

Sophie King

From: Helen Guest
Sent: 19 January 2015 06:27
To: LDF
Subject: Selby Plan Consultation

Dear Sir or Madam,

I would like to submit comments on behalf of Gateforth Parish Council as follows:

This consultation document is very extensive and our reply is limited as a result of the response time. We would welcome a more protracted consultation especially at times where it is impacted by public holidays.

Please find below our response to the Plan Selby Public Consultation.

Q22 Development Limits

In order to maintain the character and the rural environment, development limits in the more rural villages should remain tight. Some of the villages have little in the way of amenities and the infrastructure is not designed to allow for expansion. Public transport on some of the village routes is very limited and there are no cycle paths.

Q26 Climate Change and Renewable Energy

Question 26a)

We oppose this approach.

Targets have been abolished by the current Government and we agree that they are unnecessary.

Even if deemed necessary, sensible and realistic targets would be impossible to set for the following reasons:

- They should not be based on installed capacity but on actual output. Targets based on installed capacity could lead to a proliferation of low output developments spanning vast areas of the countryside and impacting many settlements.
- Targets must include the contribution made by Drax and Eggborough, but what the power stations do or do not do is decided by central government and not the local authority. So a target would be set, over which the District Council has only peripheral control.
- There is no point in having a target which excludes the power stations since what they do can make a huge difference to the contribution of this area to renewable energy output, making contributions from other sources (particularly wind and solar) meaningless.

Instead of targets we recommend a policy which maximises energy output and minimises the effect on villages and the countryside.

Question 26b)

We oppose this approach.

A policy which encourages businesses and households to install renewable energy (in the form of solar panel, heat pumps etc.) would be welcome and is preferable to adding additional burdens on to developers who would have to pass on the costs to property purchasers. In such a case developers may prefer to build outside of the District.

Question 26c)

We feel that the current nationally set requirements should not be altered.

Question 26d)

We strongly oppose this approach.

Setting a specific area aside for renewable energy development would result in a concentration of applications in that area where presumably there would be a presumption of approval. This would be to the severe detriment of the local residents. Equally, such a policy would not prevent applications (and subsequent approvals) for schemes in the District outside that area.

Applications should be decided on their merits, wherever they are proposed.

Question 26e)

We strongly agree with this approach.

It would be an effective means of affording all residents in the District protection from the harmful effects of renewable energy developments. There is legal precedent for a carefully worded policy here.

When compiling the policy we recommend that the following matters are incorporated:

- Proximity to:

- homes
- all designated areas such as green belt, SSSI's etc.
- local listed buildings and their settings (whether residential or not)
- footpaths and bridleways
- Noise
- Visual impact
- Cumulative impact
- Traffic disruption
- In the case of wind farm proposals we recommend additionally that any separation distance is measured in multiples of the height of the turbines proposed. Wind turbines are increasing in size all the time and any policy needs to reflect this
- Additionally for wind farms, because they are such tall structures, the cumulative impact of turbines must be particularly borne in mind. Two turbines must warrant a higher separation distance than one turbine; three a higher separation distance than two and so on.

Question 26f)

They could include:

- Cumulative impact (visual and noise) of wind farms
- Solar farms – reduction of agricultural land and open spaces

Question 26f)

In the case of wind farms, amplitude modulation must be considered. This parish Council has raised this before but our contribution has not been heeded.

Question 26h)

We will answer this question when the site allocations are known.

Kind regards,

Helen Guest
Clerk/RFO
Gateforth Parish Council

Helen Guest