

Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Person ID (Agent)	Full Name (Agent)	Organisation Details (Agent)	<p>Question 1 - For each of the topics have we captured the relevant plans, programmes and policies in the contextual review?</p> <p>Question 2 - For each of the topics is the baseline information that we have gathered adequate? Are you aware of any additional sources of information?</p> <p>Question 3 - For each of the topics have we identified the relevant sustainability issues for the emerging Selby Local Plan?</p> <p>Question 4 - For each of the topics have we identified an appropriate framework for appraising the emerging Selby Local Plan? (The sustainability objectives and the site appraisal criteria).</p>	AECOM / Council Response
1240645	Mrs Robina Burton					<p>CLRs found the document to be over whelming because of its size; it was felt there is too much to understand & react to. It was agreed commenting on the mine sites which were originally agreed would be returned to green field sites & not redeveloped.</p>	The scoping report is necessarily a technical document that covers a wealth of information. The key take-away points are the key issues and SA framework.
1244862	Mr Gerard Dunne					<p>Q1. Not them all - please see my comments earlier - sustainability should be the key.</p> <p>Q2. What about where people work. You would be surprised.</p> <p>Q3. I think you have missed many key issues such as public transport, cycling and walking.</p> <p>Q4. Not enough emphasis on sustainability and housing for the old and young starters</p>	Commuting and place of work is discussed in the chapter 6 (paragraph 6.17) of the updated scoping report. Cycling, walking & public transport are discussed throughout the document and included in SA framework. Housing for older residents is discussed in chapter 9 and highlighted as key issue (9.15) and included in SA framework (Table 9.2). Similarly, the need for affordable housing is highlighted in chapter 9 and the SA framework.
1244918	Mr Geoff Harrop					<p>Q1. Don't Know Q2. No Q3. No Q4. No</p>	Not possible to respond as the comment is not specific and makes no alternative suggestions.
1245198	Mr Matthew Dunne					<p>Q1. Mostly although you should plan for the whole of society my parents are old, infirm, disabled. Where are they in your plan. My sister has a young child and are trying to get on the housing ladder. Are you planning for such housing.</p> <p>Q2. Don't think you have covered a baseline for transport movements now ie how many people do actually work outside the District, How many shop outside the District. How many people go to cities for nights out. I think you will be surprised. But the success of your plan should be to minimise this in the future.</p> <p>Q3. No I don't think you have covered public transport and the lack of it in certain villages especially on bus route to Leeds. What about villages such as North Duffield what public transport can they use? There must be many more my friend lives in Kellington there is about 2 buses/ day. So to me Public transport for some is the main issue. If you are allocating land for say housing surely public transport provision to that area must be a major consideration. Look at all the housing that is being built in Hambleton next to the main A63 when there is one bus per hour, none after 6 and no rail access - why. Please make sure any new allocation of land for housing has good public transport connections to Selby and major cities of York, Leeds, Doncaster or else people will just travel by car. In not this unsustainable.</p> <p>Q4. The appraisal looks OK.</p>	<p>The scoping report is not the 'Plan', it is a technical supporting document. Refer instead to the Preferred Options Local Plan document for the preferred approaches regarding housing, for example HG3 (creating the right types of homes), HG4 (affordable housing) and HG8 (older persons housing). The approaches are supported by and reflect the needs identified in the Council's 2020 Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment.</p> <p>The SA Scoping Report covers different community groups as follows; Housing for older resident included in chapter 9 and highlighted as key issue (9.15) and included in SA framework (Table 9.2). This is also highlighted in chapter 12 (12.11-12.13). Similarly, the need for affordable housing (of particular relevance to younger residents and young families) is highlighted in chapter 9 and the SA framework. Section 12.14 highlights issues pertaining to the more derived households in the district.</p> <p>Accessibility to public transport is highlighted as an important issue in the report;(Ch.12; 12.17-12.18 and Ch.13) and included in the SA framework (Table 13.1).</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Person ID (Agent)	Full Name (Agent)	Organisation Details (Agent)	<p>Question 1 - For each of the topics have we captured the relevant plans, programmes and policies in the contextual review?</p> <p>Question 2 - For each of the topics is the baseline information that we have gathered adequate? Are you aware of any additional sources of information?</p> <p>Question 3 - For each of the topics have we identified the relevant sustainability issues for the emerging Selby Local Plan?</p> <p>Question 4 - For each of the topics have we identified an appropriate framework for appraising the emerging Selby Local Plan? (The sustainability objectives and the site appraisal criteria).</p>	AECOM / Council Response
							A map showing access to public transport (bus stops) is shown in figure 13.1
1239938	Rachel Macefield	City of York Council				We welcome the opportunity to comment on the SA Scoping Report and support the SA Framework resulting from a review of the baseline data. However, we consider that the SA baseline information should also include reference to the designated Green Belt within the Selby District Council area as this will need to be considered in determining the location of and effects resulting from the forthcoming strategy and growth options. For York, the Green Belt is primarily identified to protect the character and setting of the historic city and should be considered as applicable in the appraisal.	<p><u>Updates made to the Scoping Report</u></p> <p>Green Belt Study added to context (para.11.5) and Current Baseline (para. 11.17)</p> <p>A Map showing green belt around Selby added (see fig. 11.2)</p>
1245577	The Bankes-Jones Family		1244966	Joanne Oldfield		<p>4.34 As part of this exercise the Council is also consulting upon the Sustainability Appraisal Framework and Scoping Report, as this will inform the preparation of the Local Plan, and in particular responding to environmental and sustainability considerations We have no particular concerns with regards to the sustainability framework, but suggest that at 85 pages long, it would seem a little lengthy in its output with a degree of repetition</p> <p>4.35 In terms of sections 4 and 5 which have regard to flood risk and adaption, we would reflect upon the importance of potential risk with regards to the extent of flood zones 2 and 3 in the district, both presently and as a future baseline, in particular the risk to life. It is important that the Council should work with the relevant Authorities to ensure that sufficient mitigation is put in place, so that risk from future flood events is minimised and that appropriate flood defences are provided to ensure that functional flood plains are protected and that vulnerable development should be directed away from flood affected areas.</p>	<p>Noted, however the Scoping Report is necessarily a technical document that must include a range of specific information. .</p> <p>Comments noted with regards to flood risk. No action required when updating the scoping report.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Person ID (Agent)	Full Name (Agent)	Organisation Details (Agent)	Question 1 - For each of the topics have we captured the relevant plans, programmes and policies in the contextual review? Question 2 - For each of the topics is the baseline information that we have gathered adequate? Are you aware of any additional sources of information? Question 3 - For each of the topics have we identified the relevant sustainability issues for the emerging Selby Local Plan? Question 4 - For each of the topics have we identified an appropriate framework for appraising the emerging Selby Local Plan? (The sustainability objectives and the site appraisal criteria).	AECOM / Council Response
1240893	Kate Wheeler	Natural England				<p>We are satisfied that the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Scoping has been prepared in a proper, logical and comprehensive manner and seeks to integrate the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive, into the SA process. The approach to SA, as set out in the Scoping Report, including sustainability objectives, assessment methodology, consideration of relevant plans, policies and programmes and the SA framework appears to generally accord with the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p> <p>The report proposes to address relevant Sustainability Appraisal themes and topics relating to the natural environment. We would support key sustainability objectives including minimising irreversible loss of BMV land, prioritising brownfield sites for development, minimising impacts to biodiversity and geodiversity and achieving net gains to create an enhanced ecological network resilient to climate change. Our advice is that a green infrastructure strategy should be prepared to identify projects to deliver these objectives through Local Plan developer requirements. An additional positive indicator for this objective should be delivery of projects and measurable net gain in biodiversity / green infrastructure.</p> <p>Water Resources Natural England welcomes key sustainability appraisal objectives to minimise water consumption and to enhance water quality for the benefits this will provide for the natural environment, particularly through the incorporation of multi-functional SUDs. Pollution and Waste We support key objectives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants to air and to reduce risk of pollution through contaminated land, for the benefits this will have for the natural environment. Sustainable Resources Natural England welcomes key sustainability appraisal objectives under climate change to increase use of renewable and low carbon energy sources where it can be demonstrated that there will be no adverse ecological effect including impacts to designated sites.</p>	<p>Comments noted (general support).</p> <p>Potential monitoring indicators will take account of suggestions in relation to environmental net gain. These will be set out in the Interim and Final SA Reports.</p>
1244839	Councillor Mike Jordan					<p>Q1. More or less, its how you deal with them</p> <p>Q2. In the main</p>	Comments noted.

Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Person ID (Agent)	Full Name (Agent)	Organisation Details (Agent)	Question 1 - For each of the topics have we captured the relevant plans, programmes and policies in the contextual review? Question 2 - For each of the topics is the baseline information that we have gathered adequate? Are you aware of any additional sources of information? Question 3 - For each of the topics have we identified the relevant sustainability issues for the emerging Selby Local Plan? Question 4 - For each of the topics have we identified an appropriate framework for appraising the emerging Selby Local Plan? (The sustainability objectives and the site appraisal criteria).	AECOM / Council Response
1244908	Mr Richard Morton	KCS Development	1244909	Mr Mark Eagland	Peacock and Smith	<p>Biodiversity: KCS Development notes that the proposed criteria for assessment of impacts upon biodiversity refer to factors that include the potential for negative effects upon biodiversity, and opportunity to achieve net gain. In our view it is critical that consideration of such criteria is not undertaken in isolation from mitigation/enhancement measures proposed by site promoters. Development can often be harnessed to fund biodiversity enhancements that deliver a net gain. In the absence of consideration of submitted mitigation/enhancements we do not consider it is possible for the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process to come to a sound conclusion as to whether proposals will result in a negative or positive impact on biodiversity.</p> <p>Health: KCS Development notes that the proposed criteria for health relate to distances (ranging from within 400m to more than 1200m) to a GP surgery. Many village settlements do not provide GP surgeries and it is quite common to have to travel more than 1200m to access such a facility. In our view this in itself is not a good guide as to whether a site is sustainable from a health access point of view. A more appropriate way of assessing relative access to health facilities would be to consider whether a site can access a GP surgery either by walking or public transport (i.e. non car modes). Where it is only possible to reach a GP surgery by private car, then that might warrant a more negative SA score.</p> <p>Population and Communities: KCS Development does not agree that sites that are more than 1200m from a primary school should attract a red SA score. Walking distances are less relevant when assessing access to primary schools, as in many instances the child will be accompanied by an adult, and/or dropped off at the school for reasons of safety. If there is a primary school within the village settlement in which the potential development site is located, then in our view that it is sensible way of accessing adequacy of primary education, since all homes within such settlements are likely to be within a reasonable travelling distance of the school. For larger settlements/urban areas, then it may be appropriate to consider an optimum distance criterion (e.g. a school within 2km). However, in our view it is inappropriate to differentiate between sites using distance bands as small as 200m, as is currently proposed by the SA Scoping Report.</p> <p>Landscape: KCS Development considers that assessment of the landscape sensitivity of sites should not be carried out in isolation from mitigation/enhancement measures proposed by site promoters. In some circumstances there will be opportunities to improve the landscape character of relatively sensitive landscapes compared to the baseline situation. For example, in Brayton recent residential development on the western edge of the settlement presents a unsympathetic interface with the adjacent Locally Important Landscape Area (LILA), due to a lack of landscaping and short garden depths. New residential development within the LILA can enhance the</p>	<p>There is a need to undertake a consistent approach to all sites when determining potential effects. Therefore, schemes with detailed mitigation would always be likely to perform more positively than those that are speculative / at earlier stages of being prepared. For these reasons, the site appraisals must be undertaken on the 'raw' data. This does not mean that potential mitigation and enhancement measures would not be taken into consideration by the Council when selecting sites. This applies to biodiversity and landscape, amongst other factors.</p> <p>We disagree that walking distances are not appropriate for comparing access to services. At shorter distances it is proven that more people are likely to walk than use a car. We accept that smaller villages (without certain services) will score less well in this respect, but this is part of the consideration of what makes a location sustainable or not. All the sites in those villages would also be compared to one another on a similar basis. Access to public transport is considered in the framework separately.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Person ID (Agent)	Full Name (Agent)	Organisation Details (Agent)	<p>Question 1 - For each of the topics have we captured the relevant plans, programmes and policies in the contextual review?</p> <p>Question 2 - For each of the topics is the baseline information that we have gathered adequate? Are you aware of any additional sources of information?</p> <p>Question 3 - For each of the topics have we identified the relevant sustainability issues for the emerging Selby Local Plan?</p> <p>Question 4 - For each of the topics have we identified an appropriate framework for appraising the emerging Selby Local Plan? (The sustainability objectives and the site appraisal criteria).</p>	AECOM / Council Response
						<p>landscape setting to Brayton Barff by providing for high quality landscaping and tree planting. Such enhancements can only be achieved through sensitively planned new development within the LILA.</p>	
1239796	Mrs Janette Mitchell					<p>Q1. Developments for both housing and employment need to recognise the availability of infrastructure to support development, Focus should be on infill and not on expansion. Heritage - Village Design Statements should be taken into account. The diversity and character of the district's villages must be maintained.</p> <p>Q2. Biodiversity - Every effort should be made to protect existing hedgerows & trees, rather than replant. Climate Change - Flood resilience is important as the risk of tidal rivers in the area flooding will be increased by rising sea levels and increased rainfall in catchment areas. Areas which have not previously flooded will flood and Flood zone 3 designations will have to be extended, further reducing the available land for development. Heritage - Community archaeology group projects eg. North Duffield's 'Ouse & Derwent Project' and work undertaken at Abbot's Staith in Selby can provide information regarding heritage and history. Many of the local villages have a Heritage/History group working on community led projects, many are Heritage Lottery Funded - e.g. North Duffield, Escrick, Hambleton, Osgodby - These may also welcome involvement in pre-development archaeological work.</p> <p>Q3. Selby 'overbuilt' against the last plan, yet still failed to provide forecast affordable housing nor to use the large areas of brownfield land they should have done & instead</p>	<p>Q1: The comments are related to strategic direction of the Plan, rather than SA scoping.</p> <p>The issues raised are dealt with in the Preferred Options Local Plan. For example, preferred approaches SG2 (spatial approach), SG8 (neighbourhood planning), SG9 (design of new development), SG12 (historic environment), IC1 (infrastructure delivery), IC2 (provision of new infrastructure), HG1 (meeting local housing needs) and HG2 (windfall development).</p> <p>Q2. Comments related to environmental protection noted, but no action to take for scoping. The Preferred Options Local Plan and the SA reports are subject to consultation. The Council's consultation database includes all Parish and Town Councils and a number of local heritage groups.</p> <p>Q3. The comments are related to strategic direction of the Plan, rather than SA scoping.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Person ID (Agent)	Full Name (Agent)	Organisation Details (Agent)	Question 1 - For each of the topics have we captured the relevant plans, programmes and policies in the contextual review? Question 2 - For each of the topics is the baseline information that we have gathered adequate? Are you aware of any additional sources of information? Question 3 - For each of the topics have we identified the relevant sustainability issues for the emerging Selby Local Plan? Question 4 - For each of the topics have we identified an appropriate framework for appraising the emerging Selby Local Plan? (The sustainability objectives and the site appraisal criteria).	AECOM / Council Response
						<p>the vast majority of development was on greenfield land. If greenfield land is not accepted into the local plan, surely it should not be put forward for development and the plan must limit, as much as possible, the amount of greenfield being promoted. Given the amount of available brownfield land it should not be necessary to use any greenfield. What will Selby DC do differently this time to ensure the failings of the last plan are not repeated? The district has many limitations which will affect where development can take place and this is key in understanding the optimal amount of development. Too much growth could affect house prices and/or make areas undesirable which would be counter productive. The use of libraries or empty shops as museum spaces should be considered, to support economic growth through tourism. How environmentally friendly is the importing of wood pellets from the USA for Drax power station? It does not seem 'carbon neutral' to me. Where is the infrastructure to support and encourage the use of electric vehicles? Uptake of such vehicles is slow due to the lack of charging points and the short distances that can be travelled compared to a full tank of petrol/diesel. Encouraging healthy lifestyles and providing facilities is commendable, but how well used are the leisure centres now? There seems to be a lot of focus on increasing the number of younger people to address the imbalance in large numbers of older people, but I don't see much in relation to supporting an aging community, who are in the majority. Where are the facilities and infrastructure to support the aging and dying? If a new settlement is to be built, could a retirement community be included. Hartrigg Oaks at New Earswick is a settlement/community for the over 50's with a long waiting list of potential residents, because it has the right facilities to support and attract them. Some people don't want to live near families with children, or schools/colleges and the siting of housing near schools (or vice versa) should be carefully considered. When people have moved (usually purposefully) to an area without a school, it would be wrong to impose one upon them. The negative effect of inappropriate development on health and wellbeing should not be underestimated.</p> <p>Q4. All settlements will have different needs and aspirations, these should be taken into account. The use of Village Design Statements to inform what would be acceptable/unacceptable developments is important.</p>	<p>The issues raised are dealt with in the Preferred Options Local Plan. In addition to those preferred approaches identified in response to Q1, there are other preferred approaches such as SG4 (development limits), SG5 (development in the countryside), EM5 (tourist, recreation and cultural facilities), EM8 (local shops), SG10 (climate change) and IC6 (parking and highway safety).</p> <p>Q4. The comments are related to plan-making, rather than SA scoping as such.</p> <p>The issues raised are dealt with in the Preferred Options Local Plan. For example, preferred approaches SG2 (spatial approach) and HG2 (windfall development).</p>
1245562	Queen Margaret's School (Escrick)	Queen Margaret's School (Escrick)	1244966	Joanne Oldfield		<p>5.21. In terms of sections 4 and 5 which have regard to flood risk and adaption, we would reflect upon the importance of potential risk with regards to the extent of flood zones 2 and 3 in the district, both presently and at a future baseline, in particular their risk to life. It is important that the Council should work with the relevant Authorities to ensure that sufficient mitigation is put in place, so that risk from future flood events is minimised and that appropriate flood defences are provided to ensure that functional flood plains are protected and that vulnerable development should be directed away from flood affected areas.</p>	<p>Comments noted. No changes required as part of the Scoping Report update.</p> <p>The issues raised are dealt with in the Preferred Options Local Plan. For example, preferred approach SG11 (flood risk) which is informed by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The Council works with infrastructure providers such as the Environment Agency in preparing the Local Plan and to feed into the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Person ID (Agent)	Full Name (Agent)	Organisation Details (Agent)	<p>Question 1 - For each of the topics have we captured the relevant plans, programmes and policies in the contextual review?</p> <p>Question 2 - For each of the topics is the baseline information that we have gathered adequate? Are you aware of any additional sources of information?</p> <p>Question 3 - For each of the topics have we identified the relevant sustainability issues for the emerging Selby Local Plan?</p> <p>Question 4 - For each of the topics have we identified an appropriate framework for appraising the emerging Selby Local Plan? (The sustainability objectives and the site appraisal criteria).</p>	AECOM / Council Response
1245565	Grimston Park	Grimston Park	1245566	Mr Paul Leeming	Carter Jonas	5.32. In terms of sections 4 and 5 which have regard to flood risk and adaption, we would reflect upon the importance of potential risk with regards to the extent of flood zones 2 and 3 in the district, both presently and at a future baseline, in particular their risk to life. It is important that the Council should work with the relevant Authorities to ensure that sufficient mitigation is put in place, so that risk from future flood events is minimised and that appropriate flood defences are provided to ensure that functional flood plains are protected and that vulnerable development should be directed away from flood affected areas.	<p>Comments noted. No changes required as part of the Scoping Report update.</p> <p>The issues raised are dealt with in the Preferred Options Local Plan. For example, preferred approach SG11 (flood risk) which is informed by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The Council works with infrastructure providers such as the Environment Agency in preparing the Local Plan and to feed into the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
1239645	Frances Edwards	Sustainable Places (Yorkshire Team) Environment Agency				Chapter 4 Climate Change Adaptation Pages 14 & 15 Is the paragraph numbering correct? Goes from 4.4 back to 4.1 at top of page 15.	Formatting error – corrected in updated Scoping Report.
1239645	Frances Edwards	Sustainable Places (Yorkshire Team) Environment Agency				Paragraph 4.7 This should be updated with the recent (February 2020) Flood event. The paragraph refers to failure of assets in York, not sure of relevance to Selby here? Also the impacts of the barrier were not the cause of flooding on the Foss. 5th bullet point, 2015 - Fails to mention the impacts of 2015 in Tadcaster and the collapse of the road bridge. Cawood was sandbagged in 2015.	<p><u>Updates made to the Scoping Report</u></p> <p>Updated numbering order point 4.7 is now 4.11. The 2020 flood events now included (4.11 bullet 6)</p> <p>Updated the 2015 event (4.11 bullet 5)</p>
1239645	Frances Edwards	Sustainable Places (Yorkshire Team) Environment Agency				Paragraph 4.8 This paragraph is positive, and highlights the importance of the as yet uncompleted level 2 SFRA. It is noted that Flood Risk is a key Priority which is welcomed.	<p><u>Updates made to the Scoping Report</u></p> <p>Comments noted. (Paragraph referred to is now 4.12 in the updated report)</p>
1239645	Frances Edwards	Sustainable Places (Yorkshire Team) Environment Agency				Paragraph 4.9 The Catchment Flood Management Plan (CFMP) still exists but we now refer to the Humber River Basin District Flood Risk Management Plan. The River Ouse flood risk management plan doesn't exist other than as a chapter in the above. For the 2nd bullet point there is also flood risk in Cawood, Tadcaster, Ulleskelf etc.	<p><u>Updates made to the Scoping Report</u></p> <p>This section has been re-written to take the comments into account. New paragraph based on the Humber River Basin district FRMP added (see new paragraphs 4.13-4.15)</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Person ID (Agent)	Full Name (Agent)	Organisation Details (Agent)	<p>Question 1 - For each of the topics have we captured the relevant plans, programmes and policies in the contextual review?</p> <p>Question 2 - For each of the topics is the baseline information that we have gathered adequate? Are you aware of any additional sources of information?</p> <p>Question 3 - For each of the topics have we identified the relevant sustainability issues for the emerging Selby Local Plan?</p> <p>Question 4 - For each of the topics have we identified an appropriate framework for appraising the emerging Selby Local Plan? (The sustainability objectives and the site appraisal criteria).</p>	AECOM / Council Response
1239645	Frances Edwards	Sustainable Places (Yorkshire Team) Environment Agency				Paragraph 4.16 We suggest the removal of the word 'natural' in the phrase 'a degree of natural protection' as not all the washlands are naturally occurring (i.e. engineered with overtopping and a barrier bank). This section appears to be 'Ouse' centric. The rivers Wharfe and Aire also impact upon the district. The section also appears to be referring mostly to Selby Town. Key issues and objectives should be district wide, and inclusive of both the Wharfe and the Aire.	<p><u>Updates made to the Scoping Report</u></p> <p>Paragraph 4.16 (renumbered 4.22 in the updated report) has been modified to take the comments into account.</p>
1239645	Frances Edwards	Sustainable Places (Yorkshire Team) Environment Agency				Paragraph 4.17 We agree that climate change should be scoped in.	Comments noted (paragraph referred to corresponds to 4.23 in the updated scoping report)
1239645	Frances Edwards	Sustainable Places (Yorkshire Team) Environment Agency				Chapter 5 Climate Change Mitigation Paragraphs 5.1, 5.2 & 5.9 These are good, but overall could be stronger on flood risk mitigation. Perhaps allow a standoff distance from defences for new developments to allow for possible future improvements or for future maintenance. We would expect to see as a minimum a 16m Easement on tidally influenced watercourses (this would reduce to 8m on non-tidal watercourses). The climate change mitigation section should reinforce the flooding message. Inclusion of Green/Blue infrastructure on new developments, has a dual purpose with respect to climate change and flood risk mitigation / provision of greenspace. We would also tie in with promotion of health and wellbeing by provision of open green spaces available for use by residents. Generally the document appears to talk about 'Selby', could do with more clarity between when talking about District and the Town.	<p>Comments upon paras 5.1, 5.2 and 5.9 refer to the policy context. These cannot be changed through the SA process. Furthermore, the issue of flooding is covered more explicitly in Section 4 (Climate Change Adaptation).</p> <p>Flood management measures don't necessarily contribute to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions (which is the focus of Section 5). Therefore, the topic sits better within 'adaptation'.</p> <p><u>Updates made to the Scoping Report</u> - In the updated Scoping Report, the distinction between Selby as a District and the town itself has been clarified.</p> <p>The issues raised are dealt with in the Preferred Options Local Plan. For example, preferred approach SG11 (flood risk) which is informed by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Also, HG14 (provision of recreation open space), NE1 (protection of green space) and NE2 (green and blue infrastructure).</p>
1239645	Frances Edwards	Sustainable Places (Yorkshire Team) Environment Agency				Chapter 14 Water Resources Paragraph 14.12 refers to the EA Groundwater Protection Policy. The EA have published Groundwater Protection position statements which can be found in the document "The Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection" .	<p><u>Updates made to the Scoping Report</u></p> <p>The Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection is now included in the context review as paragraph 14.3 in the updated Scoping Report.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Person ID (Agent)	Full Name (Agent)	Organisation Details (Agent)	<p>Question 1 - For each of the topics have we captured the relevant plans, programmes and policies in the contextual review?</p> <p>Question 2 - For each of the topics is the baseline information that we have gathered adequate? Are you aware of any additional sources of information?</p> <p>Question 3 - For each of the topics have we identified the relevant sustainability issues for the emerging Selby Local Plan?</p> <p>Question 4 - For each of the topics have we identified an appropriate framework for appraising the emerging Selby Local Plan? (The sustainability objectives and the site appraisal criteria).</p>	AECOM / Council Response
1239645	Frances Edwards	Sustainable Places (Yorkshire Team) Environment Agency				<p>Paragraph 14.15 refers to Drinking Water Safeguard Zones and refers to a Surface Safeguard Zone. It is recommended that the 3 Groundwater Safeguard Zones are also referenced. See table paper reps. Water Quality "" Water Framework Directive (WFD) WFD is considered predominantly from a water resources perspective, rather than water quality. It is noted that water resources are scoped in for further assessment, and table 14-2 does outline that water quality impacts will be considered. However, it is essential to ensure water quality impacts are considered under their own merit, and not solely as part of residual impacts from water resources activity. Table 14-1 of the scoping document lists eight WFD waterbodies in Selby District. However, in total 39 waterbodies or their catchments intersect the district boundary to some degree, including seven groundwater bodies and two canals. Potential impacts on all of these waterbodies need to be considered in the Plan. While the WFD no deterioration objective applies to all WFD quality elements, it is particularly onerous for elements at Bad status. No deterioration normally applies to changes between WFD status classes. For example a drop in class from Moderate to Poor is not allowed but within class deterioration, whilst undesirable, does not constitute a breach of the Directive. However, for elements at Bad status, as there is no lower class to deteriorate to, any further deterioration is considered a breach. Consequently, waterbodies with Bad status elements require special care with respect to developments which may cause deterioration. In the Selby District, the following nine elements are at Bad status in the 2016 classification: Development can still occur in these waterbodies, but particularly comprehensive mitigation would be required to avoid any long term deterioration of the elements listed above. The attached map shows current (2016) Overall Waterbody WFD status and the Overall status objectives set for each waterbody in the 2015 Cycle 2 River Basin Management Plan. The map demonstrates that the vast majority of waterbodies in the district require improvement to meet their objective. The waterbody objectives will be reviewed in the Cycle 3 River Basin Management Plan; however the overall level of long-term ambition is likely to remain largely unchanged.</p>	<p><u>Updates made to the Scoping Report</u></p> <p>Relevant sections within the updated Scoping Report to be updated in light of comments.</p> <p>The Chapter title changed to Water Resources & Quality to reflect the importance of the water quality aspect.</p> <p>New paragraph 14.6 added into Context to include the Humber River Basin Management Plan (HRBMP).</p> <p>New paragraph 14.9 added (Current baseline) to take account of the HRBMP</p> <p>Para. 14.10 has been modified to clarify that table 14.10 includes a 'selection' of the main water bodies in the District.</p> <p>Paragraph 14.15 (now numbered as 14.17) updated to include the 3 groundwater safeguard zones.</p> <p>Future Baseline; new paragraph 14.20 added to emphasise the importance of waterbody objectives and identifying that majority of the waterbodies in the District require improvement to meet their objectives.</p> <p>Key issues and Objectives section updated (14.21 second bullet point) to include the issue of water quality in District's waterbodies and need to ensure no further deterioration takes place.</p> <p>Table 14.2 (SEA framework) additional bullet point (bullet 4) to emphasise the importance of ensuring the water quality is not allowed to deteriorate as a result of development.</p> <p>Ch.15; The SA Framework has been updated – Section on 'Water' now titled water resources & quality and includes additional bullet (4) emphasising importance of avoiding further deterioration in water quality.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Person ID (Agent)	Full Name (Agent)	Organisation Details (Agent)	Question 1 - For each of the topics have we captured the relevant plans, programmes and policies in the contextual review? Question 2 - For each of the topics is the baseline information that we have gathered adequate? Are you aware of any additional sources of information? Question 3 - For each of the topics have we identified the relevant sustainability issues for the emerging Selby Local Plan? Question 4 - For each of the topics have we identified an appropriate framework for appraising the emerging Selby Local Plan? (The sustainability objectives and the site appraisal criteria).	AECOM / Council Response
1245724	James Langler	Historic England				At the next stage in the development of the Sustainability Appraisal the Council will need to propose measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the Local Plan. Monitoring measures may be both quantitative or qualitative, and it is often useful to include a combination of both. You might want to consider the use of some of the following measures: · Number of Listed Buildings demolished · Number of Listed Buildings and % at Risk · Number of Scheduled Monuments · Number and % Scheduled Monuments at risk · Number of registered Historic Parks And Gardens · Number and % Historic Parks and Gardens at risk · % area of district covered by Conservation Areas. · Impact of change on the character or appearance of Conservation Areas · The rate of loss of historic landscape features · Loss or damage to character or setting of a Registered Battlefield	Comments and suggestions noted and will be utilised as appropriate at the next stage of the SA process (for example, Monitoring Measures are proposed in the Interim SA Report).