

Jayne Darley

From: Keith Sleight
Sent: 14 January 2015 11:39
To: LDF
Subject: Selby plan consultation

The following are initial comments and observations on the consultation document for the Selby District Development plan.

Q26
 Selby should not identify areas for wind farms and solar farms as to do so would not limit them to those areas because developers would still be able to propose them on any other site

Q 26 A

The target at SP17 should not be revised because it is not applicable. Ideally it should be removed from SP17 and replaced by a policy that is designed to minimise renewable/low carbon energy in such a way that it minimises the adverse impact on the District. If we can generate another 1000mw from biomass, why should we want to have 100 x 410 ft turbines with a capacity of only 250mw instead or as well ?

Refer also to Nigel Adams article in his January News when he voiced his long term objections to wind farms which are subsidised by tax payers and give minimal benefits and mainly benefit the landowner and developer. He also says that "conservatives will stop wind farm subsidies" as "enough is enough"

Q26B

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

Q26C

Selby should not set policies where the matter is already dealt with by a National Standard. The term "subject to viability testing" clearly indicates that there is an exception that will increase costs and will also create work that is not required in other districts and so make Selby less attractive to developers.

Q26E

Setting minimum distances is the best way to protect Selby District residents from the effects of wind turbines. Many argue for a minimum of 2 km but this would exclude smaller turbines from the district. A minimum distance linked to the size of turbines would be a better approach and would protect communities as turbines get bigger. 2KM is reasonable for the larger turbines (145 metres) but greater for 200 mtr turbines. The number of turbines should also be considered. 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 activity.

The wind farm industry requires large areas of land for the deployment of turbines and minimum distances seriously reduce the opportunity for them so they are prepared to commit considerable resources to

oppose minimum distances.

When home owners are faced with a proposal they have to raise large sums - £5k to £100K to fight appeals. The High Court in Milton Keynes recently established the setting of minimum distances.

Q26F

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.

Solar Farms - visual impact and enclosure of open spaces

Wind Turbines - cumulative visual impacts

The number of times when travelling through different parts of the country and turbines are not turning surely emphasises how costly and ineffective this type of energy source really is

There may be other items I wish to comment on.

Regards

Keith Sleight