

Full Name	Organisation Details	Question 1 - Please provide any comments here on the Sustainability Appraisal. Please ensure you clearly reference the section, paragraph, table or appendix.
Cllr Mike Jordan		No comments
Mr Jonathan Cockeram		<p>In relation to transport the sustainability appraisal discusses the issues in general terms but appears to demonstrate no co-ordination with the highways authority, NYCC. In the case of Tadcaster there are no steps to directly address the increased traffic volumes generated by the increased housing and the reality that much of the additional traffic will wish to travel towards Leeds and West Yorkshire. Current road design will cause the additional traffic to travel through the town on a relatively long route. The addition of an exit / entry in the direction of Leeds at the A162 - A64 junction would significantly alleviate this also providing an outlet for the necessary construction and brewery traffic. The Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan identifies that the number of goods vehicles in the town is an inhibitor to cycle usage. Therefore such changes to that junction is likely to act as a direct and indirect contributor to reduced air and noise pollution levels.</p>
Mrs Carol Crutchley		<p>Thank you for giving residents a chance to comment. Let us hope that we will be listened to. We need to move out of 1960s and plan for a different Selby that is missing so much. Life has changed for ever and more people will work from home.</p>

<p>Mr Marvin Suen</p>		<p>Thanks for the preparation of the SA. I am particularly interested in section 9 Mitigation and enhancement based on the study done in the previous section. I noticed that the recommendation emphasis on the environmental aspect amount the SA objectives. In my opinion, a holistic approach that integrates environmental objectives to economical and social objectives would likely yield more impactful results. Typically economical and social needs are priorities, leading to climate change mitigation and biodiversity targets often overlooked, leading to committed carbon mitigation targets not being achieved locally, ultimately effecting the wider commitment on a national level. Selby has a growing economy and employment theme. Instead of maintaining future growth, I think there are great opportunities to directly promote the use of new technologies to existing and new employment sites. From my understanding, Selby has a strong logistic, industrial and energy sector, including Drax power plant. In addition to the new technology Drax/Mitsubishi carbon capture development, project such as Amager Bakke is a great example of how industrial facilities can be combined with social and environmental objectives, also servers as a promotion to Selby tourist attraction.</p>
-----------------------	--	--

<p>Mrs Cherry Waters</p>		<p>It concerns me that sustainability, which should be central to the entire plan, is instead an add on. An extra 97 pages that many people will not have the will or the time to study, but you will be able to say we have been consulted on. There are a lot of very important points in this document, such as, on p7, paragraph 1.1.9, that full account should be taken of local needs and flood risk, that housing should be adaptable to the impacts of climate change, and that economic development should focus on clean growth and low carbon sectors. I look forward to seeing you follow your own advice on this. Still in the same paragraphs, as one of the three towns whose town centre spaces this appraisal states should be enhanced for events and cultural activities, and enhanced evening and visiot economy, I am struggling to find any evidence of such plans for Sherburn in Elmet. I worry that the recommendation to 'diversify the distinctive roles of the three towns' will be achieved by making Tadcaster even better while continuing to only make detrimental developments in Sherburn, if past records are anything to go by. The ambition to improve leisure, cultural. tourist facilities across the district is also to be commended, but again I am struggling to see any evidence of any plans to do this in Sherburn. There is no evidence of any intention to put any leisure facilities in Sherburn, despite the fact that it is now the second largest town in the district, 50% larger than Tadcaster, which already has a sports centre and a swimming pool and this plan includes putting further leisure facilities there. The paragraph on the natural environment on p8 is very laudible, and I look forward to seeing the resulting net gains in biodiversity, although again, I haven't found any mention of actually doing any of this in the main document. I'm intrigued to know what the 'nature reconvery networks' are, they sound very promising. The next paragraph on mitigating climate change and meeting net zero carbon emission targets is interesting to read since Selby District Council is one of the few in the country which is yet to declare a climate emergency. This paragraph also talks of developing resilient and adaptive approaches to managing flood risk by diverting development to 'areas of lowest flood risk'. So, having looked at the maps, I wonder why Sherburn has already had so much development, and has so many other locations identified for possible future development, in comparison to areas such as Church Fenton, Eggborough or North Duffield. The next paragraph, on sport and recreational facilities is also heartening to read, but not supported by any plans for Sherburn. There is no evidence of any intention to put any leisure facilities in Sherburn, despite the fact that it is now the second largest town in the district, 50% larger than Tadcaster, which already has a sports centre and a swimming pool and this plan includes putting further leisure facilities there. The next paragraph on prioritising travel by foot, cycle and public transport, plus the provision of effective electrical vehicle charging infrastructure is very laudible, but doesn't seem to be backed up by any plans in the main document. Table 2.1 on pages 8-9 makes very heartening reading, if the contents of this table were to be enacted they would make a huge difference to the district and it is to be hoped that this table will be</p>
------------------------------	--	---

		<p>blown up large and hung up on all Selby town planners' walls, so that it can't be forgotten or ignored. The transport section on p13 is another interesting read. 97% of workers on Sherburn Industrial estate do not live in Sherburn, and the congestion caused by commuters at the junction of A162 and A63 needs urgent attention. The intention to 'maximise the potential of the District's sustainable transport network by seeking opportunities to connect new development with new and existing services and facilities via sustainable modes of travel' is a serious argument against the development of the Church Fenton airfield; there is no way of catering for the increased traffic this would create other than the building of new roads (across greenfield land) - hardly sustainable. The section on p14 about water resources states you should 'provide sufficient water /wastewater treatment capacity to handle additional flows from new development'. This has not been happening in Sherburn where flooding of roads is happening more and more frequently as a result of the increased frequency of extreme weather events and the concreting over of so much of the ground in the form of roads, houses and driveways so that rainfall can't drain away as quickly as it is falling. Again, I look forward, as a result of this document, to this being addressed in the future.</p>
--	--	--

Mr Ronald Stamp		GENERAL: It is very important to protect the rural nature of the wider District which provides green spaces for healthy living activities in the countryside. Significant new housing developments in the District should therefore avoid loss of rural land and take advantage of existing brownfield sites. It is not clear that the creation of a new settlement is necessary or desirable at this time. Smaller land allocations should be developed to expand and enhance existing towns. APPENDIX B, S 6.32 and 14.33: The Stillingfleet site is too remote from existing main centres of services and employment and lacks infrastructure, including transport, to be considered a viable site for a new settlement. APPENDIX B, S 14.31-14.32: The potential benefits of the Church Fenton Airfield site have been identified and clearly outweigh any benefits of a new settlement at Stillingfleet. APPENDIX B, S 14.34: The Burn Airfield site's proximity to Selby should be given very significant weight in appraising the options for a new settlement. Increasing population this close to Selby will increase the vigour and prosperity of the town and secure its long-term sustainability.
Mrs Mary Wilks		New homes are needed but it is ridiculous to to consider STIL-D, on the very edge of Selby District when two brown field sites are available.
ARAS-PC ARAS-PC ARAS-PC		The appraisal appears to be fair.
Mr Leslie Rayment		The appraisal appears to be fair.
Mrs Pauline Rayment		It appears to be a fair appraisal.

Tim Waring	Langwith Development Partnership	<p>Please refer to the attached Representations document - Representations to the Preferred Options Selby Local Plan (2021) (Quod).2.19 The above work has fed into the Interim Sustainability Appraisal16 (SA) work underpinning the draft POSLP. The SA considered eight spatial growth options, of which five options addressed a “needs led growth”, and the remaining three options addressed a “higher-level growth”. Subsequently, as explained in Section 3, SDC determined that the higher-level growth strategy was unsustainable in Selby, and adopted a needs led growth strategy.2.20 It is of note to these representations, that the SA’s17 consideration of the eight options all considered a new settlement (in some growth options two new settlements were considered), despite there being little support for such an approach and the evidence which showed there to be a range of sustainable housing growth opportunities at existing settlements to satisfy the District’s housing needs.2.21 No options considered housing growth without a new settlement, which appears irrational given that a new settlement did not attract a high level of support, and even more so as the draft POSLP’s Objectives do not support such in terms of either of the two Objectives for (i) Sustainable Patterns of Development or (ii) Housing. Self-evidently this reasonable alternative was not properly assessed.2.26 In the SA, 8 growth options were considered, all of which included at least one new settlement, despite the above. This Report goes on to demonstrate that as an option(s) that excludes a new settlement has not been tested, not all ‘reasonable alternatives’ have been assessed as part of the emerging POSLP’s evidence base. Nor has it been demonstrated that a new settlement, with one of three options so close to boundary with CYC, itself promoting its own new garden village close by, is based on effective joint working or cross-boundary strategic planning.5 Recommendations5.1 For the reasons outlined in Sections 2 – 4, it is considered that the POSLP’s spatial approach to housing by reference to a new settlement is not sound, namely:There is no assessment in SDC’s Sustainability Appraisal of a spatial planning option that excludes a new settlement; such an option would be a Reasonable Alternative based on the available evidence.</p>
------------	----------------------------------	--

Mr David Stopford		I believe that the sustainability appraisal & proposed new settlement at Burn is flawed & I object to the proposed development site on numerous grounds. Government have a policy to retain & maintain a network of general aviation facilities & the proposed development of the Burn gliding club site would be contra to this. The site is 90% greenfield & there are options in place to develop areas of brownfield such as Church Fenton Airbase which is 90% brownfield. Development of the Burn site would result in the loss of a recreational site which would be irreversible not only to those using the site as a gliding facility but to those using it for exercise such as walking, horse riding, model aircraft enthusiasts & much more. 98% of the site at Burn is in Flood Zone 3a making it unfavourable for development for housing & potentially costly in terms of future flood protection should the site be developed for housing, especially when there are other sites like Church Fenton & Stillingfleet that are a low flood risk. The local plan does not justify development of this site to meet its housing needs to the period of 2040. There is a rich & diverse habitat mosaic which should be considered of special value due to the presence of species such as Adder, breeding birds which are dependant on the area for at least part of their life cycle. Birds such as owl, Red Kite & Buzzard.
Joe Perkins	Banks Property	Banks Property agree with the findings of the Council's Sustainability Appraisal in that Urban Extensions are the most sustainable form of development.
Mandy Loach		No comment.
N/A Richard Rogerson N/A		Escrick Parish Council have submitted full and detailed comments and submissions where appropriate in respect of matters pertaining to this document. Unless otherwise stated or supplemented upon by myself I am at this time fully in support of those submissions. For the sake of clarity any additional comments are confined to question 67 which really provides my emphasis on the comments already provided by Escrick Parish Council who I must say have produced in my view a thorough and helpful document which I believe provides assistance to all parties concerned.
N/A Burn Gliding Club N/A		The Sustainability Appraisal Para 4.9.4 which states settlements on former airfields avoids loss of high-quality agricultural land, this is incorrect as 80% of the land at Burn Airfield is Grade 2 quality land.

Road Chef		<p>Please provide any comments here on the Sustainability Appraisal. Please ensure you clearly reference the section, paragraph, table or appendix. 4.3 Para 8.12.8 of the Sustainability Appraisal relates to proposed Local Plan Policy IC8 (which further comment is provided in relation to the Policy at Question 42) and sets out that:- Turning to a specific matter, IC8 (Provision of Motorist Service Areas) “ in recognition of the various strategic roads which traverse the District “ provides conditional support for a new MSA, provided such a proposal is compliant with landscape and Green Belt policies. The policy is clear that robust justification of need must be demonstrated to secure support. This is considered to be a pragmatic approach, ensuring the Council are able to respond to changing circumstances over the plan period in relation to the potential need for a new MSA. 4.4 Whilst we support the facilitation of a new Motorway Service Area, it is considered that the current Planning Application (LPA ref 2019/0547/EIA) provides the Council with the very special circumstances necessary to grant the approval of the application. It is considered that these very special circumstances provide the Council with the necessary exceptional circumstances to remove the representation site from the Green Belt and Magnesian Limestone North Landscape Area (a local landscape designation) and allocate it either as a Motorway Service Area or as a Special Service Area which would specifically facilitate a Motorway Service Area.</p>
-----------	--	--



Michelle Saunders	NYCC	<p>Sustainability appraisal “ Table 2.1 climate change adaptation - all tidal rivers should be referenced in addition to the Ouse. 5.6.1 “ NPPF only requires development to mitigate its own impacts, ie. not make a betterment. Highway networks supporting Eggborough and Selby areas have congestion issues highlighted in the stage 1 traffic model. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) suggests that option one would provide a benefit to the transport links and concludes that this therefore offers a benefit. The basis for this assumption is unstable. 5.7.4 “ Selby Town's highway network is demonstrated by phase one modelling to be under strain. Option A may lead to a significant impact on a stretched network. The strategic traffic model currently being created to support the plan will demonstrate the impacts of the options and will permit the development of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to support the sites identified, however at this stage this information is not available so assumptions cannot be made 5.8.6 “Option A would increase journeys on a constrained network with early modelling work demonstrating capacity issues. This would be addressed by the infrastructure delivery plan however at this stage the information is not available 5.11.2 “ The risk from flooding in sites around Selby Town is significant. It is unclear how this option would give minor negative impacts to climate change given the residual risk to development in this location. 5.12.5 “ Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme (SuDS) implementation would not necessarily mitigate fluvial risk. 5.12.7 It is considered that inclusion of Burn Airfield is likely to generate significant climate change issues, with the development of the Humber Strategy and the residual flood risk associated with the site. 5.17.1 “ Any capacity issues on the highway network, associated with option A demonstrated through the strategic modelling would require to be addressed in the infrastructure delivery plan. At this stage the information is not available.</p>
----------------------	------	--

<p>Mark Johnson</p>		<p>SELB-BZ “ Cross Hills Lane, Selby. This includes an indicative capacity of 1,270 dwellings. It scores red in the Sustainability Appraisal against the flood risk objective. The SA at Appendix B (paragraph 13.3) informs that the site is partially within a floodplain of the Selby Dam watercourse, around 80% is in flood zone 3 and the remaining 20% is in flood zone 2. Whilst reference is made to the requirement of a phased sequential approach, allocating ~ more vulnerable residential development within the lower flood risk areas, there are no lower risk flood areas within this site. Yet, the site is included as a preferred allocation. Whilst on-site mitigation measures may be suitable such as SuDS and attenuation ponds, blue corridors, and green spaces, as referenced in the SA, there are other sites in the District that without such high flood risk that are suitable for development. It is publicly known that numerous developers have walked away from the Cross Hills site (SELB-BZ) due to concerns regarding flooding, viability, and access constraints. Yet the Council continue to include, and rely on the site as a deliverable preferred option in the Local Plan. Further information on the scope for onsite mitigation is requested, as well as information regarding the viability and technical background information to evidence the deliverability of this site. SELB-AG Land on the former Rigid Paper site, Denison Road, Selby with a dwelling capacity of up to 330 dwellings. This site also scores red in the Sustainability Appraisal against the flood risk objective. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 (paragraph 26.11). It is also our view that the capacity of this site is over-stated. If developed, a site of circa 250 dwellings is more likely. SELB-B Industrial Chemicals Ltd, Canal View, Selby Indicative capacity 450 dwellings. Scores Red in Sustainability Appraisal against the flood risk objective. The majority of this site is in flood zone 3 (around 18% in Zone 1). The SA refers at paragraph 13.6 to there being less scope for onsite mitigation. On the basis that the Rigid Paper capacity looks to be over stated, we likewise question the capacity of this site. 2.8 The only site in Selby with no flood risk issues is SELB-D, Land west of Bondgate, Selby, which has an indicative capacity of just 9 dwellings. 2.9 It appears that flood risk in Selby Town is not considered a priority, with suitable alternative sites, that are low flood risk being dismissed due to Green Belt constraints. This suggests the Council is prepared to develop on Flood Risk land in order to protect the Green Belt, this simply cannot be right. 2.10 The SA states at Appendix B paragraph 13.9 in relation to Selby Town that Overall 76% of the total area allocated for residential development is within flood Zone 3, 20% in Zone 2 and the remaining 4% in Zone 1. However, the largest residential (mixed use but mostly residential) site; at Cross Hills Lane, has scope for onsite mitigation due to its substantial size. 2.11 We question the wording in Section 8.3 of the Interim SA Report, which contradicts the findings for Selby in relation to flood risk as explained within Appendix B. Paragraph 8.3.1 states The key aspects of climate change adaptation are the need to direct development away from areas of greatest flood risk and avoiding exacerbating the urban heat effect as the climate warms. The majority of the preferred allocations do</p>
---------------------	--	---

		<p>not fall at risk of flooding, which means that flood risk ought not to be a problem. However, a handful of sites contain areas of fluvial and / or surface water flooding. By focusing growth at Selby town which has areas affected by flood risk, the preferred spatial approach will bring forward sites partially at risk from either fluvial or surface water flooding, though there is potential to minimise this risk through policy mitigation.</p> <p>2.12 It seems that the above text downplays the quantum of housing proposed in the highest Flood Zone 3 areas in Selby in the preferred options Local Plan, which as referenced in Appendix B, equates to 76% of the residential development in Selby being located within Flood Zone 3.</p> <p>2.13 Of the 8 spatial options assessed in the SA, the Council proposed approach is Option A Greater focus on growth in Selby Town with smaller distribution elsewhere. Of the 5 spatial options (A - E) which include the preferred housing requirement of 402 dwellings per annum, only one Option, the preferred Option A, includes a significant proportion of growth to Selby at 1,750 dwellings. The other four Options (Options B to E) all include a lower requirement to Selby of 550 dwellings.</p> <p>2.14 Only three Options (E, G and H) involve Green Belt land release, two of these (G and H) are at the higher housing requirement. There is only one option (Option E) at the preferred 402 dwelling requirement that involves Green Belt land release. Option E proposes Green Belt Release. Less development in Selby Town, expansion of Eggborough. This is considered to be a sensible solution, which reduces proportionate growth of Selby to avoid high flood risk areas and redistributes growth to existing settlements, resulting in proportionate growth in a number of smaller settlements, which would result in Green Belt land release. This would allow the avoidance of higher Flood Risk areas.</p> <p>2.15 The only issue with Option E, is the inclusion of a New Settlement, which at the scale proposed, is not considered to be a sustainable solution. A more sustainable option would be the extension of an existing sustainable settlement/s, resulting in new development being accessible to existing facilities, and allowing the provision of additional services and facilities or upgrading of existing services and facilities.</p> <p>2.16 There is no overall conclusion in the Detailed Appraisal of the Spatial Strategy Options (Appendix B of the SA) which draws together the appraisal. There is no clarity of whether some SA objectives take priority or whether they are all equally weighted. Based on the Council's preferred option, there appear to be SA objectives which are given less weight than others. For example, Flood Risk, which falls within the Climate Change Adaptation objective. The fact that the majority of preferred allocations in Selby lie within FZ3 high risk areas, is obviously less of a priority than the emphasis of focussing growth in Selby. Has any option been considered whereby no development in Flood Zone 3 occurs?</p>
--	--	---

Hallam Land Management Ltd	Hallam Land Management Limited	Appendix C of Sustainability Assessment provides a Summary of Site Assessment Findings for a number of sites. We have concerns over the justification and appraisal of sites in Selby and Tadcaster which are included as preferred allocations despite significant flood risk and deliverability issues. The following paragraphs consider the sites in detail in Selby then Tadcaster referring to evidence in chapter 26 of the Local Plan and the Individual Site Profiles report, Jan 2021.
	Grimston Park Estates	<p>Sustainability Appraisal 2.5 In accordance with Section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, policies set out in Local Plans must be subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (SA), and also incorporate the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the SEA regulations In accordance with Section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, policies set out in Local Plans must be subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (SA), and also incorporate the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the SEA regulations).</p> <p>2.6 SA/SEA is an iterative and systematic process which should be undertaken at each stage of the Plan's preparation, assessing the effects of the emerging Local Plan proposals on sustainable development when judged against all reasonable alternatives. As each stage progresses the Council should ensure that the future results of the SA clearly justify any policy choices. In meeting the economic and housing development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of this assessment why some policy options have progressed, and others have been rejected. This must be undertaken through a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, in the same level of detail for both chosen and rejected alternatives. Any decision-making and scoring by the Council should be robust, justified, and transparent though ultimately will be based on planning judgement. Plan Period 2.7 It is welcomed that in the light of policies set out in the Framework that the Council is seeking to provide an end date to 2040 for the Local Plan. This ties in particularly with the proposed preparation programme set out at Picture 1, which suggests the commencement of an examination during mid-2022, suggesting adoption by early 2023. This would suggest a plan period of at least 17 years.</p>

Frances Edwards	Sustainable Places (Yorkshire Team) Environment Agency	Section 8.13 Water Resources We welcome the inclusion of a SA objective for water resources. Paragraph 8.13.1 Whilst we agree with the key consideration stated under water resources, water quality is also a key consideration and we recommend the text is amended as shown in <b>bold</b> . "The key considerations under water resources <b>are</b> ensuring that there is available capacity at water infrastructure assets which serve the District, particularly having sufficient headroom capacity at wastewater treatment works (WwTW) <b>and water quality</b> ." Paragraph 8.13.8 This paragraph refers to several proposed allocations falling close to source protection zones (SPZs). Maps indicating the site of the preferred allocations and the SPZs are included as attachments A and B. It is recommended that document 'The Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection', is referred to and that any restricted activities are not proposed in these areas. (Attachment A and B)
Mr Merlin Ash	Natural England	Natural England welcomes the Stage Preferred Options Interim SA Report and has no specific comments to make at this stage. We advise that further assessment required for the Habitats Regulations Assessment, including the traffic emissions assessment, should be considered as part of the appraisal going forward.
Church Commissioners for England	Church Commissioners for England	2.1.1 This section of the representation responds directly to Question 1 of the Council's Response Form - "Please provide any comments here on the Sustainability Appraisal. Please ensure you clearly reference the section, paragraph, table or appendix"☐. 2.1.2 Commentary relating to the findings of Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report on the Preferred Options Selby Local Plan (January 2021) (ISAR) is provided in the context of the subject matter to which it relates, when providing a response to the preferred approach questions posed by the Council.

Michelle Saunders	NYCC	<p>Sustainability appraisal “ Table 2.1 climate change adaptation - all tidal rivers should be referenced in addition to the Ouse. 5.6.1 “ NPPF only requires development to mitigate its own impacts, ie. not make a betterment. Highway networks supporting Eggborough and Selby areas have congestion issues highlighted in the stage 1 traffic model. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) suggests that option one would provide a benefit to the transport links and concludes that this therefore offers a benefit. The basis for this assumption is unstable. 5.7.4 “ Selby Town's highway network is demonstrated by phase one modelling to be under strain. Option A may lead to a significant impact on a stretched network. The strategic traffic model currently being created to support the plan will demonstrate the impacts of the options and will permit the development of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to support the sites identified, however at this stage this information is not available so assumptions cannot be made 5.8.6 “Option A would increase journeys on a constrained network with early modelling work demonstrating capacity issues. This would be addressed by the infrastructure delivery plan however at this stage the information is not available 5.11.2 “ The risk from flooding in sites around Selby Town is significant. It is unclear how this option would give minor negative impacts to climate change given the residual risk to development in this location. 5.12.5 “ Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme (SuDS) implementation would not necessarily mitigate fluvial risk. 5.12.7 It is considered that inclusion of Burn Airfield is likely to generate significant climate change issues, with the development of the Humber Strategy and the residual flood risk associated with the site. 5.17.1 “ Any capacity issues on the highway network, associated with option A demonstrated through the strategic modelling would require to be addressed in the infrastructure delivery plan. At this stage the information is not available.</p>
----------------------	------	--

<p>Mr Hugh roberts</p>	<p>Moreby Wood Owners</p>	<p>As a member of The Moreby Wood Owners Group I STRONGLY OBJECT to the STIL-D proposed site as it is in contradiction of the SA for the District.</p> <p>I support the vision for the Natural Environment:  ‘To protect and enhance: important sites for nature conservation, and priority species; distinctive landscape character; green and blue infrastructure; air quality; strategic tree planting to support the ambitions for the White Rose Forest Project, local trees and hedgerow planting; nature recovery networks; and protect against pollution and deliver net gains in biodiversity’.</p> <p>And I agree with the SA Objective for Biodiversity:  ‘Protect, conserve and enhance biodiversity, wildlife habitats and green infrastructure to achieve a net gain and reverse habitat fragmentation’.</p> <p>I agree with the Draft Plan Objective for the Natural Environment:  ‘To ensure that development safeguards the district’s high-quality natural environment and reduces the extent and impacts of climate change’.</p> <p>I acknowledge the Local Plan ‘natural environment draft objective (6) which has been assessed as strongly compatible with the SA objectives relating to biodiversity, climate change (mitigation and adaptation), land and soil and landscape. The strong compatibilities are positive where a protected natural environment is a key prerequisite for retaining rich biodiversity, for use in mitigating climate change via carbon sequestration as well as providing resilience to its effects. The natural environment also forms a core element of the landscape characteristics, especially in more rural areas. Selby Local Plan: Preferred Options Interim SA Report Prepared for: Selby District Council AECOM 21 To a similar extent, the compatibility has crossovers with SA objectives relating to land, soil and water resources, this is where protections from polluting sources and preservation of natural assets are promoted. The natural environment also brings benefits for naturally mitigating air pollution issues and serving as an asset for people to enjoy, which in turn boosts mental and physical health outcomes. The potentially incompatible SA objectives linked to Local Plan objective 6 are housing and the economy and employment, where the protection of the natural environment may act as a constraint to growth. However, economic activity may well involve the delivery of low carbon technologies, more sustainably performing homes and facilitate a move towards low carbon living. If the Plan seeks to address these issues in tandem, then the objectives are not necessarily incompatible’.</p> <p>However, the Council has not followed through on these objectives in the body of the draft plan. In particular, it has failed to follow the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on ancient woodlands, ancient and veteran trees:  Paragraph 175c of the NPPF states that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of</p>
----------------------------	---------------------------	--

		<p>irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists. The potential new Settlement at STIL-D does not fall within the scope of the exceptional circumstances cited in footnote 58 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Paragraph 177 of the NPPF states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), unless an appropriate assessment has concluded that the plan or project will not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site.</p> <p>It is in our view not consistent with the Council's stated objectives or the NPPF to include the STIL-D proposal in the Draft Local Plan</p> <p>Under the summary of findings I would support options that have a 'minor negative effect' on biodiversity across the district.</p> <p>I encourage the use of policies 'NE4 (Protecting Designated Sites and Species), NE5 (Biodiversity Net Gain for Ecological Networks), NE2 (Protect and Enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure), NE1 (Protection of Green Spaces), NE3 (Protect and Enhance Landscape Character), NE6 (Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows) and NE7 (Protect and Enhance Waterways)'.</p> <p>And I support the conclusion that 'Overall, it is considered that the draft Local Plan will give rise to minor long term positive effects in relation to biodiversity due to the potential for protection and enhancement of habitats and the focus on connecting existing habitats to enhance the wider network'.</p>
--	--	--



Karen Roe	Moreby Wood Owners	<p>As a member of The Moreby Wood Owners Group I STRONGLY OBJECT to the STIL-D proposed site as it is in contradiction of the SA for the District. I support the vision for the Natural Environment: ‘To protect and enhance: important sites for nature conservation, and priority species; distinctive landscape character; green and blue infrastructure; air quality; strategic tree planting to support the ambitions for the White Rose Forest Project, local trees and hedgerow planting; nature recovery networks; and protect against pollution and deliver net gains in biodiversity’. And I agree with the SA Objective for Biodiversity: ‘Protect, conserve and enhance biodiversity, wildlife habitats and green infrastructure to achieve a net gain and reverse habitat fragmentation’. I agree with the Draft Plan Objective for the Natural Environment: ‘To ensure that development safeguards the district's high-quality natural environment and reduces the extent and impacts of climate change’. I acknowledge the Local Plan ‘natural environment draft objective (6) which has been assessed as strongly compatible with the SA objectives relating to biodiversity, climate change (mitigation and adaptation), land and soil and landscape. The strong compatibilities are positive where a protected natural environment is a key prerequisite for retaining rich biodiversity, for use in mitigating climate change via carbon sequestration as well as providing resilience to its effects. The natural environment also forms a core element of the landscape characteristics, especially in more rural areas. Selby Local Plan: Preferred Options Interim SA Report Prepared for: Selby District Council AECOM 21 To a similar extent, the compatibility has crossovers with SA objectives relating to land, soil and water resources, this is where protections from polluting sources and preservation of natural assets are promoted. The natural environment also brings benefits for naturally mitigating air pollution issues and serving as an asset for people to enjoy, which in turn boosts mental and physical health outcomes. The potentially incompatible SA objectives linked to Local Plan objective 6 are housing and the economy and employment, where the protection of the natural environment may act as a constraint to growth. However, economic activity may well involve the delivery of low carbon technologies, more sustainably performing homes and facilitate a move towards low carbon living. If the Plan seeks to address these issues in tandem, then the objectives are not necessarily incompatible’. However, the Council has not followed through on these objectives in the body of the draft plan. In particular, it has failed to follow the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on ancient woodlands, ancient and veteran trees: Paragraph 175c of the NPPF states that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists. The potential new Settlement at STIL-D does not fall within the scope of the exceptional circumstances cited in footnote 58 of the NPPF. Paragraph 177 of the NPPF states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where the plan or</p>
-----------	--------------------	---

		<p>project is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), unless an appropriate assessment has concluded that the plan or project will not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site. It is in our view not consistent with the Council's stated objectives or the NPPF to include the STIL-D proposal in the Draft Local Plan Under the summary of findings I would support options that have a 'minor negative effect' on biodiversity across the district. I encourage the use of policies 'NE4 (Protecting Designated Sites and Species), NE5 (Biodiversity Net Gain for Ecological Networks), NE2 (Protect and Enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure), NE1 (Protection of Green Spaces), NE3 (Protect and Enhance Landscape Character), NE6 (Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows) and NE7 (Protect and Enhance Waterways)'. And I support the conclusion that 'Overall, it is considered that the draft Local Plan will give rise to minor long term positive effects in relation to biodiversity due to the potential for protection and enhancement of habitats and the focus on connecting existing habitats to enhance the wider network'.</p>
--	--	---

J Watson	Moreby Wood Owners	<p>The Moreby Wood Owners Group STRONGLY OBJECT to the STIL-D proposed site as it is in contradiction of the SA for the District. The group supports the vision for the Natural Environment: 'To protect and enhance: important sites for nature conservation, and priority species; distinctive landscape character; green and blue infrastructure; air quality; strategic tree planting to support the ambitions for the White Rose Forest Project, local trees and hedgerow planting; nature recovery networks; and protect against pollution and deliver net gains in biodiversity'. And we agree with the SA Objective for Biodiversity: 'Protect, conserve and enhance biodiversity, wildlife habitats and green infrastructure to achieve a net gain and reverse habitat fragmentation'. We agree with the Draft Plan Objective for the Natural Environment: 'To ensure that development safeguards the district's high-quality natural environment and reduces the extent and impacts of climate change'. We acknowledge the Local Plan 'natural environment draft objective (6) which has been assessed as strongly compatible with the SA objectives relating to biodiversity, climate change (mitigation and adaptation), land and soil and landscape. The strong compatibilities are positive where a protected natural environment is a key prerequisite for retaining rich biodiversity, for use in mitigating climate change via carbon sequestration as well as providing resilience to its effects. The natural environment also forms a core element of the landscape characteristics, especially in more rural areas. Selby Local Plan: Preferred Options Interim SA Report Prepared for: Selby District Council AECOM 21 To a similar extent, the compatibility has crossovers with SA objectives relating to land, soil and water resources, this is where protections from polluting sources and preservation of natural assets are promoted. The natural environment also brings benefits for naturally mitigating air pollution issues and serving as an asset for people to enjoy, which in turn boosts mental and physical health outcomes. The potentially incompatible SA objectives linked to Local Plan objective 6 are housing and the economy and employment, where the protection of the natural environment may act as a constraint to growth. However, economic activity may well involve the delivery of low carbon technologies, more sustainably performing homes and facilitate a move towards low carbon living. If the Plan seeks to address these issues in tandem, then the objectives are not necessarily incompatible'. However, the Council has not followed through on these objectives in the body of the draft plan. In particular, it has failed to follow the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on ancient woodlands, ancient and veteran trees: Paragraph 175c of the NPPF states that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists. The potential new Settlement at STIL-D does not fall within the scope of the exceptional circumstances cited in footnote 58 of the NPPF. Paragraph 177 of the NPPF states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where the plan or</p>
----------	--------------------	--

		<p>project is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), unless an appropriate assessment has concluded that the plan or project will not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site. It is in our view not consistent with the Council's stated objectives or the NPPF to include the STIL-D proposal in the Draft Local Plan. Under the summary of findings we would support options that have a 'minor negative effect' on biodiversity across the district. We encourage the use of policies 'NE4 (Protecting Designated Sites and Species), NE5 (Biodiversity Net Gain for Ecological Networks), NE2 (Protect and Enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure), NE1 (Protection of Green Spaces), NE3 (Protect and Enhance Landscape Character), NE6 (Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows) and NE7 (Protect and Enhance Waterways)'. And we support the conclusion that 'Overall, it is considered that the draft Local Plan will give rise to minor long term positive effects in relation to biodiversity due to the potential for protection and enhancement of habitats and the focus on connecting existing habitats to enhance the wider network'.</p>
--	--	---

Amanda Finn		I would like further time to consider this and would appreciate the option to comment on the Sustainability Appraisal after the closing date. I feel that this must be communicated to residents of Selby when coronavirus restrictions allow
-------------	--	--

<p>Mr Mark Birtles N/A</p>		<p>As a member of The Moreby Wood Owners Group I STRONGLY OBJECT to the STIL-D proposed site as it is in contradiction of the SA for the District. I support the vision for the Natural Environment: 'To protect and enhance: important sites for nature conservation, and priority species; distinctive landscape character; green and blue infrastructure; air quality; strategic tree planting to support the ambitions for the White Rose Forest Project, local trees and hedgerow planting; nature recovery networks; and protect against pollution and deliver net gains in biodiversity'. And I agree with the SA Objective for Biodiversity: 'Protect, conserve and enhance biodiversity, wildlife habitats and green infrastructure to achieve a net gain and reverse habitat fragmentation'. I agree with the Draft Plan Objective for the Natural Environment: 'To ensure that development safeguards the district's high-quality natural environment and reduces the extent and impacts of climate change'. I acknowledge the Local Plan 'natural environment draft objective (6) which has been assessed as strongly compatible with the SA objectives relating to biodiversity, climate change (mitigation and adaptation), land and soil and landscape. The strong compatibilities are positive where a protected natural environment is a key prerequisite for retaining rich biodiversity, for use in mitigating climate change via carbon sequestration as well as providing resilience to its effects. The natural environment also forms a core element of the landscape characteristics, especially in more rural areas. Selby Local Plan: Preferred Options Interim SA Report Prepared for: Selby District Council AECOM 21 To a similar extent, the compatibility has crossovers with SA objectives relating to land, soil and water resources, this is where protections from polluting sources and preservation of natural assets are promoted. The natural environment also brings benefits for naturally mitigating air pollution issues and serving as an asset for people to enjoy, which in turn boosts mental and physical health outcomes. The potentially incompatible SA objectives linked to Local Plan objective 6 are housing and the economy and employment, where the protection of the natural environment may act as a constraint to growth. However, economic activity may well involve the delivery of low carbon technologies, more sustainably performing homes and facilitate a move towards low carbon living. If the Plan seeks to address these issues in tandem, then the objectives are not necessarily incompatible'. However, the Council has not followed through on these objectives in the body of the draft plan. In particular, it has failed to follow the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on ancient woodlands, ancient and veteran trees: Paragraph 175c of the NPPF states that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists. The potential new Settlement at STIL-D does not fall within the scope of the exceptional circumstances cited in footnote 58 of the NPPF. Paragraph 177 of the NPPF states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where the plan or</p>
--------------------------------	--	---

		<p>project is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), unless an appropriate assessment has concluded that the plan or project will not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site. It is in our view not consistent with the Council's stated objectives or the NPPF to include the STIL-D proposal in the Draft Local Plan Under the summary of findings I would support options that have a 'minor negative effect' on biodiversity across the district. I encourage the use of policies 'NE4 (Protecting Designated Sites and Species), NE5 (Biodiversity Net Gain for Ecological Networks), NE2 (Protect and Enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure), NE1 (Protection of Green Spaces), NE3 (Protect and Enhance Landscape Character), NE6 (Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows) and NE7 (Protect and Enhance Waterways)'. And I support the conclusion that 'Overall, it is considered that the draft Local Plan will give rise to minor long term positive effects in relation to biodiversity due to the potential for protection and enhancement of habitats and the focus on connecting existing habitats to enhance the wider network'.</p>
--	--	---

James Langler	Historic England	<p>SELBY PREFERRED OPTIONS LOCAL PLAN – INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Historic England about the Interim Sustainability Appraisal of the preferred options draft of the Selby Local Plan. In terms of our area of interest, we would broadly agree with the evaluation and conclusions regarding the likely impact which the policies and proposals of the Plan might have upon the historic environment. However, a number of specific comments are set out below. Firstly, we need to highlight that the summary of representations received on the SA Scoping Report (January 2020) set out at Appendix A is not a true reflection of the extent of Historic England's comments on this report. Currently, only our comment on monitoring the effects of the Local Plan, made in response to the Issues and Options Local Plan document, is included in the appendix. A copy of our response on the SA Scoping Report is attached. It is clear from a review of the updated SA Scoping Report, published in May 2020, that our comments have not been considered when preparing this document. We support the recommendation on heritage under Table 9.1 regarding the need to set out some general principles to guide development in Conservation Areas under Policy SG12 due to the absence of Conservation Area Appraisals for all designated areas in the District. We are aware that Selby District Council has recently published a number of draft appraisals for consultation which is a welcome sign that progress is being made on addressing this position. Finally, it is worth noting that the predicted effects of new development in Tadcaster are based on successfully implementing a heritage-led approach to regeneration and development in the town. It is therefore crucial that the Local Plan sets out a sufficiently robust policy position to guide the location, scale, type and design of new development to ensure that this ambition is realised, and significant adverse effects on the historic environment are avoided. This opinion is based on the information provided by you in the document dated January 2021 and, for the avoidance of doubt, does not affect our obligation to advise you on, and potentially object to any specific development proposal which may subsequently arise from this or later versions of the plan which is the subject to consultation, and which may, despite the SA/SEA, have adverse effects on the environment. If you have any queries about this or would like to discuss anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
CPRE North Yorkshire		The methodology used for the Sustainability Appraisal is appropriate.



