

**Sophie King**

---

**From:** Scott Gilbert  
**Sent:** 15 January 2015 15:56  
**To:** LDF  
**Subject:** Selby plan consultation

Scott Gilbert

**Response to Selby Plan Consultation**

**Question 4 Engagement Plan**

It would be useful if the plan were written in plain English not planning speak. Even though I have had some experience of looking at planning documents I still found the document long winded and difficult to follow.

The timing of the consultation is over holiday periods where people are either away or have their minds on other matters such as Christmas or childcare is also not ideal.

The plan also contradicts with the information on the SDC web site in that it actually allows for e mails to be sent but the SDC website suggests that a pdf be used. It is not possible to save the pdf or the information on it and the document itself is unwieldy. We would suggest that going forward it is made clear that any form of response will be accepted as long as it is clear as to which question is being commented on. This will probably encourage more people to respond as you can just pick sections that are of interest.

Although it appears that SDC have published the existence of the plan in many places, the reality of it is that most people do not follow SDC on social media and many of the other places are not ones where the public would access. The only real way to make people aware of this process is to write to each address and this is a costly exercise. If a more direct approach were combined with a concise document written in plain English this would probably encourage more people to engage.

**Question 26a**

**Installed Renewable Energy Targets**

I am not in favour of having a target for renewable energy .

Ideally I would suggest that a policy be introduced to focus on low carbon energy that has minimum impact on the district. I believe that SDC should be encouraging the use of biomass at Drax and Eggborough power stations which have both a large capacity, generate electricity on a reliable and consistent basis and provide well paid local jobs. In addition to this given the agricultural nature of the area then anaerobic digesters are a good way to use waste products to generate electricity whilst also producing fertiliser as part of the process which can be used on the local land. Both of these mean little impact on the visual amenity of the district, produce local jobs and benefits for the economy and are reasonably reliable ways of generating low carbon electricity on a steady and reliable basis. As wind turbines and solar take away farm land, have a significant impact on amenity of people living in or around them, create next to no local jobs and are an unreliable source of energy I believe that SDC should not encourage the development of these.

**Question 26b**

**10% on site requirement**

I think that this should be reconsidered as it is an unachievable target and means higher costs for any houses to be build in SDC. At a time when one issue faced by local people is affordable local housing then to add such a requirement as part of the SDC plan would seem to be counter productive. By all means encourage builders to build energy efficient houses but to add such a burden to the cost of a home will discourage developers from building and add costs to buildings will result in less building being erected and thus both higher house prices (due to lack of supply) and people moving outside of the SDC area as homes are not available.

#### **Question 26c**

##### **Sustainable Design**

SDC should follow National Standards and not add any additional requirements for all of the reasons set out in my response to 26b

#### **Question 26d**

##### **Identify Areas for Wind Farms or Solar Development (or any other developments)**

I do not think that this is a good idea. As set out earlier I think that these developments should not be encouraged and SDC should actively encourage biomass and anaerobic digesters which fit in with the ethos of the area.

Identification of sites does not restrict development to these sites but merely means that in any planning application if the site selected by the developer has similar profile then this will aid there case in a planning application. Thus I do not think this is a suitable idea for inclusion in the plan.

#### **Question 26e**

##### **Separation Thresholds for Wind Turbines**

I am in favour of SDC introducing separation thresholds for wind turbines as there have been a number of instances (getting more frequent) of both blade failure where parts of the turbine blades have been thrown for considerable distances, the same with ice forming on the blades and there have been a number of turbine towers falling due to either faulty construction or installation.

It is my belief that there should be a minimum distance of at least 10 to 15 times the turbine height and that this should be set as the distance from homes, public areas roads and public footpaths or any area used for recreational activity.

#### **Question 26f**

##### **Development Management Policy**

I am in favour of SDC having a policy relating to managing renewable developments.

The main policy should to do with cumulative impact and I believe that SDC should also consider a visual impact policy as allowing such developments has a high impact on the whole area and will probably discourage people from living in the areas where significant impact is made.

With regards to developments which affect air quality and traffic (such as waste incinerators) then policies relating to traffic and monitoring of air quality should be considered. If waste for anaerobic digesters is to be imported into the area then the traffic issues faced with getting the matter to the digesters should be considered as many will be based on rural farms where narrow country roads may not be suitable for the level of traffic.

#### **Question 26g**

##### **Topics to be left to SPD or Guidance**

It would probably be best for SDC to look at what other authorities deal with by SPD in areas such as:

- Minimum Separation Distances for Wind Turbines
- Fencing and Enclosures on Solar
- Incinerators
- Anaerobic Digesters
- Amplitude modulation noise conditions relating to wind turbines.

It would probably assist as a baseline measure if SDC did a detailed landscape character assessment as this could then be used in consideration of planning applications which impact on the character of the area.

#### **Question 26h Site Allocations**

This is difficult to comment on without having sites allocated.

Consideration should be given to:

If solar is going to be considered it should be in industrial areas and firms should be encouraged to have solar panels fitted on their roofs. This is the most efficient way to house panels, leaves farm land for farming and as they are not really that different to roof tiles has little impact on the amenity or landscape character of the area.

Encourage biomass heating of new industrial developments or premises.

Encourage the use of heat pumps such as ground source heat pumps or shared heat exchangers. We actually have a ground source heat pump and these provide a good source of heating and if encouraged in the planning stage would not add significant costs to the build.

#### **Question 28**

I am in favour of SDC having a policy on Heritage Assets. This should not be just restricted to listed assets but also to other buildings of historic nature (or even of landscapes).

Assets that I think should be considered that are near me include Birkin Church, Gateforth Hall, Hillam Hall and the views to Gateforth Wood.

#### **Question 29**

As far as I am aware SDC does not have a list of Heritage Assets and I think that a list should be made. Some of my own suggestions as to the area I live in are in question 28.

I trust that due consideration will be given to all of these points.

Yours faithfully

Scott Gilbert