42

Jayne Darley

From: David Atkinson
Sent: 11 January 2015 20:52
To: LDF
Subject: plan

Name David Atkinson

Please ensure you provide reference to the Question and Topic area for each comment you wish to make.
Topic / Chapter P70

Question no. 26a

Comments **The target at SP17 should not be revised because it is irrelevant. Ideally it would be removed from SP17 and replaced by a policy that is designed to maximise renewable/low carbon energy in such a way that it minimises the adverse impact on the district. If we could generate another 1000 MW from biomass , why would we want to have 100 x 410 foot turbines with a capacity of only 250MW instead or as well.**

Topic / Chapter P70

Question no. 26b

Comments **Selby should not set policies which exceed national standards, the 10% target should be removed and replaced by one which encourages solar on existing roofs and encourages other energy resource efficiency such as heat pumps and biomass, but not to do this in such a way that it is dependant on the level of subsidy. This matter is covered by para 95 of the NPPF, it does not need additional statements.**

Topic / Chapter P70

Question no. 26c

Comments **Selby should not set policies where the matter in already dealt with by a national standards. The inclusion of the term " subject to viability testing " clearly indicates that there is an expectation that it will increase costs. It will also create work that is not required in other districts and make Selby less attractive to developers.**

Topic / Chapter P70

Question no. 26d

Comments **Selby should not identify areas for wind farms and solar farms because to do so would not limit them to those areas because devlopers would still be able to propose them on any other site.**

Topic / Chapter P70

Question no.26e

Comments **Setting minimum distances is the best way to protect Selby District residents from the worst effects of wind turbines. Many argue for a minimum of 2km but this is unreasonable because it would exclude all turbines, including smaller turbines from most of the District. A minimum distance which is linked to the size of turbine is a better approach and would protect communities as turbines get bigger. 2km is reasonable for the larger turbines (145metres , it should be greater for 200 metres turbines).**

The number of turbines should also be taken into consideration. It must not be permissible to have more than one turbine at the minimum distance.

Minimum distances should be set for distances from homes, roads, pathways, public areas and areas used for recreational acivity.

Topic / Chapter P70

Question no. 26f

Comments **It is important that any work done has value and deals with genuine issues. Any policies must be cost effective in dealing with issues that affect numerous planning applications. Candidate subjects that are current include**

- Cumulative issues of incineration - traffic and air quality
- Solar farms - visual impact and enclosure of open space
- Wind turbine cumulative visual impacts

Email rec'd 11/12/15

42

Selby District Council
Local Plan Consultation

"PLAN Selby"
(The Sites and Policies Local Plan)

Initial Consultation Comments Form

"PLAN Selby" is the Sites and Policies Local Plan which the Council is developing to deliver the strategic vision outlined in the Core Strategy that was adopted in 2013. When adopted, PLAN Selby will form part of the Local Plan for the District against which planning applications will be assessed.

This consultation is the first stage in our on-going dialogue with you and we hope that you will take time to respond to it and help us move forward. The responses to this consultation will help inform our work and shape the District for the future.

Comments are therefore invited as part of this Initial Consultation.

Please use this form to make your comments.

Please read the main document PLAN Selby and associated papers, which are available on the Council's website at **www.selby.gov.uk/PLANSelby** and at local libraries and Public Council offices.

You will need to see what is in PLAN Selby in order to make your comments. It contains a wide range of issues and specific questions on which we would like your views. Please make sure you are clear about which part of PLAN Selby you are commenting on and ensure we have your full contact details so we can take your comments into account and so that we can contact you about the next stages.

Completed comments forms must be received by the Council no later than 5pm on Monday 19th January 2015

Contact Details - Please provide contact details and agent details, if appointed

	Personal Details	Agent Details (if applicable)
Name	David Atkinson	
Address		
Postcode		
Telephone no.		
Email address		

It will be helpful if you can provide an email address so we can contact you electronically

Additional Comments - Please provide any additional comments you may wish to make.

1) The consultation period was far too short particularly as it included Christmas.
2) No public meetings were organized in Hillam/Monk Fryston. At the time of core strategy consideration there was a well attended meeting in the villages.
3) Reference was made in a leaflet distributed to most households to a Community Engagement (CEF) Forum presentation in Monk Fryston on 2/12/14. This took place a week before I and many others, with whom I have checked, received the leaflet. Moreover the meeting was described on the CEF website as 'closed and by invitation only.'
3) I am not sure that Hillam and Monk Fryston should be treated as one unit. This has resulted in them being listed as a Designated Service Village (DSV). Hillam on its own is much smaller than the other Designated Service Villages (DSVs) listed at 5.44. If they had been listed separately Hillam would, like Fairburn not have been classed as a DSV. Hillam, in particular, has no shop, church, school or access to main public bus routes.
4) There are other means of responding to climate change than constructing wind turbines and this factor should be taken into account when planning a climate change strategy. T5
5) Because a large part of Selby is not in the green belt, the establishment of gypsy sites on green belt land should never be allowed. To make sure this policy is understood existing sites on green belt should be removed, whatever the cost. page 40
6) There are no circumstances in which Hillam can absorb a 300 house new estate as is mentioned in the 'Call For Sites' map book p47.
7) 5.78 says Monk Fryston and Hillam contain a mixture of residential development which has been well assimilated into both villages. **And this is worth preserving. Villagers will want to retain this status and resist large scale development.**
8) page 49 table 6 states ... there may be a need to provide some start up space for small businesses within the Designated Service Villages. Austfield Lane, east of Hillam and Monk Fryston might make a useful commercial zone. Already the three farmsteads which were established in the nineties by farmers leaving their premises in the village centre for housing have seen change of use (or applications) to non farming activities. If this area was designated in an appropriate way more suitable new enterprises could be encouraged.

I have spent over a day trying to understand the plan as a whole and found it impossible. Without guidance I don't think anyone can understand it and make meaningful comments. Selby Council has not supplied a summary. The very least for Hillam and Monk Fryston would have been to hold a PUBLIC meeting similar to that held during Core Strategy consultation. The suggested consultation period is too short particularly when it includes Christmas.

Hillam has managed to retain its individual character whilst evolving from a primarily farming village into a mixed farming and commuter village by means of steady development over many years. We do not have developed transport services or easy railway access, so mass commuting which would go with a large estate is not possible. Hillam has a good mix of working and retired people including several families, often of farming stock, who trace back several generations. These are all characteristics worth preserving and not to be endangered by going for large estates which would change the balance of the village.

(Text is limited to the available area to ensure all text is visible. Continue on a seperate sheet if necessary)

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 identfying 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.

Signed [ ] **Dated** 15-12-14

Please ensure you save a copy of your completed comments form to your computer before sending by email

Completed comments forms must be received by the Council no later than 5pm on Monday 19th January 2015

Email: ldf@selby.gov.uk

Post to: Policy and Strategy Team, Selby District Council, Civic Centre, Doncaster Road, Selby YO8 9FT