

## Sophie King

---

**From:** Peter Pemberton  
**Sent:** 19 January 2015 14:30  
**To:** LDF  
**Subject:** FW: PLAN Selby consultation - Question number 26a & 26b

Name Peter Pemberton

Please ensure you provide reference to the Question and Topic area for each comment you wish to make.

Topic / Chapter

Question no. Q 26 a Is it necessary for PLAN Selby to consider : Providing revised targets for the plan period to 2027 for installed renewable energy ?

Comments no - for the following reasons

- There is no benefit in having a target when the targets in the former Regional Spatial Strategy no longer applies and the NPPF makes clear that targets are taken as minima and not maxima.
- When RSS targets were still in force, achievement of them carried little if any weight in planning appeals about wind farms. Example decision documents could be found if required.
- Simple targets linked to total generating capacity are ill-conceived because they do not take into account the difference in load factor between solar, wind, biomass and anaerobic digesters. This means that the total installed capacity would bear little relationship to the actual energy generated / carbon dioxide saved because the energy is determined by the load factor and the generating capacity. For example Drax biomass has a load factor of 80% whereas solar panels are closer to 10%. Wind will varies between 10% for small turbines and 30% for larger ones in very windy locations. The objective is to GENERATE more power from low carbon sources, not to install more capacity that produces little power and damages the environment.
- In the introduction to T5 page 56 of the consultation document "Renewable Energy" is Vaguely defined as incorporating renewable and low carbon and decentralised energy.
- The target included in the Core Strategy is for 32MW generating capacity by 2021. SP16 Page 111. This target was based on assumptions that it would be wind energy based. Due to diversification of renewable energy generating technologies this target has already been greatly exceeded. There is 1000 MW at Drax which has converted to units to fully operate on biomass. Wind farms already operational or approved exceed 32 MW in their own right. In addition to this there are two waste incineration plants either approved or expected to be approved shortly and a number of anaerobic digesters. The total installed capacity in Selby District greatly exceeds 1000 MW and is dominated both by load factor and capacity considerations by Drax biomass.
- Drax would like to convert other units and Eggborough would like to convert to low net CO2 biomass - but the decision rests outside of Selby District with DECC. The achievement of any target which included biomass would depend on central Government decisions and not on Selby planners. As such there is no merit is Selby setting such a target - a separate lower target for wind is pointless because Selby District has the capacity to generate far more renewable energy by other means and at lower environmental cost to the district.
- Any target which included biomass would not be achievable by any other means because of the scale difference - 1000MW versus a few 10's for wind farms and up to 100 MW for each incinerator.
- Granular targets which are based on current assumptions about technology serve no purpose as has been shown by the extent to which projections in the AECOM (2011) report, cited as evidence in para 3.125 are already so obviously wrong.

•  
Question no. Q 26 b Is it necessary for PLAN Selby to consider : Reviewing the 10% on-site requirement  
Comments yes, the requirement should be reviewed then removed in favour of more positive policies - for the following reasons

- There is no benefit in Selby District setting targets which exceed national standards, especially when it is not clear if these targets can be achieved.
- Any standard which drives up the cost of new homes will act as a deterrent to developers and should be avoided. Developers should be encouraged to make provision for fitting solar panels and heat pumps but actually fitting them should not be mandatory.
- There is a greater opportunity to accelerate renewable energy deployment ( solar panels and heat pumps ) by supporting deployment on existing buildings than forcing it on new build.
- The market is in any case driven by market subsidies which are determined by Government. Selby District policies should not be dependant upon continued subsidies.
- Supporting the use of heat from CHP plants can be done via other policies which deal with CHP plants.

#### Comment Submission Statement

All comments must be made in an email or in writing if they are to be considered. Your comments and some personal identifying details will be published in a public register and cannot be treated confidentially. Where practical, personal identifiers may be redacted, however Selby District Council cannot guarantee that all identifiers will be removed prior to publication of consultation records.

Name Peter Pemberton

Date 19.01.2015

## Sophie King

---

**From:** Peter Pemberton  
**Sent:** 19 January 2015 14:30  
**To:** LDF  
**Subject:** PLAN Selby consultation - Question number 26c & 26d

Name Peter Pemberton

Please ensure you provide reference to the Question and Topic area for each comment you wish to make.  
 Topic / Chapter

Question no. Q 26 c Should Selby include specific requirements for sustainable design.

Comments NO - Selby should follow and adhere to national standards. There is no benefit to Selby of imposing standards to those that apply in the rest of the UK. Selby would incur additional costs and if they were higher standards they would deter developers from coming to the district.

Question no. Question 26d Is it necessary for PLAN Selby to consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon schemes ?

Comments This is the same question and process as the site allocations for things like traveller sites. The NPPF says that doing this should be considered. It does not say that it has to be done.

Para 97 states *They should:*

●●*consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure the development of such sources;17*

Then in note 17 it says

*Where plans identify areas as suitable for renewable and low-carbon energy development, they should make clear what criteria have determined their selection, including for what size of development the areas are considered suitable*

Then in para 98 it says

*When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should: approve the application<sup>18</sup> if its impacts are (or can be made) acceptable. Once suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy have been identified in plans, local planning authorities should also expect subsequent applications for commercial scale projects outside these areas to demonstrate that the proposed location meets the criteria used in identifying suitable areas.*

### Comment Submission Statement

All comments must be made in an email or in writing if they are to be considered. Your comments and some personal identifying details will be published in a public register and cannot be treated confidentially. Where practical, personal identifiers may be redacted, however Selby District Council cannot guarantee that all identifiers will be removed prior to publication of consultation records.

Name Peter Pemberton

Date 16.01.2015

## Sophie King

---

**From:** Peter Pemberton  
**Sent:** 19 January 2015 14:31  
**To:** LDF  
**Subject:** FW: PLAN Selby consultation - Question number 26e & 26f

Name Peter Pemberton

Please ensure you provide reference to the Question and Topic area for each comment you wish to make.  
 Topic / Chapter

Question no. Question 26e d Is it necessary for PLAN Selby to consider: Identifying separation thresholds? What might they be?

Comments yes - separation distances are very important. There should be minimum distances from homes, roads, paths, public areas and railways. The distances should take into account safety, amenity, visual impact noise and health issues. The distances should also be linked to turbine size. Turbines can vary in size between 25 metres and 200 metres. For that reason the distances must be related to total height.

The only rule which sets distance is indirect through the ETSU R97 noise rules. These are unique to wind turbines and allow more noise than other industrial equipment and premises. The noise rules do not provide protection for home owners. The rules are also very complex and difficult to enforce. Additional protection against noise nuisance is also required due to the unique characteristic of wind farm noise and the fact that it is more annoying to people than other types of noise - traffic, aircraft etc. The ETSU Noise rules are also unique in that they allow more noise at night than during the day.

It is a principle of planning law that you are not entitled to a view, but such laws did not foresee structures like wind turbines towering over villages. A minimum distance would provide a level of protection that does not currently exist.

Question no. 26f Is it necessary for PLAN Selby to consider:) Incorporating more detailed development management policies for climate change and renewable/low-carbon energy requirements? If so what do they need to cover? For example taking into account cumulative impacts of schemes?

Comments Renewable and low carbon energy technologies are evolving rapidly and there is no point developing policies which are irrelevant by the time that they are introduced. Policies should focus on issues which are expected to apply generally. For example policies to deal with Carbon capture and storage could not have been foreseen as a requirement and in any case the project will be determined by national policies. Policies should focus on matters which will relate to large numbers of planning applications and be relevant to more than one type of application.

If a need for such policies is determined to be sufficient to justify the effort and expenditure the following should be considered.

Light pollution - arising from industrial developments and on wind turbines but also including rural domestic.

Air pollution - especially cumulative impact from incinerators

Landscape and visual impact - cumulative impact from renewable energy projects and power generation and distribution.

Traffic - especially heavy goods related to renewable and low carbon energy generation - applies particularly to incineration and anaerobic digestors.

Fencing and enclosures resulting from large scale solar - cumulative impact on the free movement of wildlife.

#### Comment Submission Statement

All comments must be made in an email or in writing if they are to be considered. Your comments and some personal identifying details will be published in a public register and cannot be treated confidentially. Where practical, personal identifiers may be redacted, however Selby District Council cannot guarantee that all identifiers will be removed prior to publication of consultation records.

Name Peter Pemberton

Date 19.01.2015

## Sophie King

---

**From:** Peter Pemberton  
**Sent:** 19 January 2015 14:31  
**To:** LDF  
**Subject:** PLAN Selby consultation - Question number 26f & 26g

Name Peter Pemberton

Please ensure you provide reference to the Question and Topic area for each comment you wish to make.  
 Topic / Chapter

Question no. Q 26 g Is it necessary for PLAN Selby to consider : What topics should instead be left to subsequent SPD or guidance

Comments what subjects other do authorities deal with via SPD and select those which are relevant to Selby District.  
 Candidates would be in the following areas

- Minimum separation distances for turbines
- Amplitude modulation noise conditions for wind farms - although the need for such policies will be influenced by ongoing court cases and Government review.
- Fencing and enclosure issues to do with solar farms.
- Incinerators
- Anaerobic digesters

Question no. Q 26h Is it necessary for PLAN Selby to consider : How should each of the site allocations (to be identified in later stages) deal specifically with climate change and renewable energy issues?

Comments The question should be asked when the subjects to be covered by site allocations are known.

However the following are examples of things that should be included in baseline considerations:-

- Flooding - which is attributed to climate change but is more about drainage.
- CHP- ensure that sources of heat from CHP plants is considered in conjunction with potential use of the heat
- Encourage industrial developments to deploy solar panels on roofs
- Encourage biomass heating of industrial premises
- Encourage use of heat pumps - preference should be given to ground source and potential for shared use of the underground heat exchangers.

- Consider the impact and opportunity provided by carbon capture and ensure that sources of carbon other than Drax can use the facility. Site allocation for industrial use should have this as a prime consideration.

**Comment Submission Statement**

All comments must be made in an email or in writing if they are to be considered. Your comments and some personal identifying details will be published in a public register and cannot be treated confidentially. Where practical, personal identifiers may be redacted, however Selby District Council cannot guarantee that all identifiers will be removed prior to publication of consultation records.

Name Peter Pemberton

Date 19.01.2015