSI. Potential impacts which may arise include increased recreational disturbance. Advise the site is managed by Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and any advice they provide on the allocation should be taken into account.</p>	<p>Criterion 7 and supporting point e updated to reflect various comments on access to the north of the site.</p> <p>A new criterion, and amendments to criterion 4 and supporting point b to reflect updated information on the highways crossing and drop-off point for the school reflecting comments from NYCC Education and Highways.</p> <p>Additional criteria added in relation to SSSI.</p>
<p><b>AROE-I</b> (6 responses)</p>	<p>Some representations duplicate comments made through previous consultations re lack of facilities and services within Appleton Roebuck, including: surface water and foul water capacity; school size; young persons activities; local transport; congestion and</p>	<p>Amend supporting points a and f and create new criterion on landscaping to reflect the comments from Historic England to align with HIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise supporting text to point F to be more concise and state where possible, it is important that Ridge and Furrow is retained</li> </ul>

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>employment opportunities. Potential impacts on heritage and light pollution also raised.</p> <p>Specific concerns were raised regarding suitability of Malt Kiln Lane Access (particularly regarding shared use with wedding venue) as well as the need to incorporate HIA outcomes into site policy. It is also noted that this site has been reduced in size with the deletion of AROE-O and suggests that therefore this final boundary has not been consulted upon, so further opportunities for residents to comment on final suite of sites is requested.</p> <p>Samuel Smith Brewery also suggest the site represents inorganic growth encroaching into the open countryside, that the site is contrary to the Neighbourhood plan and that the settlement as a whole should be revised as a smaller village in the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>Heritage concerns were raised by some, but Historic England confirmed that the mitigation measures (which the Heritage Impact Assessment has put forward) need to be implemented as part of any future development proposal for this area. They also pointed out that currently, not all of the mitigation measures recommended in the assessment are adequately reflected in the Site Requirements for this allocation.</p> <p>The County Highways engineers provided their requirements for the site access.</p>	<p>and positively incorporated into the design of the site, along with biodiversity and open space. Rephrase point f. to ensure it is clear what the Council are trying to achieve by this point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add an additional Site Requirement to read: “Development should be set back from Malt Kiln Lane to maintain its rural character and retain views of the open countryside to the west of the village. “</li> <li>• Add an additional Site Requirement to read: “Provide appropriate landscaping of the western edge of the site mark the transition between settlement edge and the countryside.”</li> </ul> <p>Rewrite supporting point e to reflect the site access requirements of NYCC Highways.</p>
<p><b>AROE-K</b> (4 responses)</p>	<p>Some representations duplicate comments made through previous consultations re lack of facilities and services within Appleton Roebuck, as well as concerns raised re suitability of Malt Kiln Lane Access (particularly regarding shared use with wedding venue) and the previous rejections of planning application on the site due to impact on character and form and procedural issues.</p> <p>Samuel Smith Brewery also suggest the site represents inorganic growth encroaching into the open countryside, that the site is</p>	<p>No changes to the policy in response to comments.</p>

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>contrary to the Neighbourhood plan, that the fundamental sustainability of the site is poor, and that the settlement as a whole should be revised as a smaller village in the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>Further opportunities for residents to comment on final suite of sites is requested.</p> <p>The site developer also fully supports the site and confirms availability, deliverability, social and economic benefits and previous planning application evidence and approvals.</p>	
<p><b>AROE-N</b> (4 responses)</p>	<p>Some representations duplicate comments made through previous consultations re lack of facilities and services within Appleton Roebuck, as well as concerns raised re suitability of Malt Kiln Lane Access (particularly regarding shared use with wedding venue). Samuel Smith Brewery also suggest the site represents inorganic growth encroaching into the open countryside, that the site is contrary to the Neighbourhood plan and that the settlement as a whole should be revised as a smaller village in the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>Further opportunities for residents to comment on final suite of sites is requested.</p> <p>The site developer also fully supports the site and confirms availability, deliverability, social and economic benefits and previous planning application evidence and approvals.</p> <p>Natural England highlight that sufficient site specific ALC survey data should be available to inform decision making. For example, where no reliable or sufficiently detailed information is available, it would be reasonable to expect developers to commission a new ALC survey, for any sites they wish to put forward for consideration in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The County Highways engineers provided their requirements for the site access.</p>	<p>Policy SG4 reflects the comments from Natural England regarding the need for an Agricultural Land Classification Survey. Criterion 4 and the supporting text is removed.</p> <p>Supporting point b is reworded to reflect the site access requirements of NYCC Highways.</p>

<b>Site Policy</b>	<b>Summary of Responses</b>	<b>Changes made in light of responses</b>
<b>BARL-K</b> (3 responses)	There was both support and objection to the site. Concerns included: Site is too far from services. The policy for the site should reflect its proximity to the flood defences and secure a buffer for regulator access for inspection, maintenance or future flood defence works. No development should take place within 16m of the main river (River Ouse).	An additional policy criterion and supporting text added to reflect the response from the Environment Agency regarding proximity to a main river and that no development should take place within 16m of the main river (River Ouse).
<b>BRAY-AC</b> (1 response)	Support for rejected site BRAY-AC to use it for a specialist Haulage business (Campeys Haulage business).	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.
<b>BRAY-B</b> (1 response)	Support for the site to be allocated provided by the agents. Further information provided includes: southern section of the site is in flood zone 1. A highway assessment has shown that access can be achieved on Evergreen Way. An access can also be gained by demolishing a property on Moat Way.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.
<b>BRAY-X</b> (3 responses)	There was both support and objection to the site. Concerns included: Request to limit access from Mill Lane and to require bungalows on the southern half of the site in order to match existing dwellings. Concerns regarding the traffic and education places which would be generated by the development. Access to be from St Wilfred's or Poplars, whilst the frontage along Mill Lane to be maintained as such behind a hedge.	Criterion 7 amended to clarify the purpose of the pedestrian / cycling route on the western edge of the site.
<b>BRAY-Z</b> (1 response)	The objection to this site included: request to limit access from Mill Lane, and request to require bungalows on the southern half of the site in order to match existing dwellings, access to be from St Wilfred's or Poplars, whilst the frontage along Mill Lane to be maintained as such behind a hedge	No changes to the policy in response to comments.
<b>BURN-G</b> (1 response)	Suggest the site should be explored for development once the site has been made safe from flooding as advised by the Environment Agency.	No further action - no longer a requirement to progress a new settlement option.
<b>CAMB-B</b> (2 responses)	Support from both the landowner and the developer to allocate this rejected site for housing.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.
<b>CARL-G</b> (3 responses)	Natural England advised that the site is within 10km of Lower Derwent Valley SPA/Ramsar and Humber Estuary SPA/Ramsar and	Criterion 14 amended to reflect comments of Natural England

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>therefore may have impacts on functionally linked land. Natural England require evidence that there will be no harm to designated Nature conservation sites through harm to functionally linked habitat associated with Lower Derwent Valley SPA/Ramsar and Humber Estuary SPA/Ramsar overlapping with this site - this can be ascertained by surveys to show the land is not a suitable habitat, wintering bird surveys showing land is not used for this purpose, or appropriate mitigation being put in place. Site policy needs to reflect this.</p> <p>Additional evidence to support the development was provided by the developer, but requested that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• criteria 2 is removed for development proposals to ensure single storey dwellings are used in proximity to the existing built development of Broadacres.</li> <li>• The SAM scores are amended with specific evidence provided.</li> <li>• It is not justified not to allocate larger site area extending to the North.</li> </ul> <p>Concerns raised by other respondents include: junction safety issues and the potential for negative impacts on the Grade I listed Carlton Towers.</p>	
<b>CARL-K</b> (1 response)	Support from the developer to allocate this rejected site for housing.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.
<b>CFAB-A</b> (1 response)	Consider using the old airbase for a small housing site in the next Local Plan, not a new settlement.	No further action - no longer a requirement to progress a new settlement option.
<b>CLIF-AB</b> (1 response)	The Plan fails to provide, or to provide adequately, for certain forms of tourism and outdoor leisure. CLIF-AB should be allocated for leisure development because policy EM6 is too restrictive.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.
<b>CLIF-B</b> (0 responses)	n/a	No changes to the policy in response to comments.



Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
<b>CLIF-O</b> (3 responses)	<p>Support for the site stating that Distribution of Housing is inconsistent with Hemingbrough being of a higher tier with more services and should therefore accommodate more growth.</p> <p>Those objecting state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• had the council not scoped out Green Belt at the outset other reasonable alternatives could have been considered.</li> <li>• The current openness of site is an important element in the rural character of Cliffe providing an important break in the building line along Main St and York Road.</li> <li>• The 2021 Landscape Sensitivity Study states that, on the west side of Cliffe, 'larger scale development would result in settlement encroachment'.</li> <li>• The site is in open countryside and not next to other dwellings.</li> <li>• It is inappropriate for a secondary village to have this amount of development.</li> <li>• Development would constitute a significant expansion of the settlement into the open countryside, and of a scale that is disproportionately large to the current built form and character of the settlement.</li> <li>• The village has other sites which are much more appropriate in location.</li> <li>• The inclusion of a school drop-off point encourages the use of private cars.</li> </ul>	No changes to the policy in response to comments.
<b>CRID-C</b> (1 response)	Support for this rejected site to be allocated.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.
<b>EGGB-AA</b> (5 responses)	<p>Concerns regarding the over-development of Eggborough and over-reliance on large brownfield sites to meet employment needs. Support for the site was also received along with the request to incorporate adjacent sites within this site.</p> <p>The owner proposed new wording for criteria 3 and 5 and supporting text a and c regarding their concerns on vehicular</p>	<p>Criterion 5 and part c amended to reflect the comments from St Francis group regarding vehicular access.</p> <p>Additional part 10 and 11 and supporting information point g added to reflect the comments from Natural England regarding the Agricultural Land Classification Survey and a green infrastructure masterplan</p>

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>access and that the policy is worded to restrict the employment to uses that can utilise the on-site rail infrastructure.</p> <p>Natural England highlight that sufficient site specific ALC survey data should be available to inform decision making. For example, where no reliable or sufficiently detailed information is available, it would be reasonable to expect developers to commission a new ALC survey, for any sites they wish to put forward for consideration in the Local Plan. Given the scale of this site Natural England would also like to see the requirement for master-planning of green infrastructure and biodiversity net gain specified in the site requirements.</p>	
<b>EGGB-B</b> (3 responses)	Support for this rejected site which was previously allocated in the Selby Local Plan to be reinstated as an allocation.	Site is now allocated
<b>EGGB-S</b> (3 responses)	Concerns regarding loss of agricultural land, impact on traffic, public transport, infrastructure, loss of amenity space and no local job opportunities. Support for the site and for it to be expanded to include the adjacent site EGGB-AC.	No changes to the policy in response to comments.
<b>EGGB-T</b> (4 responses)	Support for this rejected site to be an allocation.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.
<b>EGGB-U</b> (4 responses)	Support for this rejected site which was previously allocated in the Selby Local Plan to be reinstated as an allocation.	Site is now allocated
<b>EGGB-Y</b> (34 responses)	Objections to this allocated site include: the scale of housing, the impact on the landscape, the additional traffic, the proposed link road, insufficient public transport services, insufficient social infrastructure, pollution, the lack of suitable employment opportunities, the impact on wildlife and ecology, surface flooding and drainage, pollution, carbon emissions and the loss of recreational opportunities. Also provided were the wider concerns that the allocation of this site is not in keeping with the spatial strategy / settlement hierarchy along with deliverability and viability concerns.	Requirements amended to reflect the response of the Canal and River Trust regarding the towpath along the Aire and Calder Navigation to the Konect Business Park. Amended to reflect the comments of Banks Group regarding the local centre, parking provision, bus stops, pipelines and development distances, the feasibility study for the capacity of Eggborough Wastewater Treatment Works, the provision of connections to Whitley Bridge, and affordable dwellings provision respectively.

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>The Canal and River Trust suggested that the towpath along the Aire &amp; Calder navigation provides a good pedestrian link from EGGB-Y to Kellingley Colliery which is being redeveloped and provided suggested wording.</p> <p>Wakefield Council suggested a modification to the policy wording regarding the proposed link road and proposals.</p> <p>Banks Group requested numerous changes to both the policy and supporting text regarding the local centre, parking provision, bus stops, pipelines and development distances, the feasibility study for the capacity of Eggborough Wastewater Treatment Works, the provision of connections to Whitley Bridge, and affordable dwellings provision.</p> <p>Historic England requests that to minimise harm to St Edmunds Listed church development should be set back from the north west corner of the site and be designed to provide a gentle transition between the village edge and the countryside.</p>	<p>Requirements amended to reflect the comments of Historic England and to reflect comments regarding drainage.</p>
<b>HAMB-A</b> (1 response)	<p>Promoter of this rejected site demonstrates that access can be achieved via Chapel Street through the curtilage of an existing property as set out in planning application 2022/0665/OUTM.</p>	<p>The site is now allocated</p>
<b>HAMB-D</b> (1 response)	<p>Site promoter requests a smaller version of this rejected site to be assessed rather than the larger version.</p>	<p>No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.</p>
<b>HAMB-F</b> (9 responses)	<p>Objections to the site include more traffic and there are no services to support the development.</p> <p>Support for the site by the landowner and will meet the requirements of the draft site policy.</p>	<p>No changes to the policy in response to comments.</p>
<b>HAMB-N</b> (13 responses)	<p>Objections to this site include traffic concerns, lack of services and the impact on the Hambleton Hough LILA. Suggest the policy should be more definite in the request for bungalows as the wording is currently ambiguous.</p> <p>The site promoter supports the allocation and has prepared a masterplan that shows 60 dwellings can be provided and requests that the allocation should be expanded to the east. Also provides</p>	<p>Bungalow requirement reworded in criterion 1.</p>

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
	suggested minor wording changes to criterion 4 and supporting text part a.	
<b>HEMB-AE</b> (1 response)	Support for this rejected site to be allocated.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.
<b>HEMB-C</b> (1 response)	Support for this rejected site to be allocated.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.
<b>HEMB-G</b> (9 responses)	Concerns regarding scale of development, impact on infrastructure, public transport provisions, loss of agricultural land, ecology, flooding, loss of recreational opportunities, traffic. Natural England advise that the site is close to the River Derwent SAC and there may be potential for water quality impacts if there isn't available headroom at the Waste Water Treatment Works.	No changes to this policy in response to comments.  However, Policy IC4 is amended in response to comment by Natural England.
<b>HEMB-K</b> (8 responses)	Concerns regarding traffic, lack of infrastructure, loss of agricultural land, ecology, drainage / flooding and loss of recreational opportunities. Support for the site to be extended to incorporate adjacent site HEMB-Z. Natural England advise that the site is close to the River Derwent SAC and there may be potential for water quality impacts if there isn't available headroom at the Waste Water Treatment Works..	No changes to this policy in response to comments.  However, Policy IC4 is amended in response to comment by Natural England.
<b>HEMB-S</b> (7 responses)	Objections received to this site despite it not being allocated for development. Support for the site to be allocated from the promoter of a village hall to be built on part of the site.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.
<b>HEMB-V</b> (1 response)	Support for this rejected site to be allocated.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.
<b>HENS-A</b> (2 responses)	Both support for the development of this rejected site from the promoter and support for the site to be not developed.	Site now allocated.
<b>HENS-L</b> (3 responses)	Objections to the site include: lack of amenities, school capacity issues and public transport. Concerns regarding the narrow road along Wand Lane and highway safety, poor sewer and surface water drainage capacity and subsidence from former coal mining in the area.	No changes to the policy in response to comments.

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
<b>HENS-P</b> (4 responses)	Both support and objection to the site. Those supporting request that the site is enlarged to incorporate site HENS-X.	No changes to the policy in response to comments.
<b>HILL-A</b> (5 responses)	Support by promoter for this rejected site in the Green Belt to be allocated. Objections and concerns raised over the sustainability of site, the impact on the adjacent SINC, the impact on the landscape, drainage infrastructure constraints, the site being within the conservation area and land stability issues. Historic England request that development is confined to the northern and eastern parts of the site to lessen the impact on the Conservation Area.	Point 2 amended to reflect the response of Historic England regarding strengthening the need for a Heritage Impact Assessment.
<b>HILL-D</b> (1 response)	Support for this rejected site in the Green Belt to be allocated.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.
<b>HILL-K</b> (1 response)	Support for this rejected site in the Green Belt to be allocated.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.
<b>KELL-B</b> (34 responses)	Objections and concerns raised due to inadequate drainage and surface water problems, including the site flooding and being within Flood Zone 2 and not Flood Zone 1. Concerns regarding viability of the site when considering mitigation measures in respect of Heritage assets. No reference to underground water mains pipe which crosses the site or electricity cables which pass overhead. Objections to the loss of good agricultural land. Concerns regarding primary school capacity. Reduction in available bus services. Historic England suggest that all recommended mitigation measures in the Heritage Impact Assessment are adequately reflected to ensure no harm to the nearby heritage assets. Kellingley Parish Council suggest the supporting text information is updated to remove reference to Eggborough Power Station dominating the landscape as the power station has now been demolished.	Part 1 and part d of supporting text amended to reflect response of Historic England regarding design and footpath provision respectively. Paragraph 23.2 amended to reflect the response of Kellington Parish Council regarding the demolition of Eggborough Power Station.  Part 8 of the policy amended to reflect the need to ensure the Water Main that crosses the north-west corner of the site has no curtilages of residential properties within the required standoff, as defined by Yorkshire Water.  Part 9 of the policy amended to reflect the need to protect the area of the electricity lines on the site.

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
<b>KELL-G</b> (1 response)	Support the allocation of KELL-G as a housing site in place of KELL-B which is sited in open countryside. To overcome reason for rejection of KELL-G, detailed access plan provided showing suitable access can be achieved from Manor Garth. Comparison of individual site profiles between KELL-B and KELL-G suggesting KELL-G score is incorrect and the reason for rejection (access) can be overcome. Suggest KELL-G is included as an allocated site.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.
<b>MFRY-D</b> (1 response)	Support for this rejected site to be reconsidered for allocation.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.
<b>MFRY-U</b> (1 response)	Support for this rejected site to be reconsidered for allocation.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.
<b>NDUF-B</b> (1 response)	Support for this unallocated site to be allocated as the promoter considers the site to be deliverable and has an access point.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.
<b>NDUF-D</b> (2 responses)	Support for the site to be allocated. The proposal for the site now includes a pedestrian link to the west of the site directly onto Back Lane, via the demolition of a bungalow. Therefore, the reason for rejecting the site as an allocation has been overcome by the promoter. The site can also be extended to include more land to the north.	Site is now an allocation. Policy worded to reflect comments from the Preferred Options (2021) and Publication (2022) consultations regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• footpath links to the village,</li> <li>• S106 contributions for additional school places,</li> <li>• The possibility of archaeological impacts recognised with the need for an archaeological assessment</li> <li>• S106 contributions mentioned for education needs arising from the development of the site.</li> </ul>
<b>NDUF-O</b> (4 responses)	Objections due to disproportionate size of the development. Impact on the North Duffield Carrs natural nature reserve and the Lower Derwent Valley National Nature Reserve and the birds which use this as their habitat. The site promoters have proposed to extend the scheme eastwards and have changed the access arrangements for the site. Gothic Farm land is not used and the access now extends further down Back Lane to the east. Creating an access involves removal of trees and front gardens on Back Lane.	No changes to the policy in response to comments.

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>Natural England advise that the allocation of NDUF-O may lead to additional recreational impact to the Lower Derwent Valley SPA/SAC and Ramsar. Welcome consideration of a 400m buffer around the Lower Derwent Valley designations in order to avoid and mitigate for recreational disturbance and urban edge effects from housing or tourism development which are difficult to avoid in closer proximity. Significant avoidance and mitigation measures would need to be provided for this option to be advanced such as the provision of alternative greenspace, signage, provision of gates or information provision to new residents. Requirement for an access management or recreation strategy in order to inform the development of the site.</p>	
<p><b>NTHP-A</b> (1 response)</p>	<p>Support for the allocation of this site</p>	<p>No changes to the policy in response to comments.</p>
<p><b>OSGB-C</b> (4 responses)</p>	<p>Concerns regarding traffic, infrastructure capacity, air pollution, noise and amenity.</p>	<p>No changes to the policy in response to comments.</p>
<p><b>OSGB-D</b> (5 responses)</p>	<p>Concerns regarding traffic, infrastructure capacity, air pollution, noise and amenity. Site promoter stated that NYCC Heritage Services raised no objection therefore no need for site requirement for an Archaeological Assessment to be undertaken. Object to the restriction to 2 storeys in height.</p>	<p>No changes to the policy in response to comments.</p>
<p><b>OSGB-G</b> (5 responses)</p>	<p>Objections due to loss of agricultural land and lack of services in Osgodby. Concerns over vehicle access onto South Duffield Road. Concern regarding historical evidence not being considered. Site promoter objects to the restriction of 2 storeys in height. 2.5 or 3 storey buildings which may be able to be delivered without any detrimental impact to the existing residents in terms of overlooking, shadowing or overdevelopment. Want the school provision to only be provided if evidenced and the affordable housing to be provided subject to viability.</p>	<p>No changes to the policy in response to comments.</p>

<b>Site Policy</b>	<b>Summary of Responses</b>	<b>Changes made in light of responses</b>
<b>OSGB-H</b> (1 response)	Objection to the site being rejected and the reason for rejection stated as the site is too big for village when this is inconsistent with the allocation of the EGGB-Y site.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.
<b>OSGB-I</b> (6 responses)	Objections stating the site is too big for Osgodby. Objections due to loss of agricultural land and lack of services in Osgodby. Concerns over vehicle access onto South Duffield Road. There is a need for further planting to the northern border to protect views from South Duffield Road. The landowner requests further clarity on what is meant by criteria 1 "the development should act as a transition point from the village to open countryside". Include the Hollies as an additional vehicular access point. Also requested an amendment to point 8 to enable the removal of trees on the boundary if required and supported by appropriate evidence.	Vehicular access requirements amended.
<b>OSGB-K</b> (2 responses)	Site promoter disagrees with the reason for rejection "green wedge to be retained as open space for the benefit of the community". It has no characteristics of a wedge shape or location with respect to adjacent land and it is in private ownership. There are no physical, technical or ownership constraints to its development and it is well related to adjacent housing.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.
<b>OSGB-L</b> (2 responses)	States that the development of this site would not have a negative impact on the openness and setting of the Strategic Countryside Gap. Site is deliverable and in flood zone 1. Recognise that access points onto the A19 and improvements on the A19 are required, but these improvements are within adopted highway or land in the landowner's control.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.
<b>OSGB-N</b> (8 responses)	Objections due to loss of agricultural land and the lack of services and infrastructure in Osgodby. Concerns over the state of the PROW. Concerns that adding services will lead to more houses. Need to ensure that sufficient site-specific Agricultural Land Classification Survey data is available. Natural England request a Soil survey is undertaken.	No changes to the policy in response to comments. Requirements amended in relation to ALC and soil survey on the request of Natural England.



Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
	Support for the site from the Local Education Authority as the provision of a school in this location is seen as essential to enable the local authority to meet local demand for places.	
<b>RICC-J</b> (1 response)	Support for the site from the landowner who states that the full extent of the site should be developed for 180 homes because their transport study confirms that the surrounding roads can be made suitable to accommodate the extra traffic generated from this many homes.	Information added to the site assessment. No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.
<b>SMIL-B</b> (1 response)	Support for this rejected site in the Green Belt to be allocated from landowner.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.
<b>SMIL-C</b> (1 response)	Support for this rejected site in the Green Belt to be allocated from landowner.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.
<b>SMIL-D</b> (1 response)	The Stillingfleet Mine site should be reassessed for employment provision given the proximity to Heronby.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comment.
<b>STIL-D</b> (147 responses + 742 emails and petitions signatures (excluding duplication))	<p>Both support, but mainly objection to the new settlement of Heronby.</p> <p>Concerns raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the spatial approach and the new settlement option</li> <li>• No need for a new settlement in this plan period</li> <li>• Infrastructure delivery – schools, highways, water, waste water</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Impact on the landscape</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land</li> <li>• Design of the settlement</li> <li>• Funding implications</li> <li>• Impact on biodiversity</li> <li>• Objection to the proposed new settlement at Heronby:</li> <li>• Ambitious build out rates proposed - NPPF (2021) paragraph 22 clarifies that new settlements and major</li> </ul>	Site removed as an allocation.

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
	<p>urban extensions will need to look over a longer time frame, of at least 30 years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• instead of 15 years, to take into account the likely timescale for delivery.</li> <li>• Site would comprising 12% of the overall housing supply across the District.</li> <li>• Proposals have been introduced at a late stage of the Plan making process</li> <li>• Close proximity to the boundary with the City of York and only circa 6.5km from the proposed new settlement at Elvington, which the Selby Plan has not paid sufficient diligence to.</li> <li>• City of York Councils formal objection to the Selby Local Plan with regard to the wider highway network.</li> <li>• Need for extended negotiations with Highways England and Homes England regarding infrastructure delivery and funding around the A19 and A64 intersection and surrounding area.</li> <li>• The proposed bypass is a major piece of infrastructure which could face significant unknowns which have yet to be sufficiently investigated.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>THRP-K</b> (3 responses)</p>	<p>Various changes to policy wording suggested by the site developer to allow greater flexibility in the development of the site. Support for the site from the adjacent landowner of rejected site (THRP-X) to achieve development of their site as well. Objection from landowner of Thorpe Willoughby rejected sites.</p>	<p>No changes to the policy in response to comments.</p>
<p><b>THRP-N</b> (2 responses)</p>	<p>Objection from landowner of Thorpe Willoughby rejected sites. Site assessment to be amended as the site is not disconnected as it is adjacent to an allocation</p>	<p>No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.</p>
<p><b>THRP-U</b> (1 response)</p>	<p>Site assessment to be amended to be consistent with other Thorpe Willoughby sites regarding proximity to road and rail network. Highways is a design issue can be resolved</p>	<p>No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.</p>

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
<b>THRP-V</b> (4 responses)	Site should be pdl to achieve 5% low value area rate in policy HG7. Support for the site from the adjacent landowner of rejected site (THRP-X) to achieve development of their site as well. Objection from landowner of Thorpe Willoughby rejected sites. Objection to being labelled as a Thorpe Willoughby site as it is within Hambleton Parish.	No changes to the policy in response to comments.
<b>THRP-W</b> (2 responses)	Support for this rejected site to be allocated. Objection to being labelled as a Thorpe Willoughby site as it is within Hambleton Parish.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.
<b>THRP-X</b> (1 response)	Site assessment to be amended to be consistent with other Thorpe Willoughby sites regarding proximity to road and rail network. The site should be allocated and it presents an opportunity for comprehensive development to the west of Thorpe Willoughby	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.
<b>ULLE-D</b> (1 response)	Support from the promoter for this rejected site to be allocated.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.
<b>ULLE-H</b> (1 response)	Support from the promoter for this rejected site to be allocated.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.
<b>ULLE-K</b> (3 responses)	Support from the site from the site promoter. Historic England advise that the site is adjacent to Manor Farm Cottages, a Grade II Listed Building. Development of this area could harm elements which contribute to the significance of this heritage asset. They agree with the conclusions of the Heritage Impact Assessment for this site with regards to the potential impact of development on the significance of heritage assets in its vicinity. They endorse the mitigation measures which have been put forward in the assessment and consider that these are likely to be effective in reducing the harm to the level indicated. Natural England advise that the site is in close proximity to Bolton Percy Ings SSSI and Kirkby Wharfe SSSI. Potential impacts which may arise to the notified features of these sites due to increased recreational disturbance from this allocation should be considered.	Additional criteria added in relation to SSSI.

Site Policy	Summary of Responses	Changes made in light of responses
ULLE-M (2 responses)	Support from the promoter for this rejected site to be allocated.	No changes to the decision for the site to be rejected in response to comments.