

# Sequential Approach to the Managed Release of Residential Development Sites

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Council has adopted Interim Planning Guidance 1 (IPG) in response to the policy direction for the delivery of housing through the planning system based on the Government's 'plan, monitor, manage' approach.
- 1.2 The principal objectives of this approach are to control the pattern and speed of urban growth and deliver the authority's target of recycling previously developed land. Presently, that IPG states that, "...it is unlikely that the Council would need to approve planning applications for any further substantial Greenfield sites in any part of the East Riding."
- 1.3 This approach is reviewed every year against the level of housing completions, the supply of potential housing land and the annual requirements set out in the Joint Structure Plan for Hull and the East Riding 2 (JSP). The review of the IPG published in July 2005<sup>3</sup> indicated that there is a need to release a number of major Greenfield sites in the Western JSP sub-area.
- 1.4 The purpose of this document is to set out a sequential approach for the release of major allocated Greenfield sites in a manner that meets the requirements of current policies and guidance.
- 1.5 A broad sequential approach for the review, allocation and release of housing land is already set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)<sup>4</sup> and the JSP. The purpose of this document is to develop that broad sequential approach further by setting out a more detailed mechanism to guide the release of land on a site-by-site basis in the Western JSP sub-area.
- 1.6 This document has been prepared after consultation with parish councils, house builders and agents during September/October 2005. A schedule of individual responses, including officer comments and proposed amendments to the consultation draft is available upon request from the Forward Planning Manager.
- 1.7 The Sequential Approach as detailed below will be used as a 'tool' to help officers and Members judge which sites are most appropriate for release. The decision on which sites to release will be based on the criteria set out in the Sequential Approach and consideration of the housing requirement position.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Managed Release of Residential Development Sites, Interim Planning Guidance, ERYC, October 2003

<sup>2</sup> Joint Structure Plan for Kingston upon Hull and the East Riding of Yorkshire, July 2005

<sup>3</sup> Available from the Council's Forward Planning Manager

<sup>4</sup> Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire and the Humber based on Selective Review of RPG12

## 2. Policy Background

### PPG3: Housing <sup>5</sup>

- 2.1 Planning Policy Guidance note 3 ‘Housing’ (PPG3) sets out the Government’s commitment to promoting more sustainable patterns of development. This includes concentrating most additional housing development within urban areas and making more efficient use of land by maximising the re-use of previously-developed land<sup>6</sup>.
- 2.2 A ‘plan, monitor, manage’ approach has been established which requires local planning authorities to monitor and manage the provision and release of housing sites including the managed release of housing sites in support of the planning strategy set out in the Development Plan (RSS, JSP and the Local Plan/Local Development Framework (LP/LDF)). Guidance in PPG3 advises that local planning authorities should:  
*"manage the release of sites over the plan period in order to control the pattern and speed of urban growth, ensure that the new infrastructure is co-ordinated with new housing development and deliver the local authority's recycling target."* <sup>7</sup>
- 2.3 By managing the release of sites, local planning authorities can influence not just the location of new development but the type of sites released, the order in which they are released for development and the timing of that development.
- 2.4 Within this context, local planning authorities are expected to assess the suitability of sites for housing development through the application of a ‘sequential approach’. Essentially, this expects local planning authorities to assess potential housing sites against each of the following criteria <sup>8</sup>:
- the **availability of previously-developed sites** and empty or under-used buildings and their suitability for housing use;
  - the **location and accessibility** of potential development sites to jobs, shops and services by modes other than the car, and the potential for improving such accessibility;
  - the **capacity of existing and potential infrastructure**, including public transport, water <sup>and</sup> sewerage, other utilities and social infrastructure (such as schools and hospitals) to absorb further development and the cost of adding further infrastructure;
  - the **ability to build communities** to support new physical and social infrastructure and to provide sufficient demand to sustain appropriate local services and facilities; and
  - the **physical and environmental constraints on development of land**, including, for example, the level of contamination, stability and flood risk, taking into account that such risk may increase as a result of climate change.

### PPG13: Transport <sup>9</sup>

- 2.5 The Government is seeking to link planning and transport to ensure that local planning authorities develop complementary plans. Consideration of development plan allocations

---

<sup>5</sup> Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: ‘Housing’, Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions, March 2000

<sup>6</sup> PPG3 Housing paragraph 21

<sup>7</sup> PPG3 Housing paragraph 33

<sup>8</sup> PPG3 Housing paragraph 31

<sup>9</sup> Planning Policy Guidance Note 13: ‘Transport’, Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions, April 2001

and local transport priorities and investment should be closely linked<sup>10</sup>. Local authorities should seek to make maximum use of the most accessible sites, such as those in town centres and others which are, or will be, close to major transport interchanges.

- 2.6 Local planning authorities are asked to produce consistent development plans and transport strategies that help achieve sustainable development objectives, namely:
- to focus land uses which are major generators of travel demand in city, town and district centres and near to major public transport interchanges;
  - to actively manage the pattern of urban growth and the location of major travel generating development to make the fullest use of public transport; and
  - to locate day to day facilities which need to be near their clients in local and rural service centers (where people would have the ability to meet most of their needs locally), and
  - to adopt measures to ensure safe and easy access, particularly by walking and cycling.
- 2.7 This reaffirms the position of PPG3 of maximising the use of land in sustainable locations and to reduce the need to travel by car.

### **Regional Spatial Strategy**

- 2.8 The Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire and the Humber includes a broad sequential approach where previously developed land and buildings in urban areas are considered before other infill and extensions. In rural areas, development and housing allocations are restricted to meeting local needs particularly for affordable housing (such as for those who need to work in the area and cannot afford housing on the open market) and/or supporting sustainable local services. Priority is given to the re-use of previously-developed land or buildings. Policy H2 of the RSS is detailed below:

#### **Policy H2 Sequential approach to the allocation of housing land**

- a) Subject to any overriding consideration of the relative sustainability of different locations and to the advice in PPG 3 (particularly paragraphs 31 and 70), the order of preference in the sequential approach to be applied through development plans to the allocation of land should be as follows:-
- i) previously-developed land and conversions of existing buildings to housing use within urban areas subject to providing decent accommodation in an acceptable setting
  - ii) other infill within urban areas, subject to achieving appropriate standards of urban greenspace and conserving (and where possible, enhancing) the character of the area
  - iii) extensions to main urban areas where the land is accessible or capable of being made accessible to services and jobs by good public transport and other non-car modes; priority to be given to the use of previously developed sites and conversions before greenfield land
  - iv) extensions to market and coalfield towns where the land is accessible or capable of being made accessible to services and jobs by good public transport and other non-car modes; priority to be given to the use of previously-developed sites and conversions before greenfield land
  - v) other development that supports the regional spatial strategy and which provides, or has the potential to provide, good public transport and non-car mode links to a wide range of employment and services

---

<sup>10</sup> PPG13 Transport paragraph 20

b) In rural areas, the provision of housing should be to meet local needs and/or support local services, giving priority to the re-use of previously developed land or buildings and to conserving (and where possible enhancing) the character of the small town or village.

## Joint Structure Plan

2.9 Joint Structure Plan for Hull and the East Riding<sup>11</sup> sets out a clear development strategy. The location, scale and type of development should support the overall development strategy set collectively by policies DS1, DS2, DS3, DS4 and DS5<sup>12</sup> that establishes a hierarchy of settlements with appropriate levels of development. Policy H3 establishes a sequential approach for housing development in the Hull and East Riding area:

### Policy H3

In order to ensure that the scale and location of development supports the JSP development strategy, and the rate of development is in accordance with the housing provision requirements set out in Policy H1, a sustainable approach will be adopted to:

- (a) review existing housing allocations and lapsed planning consents with a view to dispensing with sites which no longer conform with the strategy of the JSP; and
- (b) identify any new land for housing development that might be required, manage the release of housing land and minimise environmental impact.

The sequential approach will be applied at the sub-area level. Within each sub-area priority will be given to the use of previously developed land and buildings followed by other suitable infill in the identified development strategy settlements. Where sufficient land in these categories cannot be found to meet the requirements set out in Policy H1, consideration should be given to urban extensions to these settlements in the priority order established through Policies DS1 – 3, followed if necessary by sites around nodes in good public transport corridors.

2.10 Furthermore, Table 6.4 of the JSP (see Table 1, below) sets out the broad application of the sequential approach as an interpretation of the approach set out in PPG3 and the RSS to guide the review, allocation and release of housing land in the JSP area.

**Table 1: Application of the Sequential Approach (Table 6.4, JSP)**

<i>Sequential Approach by Sub-area</i>	Within Settlements		Extensions			
	Previously developed land etc.	Other suitable infill within settlements	Sub-regional Urban Area	Principal Towns	Towns	Public Transport Nodes
Central	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	5 <sup>th</sup>	6 <sup>th</sup>
Northern	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>			3 <sup>rd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>
Eastern	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>		3 <sup>rd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	5 <sup>th</sup>
Western	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>		3 <sup>rd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	5 <sup>th</sup>

<sup>11</sup> see footnote 2

<sup>12</sup> Policies D1-DS5 are set out in Appendix A

## **Local Development Framework**

- 2.11 The Council has identified the Housing Development Plan Document as one of the priority Documents to be produced as part of its Local Development Framework. This sequential approach will be reviewed as part of the preparation of this Document.

## **Interim Policy Guidance on the Managed Release of Residential Development Sites**

- 2.12 As stated above, the Council adopted Interim Planning Guidance (IPG) on the Managed Release of Residential Development Sites in October 2003. The purpose of the guidance was to manage the supply of residential sites in line with the dwelling requirements set out in the JSP and to improve the area's recycling target in terms of maximising greater use of previously-developed land.
- 2.13 The IPG is reviewed annually, but at present, the IPG:
- Confirms that previously-developed land will continue to be approved in accordance with the Development Plan and other material considerations;
  - Sets out a number of Greenfield 'pragmatic exceptions' and;
  - Restricts the release of major Greenfield sites unless they are needed to meet the strategic housing requirement.

## **3. Sequential Approach to the Release of Major Greenfield Sites**

- 3.1 The annual update of the managed release IPG in July 2005 recommended that a number of major Greenfield sites be released in the western JSP sub-area. It was agreed that those sites be released through the application of a sequential approach identifying the most appropriate sites for residential development.

## **Targeting Development in Appropriate Locations**

- 3.2 The RSS and JSP require a particular sequential approach to managing the supply of housing, as detailed in Table 1 above. This is founded on JSP policies DS1-5 that set out a clear settlement hierarchy within each JSP sub-area where the sub-regional urban area (DS1) is the main focus for activity and where limited development will be allowed in smaller settlements in certain circumstances (DS4 areas). Housing policies within the JSP support this approach by ensuring the scale and type of development envisaged within each of the settlements identified is commensurate with the development policies.
- 3.3 The JSP outlines the housing provision requirements by sub-area, though it stops short of prescribing proportions of development for each level of the hierarchy (as defined by policies DS1-4). In order to ensure that any release of greenfield sites accord with the development and housing policies set out in the RSS and JSP, it is necessary to establish a distribution of housing completions by settlement type (i.e. DS1-DS4 settlements).
- 3.4 Table 2 sets out the number of settlements in each level of the hierarchy by sub-area according to policies DS1-DS3. Settlements not identified under DS1-DS3 have not been included within Table 2 as they are not intended as settlements for substantial provision<sup>13</sup>. The Council is preparing a LDF Development Plan Document (DPD) that will establish which settlements are designated 'smaller settlements' under policy DS4.

---

<sup>13</sup> JSP Policy H7 see also Policies DS4 and DS5

**Table 2: Settlement Types by Sub-Areas**

JSP Sub-area	Sub-regional Urban Area (DS1)	Principal Towns (DS2)	Towns (DS3)
Central (ER)	1	1	2
Eastern	0	1	2
Western	0	1	2
Northern	0	0	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>

3.5 Table 2 provides a basis for assessing a desired distribution of development by settlement type for each sub-area. Further to this, table 3 sets out a distribution of the total housing requirement for the Western JSP sub-area by settlement type that is suggested in the ‘Issues and Options’ paper as consistent with the overall JSP strategy<sup>14</sup>.

**Table 3: Potential Dwelling Distribution by Settlements by 2016**

JSP Sub-area	DS2 <i>Goole</i>	DS3 Howden Snaith	DS4
Western	40-50%	30-40%	10-30%

3.6 Table 3 reflects the RSS/JSP requirement to focus residential development in those settlements which are more sustainable – i.e. DS1 > DS2 > DS3 > DS4. The figures take into account the distribution and number of settlements (DS1 to DS3) by sub-area as set out in Table 2.

3.7 In the Western JSP sub-area, it is suggested that 40-50% of completions should take place in the principal town (Goole) as the most sustainable location followed by 30-40% of completions in the towns (Howden, Snaith). Only a small proportion of the total requirement for housing is suggested for the DS4 settlements (see paragraph 3.4). It is unlikely any Greenfield land will need to be released in DS4 settlements to meet the required housing numbers set out in the JSP and in the desired distribution as illustrated in Table 3.

### Current Completion Levels

3.8 The distribution levels detailed in Table 3 can be considered against the trends of recent housing completion levels. This will establish the shortfall between the desired focus of the JSP and the prevailing situation within the East Riding.

3.9 Table 4 details the number of housing completions in the Western JSP sub-area between 2001-02 and 2004-05 by settlement type. Each parish has been classified according to its settlement type (e.g. Goole is DS2, Howden and Snaith are DS3, and others are DS4).

3.10 It shows that in the Western JSP sub-area over the last four (financial) years, house completion levels in Goole (DS2) accounted for just 27% of total completions (around 58 housing completions per annum). In Snaith and Howden (DS3), housing completions averaged around 71 per annum, or 33% of the total Western JSP sub-area completions. The remaining 41% of completions were in smaller settlements outside Goole, Howden and Snaith (average of 89 per annum).

<sup>14</sup> The ‘Issues and Options Consultation Paper’, August 2005, is part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) preparation process.

**Table 4: Housing Completions in the East Riding by Settlement Type (2001-2004)**

JSP Sub Area	Year	DS2		DS3		DS4		Grand Total
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	
Western	2001	24	18%	33	24%	79	58%	136
	2002	72	34%	57	27%	86	40%	215
	2003	67	24%	115	42%	93	34%	275
	2004	70	28%	80	32%	99	40%	249
Western Total		233		285		357		875
Western Avege		58	27%	71	33%	89	41%	218
Table 3 distribution			40-50%		30-40%		10-30%	

- 3.11 To reach the suggested distribution in the Principal Town, completion levels would have to almost double in Goole, remain around the same level in the Towns, and significantly reduce in the smaller settlements (DS4).
- 3.12 The identification of sites to release will take into account the desired hierarchical distribution of housing completions as outlined in the JSP and to be developed through the Housing Development Plan Document (DPD). The current completion rates and existing consents will also help inform the decision to release particular sites.

#### **Infill Sites and Extension Sites**

- 3.13 The approach to releasing one site within a settlement in favour of another also needs to be consistent with the guidance and policies outlined in PPG3, RSS and the JSP.
- 3.14 Table 6.4 of the JSP (see Table 1 above) establishes a sequential approach under JSP policy H3 whereby previously-developed land should be prioritised before other infill sites within suitable settlements for all four sub-areas. Furthermore these sites should be released before urban extension sites.
- 3.15 The definitions of infill and urban extension locations need to be clarified. For the purposes of this exercise the following definitions are used:

**Infill Site:** A parcel of land within the existing built up area of a settlement that is surrounded by development on all sides or on all but one full side. Development would include uses such as residential, employment, leisure, retail and education. It would also include safeguarded recreation and open spaces that lie within the defined development limits.

**Extension Site:** Any site that will extend the settlement's existing built up area beyond its present confines. Extension sites may have more than one full side abutting the defined open countryside or less than three full sides surrounded by development.

It should be noted that the definition of the built up area is not necessarily the extent of the defined development limit.

- 3.16 The following pages illustrate a number of examples of both infill and extension sites using the definitions outlined above.

## Examples



1. **Infill Site** – the site is within the existing built up area and is surrounded by residential development on all of its four sides.



2. **Infill Site** – the site is within the existing built up area and is bounded on the east and west sides by residential use, on the north by a school/recreation land and on the south by a highway and residential use.

## Examples



**3. Infill Site** – the site is within the existing built up area and is surrounded by residential development on three of its four sides.



**4. Extension Site** – the site shares just one border with the settlement's existing built up area (although the site is within the current development limits).

## Examples



**5. Extension Site** – the site shares two of its borders with existing residential uses but development would lead to an extension of the built up area.



**6. Extension Site** – the site is only bounded on the east by existing residential development and its development would result in an extension of the existing built up area.

Please Note: These examples are for illustration purposes only. They have been chosen to illustrate particular types of extension and infill development as defined in paragraph 3.15. Other factors detailed below would need to be taken into consideration before release.

## Site Availability

- 3.17 It is important that any sites released are genuinely available and free of physical constraints. There are a number of constraints that can hinder the development of sites and any sequential approach needs to take account of the likelihood of development within a specified timescale.
- 3.18 For land to be genuinely available for development, sites must be:
- a) free, or easily freed from, planning, physical and ownership constraints, with the owner being prepared to develop the site in the short term;
  - b) capable of being developed economically;
  - c) in areas where potential house buyers want to live; and
  - d) suitable for the range of housing types that the market requires.
- 3.19 Those sites prioritised for development should meet these criteria and should be free of any constraints that can be overcome with normal investment. These constraints would include:
- |                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| Ownership               | - Willingness to release land and multiple ownership  |
| Physical                | - Drainage, topography and flood risk.  |
| Environmental           | - Nature constraints, contamination and noise.  |
| Infrastructure capacity | - Utilities (roads, access, electricity, sewerage and water).<br>- Social (schools, hospitals and other health facilities). |
- 3.20 To analyse potential constraints, the Council will seek advice, where relevant, from key stakeholders such as utility companies, environmental bodies and transport agencies. Due consideration will also be given to the Landscape Character Assessment currently being prepared for the Council.

## Ability to Build Communities

- 3.21 The regeneration merits of releasing a particular site will also be considered as part of the sequential approach. Paragraph 31 of PPG3 states that “the ability to build communities to support new physical and social infrastructure and to provide sufficient demand to sustain appropriate local services and facilities” should be considered as part of the allocation and release process.
- 3.22 Where it can be demonstrated that the release of a site will add to the sustainability of a community, in terms of supporting local services and creating a mix of uses or house types, additional weight will be given to prioritising the site for release.

## Relationship to Services and Facilities

- 3.23 Planning Policy Guidance note 13 (Transport) highlights the importance of the relationship between land use planning and accessibility issues. Both PPG3 and PPG13 stress the need for local planning authorities to “*build in ways which exploit and deliver accessibility by public transport to jobs, education and health facilities, shopping, leisure and local services*”.<sup>15</sup>
- 3.24 As part of the sequential approach for allocating sites for housing development within local development frameworks, local planning authorities are expected to consider their accessibility to employment, shops and services.
- 3.25 Access to jobs and services should primarily be available by modes other than the car. Local planning authorities need to ensure that these facilities are located near residential areas within

---

<sup>15</sup> PPG13 Transport paragraph 13

walking and cycling distances or on public transport routes. This approach should be adopted for the managed release of residential development sites.

3.26 Furthermore, accessibility planning is an integral part of Local Transport Plans and guidance from the Department for Transport highlights four key destination areas that those Plans will need to focus on. They are:

- Access to work
- Access to learning
- Access to shopping
- Access to health

3.27 The managed release of residential development sites also needs to consider accessibility in relation to these four key destinations. A number of indicators can be used to determine the most sustainable locations within a settlement.

### **Employment**

3.28 Possible indicators: *Distance to nearest concentration of employment*

Employment land is a significant generator of traffic movements, especially by car. Through releasing residential land close to existing (or proposed) employment concentrations, opportunities may be created to access employment by means other than the car. The definition of a concentration of employment will generally include<sup>16</sup>:

- An industrial estate or other employment area within or adjacent to the development limits of the settlement
- The commercial core/central shopping area of a settlement (as identified in the Local Plans) and/or;

It is acknowledged that not everyone will find opportunities in such employment centres.

### **Learning**

3.29 Indicator: *Distance to nearest primary school*

Access to the nearest sustainable primary school is a significant factor in generating traffic due to the frequency of access and volume of activity. Releasing sites within walking distances of primary schools should be one of the main determinants of evaluating accessibility.

### **Shopping**

3.30 Indicator: *Distance to nearest food shop (large convenience store)*

Large convenience stores/supermarkets (4,000-25,000ft<sup>2</sup> of floorspace<sup>17</sup>) generate high volumes of traffic and attract shoppers from broad catchment areas. Releasing sites closer to existing provision may help reduce the number of car borne journeys, as some people will be able to utilise alternative modes of transport and also the distance of any journeys that are made.

### **Health**

3.31 Indicator: *Distance to nearest GP premises*

---

<sup>16</sup> Key employment concentrations have been mapped using results from the Census 2001 (Origin Destination tables) and in conjunction with the Council's Economic Development team.

<sup>17</sup> Eurostat definition of a supermarket (4,000-25,000ft<sup>2</sup>/371-2,323m<sup>2</sup>) distinguished from a mini market and superstore/hypermarket. *Retailing in the European Single Market*, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg, 1993.

Access to a GP is important for all sections of society and people should be able to use a variety of transport modes to reach them. This particular indicator is potentially more helpful in determining the most sustainable sites compared to indicators looking at access to health centres and hospitals (there is a varied range of facilities provided by such establishments which would lead to inconsistencies in the comparison of sites).

### **Other Factors/Public Transport**

- 3.32 To aid access to each of the above four key destinations (and other facilities within the locality), two indicators for public transport will be used to further the analysis of the relative accessibility of a particular site. They are:
- *Distance to nearest train station*
  - *Distance to nearest bus stop*
- 3.33 The Council is developing an Accessibility Strategy that will form part of the second Local Transport Plan for the period, 2005-2010. The Strategy will incorporate a mechanism for analysing the accessibility of individual locations within the authority area and will use a large number of indicators and sophisticated data.
- 3.34 The Accessibility Strategy will inform the Local Development Framework and help determine a number of relevant spatial planning and local transport planning targets. Indicators involving distances to services and facilities will be more robust in terms of using actual walking distances and actual journey times using public transport information.
- 3.35 In advance of this Accessibility Strategy, a more simple points system has been devised to prioritise those sites that are most sustainable according to the key destination criteria. To distinguish between sites, a series of acceptable walking distances of 400m (approximately 5 minutes walk), 800m (approximately 10 minutes walk) and 1200m (approximately 15 minutes walk) has been established to capture data relating to the accessibility of each site.
- 3.36 The distances chosen have been selected to provide a range of acceptable walking/cycling distances to each destination. A suggested distance of 400m was provided by the Council's Transport Policy team as an acceptable walking distance to a bus stop. A gradient of relative proximity is provided by the addition of two further bandings (800m and 1200m) which may be achieved through walking and/or cycling.
- 3.37 For example, a site within a walking distance of 400m of all four key destinations should be prioritised before a site that is within a walking distance of 400m of just one key destination. Although the four key destinations are equally valued within the Government's social inclusion agenda, the Council will apply various weights to different key destination points reflecting their impact on traffic generation. The scoring system is as follows:

**Table 5: Scoring System for Access to Services**

	Distance from key destination (average walking time)		
	Within 400m (5 mins)	Within 800m (10 mins)	Within 1200m (15 mins)
<b>Employment</b>	3 points	2 points	1 point
<b>Primary School</b>	3 points	2 points	1 point
<b>Supermarket</b>	2.5 points	1.75 points	0.75 points
<b>GP Premises</b>	2 points	1 point	0.5 points
<b>Train Station</b>	2.5 points	1.75 points	0.75 points
<b>Bus Stop</b>	3 points	2 points	1 point

- 3.38 The need to access employment and primary education is an almost everyday event, which accounts for a large proportion of the traffic on the East Riding's roads. This is reflected in the scoring system by ensuring that those sites located close to employment concentrations and primary schools are awarded maximum (3) points.
- 3.39 Trips to the supermarket generate significant levels of traffic, though most people visit these shops on a less frequent basis than they would their place of employment/education. Retail studies conducted within the East Riding reveal that most people shop at supermarkets for their main food shopping. Supermarkets have therefore been chosen in preference to individual stores (i.e. butchers, bakers). As a result, the weightings are such that a site within 400m of an employment concentration is awarded more points than a site within 400m of a supermarket.
- 3.40 Public transport can provide access to all the destinations included within the scoring mechanism. The proximity of a site to a current bus stop is awarded as much weight as access to employment and education as this is a more sustainable form of transport than the car. A bus stop will only be included within the calculation if there is a regular service (5 days a week) and that the service coincides with the start and finish times of most employers (service before 9am and after 5pm). The proximity of a train station does not have equal weighting to that of a bus stop because of the longer journey times and the more limited frequency of train services in the East Riding.
- 3.41 Access to a GP, although important, is not awarded as many points as the other destinations due to the number of times an individual may visit relative to other destinations.
- 3.42 The scoring system illustrated in Table 5 relates to the 'Access to Services' criterion only. This is an analysis regarding the proximity of a site to existing services and facilities. The decision to release a site is based on both objective and subjective criteria as detailed in PPG3, paragraph 31.

#### **4. Application**

- 4.1 The Council will apply the sequential approach to all allocated Greenfield sites in the Western JSP sub-area identified in the Housing Land Position Statement. A database will be maintained that considers each of the sites against the elements of the sequential approach.
- 4.2 As stated previously, Sequential Approach as detailed below will be used as a 'tool' to help officers and Members judge which sites are most appropriate for release. The decision on which sites to release will be based on the criteria set out in the Sequential Approach and consideration of the housing requirement position.

- 4.3 The Sequential Approach will also be applied to any windfall Greenfield site (that would not be approved as a pragmatic exception<sup>18</sup>). Any site that scores equivalently or better than a site already released under the application of this approach will also be released unless that site would in itself risk undermining the strategy for housing provision in the sub area. The Sequential Approach is not looking to allocate further Greenfield sites. This will be considered as part of the Housing DPD within the LDF process.
- 4.4 An analysis sheet will be produced for each site against the criteria set out in this document and will conclude whether or not the site should be released. An example of what the analysis sheet will look like is at Appendix B.
- 4.5 The Council will make a record of its analysis for each site and the decision on which sites will be released publicly available, including on the Forward Planning page of the Council's website.
- 4.6 The development of those sites identified for release will of course still need to meet any relevant provisions within the Development Plan and all other relevant material planning considerations.
- 4.7 The appropriateness of the provisions within this sequential approach will be kept under review annually as part of the annual review conducted on the IPG on Managed Release.
- 4.8 The Sequential Approach as detailed is an interim measure which attempts to take into account all the relevant factors at the time of review. Further factors which will affect the release of Greenfield sites, will be considered as part of the annual review where necessary (i.e. additional services and facilities in part of a settlement

---

<sup>18</sup> Paragraph 55 of the Interim Policy Guidance on Managed Release refers

### Relevant JSP Policies (Adopted Version, July 2005)

- Policy DS1     The combined built-up area of Hull and the adjoining settlements of Anlaby, Willerby, Kirkella, Cottingham and Hessle will fulfil the role of a sub-regional urban area. It will function as the focal point for housing, public transport, employment activities, shopping, cultural and community facilities for the JSP areas and the wider sub-region. Major development, redevelopment and regeneration activity will be required to support and enhance the function of this area.
- Policy DS2     The settlements of Bridlington, Goole and Beverley will fulfil the role of principal towns. They will function as the focal points for housing, public transport, employment activities, shopping, cultural and community facilities for significant parts of the JSP area, providing a complementary and supporting role to the sub-regional urban area. Development and regeneration activity should support and enhance the function of these settlements.
- Policy DS3     The settlements of Driffield, Pocklington, Market Weighton, Elloughton/Brough, Hedon, Hornsea, Howden, Snaith and Withernsea will fulfil the role of towns. They will function to provide the focus for local housing, employment activities, shopping, cultural and community facilities and transport services for the town and its hinterland. These towns will support and complement the principal towns and sub-regional urban area. Development and regeneration activity should be sufficient to support and enhance the local service centre function of the town, and will be appropriate to the size and characteristics of each town.
- Policy DS4     The countryside should function as an attractive and viable environmental, economic and recreational resource, with existing villages providing for most of the everyday needs of local communities. Limited development will be allowed in existing villages if this meets local needs and contributes to sustaining the role of the settlement. Housing development in existing settlements must conform to the requirements of JSP Policy H7.
- Policy DS5     The countryside should function as an attractive and viable environmental, economic and recreational resource. Development will only be allowed if it involves:
- i.     the provision of essential infrastructure;
  - ii.    sustainable rural diversification proposals and development of existing rural enterprises, giving priority to the re-use of existing buildings;
  - iii.   development requiring direct access to rail and water transport infrastructure;
  - iv.    the provision of appropriate facilities for sport/recreation and/or tourism; and
  - v.     essential development for agricultural or forestry purpose.
- Policy H3     In order to ensure that the scale and location of development supports the JSP development strategy, and the rate of development is in accordance with the housing provision requirements set out in Policy H1, a sustainable approach will be adopted to:
- (a) review existing housing allocations and lapsed planning consents with a view to dispensing with sites which no longer conform with the strategy of the JSP; and
  - (b) identify any new land for housing development that might be required, manage the release of housing land and minimise environmental impact.

The sequential approach will be applied at the sub-area level. Within each sub-area priority will be given to the use of previously developed land and buildings followed by other suitable infill in the identified development strategy settlements. Where sufficient land in these categories cannot be found to meet the requirements set out in Policy H1, consideration should be given to urban extensions to these settlements in the priority order established through Policies DS1 – 3, followed if necessary by sites around nodes in good public transport corridors.

## Managed Release of Greenfield Residential Sites

### Western Sub-Area

DETAILS				ACCESSIBILITY	
<b>ANYTOWN</b>	Site ID: 4				<u>Scores:</u>
Settlement: DS2	Greenfield/Mixed: G			Employment	2
Size (Ha)	1.64			Primary School	3
Greenfield:	1.64			Bus Stop:	1
PDL:	0			Train Station:	0.75
	0-5 years:	5+ years:	Total:	Convenience Store	0.5
Site Capacity	0	45	45	GP Premises	1
Consent: NO				<b>Total Access</b>	<b>8.25</b>



#### KNOWN CONSTRAINTS AND POTENTIAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROBLEMS

The site is located within a flood risk area. Utility companies have been consulted and have not reported any known constraints.

#### BUILDING COMMUNITIES

Housing development should complement the planned growth in employment for Anytown. Anytown has been identified in the JSP as the sub-area focus for development.

#### CONCLUSION

RELEASE