

Jayne Darley

From: STUART TWIDALE
Sent: 22 December 2014 11:01
To: LDF
Cc: nigel.adams.mp@parliament.uk
Subject: Re: Plan Selby- The Sites and Policies Local Plan-Initial Consultation.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would refer to your letter dated 20th November 2014, outlining the challenges to the council regarding PLAN Selby, and requesting responses from the general public regarding this plan. Our responses are as follows,

- [1] From our research it would appear that the current population within Selby district is approximately 80,000. The proposal to build 7200 new homes by 2027, would increase this population by, in our estimation, by 20,000 to 25,000, to give a total of over 100,000. The resultant demand on the local infrastructure with respect to schools, jobs, transport, roads, Etc, is difficult for a lay person to quantify, but it has to be significant. Clearly additional infrastructure will be required, but we not clear how this will be financed. From the public purse, or a combination of public and private capital. There are political implications here.
- [2] We wish to continue to live in an environment which is green and pleasant, so the integration of the these plans, alongside all the current applications for wind farms will not be easy. So the proposals you have prepared, for public consultation and involvement, are vital for successful outcomes.
- [3] We see the following as key areas for consideration,
- [3.1] Robust Greenfield Policies. In this respect, please read Geoffrey Lean's article in the Saturday 20th December 2014 edition of "The Daily Telegraph". "The Catch -22 that helps developers build on cherished land"
- [3.2] Utilise to the maximum, the use of Brownfield sites, for both business and residential use.
- [3.3] Utilise to the maximum, any empty business or residential property, when economic to do so.
- [3.4] A clear capital plan[Please refer also to paragraph 1]

Yours faithfully,
Patricia and Stuart Twidale. _____

Jayne Darley

From: STUART TWIDALE
Sent: 13 January 2015 17:23
To: LDF
Subject: Re: Plan Selby----The Sites and Policies Local Plan.- Initial Consultation.

Dear Sir/Madam,
We have further comments to make regarding PLANSelby, so these should be read in conjunction with our previous comments submitted on e-mail, dated Monday 22nd December 2014.

[a]Mission and Objectives.

Your mission statement quiet rightly makes reference to "Improve the Quality of Life" for those who live and work in the district; refers, again quite rightly, to achieving an "Outstanding environment" in attractive "towns and villages". All exactly in accord with our sentiments, outlined in para 2 of our first e-mail.

[b]Specifically we would like to comment on some elements of your policy relating to Wind Turbines, that we feel conflict with your Mission and Objectives.

[b1]Regarding policy 26a, if we can generate 1000MW from biomass[Drax], in a much more efficient way than by multiple[How many??] Wind Turbines, why not abandon the target at SP17, and replace it with a policy that is designed to minimise impact in the district.

[b2]Regarding policy 26d, are we not leading developers to believe they have pre conditioned right to build in these areas, but at the same time, not excluding other areas.??? To summarize, please do not allow for "identified" areas, and "Cherry Picking".

[b3]I understand that "Lincolnshire County Council" have a policy of 2KM minimum separating distance, between the nearest turbine and a dwelling. We would suggest that many parts of Lincolnshire, are less densely populated than Selby District. Clearly turbine size, layout of the site, public amenities[Footpaths],Etc Etc, have to be taken into account, but the High Court ruling in relation to the Milton Keynes application, established that, providing a robust case is made, that minimum distances can be set by SPD.

Yours Faithfully,
Patricia and Stuart Twidale._____

Jayne Darley

From: STUART TWIDALE
Sent: 14 January 2015 10:31
To: LDF
Subject: Fw: Plan Selby----The Sites and Policies Local Plan.- Initial Consultation.

Dear Sir/Madam,
To avoid confusion, please note that SPD in our e-mail means, Selby Planning Department.
Regards,
Patricia and Stuart Twidale.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: STUART TWIDALE
To: "ldf@selby.gov.uk" <ldf@selby.gov.uk>
Sent: Tuesday, 13 January 2015, 17:23
Subject: Re: Plan Selby---The Sites and Policies Local Plan.- Initial Consultation.

Dear Sir/Madam,
We have further comments to make regarding PLANSelby, so these should be read in conjunction with our previous comments submitted on e-mail, dated Monday 22nd December 2014.

[a]Mission and Objectives.

Your mission statement quiet rightly makes reference to "Improve the Quality of Life" for those who live and work in the district; refers, again quite rightly, to achieving an "Outstanding environment" in attractive "towns and villages". All exactly in accord with our sentiments, outlined in para 2 of our first e-mail.

[b]Specifically we would like to comment on some elements of your policy relating to Wind Turbines, that we feel conflict with your Mission and Objectives.

[b1]Regarding policy 26a, if we can generate 1000MW from biomass[Drax], in a much more efficient way than by multiple[How many??] Wind Turbines, why not abandon the target at SP17, and replace it with a policy that is designed to minimise impact in the district.

[b2]Regarding policy 26d, are we not leading developers to believe they have pre conditioned right to build in these areas, but at the same time, not excluding other areas.??? To summarize, please do not allow for "identified" areas, and "Cherry Picking".

[b3]I understand that "Lincolnshire County Council" have a policy of 2KM minimum separating distance, between the nearest turbine and a dwelling. We would suggest that many parts of Lincolnshire, are less densely populated than Selby District. Clearly turbine size, layout of the site, public amenities[Footpaths],Etc Etc, have to be taken into account, but the High Court ruling in relation to the Milton Keynes application, established that, providing a robust case is made, that minimum distances can be set by SPD.

Yours Faithfully,
Patricia and Stuart Twidale.