Jayne Darley

From: Lynn
Sent: 12 January 2015 14:51
To: LDF
Subject: PLAN Selby consultation - Question number

Name Mrs M L Ingledew

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

Question no. 26a
Comments There is no need to provide a revised target when it is no longer required and in effect, when in force, did not affect planning appeals. Targets which do not differentiate between actual energy generated provided by low carbon sources are ill conceived and do not enhance but can damage the environment. The total installed capacity in our area already greatly exceeds any original targets and any further large scale conversions to biomass is dependent on Government and not Selby planners and therefore any further target for wind produced energy is pointless. Granular targets were all based on assumptions which have already been proved very inaccurate.

Ideally the target at SP17 should be removed and a policy put in place which minimises the service impact in the district. We do not want 100 x 410 wind turbines which only give 250MW when biomass could give 1000MW

Question no. 26b
Comments Selby should not set policies which exceed national standards. It should encourage solar on existing roofs as covered by para 95 0f the NPPF. No additional statements are needed.

Question no 26d

Selby should not identify areas for wind or solar farms. No such farms are needed to achieve our targets.

Question 26e

Minimum distance is the best way to protect our district residents. The minimum distance could vary in size according to the size of turbines and should be set from homes, roads, pathways, public areas and recreational areas.

Question 26f

Renewable and low carbon energy technologies are evolving rapidly and therefore there is no point developing policies which are irrelevant by the time they are introduced.

Questiong

Landscape policies must be put in place to ensure that our rural district has an outstanding environment to make the area attractive to both current residents and businesses and further growth of the area

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.

Name Margaret Lynn Ingledew

Date 12.1.2015

Sophie King

From: Lynn
Sent: 15 January 2015 23:17
To: LDF
Subject: Question 4 The Consultation process

Name Margaret Lynn Ingledew

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

Question no. 4 The Consultation process.
Comments

Six weeks for such a long and complex plan is too short. Surely 3 months especially taking the coincidence of holiday periods would be more reasonable.

Question no. 3.7 The Council has failed to publicise this plan effectively as none of the methods used have made me aware of the importance of this plan and how it will affect me and my community. A more easily understood information package could have been attached to every refuse bin with reference to where to get more thorough details.

Comments The way of communication with SDC should not be restricted to computer use only. Not everyone has pdf but most people have pens and paper

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.

Name Mrs M L Ingledew