

**Sophie King**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 15 January 2015 14:45  
**To:** LDF  
**Subject:** T5 Climate Change and Renewable Energy

**Name:** Stuart Anderson

**Comments**

**Topic / Chapter:**

**3. Key Issues: T5 Climate Change and Renewable Energy**

**Question 26**

**26a) The target for installed renewable energy should not be revised because it is irrelevant. Existing 'targets' have borne no weight in previous planning decisions. Targets should be removed and replaced by a policy that encourages renewable/low carbon energy in such a way that it minimises the adverse impacts on the district. If the target is to be retained in any form then it should be in the form of an 'annual generation' clause which takes true account of the effectiveness of the renewable energy technologies.**

**26b) Selby should not set local standards that exceed the National standards. The 10% onsite requirement should be deleted and replaced by a policy that is designed to maximise renewable/low carbon energy but minimise the adverse impact on the district. Selby should encourage solar panels on existing roofs and other energy resources 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 adequately covered by para 95 of the NPPF, it does not need additional statements.**

**26c) Selby should not set policies where the matter is already dealt with by NPPF Para 95 and National standards. The need for "subject to viability testing" clearly indicates that there is an expectation that it will increase costs. It may well make Selby less attractive to developers.**

**26d) Even if Selby were to identify areas for wind farms and solar farms subject to adequate separation distances (26e) then developers could still propose them on any other site (NPPF Para 98).**

**26e) Separation thresholds should be linked to size and number of wind turbines. A distances of 2km from the current larger wind turbines is not unreasonable. Both domestic residences, designated landscape areas and peaceful areas of recreational activity should all be included in the considerations.**

**26f) Most certainly 'Cumulative Impact' is an important issue and should be adequately addressed in all its aspects e.g. visual impact, increased traffic, loss of tranquillity, change of landscape etc. Any additional policies should add clear value to the processes involved.**

**26g) Any delay in putting together policies with regard to Climate Change and Renewable Energy could result in the proliferation of unsuitable wind farms/solar farms throughout the area and Selby District will lose its character, The stated vision of "By 2027 Selby will be a**

*distinctive Rural District with an outstanding environment, a diverse economy and attractive towns and villages. Residents will have a high quality of life and there will be a wide range of housing and job opportunities to help create socially balanced and sustainable communities, which are less dependant on surrounding towns and cities."* will be lost forever.

**26h) This is difficult to answer without knowing the exact sites but in general section 10- "Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change" of the NPPF gives guidance.**

**Suitable planning should be in pace to ensure positive co-operation/joint use of power/heat through, for example, centralised local biomass CHP plant, ground heat pumps, heat recovery plant etc. Consideration should also be given to the use of the Drax carbon capture plant infrastructure.**

**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.

**Sophie King**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 15 January 2015 16:33  
**To:** LDF  
**Subject:** Question 4 The Consultation process

Name Stuart Anderson

Topic / Chapter

1. Introduction: The Engagement Plan

Question no. 4 The Consultation process.

Comments

Timing of the consultation period over the Christmas period has been way less than ideal. Further 'consultations' also appear to be planned over future 'summer holidays' and 'Christmas' periods. During these periods of the year when people have other priorities 6 weeks is not a reasonable period given the amount of information to be read and the time needed for the preparation of considered and meaningful comments.

Such timings are hardly likely to encourage the maximum participation of the public.

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

## Sophie King

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 17 January 2015 21:03  
**To:** LDF  
**Subject:** 3. Key Issues - T3 Defining Areas for Promoting Development and Protecting Key Assets

Name Stuart Anderson

### Topic / Chapter

3. Key Issues - T3 Defining Areas for Promoting Development and Protecting Key Assets

### Question No. 22

#### Comments

Development Limits should be defined tightly any deviation from that must be subject to a case by case review on a benefit/harm basis. If limits are 'loose' there will be a tendency to test their robustness.

### Question No. 23a)

#### Comments

The Strategic Countryside Gap between Selby and Thorpe Willoughby should be drawn from the current western edge of Selby housing to the existing bridle path on the eastern edge of Thorpe Willoughby. Any excursion in an easterly direction from Thorpe Willoughby risks encroachment towards Brayton on the southerly extreme nearest to Brayton Barff.

### 4. Development Management Policies

### Question 30b)

#### Comments

'Design' will generally be stipulated by National standards, reflected into NPPF and hence Core Strategy. There may be some value in providing policy with respect to materials and sympathetic inclusion within existing environment.

### Question 33b)

#### Comments

Short answer .. YES. In order to ensure the continued aesthetic quality of a distinctive rural community with an outstanding environment it may be necessary to establish particular design requirements to avoid unsuitable development.

**Question 34c)****Comments**

Plan Selby can promote tourist accommodation (tourism in general) and use of recreation open spaces by limiting the intrusion of wind turbines into our countryside or at least ensuring adequate setback distances from these areas.

**Question 36****Comments**

There should be a strong positive drive to reutilise previously developed sites (brownfield) before any greenfield.

**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.

Sent from Windows Mail